

# FAS Senate

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

FAS Senate Meeting

February 18, 2021

Open Session from 4 PM – 5:30 PM via Zoom

APPROVED

Present: Matthew Jacobson, Sybil Alexandrov, David Bercovici, Howard Bloch, Nicholas Christakis, Aimee Cox, Emily Erikson, Joseph Fischel, John Geanakoplos, Alessandro Gomez, Miki Havlickova, Valerie Horsley, Jennifer Klein, H el ene Landemore, William Nordhaus, Ruzica Piskac, Kathryn Slanski, Meg Urry, Paul Van Tassel, Steven Wilkinson

Rose Rita Riccitelli, Staff

Absent: Timothy Newhouse

Guests:

Alhassid, Yoram; Arkolakis, Costas; Asensio, Pilar; Aslanidis, Paris; Aziz, Muhammad; Baynes-Ross, Felisa; Bennett, Beth; Bowerman, Claire; Chen-Kraus, Chloe; Choi, Seungia; Coates, Emily; De La O's, Ana; Deming, Richard; Dolgova, Irina; Donoghue, Michael; Douglas Rogers; Dunn, Casey; Edward, Erika; Elbousty, Jonas; Feimster, Crystal; Fischer, Michael; Gage, Beverly; Gaifman, Milette; Garcia, Maripaz; Gehiker, Marion; Gendler, Tamar; Gerber, Alan; Goren, Shiri; Greenwood, Emily; Grimstad, Paul; Heeger, Karsten; Hirsch, Jennifer; Holland, Patrick; Huber, Gregory; Iacovella, Anna; Jackson, Kenneth David; Jewiss, Virginia' Kaliambou, Maria; Kalyanakrishnan, Sivaramakri; Kao, Grace; Klevorick, Al; Koga, Yukiko; Koundi, Soumia; Kraus, Chris; Kreiner, Tim; KristoNagy, Elka; Laguna, Albert; Lee-Smith, Angela; Lim, Hyunsung; Lofton, Kathryn; Lowe, Lisa; Marcus, Ivan; Margolin, Deborah; Maruyama, Reina; Menon, Alka; Messeri, Lisa; Najera, Luna; Nishimura, Hiroyo; Nyong'o, Tavia; Phillips, Laura; Pinzka, Lauren; Quinn, Ian; Ramos-Ruano, Juliana; Rankin, Bill; Roberts, Nathan; Sabe, Lourdes; Sabin, Paul; Samuelson, Larry; Savci, Evren; Schiffer, Peter; Schneider, Francoise; Semmel, Stuart; Shayesteh, F.; Sherak, Constance; Skiba, Witold; Skorupa, Candace; Smith, Tony; Solomon, Mark; Thomasson, Camille; Tierney, James; Titus, Julia; Toorawa, Shawkat; Tordin, Giseli; Tortora, Margherita; Toseland, Rebecca; Uskokov, Aleksandar; Valle, Sonia; Von Kunes, Karen; Warner, John; Washington, Ebonya; Wetters, Kirk; Wyrzten, Jonathan; Yamaguchi, Mika; Yeret, Orit; Yiengpruksawan, Mimi; Zanuttini, Raffaella

The closed session of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) was called to order by Chair **Matthew Jacobson** at 3:30 PM. No minutes will be provided for this closed session.

At 4 PM, FASS Chair **Matthew Jacobson** welcomed guests to the open session of the FASS meeting. He asked everyone to remember to fill out their nomination forms for the upcoming FASS election and reminding people that in order to keep the FASS going, we need good people to elect.

