

FAS Senate

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

Minutes for the FAS Senate Meeting

Thursday, April 13, 2017

HGS 211, 322 York Street

APPROVED

In attendance: Chair Emily Greenwood, Deputy Chair/Secretary Doug Rogers, David Bercovici, Jill Campbell, Beverly Gage, John Geanakoplos, Shiri Goren, John Harris, Matthew Jacobson, Ruth Koizim, Christina Kraus, Kathryn Lofton, Reina Maruyama, Mark Mooseker, Yair Minsky, William Rankin, Katie Trumpener, Charles Schmuttenmaer, Ian Shapiro, Vesla Weaver, Karen Wynn

Absent: William Nordhaus

Guests: Sybil Alexandrov, Jennifer Allen, Adel Allouche, Sidney Cahn, Hsiu-hsien Chan, Stan Eisenstat, Tamar Gendler, Nancy Levene, Yoshiko Maruyama, Tim Robinson, Joel Rosenbaum, Lourdes Sabè, Angela Lee Smith, Mari Stever, Julia Titus, Sonia Valle, Karen van Kunes, Bethany Zemba, William Zhou

Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) Chair, Emily Greenwood, called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM. Ms. Greenwood noted that the FASS is having elections in May. The Nominations Committee will send information on the nominations process to all FAS faculty with instructions on how to participate. John Geanakoplos asked which of the current senators' terms will be up. Ms. Greenwood explained that when the initial FASS was elected in 2015, some senators were randomly assigned two-year terms and the remaining were assigned three-year terms to ensure that there would not be a complete change-over after two years. She said that she would send an e-mail to the senate members to remind them who is on a two-year term and who is on a three-year term.

Ms. Greenwood noted that Stan Eisenstat asked if the FASS draft minutes from the previous meeting could be posted on the FASS website a few days before the next meeting for all to view. She said that this was discussed by the FASS Executive Council (EC) and all agreed this was a good idea and to bring it up before the entire FASS to vote on. Charles Schmuttenmaer moved that the draft of the FASS meeting minutes be put on the FASS website on the Monday before the next meeting. Karen Wynn seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Greenwood reported that she and Doug Rogers met with two trustees from the Yale Corporation and updated them on what the FASS is doing. She said that the topics covered included the work of the committee on the status, pay, and conditions of non-ladder faculty, issues of overall faculty size and excellence, and other topics. Ms. Greenwood, Mr. Rogers, and the trustees also discussed general matters of faculty governance.

Ms. Greenwood noted that there is one more meeting of the FASS for this year taking place on May 11, 2017. Topics will include an open conversation by Tony Smith, chair of CESOF (the committee on the economic status of the faculty); a presentation by Richard Bribiescas, Deputy Provost for Faculty

Development and Diversity; and any unfinished business carried over from this meeting.

Ms. Greenwood presented the minutes from the FASS meeting of March 9, 2017 for review, comments, and corrections. There were none. Mr. Geanakoplos made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 9, 2017 FASS meeting, and Matthew Jacobson seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Greenwood asked for reports from FASS committees.

William Nordhaus was not present to report on the Budget Committee and Jill Campbell said that there was no new business to report.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer said that there was no new business from the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusivity.

Vesla Weaver reported on the Nominations Committee which is working with the Elections Committee to facilitate upcoming Senate elections.

Jill Campbell reported that the Peer Advisory Committee had some reoccurrences of issues that faculty members had brought to the committee last year, most of which had to do with factors affecting the careers and working conditions of non-ladder faculty. She said that, looking ahead to one of the FASS's main orders of business, the Peer Advisory Committee recommends the establishment of a dedicated unit for non-ladder faculty within the FAS Dean's Office so that these issues have an institutional basis for being addressed.

Yair Minsky reported on the Faculty Advancement Committee and noted that the survey that the committee has been working on is close to done and the next step will be to get a small pilot version of the survey running with 15 or more people to give their responses.

Ruth Koizim reported that the Yale College Expansion Committee had received no updates about progress on the expansion.

Christina Kraus, who sits on the Bass library committee along with Mark Mooseker, reported on the possible Bass Library renovation. She noted that Susan Gibbons, University Librarian and Deputy Provost for Collections and Scholarly Communication, has been remarkably responsive to faculty concerns. The Bass committee has approved a document, to be circulated soon, that contains a number of proposed next steps including having consultation with faculty and students about how they conceive of the space in Bass. Ms. Kraus said that Ms. Gibbons also proposes to work with a consultant who specializes in academic and research space and will look at the situation in the Bass Library.

Ms. Greenwood noted that there is no news from the Committee on Committees.

