

FAS Senate

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

Minutes for the FAS Senate Meeting

Thursday, September 22, 2016

CT Hall, 1019 Chapel Street

4:00 PM – 6:00 PM

APPROVED

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

Staff: Rose Rita Riccitelli

Absent: Mark Mooseker, John Harris, Ian Shapiro, Katie Trumpener

Guests: Tim Barringer, Talya Zemachy-Bersin, Stan Eisenstat, Mike Fischer, Milette Gaifman, Tamar Gendler, Jonathan Holloway, Brad Inwood, Tim Robinson, Pamela Schirmeister, Jason Stanley, Nicola Suthor, Steven Wilkinson, John Witt, Joel Wolenski, Bethany Zemba

Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) Chair Emily Greenwood called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM. She noted that the FASS is an advisory body that offers advice on matters that are of importance to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) faculty, is committed to faculty governance, ensures that it provides a strong voice when representing faculty concerns, and offers a forum where the administration can bring initiatives of essential importance to FAS faculty for consideration at an early stage in planning, noting that advisory and consultation relationships go two ways. She reported that the FASS Executive Council (EC) recently met with President Peter Salovey and FAS Dean Tamar Gendler, and spoke frankly and openly about issues of trust and transparency and the sharing of information. She said that the FASS has had conversations about getting the right people to join in conversations to ensure productive collaboration and cooperation on the various issues that the FAS addresses, and making sure that it extends the kinds of open conversations like the one that took place on May 5th regarding Calhoun College, so that we work together on faculty governance as a project involving the whole of the FAS and the administration. Ms. Greenwood acknowledged that the FASS received an official response to its report – *The Yale College Expansion Report* - and thanked the administration for its response. She believes that this topic will be an ongoing issue of concern and discussion.

Ms. Greenwood mentioned that many Directors of Graduate Studies (DGS) are concerned with the issue of department size, and that Dean Cooley has agreed to address this issue at the next FASS meeting on October 13, 2016. She also mentioned that there are ongoing conversations with FAS faculty on their concerns about CANVAS and the safeguarding of faculty intellectual properties in Yale's course management system, and that she, Doug Rogers and Mark Mooseker plan to meet with Scott Strobel to discuss how the General Counsel's office and the Center for Teaching and Learning can further resolve this issue. She mentioned the ongoing conversations about labor issues with Local 34 and Local 33, and that the FASS will continue to stay apprised and may schedule an open information session to make sure that faculty have the best information on these issues.

Ms. Greenwood announced the new date for the meeting with President Salovey – *A Conversation About the FAS with Peter Salovey* - Thursday, October 27th from 4-6 PM in Davies Auditorium, with a reception to follow.

Deputy Chair and Secretary Doug Rogers presented for review and approval the minutes from the FASS's open meeting on May 19, 2016 and its closed meeting on September 8, 2016, asking for comments or corrections. There were none and a motion was made (by Shiri Goren) and seconded by (Charles Schmuttenmaer) to accept the minutes from the May 19, 2016 and September 8, 2016 FASS meetings. A vote was taken and both sets of minutes were unanimously approved.