**Mr. Jacobson** introduced **Kathryn Lofton**, Divisional Dean for the Humanities, to speak on two subjects: the review of the status of instructional faculty; and the recent Graduate School report. **Dean Lofton** began by addressing the Doctoral Education Report, which she noted was the product of 8 months of labor by a 20-member committee made up of 50% students and 50% faculty. She noted that it emerged from a common feeling that there needs to be a serious and ongoing conversation about doctoral education. She also noted that the report is the result of 99 drafts, 350 survey responses from students and faculty, and consultations with every doctoral program in the Humanities. She observed the report's recommendations do not have a binding effect other than to offer advice to doctoral programs. In considering what reforms to make internally. It is also a route for collectives of faculty when they do not have a departmental outlet for admissions. She noted some highlights in the curriculum section that offer unprecedented encouragement to allow for student autonomy in thinking about language requirements, exceptions, ways to swap requirements for other kinds of professional development, and new ways for students to receive pedagogical training. She noted that an important aspect has to do with putting on paper a resource, for students and faculty alike, to think about categories such as advising, teaching, mentoring, the genre of their dissertation – and is something that every department should use and agree to. She said, in addition to input from faculty, the committee wanted to put forth an imperative that might involve students more in conversations about their educational future, and create a set of standards for advising and mentoring that was more collaborative than controlled by a single advisor. **Dean Lofton** opened the floor for questions about implementation, noting that this is a working group that is giving advice and cannot tell doctoral programs what to do. The committee, she said, will send their report to each doctoral program, and several programs that don't have doctoral programs but are interested parties, and to affiliated students, in order to encourage them to have conversations about doctoral education. She said she is pleased that the report offers support in the form of course releases for faculty and paid hourly labor for graduate students who get involved significantly in thinking about reform within their departments. **Mr. Jacobson** asked **Dean Lofton** as an educator, what her own hope is for what will come out of this report. **Dean Lofton** said that she came to Yale in 2009 and found doctoral education at Yale to be a significant and an important point of pride for faculty, yet there was very little conversation about it. She noted that, like magical thinking, we all value it and care deeply about our students, but we never put the words to it that people can provide voluminously about their research and methodology as thinkers, and this is a loss because we are leaders in doctoral education, and there is value in articulating what it is and how we know what works well. She said this is a small scale of hope she has that we will start externalizing more the challenges and opportunities that doctoral education provides and thinking more collaboratively about it so that we can be as innovative and as supportive of fields of study that have concern, and that without active and concentrated political effort, graduate education could be diminished in the years ahead by challenges of the academic job market. She says the number one ambition of the report is to encourage us to talk about this topic more overtly, collaboratively and inclusively,

especially with student voices. She also noted, on a personal level, that doctoral admissions are not perfectly matched with areas of innovation, and that we need to think of expanding doctoral education in fields that are not currently represented. She also mentioned the challenge of faculty misconduct. When she entered Yale as a junior faculty member, she was struck by the behaviors that were understood as the natural and appropriate aura of the greatness assigned to senior faculty which led to a way-too-wide degree of unacceptable behavior in the practice especially of doctoral education. She said she thinks that is unbefitting the honor that we have of being doctoral educators, and this report, especially in the sections on advising and teaching, give a strong moral mandate for how we can function as leaders and thinking about doctoral education as a political act and not just an act of perpetuating intellectual kingdoms. She called on **Valerie Horsley** for a question. **Ms. Horsley** said she is curious to know what is different about this report than just having conversations about doctoral studies and how it might change what is currently happening. **Jennifer Klein** added that it is often the case in conversations, when they take place, that the question is asked if disciplines are adapting to new ideas. She asked if this report has an alternative vision for people to consider. **Dean Lofton** noted the challenges that are present in the academic market, and that one of the things the report does is to create a baseline of honesty about it. She said she was moved by the responses received from students who said they came to Yale to become professors, even though they knew that it was a future that would be hard to achieve. The report acknowledges this truth while continuing to play a very strong role in helping them to achieve their goal. She said we can tell students when they get here, that the reality is that 47% will achieve their goal of becoming an academic, and the rest will need to figure out how to transform this extraordinary, secure opportunity to a future of being an intellectual leader in whatever professional path they choose. And, she said, "let's start thinking about this now and adjust some of the requirements to meet the challenges should they occur." She was happy that **Dean Lynn Cooley** has committed to an ongoing, standardized number of admissions of doctoral students, noting they may not be distributed exactly the same way every year. However we will commit to having a level of doctoral education. With the commitment from **Dean Cooley** that doctoral education is a part of our non-profit obligation, and also being honest that it is an imperfect market, **Dean Lofton** hopes this creates a healthier environment for recognizing our students' diversity and their outcomes.