Doug Rogers reported on the Committee on Institutional Policy, noting that William Nordhaus is the chair of this committee and is not here to present the report. Mr. Rogers explained that this committee is a sub-committee of the FASS Executive Council and was formed last fall to deal with issues that come up when the Senate receives a set of questions from faculty that do not warrant the establishment of a large committee or a report. He said that in this case, the committee was following up on a number of

questions about the status of faculty e-mail (where it is stored, who has access to it, etc.). The committee was in touch with Helen Caines who chairs the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITSAC), and who brought this issue to her committee. In response to these queries, the ITS office produced an FAQ document on Faculty E-Mail Retention and Access, distributed at today's Senate meeting. Mr. Rogers asked the FASS to review the document and asked for permission to send it to FAS faculty through FASS email. He noted that, if additional questions come back, the committee will continue the conversation with the ITSAC. Ms. Greenwood made a motion to distribute a copy of this report to FAS faculty. Vesla Weaver seconded the motion. A vote was taken and was unanimous to distribute, through FASS email, the Faculty E-Mail Retention and Access Report to all faculty in FAS.

Mr. Rogers took over as chair for the next agenda item – a discussion on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS. Ms. Greenwood noted the members of the committee: Shiri Goren and herself as co-chairs; Ruth Koizim, Jonathan Reuning-Scherer and Charles Schmuttenmaer, who were present at this meeting; and Rona Ramos and Joseph Wolinski, who were not able to attend this meeting. Ms. Greenwood explained that the committee's report is 64 pages, with 30 pages of narrative and 34 pages of data tables. She said that the committee sees its Report on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty as, in part, a continuation of the work done by the FASS last year, including reports of the Yale College Expansion Committee and the Diversity and Inclusivity Committee. She said that it was clear to the committee, from the 237 non-ladder faculty responses to the Senate survey, that the status, pay and conditions of non-ladder faculty at Yale have historically been neglected. The committee approached the research and writing of this report as a friendly and constructive project, and was in regular communication with the FAS Dean's Office. The committee hopes that its report will inform and be useful to work that the FAS Dean's Office is already doing. The committee appreciates the initiatives that the Dean's Office has already put in place, such as setting up conference funding for some non-ladder faculty and reviewing the question of opportunities to apply for teaching development leave, but these initiatives are not sufficient. She pointed out a very serious issue that many of the narrative responses to the survey brought to light: the alienation, invisibility, and neglect of non-ladder faculty. The survey revealed low morale, lack of recognition, lack of career advancement and stagnating pay, and also concerns about future job security and options for career advancement. She noted that 237 non-ladder faculty took the survey, which is a response rate of 57%. She pointed to figures from the Office of Intuitional Research (OIR) stating that non-ladder faculty in FAS number 410, or 38% of the faculty, and reiterated that the charge of the FASS is to represent all FAS faculty – both ladder and non-ladder. She noted that the issues facing non-ladder faculty are national and are often difficult to examine because record-keeping about non-ladder and non-tenured faculty is so poor across the country and at Yale. She said that the report on the status, pay and conditions of non-ladder faculty also leads to questions about ladder faculty. How, for instance, is the FASS going to emphasize increasing the size of ladder faculty in FAS while also addressing the status, pay and conditions of non-ladder faculty in FAS? She noted that the committee sees the lack of priority devoted to non-ladder careers as eroding the very idea of what it means to have qualified faculty to teach, work, and conduct their research in a university. The extent of non-recognition and career advancement for non-ladder faculty in FAS is so severe that it creates a crisis for how faculty work is recognized, acknowledged, and rewarded within the institution. She said that the report also says that it is in the interest of the entire faculty to have all faculty career tracks at Yale be well rewarded and recognized.

Ms. Greenwood introduced Ruth Koizim to begin presenting the recommendations of the report. Ms. Koizim began by recognizing John Mangan and Bob Burger from the FAS Deans office and thanking them for organizing a working group in that office to work on the issues for the status, pay and conditions of non-ladder faculty in FAS. She noted that it is very important that some issues are already being addressed but that there is still work to be done. She spoke on record keeping as a major challenge: if we do not know who all the non-ladder faculty are, then it is difficult to communicate with them. Some are excluded from being informed and from participating in various situations and activities. The report, she said, recommends that there be a dedicated unit for non-ladder faculty within the FAS Dean's Office. It would be good to investigate what our peer institutions are doing and make note if there are things that we can learn from them or things that we should not do to replicate their errors.