Ms. Greenwood introduced John Witt to talk about the *Committee to Establish Principles on Renaming*. Mr. Witt noted that this committee is looking into how this issue has been addressed by other universities, and also gathering input from Yale faculty and students. He noted that the committee is not charged with making name changes but it will create a set of principles to address the issues of changing or not changing names. He encouraged everyone to contact him with their thoughts and ideas and said that the committee has launched outreach efforts to students, faculty, staff and all of the constituencies that might want to have a say in these matters. He noted that there would be an open forum scheduled at the Law School at noon on Monday, September 26, 2016 involving speakers who have addressed these issues at other institutions and invited all who can, to attend. John Geanakoplos asked if there was discussion in this committee about having colleges change names at certain intervals – like every five or ten years – and that this could eliminate this kind of issue. Mr. Witt responded that there have been a number of versions of this idea suggested that are being taken into consideration. William Rankin asked about the committee's capacity to address this problem. Mr. Witt said he believes that the committee is able to look into all of the considerations available. Beverly Gage noted that the committee's report will be specific to how this particular controversy emerged and will address Calhoun directly, however the principles that come out of the committee's deliberations will be more general. Karen Wynn noted that there is a committee to look at all of the different iconography at Yale (The Committee on Art in Public Places), and asked if the committee is looking at specific names that might be more of an affront, offensive or problematic to part or all of the community. She also noted that nearly all of the iconography at Yale represents an increasingly small segment of the Yale community, and that other segments are growing and not represented. She asked if the committee chaired by Mr. Witt is looking into this aspect of the problem. Mr. Witt said that they are aware of these issues, however his committee has a much narrower charge. It will study the work of the Committee on Art in Public Places, and will try to incorporate that work into how his committee addresses their specific charge. Shiri Goren asked about a timeline for their report. Mr. Witt said that their goal is to have something by the end of the fall semester. William Nordhaus said that the committee should not only be looking to create principles, but also to create a structure and process for putting them into practice. Mr. Witt responded that it is unclear whether this committee has the mandate to develop a process for the principles that they are being charged with creating. He noted that it may pose a risk to the independence of the committee if they take on the task of putting together a process, however he acknowledged that the process is very important and hopes that the final report will include a process for implementing the principles. Jill Campbell said that she hopes that the committee will not rise too much above the local controversy and will draw upon the comments that are in the minutes from the Yale College Faculty meeting of last May (2016) and consider those comments. Ms. Campbell said that she took very detailed notes and is happy to transcribe them and send them to the committee. Ms. Gage encouraged people to go to the website of the Committee to Establish Renaming Principles and offer comments, noting that several alumni have already done so but only a few comments have come from faculty. Mr. Witt noted that one can indicate if one's comments should be made public or kept

private. Ms. Greenwood asked about historicism and Mr. Witt replied that the report will try to capture as much wisdom as they can to provide a provisional capstone to the last year and a half of conversation, and that these debates will never end, nor should they. These are the kinds of conversations that communities have. Mr. Witt said that this is an opportunity to write a report that allows us to move to a new stage and one that will continue to change over time. Matthew Jacobson asked if the committee researched the question of on whose behalf are buildings being named and who is the intended audience for how a building is named. Mr. Witt said it will ask these questions and also how names are connected to the mission of the university –these are the kinds of things that the committee will be discussing. Tim Barringer asked why there were more alumni than students on the committee. Mr. Witt noted that faculty outweigh both alumni and students on the committee, however he was not the person who chose the committee. He said that he is very happy with the members and their representation as it stands and noted that the alumni members have long-standing involvement at Yale over a long-period of time. Ms. Campbell asked if the committee wants to talk to people who don't necessarily want to talk. Mr. Witt said that he wants students to know that the committee wants their input and will give them the opportunity to be heard, that their comments will have an impact on shaping how the committee thinks about this issue, and that the committee also has input from letters and comments that were sent to the President, and that all are being read and considered. Mike Fischer commented that there are many people with different opinions and he feels that the best way to come to an outcome that serves the majority would be to hold a vote. This would also shift the responsibility from the administration and put the responsibility of the outcome onto the stakeholders. Mr. Witt asked Mr. Fischer to submit this suggestion through the committee's web site. Ruth Koizim commented that in the past, many outreach endeavors turn out to be strictly for show, however this endeavor appears to present an opportunity to convey to people who participate that this time they *will* be listened to and that their comments *will* make a difference on how this issue is handled in the future, and also to stress that somebody has not already made a decision.

Ms. Greenwood thanked Mr. Witt and introduced FAS Dean Tamar Gendler to give a short presentation on the *State of the FAS as an addendum to her presentation in Spring 2016*. Dean Gendler thanked the FASS for the work that they have done to improve the FAS, and presented its members with newly designed FAS tote bags, coffee mugs, water bottles and pins, all with the new seal of the FAS that was created by John Gamble.

Dean Gendler noted that two documents were sent to the members of the FAS yesterday, one about the new colleges that she, Lynn Cooley, and Johnathan Holloway prepared, and the other about work of the Faculty Resource Committee in 2015-16. She said that she and Dean Holloway would be happy to answer any questions regarding these two reports. No questions were forthcoming. Dean Gendler distributed a two-page executive summary of the goals document that she had submitted to President Salovey that contains six goals that she is working to accomplish:

Goal I: *Cultivate and maintain FAS faculty excellence by attracting and retaining eminent scholars and creating an intellectually vibrant environment for new and continuing faculty across the FAS.*

Goal II: *Strengthen Yale for the future by recruiting and supporting excellent tenure-track faculty.*

Goal III: *Actualize diversity*

Goal IV: *Develop transparent and goal-oriented policies and practices*

Goal V: *Engage in longer-range planning and effective communications.*

Goal VI: *Continue to make progress on unrealized goals from 2014-15 and 2015-16*

Dean Gendler pointed to the steps that she plans to take to implement each of these goals.