**Dean Lofton** turned to the topic of instructional faculty and noted that, until she spent time as a FAS Senate senator, where she was schooled and educated by her colleague on the Senate Shiri Goren, she knew nothing of the radical differences associated with instructional faculty. She also mentioned that when she was chair of the Department of Religious Studies, she realized that the department could not exist without the instructional faculty who teach the languages necessary for its research excellence. She also did not realize that this University's hierarchy of cruelty, which junior faculty know well, was more brutal upon our instructional faculty without whom we cannot exist, and yet who are subjected constantly and daily to these nips and tucks which we apply to them. She said that **Ms. Goren** and other senators wrote a wonderful report, and that some of the changes proposed in that report were applied; however, many were not. **Dean Lofton** said that when she became Dean of the Humanities and we hit our crisis point last March with Covid, she was personally struck and devastated by how easily and quickly instructional faculty could be used as a budget relief, which is not possible if you want to maintain true

research and educational continuity in the university's fields of excellence. **Dean Lofton** wants to think about how we can be more transparent about the occupational life of instructional faculty, specifically in the Humanities. She noted that she cares about all instructional faculty. However, she also noted that they are paid better in the other divisions. She spoke about three main areas of concern:

1. Rank and title (too many titles exist and we need better titling)
2. Equity (benefits, course equivalents, etc.)
3. Governance (promotions, etc.)

**Dean Lofton** asked for comments and questions from the audience.

**Aimee Cox** noted that instructional faculty she has spoken with are not able to plan for the future because their contracts are only for one year at a time. She asked if this is department specific or if all instructional faculty contracts are more generally on a year-to-year basis. **Dean Lofton** said that this is one of the issues brought up last March, and one that shockingly she was not aware of: 50% of the 210 instructional faculty are on these one-year appointments, which leads to a very precarious life. She said that the University would say that some of these individuals prefer a one-year appointment. However, we all know that number is less than 50%. **Dean Lofton** remarked that the problem would have to be addressed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the continuity of our curriculum is met and that the needs of individuals filling these appointments are considered. **Joseph Fischel** noted that he was able to find the breakdown of average salaries for assistant professors, associate professors, lecturers, and asked if there could be a publication of salaries for instructional faculty separated by division. **Dean Lofton** said that the committee is looking at things like per course rate, the range of per course rate, and thinking about our peer institutions. She said that when the CESOF committee looked at the issue of underpayment of Yale faculty, instructional faculty were not part of their study. And, she noted, when we look at our peer institutions, we found that they also pay instructional faculty poorly and that this is a national category of person, as valuable as they are, who are not treated as equals. She said that we need faculty to step forward and lead and imagine that the pay equity is of value. Even if it in some ways affects all of us, we should demand that Yale leap ahead in treating its instructional faculty better than our competitors. **Karen von Kunes** noted that it is not only the contracts and salaries that are problems, but also that instructional faculty are trapped in this situation and have no prospects to move up to an assistant professor position or higher. We, she said, are not taken seriously, and although she is widely published, she has been told that her publications do not count. She feels that the instructional faculty issues definitely need reform. **Dean Lofton** agreed and said that she was struck that we don't reward research of instructional faculty. She said that she believes that Yale tenured faculty believe that they could not function without instructional faculty, and that we need to find a way to work together to remunerate and recognize and value that labor. **Ms. Klein** asked for clarification of the course load inequity, and how course loads are arranged. **Dean Lofton** said that there are principles that guide these appointments that vary with each appointment, and the committee plans to issue a list of the principles as a guide to follow in structuring instructional faculty appointments. In closing, **Dean Lofton** said that she welcomes thoughts and ideas on this project and asked people to e-mail her directly.

**Mr. Jacobson** thanked Dean Lofton for her thoughtful comments about instructional faculty, taking what is most commonly thought of as a provostial question and turning it into a philosophical and ethical question, one that we all are called upon to think about. He said that we have been fighting to close the gap of the salaries at Yale and the salaries of our peers, and have been told that the biggest gap is at the upper end of the pay scale. However, he said, that we all know that the people who are getting crushed are the people who are at the lower end of the pay scale. He thanked **Dean Lofton** for her leadership and vision.