Charles Schmuttenmaer spoke to the report's recommendation that the administration carefully review the compensation for non-ladder faculty, with the goal of increasing salaries of people who have been at Yale for a very long time. He said that, given that annual raises are typically less than inflation, people who have been here for many years actually are paid less than recently hired people who may have the same qualifications but less experience. He said that the recommendation is not only to conduct a comprehensive review, but to make structural adjustments for non-ladder faculty who have been at Yale for a long time.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer spoke about the possibility of having a more robust merit review for non-ladder faculty raises and having enhanced opportunities for non-ladder faculty to have paid leave. Although there are currently some opportunities, the application process is very cumbersome and off-putting. He said that the recommendation is that full-time non-ladder faculty who have been in the teaching ranks for six years or more be eligible for the privilege of a semester of paid leave, with the privilege recurring at six year intervals thereafter. The recommendation suggests that teaching faculty who have a proven record of excellence in teaching / service / research be able to apply for this leave by submitting a brief description of the project proposed for the period of leave (no longer than a single page). Whereas the current (very limited) leave scheme restricts projects to research related to teaching, the committee recommends that leave be granted for original projects that contribute to Yale's core academic mission, including writings articles and/or books, research into pedagogy and teaching innovation, the creation of new teaching materials, digital humanities projects, creative writing, and dramaturgy, etc. Mr. Schmuttenmaer noted that the report recommends that no member of the teaching faculty in the non-ladder ranks teach full-time in Yale College for more than ten consecutive years without paid leave, and that they should be automatically eligible for a semester of paid leave, providing that they are in good standing in their department/program.

Shiri Goren spoke on the parental leave policy recommendation and the committee's firm belief that there should be one parental leave policy for all teaching faculty, ladder and non-ladder alike, which is currently not the case. She mentioned that this morning President Salovey sent a message saying that Yale was ranked as one of the best places for women to work. Ms. Goren pointed out that this is not the case for non-ladder women faculty and non-ladder faculty parents.

Ms. Goren spoke about retirement benefits for non-ladder faculty that need to be addressed, such as library privileges and e-mail privileges. Also, the committee recommends that members of the non-ladder teaching faculty who, at the time of their 65th birthday, have worked at Yale in full-time employment for ten consecutive years or more, be eligible for a simple phased retirement scheme

enabling faculty to teach a half load at half pay for their last two years of employment at Yale, with no reduction in benefits.

Ms. Koizim noted that, before working on this report, she was unaware of the number of people who are on regular part-time teaching duties at Yale, year after year, and have had to patch together a living by taking jobs elsewhere. These individuals, she noted, teach at Yale out of devotion to this institution. By the time they pay for their accommodation and travel during the days that they are in New Haven, their take-home pay can be quite small. Therefore, she said, one of the recommendations is to investigate the possibility of subsidized accommodation for part-time non-ladder teaching faculty on multi-year contracts. She then spoke about compensation for summer teaching and said that at present, many non-ladder teaching faculty who teach for Yale's summer session are paid at the same rate as graduate student instructors. It is the committee's recommendation that the FAS Dean's Office work with the Dean of Yale Summer Session and the Provost's Office to ensure a more equitable compensation scale for non-ladder faculty instructors who teach for Yale's summer session, so that compensation is commensurate with the position, experience, and expertise of each non-ladder faculty instructor.

Ms. Goren spoke about the committee's recommendation for improved opportunities for career advancement, noting that the committee strongly urges the FAS Dean's Office to establish a framework for enhanced opportunities for career advancement and promotion for non-ladder faculty. The committee recommends clear communication of the different policies and procedures for promotion, and the publication of standard minimum raises associated with promotion between ranks, similar to current practices at some of Yale's peer institutions. In addition to increasing equality and transparency, she noted that having explicit pathways for career advancement will aid with recruitment of excellent faculty into the non-ladder ranks. Ms. Goren said that spousal hires are a crucial issue and the committee recommends that the FAS Dean's Office review the status and conditions of faculty who have entered the non-ladder faculty as so-called spousal hires. First, she said, the committee recommends an alternative term, since "spousal hire" undermines the professional autonomy and academic self-determination of the faculty members in question. She noted that, in a small way, changing the terminology will help to alter perceptions. Second, she said, the committee recommends putting measures in place to ensure greater job security for faculty who have entered the non-ladder ranks as part of a dual-career appointment. She noted that non-ladder faculty in this position are currently vulnerable to changes in their relationship status or in the employment status of their spouse. Therefore, she said, the committee suggests that the FAS Dean's Office work with the Provost's Office to devise specific policies to safeguard the employment status of faculty who may find themselves in these positions. Ms. Goren spoke about prizes to recognize non-ladder faculty excellence and said that, in the narrative responses to the survey, many respondents identified lack of professional recognition as a significant impediment to flourishing in their careers at Yale. She noted that, given that one of the common ways of recognizing the contribution and excellence of faculty in the academy is through awards and prizes, the committee recommends the creation of additional high profile prizes. She noted that at the time of writing, non-ladder faculty are only eligible to receive one of the prizes for excellence in teaching awarded in Yale College (this is the Richard H. Brodhead '68 Prize "awarded for teaching excellence by non-ladder faculty.") She said that the committee would also like to see the establishment of prizes that recognize excellence in mentoring and advising, and prizes that recognize distinction in research and the creative arts. The FAS Dean's Office could work with the Development Office to raise funds for these prizes and, wherever possible, they should be named to honor non-ladder faculty who have profoundly influenced the undergraduate experience at Yale. Ms. Goren then spoke on funding for