For Goal I, Dean Gendler's plan is to cultivate and maintain faculty excellence by attracting and retaining eminent senior scholars and creating an intellectually vibrant environment that attracts, supports, and retains faculty of eminence. She wants to engage faculty leaders as strategic partners to create an atmosphere of collegial collaboration across the FAS by creating an intellectually vibrant atmosphere and by supporting new and continuing faculty in their efforts to engage in satisfying, productive work as scholars, teachers, and university citizens. She plans to develop policies and practices that appropriately recognize the contributions of FAS non-ladder faculty and plans to find innovative ways to support faculty spouses and partners by identifying and supporting opportunities for meaningful engagement with the Yale and New Haven communities. Her office is looking at indicators of success for departments and faculty, including considering whether departments enroll graduate students who are their top choices and whether graduates find jobs that they have sought. FAS administration is also asking colleagues in departments what the measures are for achievement in their particular fields. They are also hoping to look at such things as how the books that the faculty have written are used – if they are the subject of symposia and if they attract attention in their field; if the topics that our faculty raise are used for dissertations, and how often their books appear on the syllabi of other institutions. Dean Gendler expressed that she is happy to receive any suggestions on further determining faculty excellence.

For Goal II, Dean Gendler's plan is to strengthen Yale for the future by recruiting and supporting excellent tenure-track faculty by hiring, recruiting and supporting the best tenure-track faculty and overseeing and nurturing their scholarly development, growth and success. She wants to articulate and implement effective mentoring across the FAS.

For Goal III, Dean Gendler's plan is to actualize diversity by recruiting, mentoring, and retaining a diverse faculty within the vibrant social and intellectual environment that Yale offers. The plan also includes conducting and completing a search for a (non-interim) FAS Deputy Dean for Faculty Diversity and Development (DDDD). Through a comparative study of peer institutions and an internal audit, she wants to define structures of support for permanent institutional commitment to faculty diversity in Yale's FAS. She plans to work to ensure that a commitment to excellence through diversity, and diversity through excellence, permeates all aspects of FAS culture. And in collaboration with the Provost's Office, she wants to assess and implement fair and appropriate parental leave policies.

For Goal IV, Dean Gendler's plan is to develop transparent and goal-oriented policies and practices. She will accomplish this through the review of policies and procedures and adopting new ways of moving through processes. She will work to identify ways in which the FAS Dean's office can become nimbler and responsive to faculty concerns. Working with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), she plans to create a robust and efficient system of collecting and publicizing longitudinal data about the FAS.

For Goal V, Dean Gendler's plan is to engage in longer-range planning and communications by creating longer-range (three to five year) plans, designing communications tools, and developing strategic partners to help realize those plans.

For Goal VI, Dean Gendler's plan is to continue to make progress on unrealized goals from 2014-15 and 2015-16 by developing efficient and responsive systems and governance structures for routine and non-routine FAS governance matters. She plans to continue to ensure that Yale comes to have or maintains a world-class faculty in each of the intellectual areas that compose the FAS, with particular attention to key departments that are in need of focused attention, or that sit on the cusp of a new level of nationally-recognized excellence. She will also continue to identify and cultivate opportunities for

pedagogical and intellectual cooperation between the FAS and Yale's professional school faculty and programs, and between the FAS and Yale's museums, libraries and collections.

John Geanakoplos asked about Yale's plan to increase the size of the FAS by roughly 10 faculty a year for five years and asked how the speed for this expansion was decided. Dean Gendler said that the plan is to bring the number of faculty to where it was in 2010 at 700, and to do it with the care and attention that is required when conducting searches. She explained that it takes a great amount of time to get faculty searches approved and completed, and that expansion should be viewed as a multi-year process. There were no searches in years 2012/13 and 2013/14 and for 2014/15, there were 35-40 approved with no back-log. These searches resulted in 22 hires. She said an additional 35 searches were added last year. She noted that Yale loses on an average 3-4 full professors per year from lateral moves, however because of phased retirements, Yale lost a larger number of full professors over the last few years. She noted that hiring excellent faculty should prove to attract other excellent faculty to come to Yale.