**Mr. Jacobson** introduced **Costas Arkolakis**, the chair of the 2020/21 CESOF (Committee on the Economic Status of Faculty) to present the committee's preliminary findings. **Mr. Arkolakis** noted the committee members: **Veneeta Dayal, Casey Dunn, Milette Gaifman, Beverly Gage, Rebecca Kramer-Bottiglio, Elka KristoNagy, Douglas Rogers and Robert Burger**. He noted that the committee was supported by the FAS Dean's Office and especially **Dean Tamar Gendler and Robert Burger** who supplied the committee with a flow of data for the committee to do their analysis. The committee, he said, was also supported by the team at the OIR (Office of Institutional Research). He noted that the committee is not done with their work, and that they have four major subcommittees. Today we will discuss salary issues, but at a future date we can talk about other topics that the committee is working on such as non-salary issues and the response to the pandemic. He noted that part of his presentation is based on confidential data from the OIR which they approved for him to share with the FAS Senate, but it should not be discussed outside of the FAS Senate until it becomes part of the committee's public report. He noted that CESOF's 2018 committee findings spurred the 2020/21 committee to discuss faculty compensation and declining faculty salaries in relation to our peers, and to revisit and update this information from the last two years. The committee is also looking at other interesting aspects of faculty economic status. He said he will talk about data sources, about methodology, and he conclude with their significant findings, which, he pointed out, are not yet completed. He stressed that they are obtaining the data used by the committee from the OIR, and that, in order to use it, the committee must adhere to OIR rules regarding restrictions for sharing this information. **Mr. Arkolakis** pointed to the three data sources used by the committee on salaries:

- AAUP (American Association of University Professors)  
Public Data: current. 1979-2019. Not granular. Average salary by rank for entire university including professional schools but School of Medicine.
- AAUDE (Association of American Universities Data Exchange)  
Confidential data. Lag of 2 years. 2008-2018. Very granular (department level)
- COFHE (Consortium on Financing Higher Education)  
Confidential Date. Lag of 3 years. 1998-2017. Quite granular (school-level)

**Mr. Arkolakis** noted that AAUDE data has a lag of 2 years and is confidential data administered only through OIR, while the AAUP is current (up to 1 year) and is at the departmental level. He said we would like to get it at the division level to have a better picture

He said that the COFHE is also confidential data, is not as good, and we prefer the AAUDE data.

**Mr. Arkolakis** talked about the methodology that is based on this data:

- Universities report to Data Collection Authorities
- Data Collection Authorities Compile data
- Comparison can be done at the level of granularity at which we have the data

He said that according to the research of the committee, Yale should only report base salary (9 month salary). He noted that if you look at the AAUP requests, “Salary”, this figure represents the contracted academic year salary for full-time faculty members excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration.” He noted that the AAUDE instructions state, “Include the faculty member’s regular annualized, full-time equivalent contract salary....this is the salary a faculty member would receive for the entire year (academic or fiscal) at a 1.00 FTE rate...” And “Exclude all supplemental stipends. This was a change in 2013-14, previous instructions said to include stipends if they exist for the duration of the person’s appointment year. Starting with 2013-14, we ask that institutions provide base salary values only.” He said that within data, we can do many more comparisons – Note: within Yale Micro Comparisons done using Yale micro data (by gender, age, etc.), we have no updated data yet and it is to be included in the 2020 CESOF report.

**Mr. Arkolakis** talked about what should be included, and said – base salary. He then noted what should not be included – summer 9<sup>th</sup> provided by Yale; mortgage reimbursement; other ongoing faculty support; extra 9ths from grants (compensation for Chair, summer teaching, etc.) He noted that an earlier iteration with OIR caused a significant delay as it included 9<sup>th</sup>, mortgage payments, etc., and was inconsistent with the above definition and with previous CESOF data.

**Ms. Horsley** said that she has always been curious about these rules about data and who is making them. She asked if the data rules were Yale rules or legal rules? **Mr. Arkolakis** said he is bound to the rules of OIR, which gives us this data. He noted that some of the OIR rules are imposed in order to share our data with other universities. In order to be part of this consortium, you need to follow its rules. He noted that he cannot say that this is true for all of the OIR data. However, it is something that he is responsible for, has no control over, or understands completely. **Ms. Horsley** said that she understands that OIR is a Yale entity. **Mr. Arkolakis** said that the Yale data that OIR reports to the consortium is their choice, as it is with other schools, and he can only report what he receives from OIR as confidential information the committee has received from them, so it is information that is not to be shared outside of this meeting. **Mr. Arkolakis** shared data comparing Yale and its peers, and in the 1980’s and 1990’s we were roughly at the level of our peers in terms of salaries, and in 2000, we see a slow but persistent decline up to 2017, and in the last two data points, there has been a consistent rise in the data point in comparison to our peers. This shows that the declines have stopped and there has been a slight catchup (we observe 2 percentage points improvement in 2 years.) The problem with the AAUP data is that they include professional schools and in addition, do not put the proper weight on the size of departments – different universities have different composition. This issue, he said, will be resolved, and we can look at the levels of the wages by looking at the AAUDE data. He noted that looking at the AAUDE data with the AAUP data, we get a better picture of the levels because AAUDE excludes professional schools. He said what we see is that it