travel to conferences and the initiative that began last year, thanking the Dean's office and noting each member of the non-ladder faculty on a full-time, multi-year contract can apply for up to \$500 per year. She said that faculty are grateful for this and that the committee also recommends the creation of more generous funding for conference travel for teaching faculty in the non-ladder ranks on multi-year contracts, both part-time and full time. She noted that, at present, funding is awarded on the basis of application and only non-ladder faculty who have three years of full-time service are eligible. She said that the amount of the current award also does not go very far when one factors in travel, hotel accommodation and registration fees. Often the only option is for non-ladder faculty to cover or subsidize conference travel from their own pay—a difficult proposition given that, for full-time non-ladder faculty who responded to the Senate's survey, the median salary was \$65,000 and the mean was \$71,000. She noted that the committee recommends that the FAS Dean's Office create a travel fund for every member of the non-ladder teaching faculty on a multi-year contract and that this fund might be established with \$250 of start-up funds, with an additional \$250 accrued for every year of teaching at Yale. The money in these funds could roll over from year to year and faculty would be able to supplement their travel fund by making applications to their department chairs or for centrally administered FAS funds. In place of the current restrictions on use, she said that the committee recommends that conference travel be allowable for presenting work that contributes to Yale's core academic mission, including research into pedagogy, teaching innovation and the creation of new teaching materials, digital humanities projects, conventional academic research writing articles or books, creative writing, etc. She said that the committee also recommends an increase in the conference travel funds for non-ladder faculty centrally administered by the FAS Dean's Office. Ms. Goren spoke about departmental support for conference travel for non-ladder faculty. The committee recommends that department and program chairs do more to support conference travel for non-ladder faculty in their departments and programs and that this is particularly important for part-time faculty or full-time faculty on one-year contracts who are not eligible to apply for the existing non-ladder conference travel grants. Specifically, she said, the committee recommends that chairs draw up and publicize the funds available within departments to support conference travel for non-ladder faculty. Non-ladder faculty should also be included in programs for child-care support for professional travel, such as the Anne Coffin Hanson Faculty Support fund.

Ms. Goren then spoke about mentoring and support for career development. She said that, at the moment, there is no established system for mentoring non-ladder faculty and providing advice and support for career development at Yale. She noted that reviews in the context of reappointment are not a substitute for ongoing mentoring, and that the committee recommends that the FAS Dean's Office work with department and program chairs to draw up a mentoring agreement for non-ladder faculty so that every new member of the non-ladder faculty on a multi-year contract (whether full or part-time), has an experienced peer mentor within their department or program and receives annual feedback. She said that it may seem bizarre to suggest peer mentoring when many members of the non-ladder faculty are extremely successful, established, and decorated in their disciplines or fields, but even in such cases there is sometimes despair or dissatisfaction about how to navigate their careers at Yale (e.g. how to apply to teach an extra class and how to get paid for teaching that additional class; how to have greater involvement in curriculum planning; how to help shape the educational mission of the department; how to tackle issues of climate, etc.).

Ms. Greenwood introduced the last section of the report on inclusion and faculty governance. She explained that at the March 9, 2017 FASS discussion about terminology, it was clear that faculty in FAS have a problem with the term "non-ladder," a term the committee does not condone because it names

by negation. She said that the committee has made recommendations regarding this terminology – specifically, the report states that the term “non-ladder” is inimical to inclusion and sends the wrong signals, and of other titles used in the non-ladder ranks, many are opaque beyond Yale (e.g. Lector, Senior Lector I, Senior Lector II) and sometimes within Yale, too. She said that the committee recommends a review of nomenclature as a matter of the highest priority and advises against using any other designations that are couched in negative terms or that imply provisional status (e.g. “contingent”, “adjunct”, “nontenure-track” faculty), and instead recommend the use of the term “faculty” to refer to all faculty at Yale and the abolition of the qualifying term “non-ladder” (arguably, “ladder” should also be reconsidered). For “non-ladder” teaching ranks, we recommend the simplification and streamlining of titles and suggest Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Professor in the Field and envisage that the titles for research scientists would remain the same.

Ms. Greenwood introduced the section on voting rights in Yale College Faculty Meetings. On this topic, the committee’s recommendation is that the Yale College Dean’s Office work with the FAS Dean’s Office to ensure that all non-ladder faculty eligible to vote in Yale College Faculty Meetings are in fact included on the register of faculty eligible to vote (passed round at each meeting) and that they receive timely electronic messages regarding Yale College Faculty Meetings and have access to the agenda, supporting documents, and minutes for meetings. She noted that the committee also recommends that all part-time faculty on multi-year contracts who teach at least one course per semester be eligible to attend Yale College Faculty Meetings and to vote.