Mr. Rankin asked whether one bottleneck that the FAS Dean's Office faces is the shortage of staff to attend to achieving these goals. Dean Gendler agreed and said that she is working to obtain resources in unexpected ways – she hired a Woodbridge Fellow and an ECE Fellow and is looking for other opportunities that do not tax the budget. She is getting a sense of what staffing needs are, and it would help that if the objection that is often brought up - that adding staff is a problematic way of deploying University resources – is resolved.

Mr. Jacobson asked how she plans to measure faculty excellence and registered the concern that “excellence” can be defined in narrow ways that disadvantage newer and less “traditional” fields of knowledge. Dean Gendler replied that she is aware of this concern. She noted that there are many ways to define excellence. In science departments, for instance, grant funding is crucial but that this metric is not appropriate in all fields.

Ms. Campbell noted that she is glad to see included creating an intellectual vibrant and collegial atmosphere and that fostering and supporting these ideas will lead to measurable faculty excellence. She wants to encourage creative thinking among faculty and administrators about how to do this and observe progress in these undertakings. Ms. Campbell believes that the emphasis on austerity by the University in recent years has had a dampening effect on the possibilities of collaboration. Dean Gendler said she is aware of this and has many ideas that she is addressing and wants to hear thoughts from faculty on where we can make things better. She noted that a questionnaire is being developed that will be distributed to department chairs for their ideas.

David Bercovici asked where development fits in to these plans. Dean Gendler said that she and Dean Holloway have been engaged in development work and now we have a full-time development officer assigned to FAS and the Graduate School, and that President Salovey plans to address the development priorities for FAS in his address in October.

Vesla Weaver mentioned that looking at departmental excellence does not always give the whole picture and there needs to be a way to look at collaborations among departments/schools/programs for a more accurate measurement of excellence.

Mr. Nordhaus asked about major priorities and initiatives that usually come out of the Provost's Office, and suggested that Dean Gendler develop the list of priorities from the bottom up, with divisional committees working on them, that are well-grounded, authoritative, legitimate, and persuasive. He

suggested that this would prove helpful in determining how to move forward with major initiatives.

Yair Minsky noted that there have been problems in recruiting faculty due to problems in finding employment for spouses. Dean Gendler noted recruiting prospects want to ensure that their families fit in with the culture in and around Yale, and that we often lose people to more attractive places like New York, Boston and San Francisco that offer more opportunities to the person and their family. What we do now is that very early in the recruiting process, we find out about the needs of the family so that these needs can be addressed throughout the recruitment process rather than at the final stages.

Shiri Goren asked about the issue of parental leave and where the Senate's report from 2015-16 stands. Dean Gendler said that this is an on-going process and has asked Kathryn Lofton to try to sort out what parts the FAS can solve on its own and then help advocate for improvements with other appropriate University offices.

Ms. Greenwood thanked Dean Gendler for her work on the response on the FASS's *Yale College Expansion Report* and for providing an insight into the Faculty Resource Committee's work. She said that faculty continue to be concerned about the size of the faculty. She noted that we have 67 new positions in 2014/15 and 2015/16, however we also have departures, and asked what the current state of the faculty size is. Dean Gendler replied that the overall faculty size will increase slightly by January 2017, when several hires will begin their contracts at Yale, but that the FAS remains slightly behind target on overall size increase.

Ms. Greenwood referred to the theme of excellence and that in parallel, we need to focus on the excellence of the University and how it conducts its mission. She thanked Dean Gendler for having this open conversation and talking candidly about issues that are pertinent to the FAS. She then introduced the next agenda item – the FASS priorities for the year ahead.

Doug Rogers continued the discussion about FAS priorities from the September 8 FASS meeting and subsequent discussions in the Executive Council (EC). He pointed to two tables – a *"Menu" of Options for New FAS Senate Work in AY 2016-17* and *DRAFT: FAS Senate Committee Existing Work Plans in 2016-17*. The goal of this agenda item is to get a sense of how the EC can manage the workload presented in these two documents and where do we think our biggest priorities are to give us a sense of what to move on.