is true that there was a decline starting in 2008, but the decline is not as fast as reported in the AAUP data (of full professor salaries) and there is a small uptake to the level of the year we have that the AAUP reported. **Mr. Arkolakis** did say that the gap is still sizable, >7 pp in the AAUP data and more than ~5 pp in the AAUDE data that does not include professional schools. This means, he said, that the gap is significant compared to our peers. He then said that, looking at the AAUDE data, we were able to see the findings by divisions (Biological & Physical Science and Engineering, Humanities, and Social Sciences) up to 2018. This was looked at for 10 years comparing Yale to our peers for full professor salaries by division. We found that the gap was not very significant in the Humanities; the Social Sciences declined more but then rose to almost to the level of our peers. However, he noted that this was not true for the Biological & Physical Science and Engineering, with the decline being consistent with no major upturn. He noted that the bottom line is that the level of administrative response seems to vary by divisions:

- The effort to boost wages in Social Sciences has been *significant*
- In Humanities rather *moderate*
- In Biological & Physical Sciences and Engineering *not significant*

In terms of levels response led to catchup in some divisions.

- There is minor gap (or small premium) in Social Sciences/Humanities
- A significant gap in Biological & Physical Sciences and Engineering remains

**Paul VanTassel** asked what effect it would have if you changed the peer group – if you threw out one or two schools from the peer group used. Would you still get the same results? **Mr. Arkolakis** said that with some schools, we are doing better or roughly the same, and unless we removed our leading peers, the picture will look similar. **Nicholas Christakis** said that the previous graph showed by division is relative movement, but the absolute levels – let's say Yale is underpaying which is clear in the Physical and Biological Sciences – but noted that maybe those salaries are higher in absolute terms than the other areas and Yale is choosing to compete in different areas, for example or treating faculty across divisions more equally. **Mr. Arkolakis** said that is correct. **Mr. Christakis** also said that he does not consider the recent rise on the chart to be significant – that it could be just a blip and not as **Mr. Arkolakis** sees it - as a significant rise. **Casey Dunn** added that the growing gap – the decline – is because since the early 2000's, the gains in salaries in other institutions has gone up more quickly than here. He also said that the peer group is very small. **Ms. Horsley** asked about the Biological and Science data because many of the scientific disciplines are paid in 12 months. Are some of the peers comparing 12 month salaries and what are the actual salaries that are being compared? **Mr. Arkolakis** thinks that if you look at 12 months, it should be equivalent to a 9 month salary. **Ms. Horsley** asked that this be verified as true because some people take summer salary from their grants. **Mr. Arkolakis** assured **Ms. Horsley** that summer salary from grants is not counted in salary calculations. **Ms. Horsley** said that, as a scientist, she wants to go on record as being very angry at Yale. **Alessandro Gomez** said what angers him is that some of us, including senators, are treated like children and basically are not considered responsible enough for OIR to share their data with. He noted that OIR does not decide policy, so presumably it is the Provost who imposes certain constraints to them. He asked **Mr. Arkolakis** what prevents another colleagues of his to look at, for example, the AAUDE granular files so he can understand department by department where we stand. **Mr. Arkolakis** said that as a member of CESOF, he wants to cooperate with the OIR to