Ms. Greenwood spoke on clarifying the policy of voting rights in FAS departments, noting that the committee understands that the FAS Dean’s Office is currently reviewing policies on voting rights (i.e. the qualification for voting on different appointments in the non-ladder ranks). The committee welcomes this work and recommends the publication of a clear set of guidelines clarifying voting rights.

Ms. Greenwood spoke about the committee’s recommendation that all full-time members of the non-ladder faculty who teach and advise undergraduates should be eligible for lunch privileges in the residential colleges. For non-ladder faculty who teach part-time, the committee recommends a number of meal-cards entitling them to lunch in a college equivalent to the number of days on which they teach in a given semester. She noted that the recommendation states that students greatly benefit from meeting their instructors and academic advisors over lunch, and faculty find that having lunch with colleagues fosters collaborations and enhances faculty integration in departments and programs.

Ms. Greenwood spoke on the climate and inclusion in department life and noted that this was a particularly sensitive issue addressed in the survey. Non-ladder faculty in FAS reported a lack of consultation and involvement in departmental planning, often when it bears directly on their own teaching. She noted that some respondents to the survey reported never once having been invited to a department meeting in over fifteen years of teaching at Yale, and that there are no Yale or FAS policies that exclude non-ladder faculty from departmental faculty meetings. She said that the only restrictions on participation pertaining to voting on different levels of appointment where the right to vote is reserved for faculty who occupy the same rank or a more advanced rank. Department and program chairs can invite non-ladder faculty to participate in regular faculty meetings and some already do. She said that the FASS recommends that chairs involve non-ladder faculty with teaching positions in regular department meetings. At a minimum, it is recommended that departments and programs hold at least one all-faculty meeting each semester to discuss the mission of the department and future planning. The committee suggests that departments and programs display all faculty profiles together (ladder and

non-ladder), arranged alphabetically in the same section of the website, in the same faculty directories and photo-boards, and that mail boxes be grouped together, rather than segregating non-ladder faculty. She noted other recommendations for chairs and department leaders to include featuring the research, projects, and other achievements of non-ladder faculty on department and program websites and in annual newsletters, as well as on display in the department library/common room or on departmental bulletin boards. She noted that several non-ladder faculty stated that students have difficulty finding their offices as their names do not appear in the building directories in their departments.

Ms. Greenwood noted that the committee also recommends a more robust involvement in faculty and university governance by non-ladder faculty. The committee recommends that the FAS Dean's Office invite more non-ladder faculty to serve on FAS-wide committees and to include non-ladder faculty on standing committees such as the Course of Study Committee, the Teaching and Learning Committee, the Yale College Dean's Office Executive Committee etc., as well as ad hoc committees for the selection of high ranking Yale officers.

Ms. Greenwood talked about the issue of greater involvement of non-ladder faculty in campus life and noted that the FASS has welcomed the recent call for non-ladder faculty to serve as Yale College first-year advisors. She noted that the opening of two new residential colleges will bring increased duties for non-ladder faculty, but also greater visibility and a clearer voice in campus conversations. The committee suggests considering non-ladder faculty for a variety of high impact positions on campus. She noted that the report states that Yale stands to benefit from the service of experienced and dedicated non-ladder faculty as residential fellows, heads of residential colleges, directors of undergraduate studies, and directors of interdisciplinary initiatives on campus.

Ms. Greenwood introduced Jonathan Reuning-Scherer. Mr. Reuning-Scherer noted that the data tables in the report have been updated from the version that he presented at the March 9, 2017 FASS meeting. He said that this is not necessarily the end of this data, which will remain available to the FASS. If there are any questions about the data in the future, he will be happy to address them.

Ms. Greenwood said that narratives will be put on the FASS web site and made available only to FAS faculty later in the summer.

Mr. Rogers thanked the committee for its presentation and for the enormous amount of work that they put into this report and then opened the floor for questions.

William Rankin asked about the recommendation on terminology and if the report is asking that faculty be identified by their title, or does it suggest subdividing the faculty into ladder faculty, teaching faculty, research faculty? Or all faculty and then by rank or title? Ms. Greenwood said that there are a number of different possibilities for terminology that will help us to think about this issue and the committee suggests an all-inclusive term "faculty" and then a rethinking of some of the designations of the non-ladder ranks. She said that this is a case where the committee in the FAS Dean's Office can give this issue further thought. Ms. Goren added that this is an area that is need of more research.

Beverly Gage thanked the committee for a wonderful report that is filled with important information and asked if the committee gave thought to making recommendations about structural questions: What is the right number or percentage of non-ladder faculty to be teaching at Yale? Who makes these decisions? What part of the University should be addressing this issue? Ms. Goren said that the

committee is not advocating for more non-ladder faculty and, in fact, thinks that there should be more ladder faculty. However, she said, the committee recognizes that there is a changing reality in higher education in the U.S. and also at Yale, and wants to pay attention to that. The committee felt that these are not issues to be addressed in this report. They are issues that must be thought about by the administration and by the faculty, and the committee's recommendation is to have a non-ladder standing committee to research best practices.