Christina Kraus gave an update on the consultations concerning the University Library, reporting that she met with Susan Gibbons who said that she is aware that the information on Bass Library renovations was not communicated accurately. Ms. Gibbons said that she is appointing a sub-committee of the Library Policy Advisory Committee to deal with these issues. Ms. Kraus suggested that, in her view, the Senate did not need to establish its own library committee at this point, and that she would work with Ms. Gibbons and others on these issues and keep the Senate informed as necessary. Ruth Koizim noted that Ben Foster put together a very powerful piece on the developments with the library. Ms. Kraus replied that some of Mr. Foster's information was not accurate but that it also pointed to real concerns.

Mr. Rankin noted that the EC and the Senate as a whole have had discussions about the distinction between helping to shape and inform decision-making, versus having to respond to decisions already taken or initiatives already underway. We want to pursue getting into conversations at the right time when they are getting off the ground.

Mr. Nordhaus brought up the issue of the management structure of the FAS as an issue that the Senate

should concern itself with. He said that one of the central issues that the FAS is facing over the coming years is the ability for administrators to have the resources to shape programs and priorities. He noted that this involves not so much their authority, but their ability to allocate money among broad groups of activities. In an earlier era, these priorities were decided in the Provost's Office with the advice of the different FAS structures. However, he noted, with the development of the new decanal structure, the programmatic responsibilities have moved to the Dean's office, but most of the budget authorities have not. In some other universities, both programmatic and budgetary responsibilities are housed within the FAS, but practices vary greatly among universities. Also, he noted, among the major schools at Yale – School of Management, the Law School and the School of Medicine – both the programmatic and fiscal responsibilities are housed within respective dean's offices, and the FAS as a major school at Yale is the only one that has a different structure. He noted that he feels that the question for the FASS is whether this structure, as currently operating, is well designed to foster the health and excellence of FAS. In his view and Mr. Shapiro's view, this is the central issue facing the health of the FAS over the longer term and we need to approach it in a cooperative spirit with the FAS Dean. For now, he suggests examining the administrative structures at other universities in their FAS and thinking about if the fiscal structure is set up in a way that allows us to shape our priorities that will promote excellence.

Mr. Geanakoplos posed the question to Dean Gendler: if, in investigating how much it would cost to promote excellence in FAS, you found that it would take a billion or two billion dollars, how would you go about securing the funds? Dean Gendler responded that there are two parts to this question – one is to look at how the resources and endowments at Yale are distributed among the various units, and the second is how do we add to the budget for the FAS? She said that she would have to talk with the Provost and the President who would consult with the Corporation on these matters.

Mr. Nordhaus noted that the current budgetary situation divides budgetary authority between the Provost and the FAS Dean.

Mr. Rogers then asked if there were any additional comments from Senators or Committee chairs regarding priorities. Ms. Goren made the case that there should be a separate committee, distinct from the Faculty Advancement Committee, to look at the status of non-ladder faculty. She also asked what the by-laws state about having non-senators on standing committees and advocates having outside members on this committee.

Katie Lofton suggested that the EC might consider streamlining FASS workload by disbanding one or two committees, at least in the short term.

Ms. Greenwood noted that we're out of time and said that a vote on adding new committees would take place at the next FASS meeting on October 13th. She also noted that it was her sense of the conversation that two major new projects that to be addressed this year are the management structure of the FAS and the status for non-ladder faculty. She asked if there was a consensus to move forward with these two initiatives.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer asked how the EC planned to work with the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (CESOF). Mr. Rogers responded that he envisioned both passing issues that have arisen in the Senate to CESOF and then inviting CESOF to come to a Senate meeting to hear about additional concerns. Mr. Nordhaus said that he believes that the CESOF committee would welcome input of the FASS.

David Bercovici asked about FASTAP implementation and Ms. Greenwood said that she will be in

8

contact with Dean Gendler and Dean Amy Hungerford to see how the FASS can help. Dean Gendler said that we are still awaiting a formal vote at the FAS Executive Committee, but that we can empanel the implementation committee to begin moving forward.

Ms. Greenwood adjourned the meeting at 6:02 PM.