get the best data from them and therefore he has agreed to obey their rules. He is not in charge of the decision. However, he agreed to ask if the data can be shared with others not on the committee, and if they decline, he will stop there. **Mr. Dunn** noted that the data being shared here today is the data that we have received from OIR, and OIR is not giving us the raw data that they receive but aggregating the information before giving it to us. **Mr. Gomez** noted that this is troublesome because there are many ways of manipulating data and we don't know exactly what is getting filtered. **Mr. Christakis** asked why administrators at Yale have any more right to this information than professors, and what is the reason that the raw data cannot be shared with the CESOF committee members. **Mr. Dunn** said that CESOF has reproduced the plots that were in the prior report so that we can ask the questions that people have from that previous report. He said some of the plots were generated only in the last couple of weeks which will create a new level of questions. He said that CESOF has not probed the full limits of what OIR can share with us and said they will be pushing for more granularity than what we now have. **Tony Smith**, the previous CESOF chair, spoke about the restrictions on data access, noting that in the previous CESOF report, we pushed for as much data as we were allowed to get, but OIR is bound by legal agreements to participate in this data sharing agreement and there are legal and very clear rules which prevent them from sharing data with a broader audience. He added that, if we violate those rules, we would not be allowed to participate in these data sharing agreements. At the time, he noted, we pushed as far as we could on granularity and what we could report to the whole faculty at Yale. **Mr. Jacobson** asked **Mr. Smith** if it were possible that we could get information that is more granular if it were anonymized – we could see by department what is going on but we would not know which departments were which. He asked if something like that would be of any use? **Mr. Smith** said the members of CESOF were able to see more than could be discussed at a FASS meeting, and we were able to see some departmental data anonymized; but, in the end, we did not feel it was as useful as the data that we reported. He felt it is not correct to think that the administration is trying to hide things from us because they made a very good faith effort to show us everything that they are allowed to show us in a public report. **Mr. Arkolakis** said he sees the start of a reversal of Yale's fortune in terms of faculty salaries and thinks this trend will continue. He noted that there was a swift administrative response but perhaps somewhat moderate. He also noted that there is a significant gap in Physical Sciences and Engineering, and Yale needs to close the gap to compete with peers in an era of technological and data supremacy. **Doug Rogers**, speaking as a member of CESOF and as a former senator, talked about some of the questions the committee is thinking about that are not necessarily about data comparisons. He is part of a subcommittee of CESOF – The Institutional Process Committee – that is doing research, will write a report and make recommendations on the general process and provide clarity on the questions of who has access to what and when and whether there are any recommendations that can be made about improving those things. He gave examples: his understanding is that the access to the data is conditioned on agreements that everyone in that consortium commit to, and is a fairly hard constraint within which we work. If confidentiality is one part of the constraint, he asked if there are ways in which we can make recommendations to improve that process and make more transparent the way this all works within the confines of the binding agreements that Yale and other institutions enter into in order to share this data? He also mentioned the fact that CESOF does not provide information on instructional faculty, and asked what kind of information can we provide in that area. **Mr. Rogers** said the committee



welcomes suggestions to help us work through these issues. He said the hope is to provide a piece of this report that is not actually numbers but may help to describe and make recommendations about the process in which we all engage to work on these issues. **Mr. Arkolakis** said that this is the latest data that we have from AAUP and AAUDE and we may receive new data later that we can share. **William Nordhaus** thanked **Mr. Arkolakis** for his report and noted that it was nice to see that the committee picked up where the last CESOF committee left off. He then offered three comments:

- On the rule of disclosure, he said this is not something that has been made up by the current administration and it has been in place for many years, and once CESOF was formed, we were able to get access to this data. He said before CESOF, there was no access to this data.
- Regarding instructional faculty, he thought there were rules within the AAUP to get data on compensation for instructional faculty and feels it would be good for us to push for that.