Karen Wynn thanked the committee for a careful and well-thought-out approach and investigation and a compelling set of recommendations. She said that she would like to see a non-ladder analog to the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty to investigate what our peer institutions are doing with their non-ladder faculty and how we compare. She also said that she sees an opportunity for Yale to be a leader in this area because we have a smaller percentage of non-ladder faculty to consider. Changes made might therefore not be as costly to Yale as to other places where the non-ladder faculty numbers are higher. She said that by issuing this report, the Senate can help change the culture and set a standard for faculty across the U.S.

Ms. Koizim commented that the committee shares this belief and that it underlies the report's recommendation for a dedicated unit in the FAS Dean's Office.

Ms. Greenwood pointed to recommendation #5, which suggests research into best practices in enhancing careers outside the tenure track.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer said that the report does say how difficult it would be to get information on non-ladder faculty from other institutions.

Ms. Campbell asked about what proportion of teaching that non-ladder faculty are assigned to, and whether this has changed. She noted that the Senate's report on the expansion of Yale College recommended that there should be a careful tracking of changes that are occurring in teaching and who is doing the teaching.

Ms. Gage asked if we have numbers about the implications of non-ladder hires with the college expansion since the colleges are opening soon.

Dean Tamar Gendler responded that Yale is adding precisely thirteen non-ladder faculty in anticipation of the opening of the new colleges, and they were added in the areas that we specified that we would – language teaching in the L1 through L3 required sequence, English 114, and in the teaching of introductory mathematics.

John Geanakoplos commented that this is a wonderful and beautifully written report. He spoke of two committees – the Faculty Advancement Committee and the Budget Committee, which he feels are just as important as the Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS. He hopes to see reports coming out of these two committees that are as good as this committee's report. He is in complete agreement with the project of doing better by Yale's non-ladder faculty. He noted that non-ladder faculty are a vital part of our University and do a vital service in their teaching and mentoring, and it would be a shame if their living conditions were so bad that it actually interfered with their ability to perform, or Yale's ability to recruit them. However, he asked, is Yale going to pretend there is no distinction between ladder and non-ladder faculty? He said that as Yale improves conditions

for non-ladder faculty, making them more like ladder faculty, there will be a certain competition between ladder faculty and non-ladder faculty, including competition for resources. If Yale makes adjustments in the budget to allocate more resources for non-ladder faculty, resources may be taken out of the ladder faculty resources. So, he said, if Yale improves the pay for non-ladder faculty, then perhaps it should have fewer non-ladder faculty. He suggested a practice of more stringent assessments of how non-ladder faculty are doing. He concluded by saying that in his home department of Economics, there are a number of fantastic non-ladder faculty and so he agrees that there need to be changes to enhance their status. However, he also believes that with the changes, there should be ways to assess their performance.

Ms. Goren noted that whenever a non-ladder faculty's contract is up for renewal, there is a very rigorous way in which that person is reviewed. Mr. Geanakoplos asked if the review process is as rigorous as the one that ladder faculty had to go through, and John Mangon replied that he thought that the non-ladder process has a higher success rate than the process for ladder faculty.

Ms. Greenwood thanked Mr. Geanakoplos for sharing his unease with what was not said in the report. She then referred to page seven of the report where it says "We resist the idea that a focus on non-ladder needs and priorities is a threat to the excellence of ladder faculty in FAS. In the context of faculty excellence, all faculty stand to gain from attending to collegiality and a commitment to strengthening the entire faculty." She said that the report also states that "This committee takes the view that a culture that distorts the reality of faculty work and expertise, harms and undermines the very idea of the faculty. Hence, indirectly, it also erodes the integrity of tenured and tenure-track faculty as well." She referred to Mr. Geanakoplos's question about whether the goal is to pretend that ladder and non-ladder faculty are the same, and in terminology, this would be true. She pointed out that 76% of non-ladder faculty who responded to the survey hold PhD degrees and some have commensurate academic achievements to those of the ladder faculty. However, she noted, non-ladder faculty are under great stress to keep their positions due to lack of job security, and have to prove their worth on a daily basis without the benefits of good pay, time-off and job security that ladder faculty enjoy.

Ms. Goren said that when the report asks for salary raises, the committee recognizes that they will never be similar. The committee did believe, however, that it seems unfair that an excellent lecturer at Yale with decades of service to the FAS might be paid less than a newly minted PhD hired into a lecturing position.

Adel Allouche from History mentioned the issue of outside grants and the fact that non-ladder faculty are not made aware of these funding opportunities. He asks that information on grants and fellowships be disseminated to non-ladder faculty more effectively.

Matthew Jacobson noted that it is striking to see how immense and meaningful changes might be created by changing the culture within departments – by changing habits, changing practices around meetings, changing our manners in the halls. All of this comes without cost or at very little cost to the University. He suggested that the FASS be proactive in making sure that some of the cultural changes be addressed, perhaps by having a committee to ensure that these recommendations are being initiated into the culture by working with chairs in the various FAS departments.

It was suggested that the FASS have more than just two non-ladder faculty members. Ms. Goren noted that there is no limit to how many non-ladder faculty members are in the FASS – the number depends on how many are nominated and elected.

John Harris noted that there are items that the FAS can address without looking at the budget, however he wants to know what the ideal paradigm and structure of faculty are to accomplish Yale's goals. He does not know whether the present fraction of non-tenured faculty is the right amount, noting that this ratio probably changes over time. He feels unqualified to judge some of the things that the report brings up. He said he feels that this is a great report and appreciated John Reuning-Scherer's presentation on the data.

Mr. Rogers responded that it was his impression that, if a number of the recommendations in this report are adopted, then the FAS and the FASS would have an infrastructure and expertise to think more carefully about the issues raised by Mr. Harris.

Mr. Rogers noted that time for this discussion was up and said that the FASS could either vote for this report as is or ask the committee to make revisions and bring the report back for a to vote at the May 11, 2017 FASS meeting.

Kathryn Lofton suggested approving the report at this meeting.

Mark Mooseker concurred with Ms. Lofton's inclination and noted that some of the small suggestions that were made today could easily be inserted into the report.

Ms. Koizim noted that some of the suggestions are almost footnotes because they are already contained in the report.

Ms. Gage said that she had no objection to voting on the report today, however she wondered if there is a way to codify some of the bigger questions. One way, she said, would be to insert a paragraph into this report that says "there are bigger questions that are not addressed in this report and we all want to engage as a faculty, at some point....." or to do this in some way outside of the report itself.

Ms. Goren said that she feels that issues mentioned could be taken up by the Faculty Advancement Committee, because these are questions for the entire faculty body and not just for this committee and there will be a lot of follow-ups.

Katie Trumpener agreed with Ms. Goren and noted that some of the issues that Mr. Geanakoplos raised are uncomfortable but important ones. She said that if, in the future, the FAS wants to foster research careers of its lecturers, then that is going to have to be an explicit piece of the hiring and retention. It will have to be more explicit in the review process and be better supported. The job, going forward, may look different than it does now.

Mr. Rogers said that what he hears is that there should be some recording of Senators' concerns, not just in the FASS meeting minutes, but also in the report itself. He proposed that the Senate vote on the report now with the stipulation that the committee will work out a paragraph that speaks to these issues. The committee, the FASS Executive Council, and Senators involved in the discussion on the floor would then approve this language. Hearing no objections to this suggestion, Mr. Rogers then asked for a

motion to vote to approve the report from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS subject to a paragraph to be added speaking to the concerns brought up by senators. Mr. Geanakoplos made this motion. Mr. Mooseker seconded. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Greenwood introduced Kathryn Lofton, chair of the University-Wide Ad Hoc Committee on Procedures for Resolving Complaints of Faculty Misconduct. Ms. Lofton pointed to the FASS's 2015 report as a key background document for the recommendations that her committee is making. Ms. Lofton pointed out that she will speak as a committee member of the University-Wide Ad Hoc Committee on Procedures for Resolving Complaints of Faculty Misconduct and not as a FASS Senator. She will ask for comments to take back to her committee and not a vote. She spoke about two issues that were raised by the FASS's original report on conduct standards and procedures: 1) that there is a history of stories, some that are substantially evidenced and some that are not, of profound abuse of individuals and profound abuse of the institution, and 2) that there is a call for limiting the amount of administrative structures that encroach on faculty freedom. She said that several points emerged from her committee's work: (1) that no bureaucratic structure can ameliorate interpersonal abuse or abusive institutions (2) that low quality of performance is not the same thing as malfeasance and (3) that in order to maximize our own capacity for self-governance and to also have our own freedom as a faculty, we needed to create a very high standard for complaints that would be reviewed in a formal manner. As a result of these principles, the committee arrived at a four-part standard by which the Provost would determine whether a case would be formally reviewed. She referred to page 8 of the report Report of the University-Wide Ad Hoc Committee on Procedures for Resolving Complaints of Faculty Misconduct, which states: *The Provost may submit a complaint to the Committee Chair on his or her own initiative or at the request of the cognizant Dean or Deans's designee. The Provost will submit a complaint to the committee chair only if the Provost determines that the complaint provides a reasonable basis to believe that (i) a faculty member's action violated the Standards of Faculty Conduct; (ii) the actions were reckless or intentional; (iii) the actions caused serious harm to the University or to an identified member of the University community; and (iv) no other process or procedure is available to address the matter.* Ms. Lofton reported that complaints must be submitted to the Committee Chair within one year after the most recent action complained of, unless the Provost and the Committee Chair agree that extenuating circumstances warrant a waiver of the time limit. Another reason for turning over a complaint to the committee, she explained, is if the Provost determines that the complaint was not reasonably addressed by informal procedures.