**Mr. Nordhaus** asked if the ratios used were ratios of means or medians. **Mr. Dunn** said that they were means. **Mr. Nordhaus** noted that the mean may be slightly noisier than the medians, so it may be interesting to look at the medians. He said that another thing that the committee might do is to get the dispersion among schools. He commented that even though the upturn is only a blip, it is very welcome and we thank the administration for doing it. However it is only a fraction of the way and we have quite a way to go until we get back to par. **Mr. Christakis** said he understands that they cannot share confidential information and asked if there are people at Yale who get confidential information from OIR collaboration that members of CESOF cannot get, who are presumably staff at Yale? And, he went on, if "Yes," why would Yale agree to those terms - what is so bad about our faculty that they cannot be trusted with the data? **Mr. Dunn** said he will ask for the full schema of the data set available and will report back to the FASS on whether he is successful. **Mr. Christakis** asked **Mr. Dunn** if there were others at Yale who have more data than he. **Mr. Dunn** said yes, they are the people who are aggregating these data out of the data bases they have and putting it into a format that we can digest. He emphasized that they have been very responsive; however, he noted, they have not probed the limits all the way. **Mr. Arkolakis** noted that the people at OIR are experts and professionals of very high regard. **Mr. Smith** noted that all universities are bound by the same set of rules, and it might be in Yale's interest at least for people in decision-making positions, to have access to more data. He said that the OIR sees all of the data and provides statistics to CESOF, and they are very professional and very serious researchers, and are bound by rules that he thinks are the same for all universities. **Mr. Gomez** pointed out that this all may be true for the peer institutions; however, it is not true for the state institutions, as each of us can find out to the penny what state institutions are spending. He said even though the OIR is bound by these agreements, would it make sense for us or somebody from OIR to collect data from state schools and make comparisons that would probably put us to shame. **Michael Fischer** said he appreciates all the efforts that went into getting this data, however on a different dimension, what matters in our competitive stance in trying to hire the best faculty and attract the best graduate and undergraduate students, and what counts here is the perception of how Yale is doing rather than the blips on the graph. **John Geanakoplos** thanked **Mr. Arkolakis** for his report. He noted that the AAUP data goes back to 1970 when we were ahead of our competitors, which makes this a more dramatic decline, and there is no reason why Yale should aspire to only being equal to our peers as opposed to being the best or in the top few, for example, as we were in the 1970's. Also, he said, the committee is

only looking at 9 month salaries because that is easier to compare across time and it's what previous reports were based on. He said that more and more, the packages that professors are being offered involve summer stipends, mortgages, free living at Columbia and things like that, and these are very important factors in compensation that should be looked at and even if you cannot go backwards in time to gather this data, if you could get access to it now, it would give a more accurate portrayal of where we are. You may even find that Yale lags even further behind than thought, or even perhaps further ahead, and these things often contribute to the decision of where a person goes. If, he said, the committee can get access to that data now, it would give a more accurate portrayal of our relative standing because in his experience, those extra dimensions of the offer often turn out to affect where the person goes. **Mr. Arkolakis** said the committee can and will collect the data from Yale on things offered other than salaries, however we cannot get that information about other universities. **Meg Urry** said her question relates to how she has seen people's salaries increase as a department chair. First, she noted, there is a huge range among faculty whose contributions and quality are not reflected in their actual salaries, but what she has noticed is that they change dramatically when they receive an outside offer. She said this seems to be the single most, and perhaps the only, way that salary increases. She wonders if all the signal in these plots is from individuals getting outside offers, and if this is right. Is this what we all should be doing? She asked if Yale is telling us that we don't value you unless you have an outside offer – she hopes not, however fears that this is the only way that we are making gains. She asked if there is some way that CESOF can find this out. **Mr. Arkolakis** asked if this is about new offers. **Ms. Urry** said she would like to know where the gains are – are they in new offers being higher than previous offers, or with the highflyers who want to be retained and kept from going somewhere else, or could it be that everyone got, instead of a 2% pool to work from, a 2 1/2% or 3% pool. These, she noted, whether it's retention or addressing the economic status of the faculty as a whole, are two completely different things, and it would be good to know what is actually happening. **Mr. Arkolakis** noted that this is a good suggestion, and he will check with OIR on whether they can provide this data for Yale. **Beverly Gage** said, in projecting ahead, she is on CESOF and is part of a mini-committee that is looking into three areas of non-salary compensation within Yale to get a sense of how they are being distributed. The first, she said, is stipends (cash compensation), the second is mortgage and housing support, the third is tuition and school support, and it appears we have already received some of the data we have asked for and hope to get a sense of how these non-salary proportions are distributed between departments, around questions of gender, and are used for retention or recruitment packages. This, she noted, is not something we can do comparatively; however, it is the hope, and she feels it is true, that those data will come out in some sense for the first time, and that should be interesting. She noted another area we are looking into is teaching load compared to other universities and is a particular issue in the Humanities and in certain areas of the social sciences where Yale is on a 2-2 load and peer schools are on a 2-1 load, so any information senators may have in this area would be useful.

**Mr. Jacobson** thanked **Mr. Arkolakis** and members of the CESOF committee for their presentation and said that they have a standing invitation to visit the FASS anytime they feel that they have anything to report. He said that the FASS is at their service and if there is anything we can do to add to the work of the committee, we will be happy to help.

**Mr. Jacobson** adjourned the FASS meeting at 5:30 PM.