She noted that there was one area of the FASS's report that was not addressed in her committee's current report: the issue of what informal procedures should look like. Her committee, she said, did not take up this issue because it believed that every school should address this topic independently, in accordance with how faculty wish to adjudicate problems. The main thing, she said, is that, in order for a formal complaint to proceed, the Provost has to be satisfied that the complainant has tried to consult informally to reach a resolution.

Ms. Lofton then asked for questions and feedback to this report. She mentioned that she is pleased with the comments she has already received from colleagues around the University, noting that some comments expressed the concern that victims are not advocated for in these procedures as much as they would prefer.

Ms. Koizim remarked that she still remembers the shock and horror that she felt when she read the first version of the Standards, and she is happy with this report because she feels it will create a space for people to bring their situation forward and have it addressed without muddying the waters with absurd issues. She likes the fact that Yale will not be going into anonymous accusations because she thinks that this just feeds a climate of bullying and suspicion. Ms. Koizim said that she feels that the work of the committee took something that was extremely important and complex and messy, and came up with something that she herself feels comfortable with.

Mr. Rogers commented that he feels that this report hits just the right notes with respect to the inclusion of informal procedures and its strong statements of the roles of faculty as educators, scholars and members of the Yale community. This language should help faculty to figure out how to intervene in informal ways.

Mr. Geanakoplos said that, looking at the various vignettes that were provided in the report, he wondered if these were examples of specific complaints that have been brought to chairs and deans, and if so, what is the purpose of including them in the report. Ms. Lofton responded that the vignettes were examples of incidents that have occurred on this campus but were changed and anonymized so that they could not be traced back to specific faculty members. She said that these vignettes were brought to chairs and deans, some of whom discussed them in their departments to promote conversations among faculty.

Mr. Rankin said that he does not think that the report sufficiently addresses the question of confidentiality.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer commented that he has found it odd that Yale does not have an ombudsperson, and asked if the committee discussed this.

Ian Shapiro noted that, looking through the vignettes, there are several that refer to sexual harassment. Why, he said, would someone present this complaint when there are already procedures in place for this type of situation?

Ms. Lofton spoke to the comment of confidentiality first, saying it is essential to due process that the person accused be aware of the complainant. She then spoke to the question of ombudspersons and said that the Medical School has one, but that an ombudsperson cannot enact procedure or intervene on behalf of a individual. An ombudsperson can give advice on how to handle a situation, but is a highly confidential source for someone to go to for counsel only. She noted that Jack Dovidio, the Dean of Academic Affairs, essentially serves this role, as does the FASS Peer Advisory Committee. Regarding the cases of sexual harassment, Senator Lofton said that there are indeed separate procedures for handling complaints of sexual harassment, but that such cases were also often closely tied to issues such as misuse of funds or other dereliction of duty.

Mr. Shapiro responded that in most cases the deans would have the power to decide whether a situation should be brought to a formal review committee, because a dean could appoint some alternative mechanism to deal with the issue or deal with it in some other way. Ms. Lofton noted that deans already have this power. In the proposed procedures, however, if an individual complainant was not happy with a dean's decision, that individual would have the right to ask for further committee review by approaching the Provost.

Ms. Greenwood applauded the work done by Ms. Lofton and this committee for presenting this report, and Ms. Lofton's role as Deputy Dean for Diversity and Faculty Development and her tireless work on behalf the FAS Faculty.

Ms. Trumpener commented that in some cases, deans must have been aware for very long periods of time about patterns of malfeasance and some do not appear to have acted. She feels that it would be very important for Directors of Graduate Studies to get detailed training on how to help students who find themselves in difficult situations and, in fact, all faculty need guidance in this respect.

Ms. Lofton said that for better or worse, our deans do have great power and they have worked hard and long to strategically resolve these problems. Her hope is that the existence of these procedures will enable the deans and faculty to have a different and better kind of conversations before matters are brought to a formal review.

Ms. Greenwood noted that the FASS is not being asked to vote on this report, however she asked the FASS to vote to establish a small committee to compose a brief written response to the report. She said that Senator Gage has been asked to chair this committee and to draw up a one-page report for discussion at the May 11, 2017 FASS meeting. Ms. Gage noted that the committee would include members William Nordhaus, Mr. Schmuttenmaer, Ms. Koizim, and Ms. Wynn.

Ms. Greenwood asked for a motion to approve the formation of this committee. It was made by Mr. Schmuttenmaer, seconded by Ms. Goren, and passed unanimously.

Ms. Gage asked that any comments sent to Ms. Lofton on this report also be sent to her and her committee members.

Ms. Greenwood adjourned the meeting at 6:04 PM.