

Minutes of Yale Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate
December 17, 2015
Connecticut Hall Faculty Room

Attending: Jill Campbell, Beverly Gage, John Geanakoplos, Shiri Goren, Emily Greenwood, Matt Jacobson, Ruth Koizim, Kathryn Lofton, Reina Maruyama, Yair Minsky, William Nordhaus, William Rankin, Doug Rogers, Charles Schmuttenmaer, Ian Shapiro, Katie Trumpener, Vesla Weaver, Karen Wynn

Guests and speakers: Tamar Gendler, FAS Dean (Philosophy), James Berger (American Studies and English), Karen von Kunes (Slavic Languages), Michael Fischer (Computer Science)

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm. Chair Beverly Gage gave an update from the chair. She reminded the Senate that the next meeting on January 28, 2016 will be devoted to a review of the Senate's rules and procedures, including any larger questions that might be considered. Some examples of question are whether the Senate is the right size and whether Connecticut Hall is the right venue. She also noted that the new website is up and running at fassenate.yale.edu. It provides information on the Senate agenda, a newsletter, the minutes of meetings as approved, and reports delivered to the Senate. Yet to be resolved is the question of whether it should include a discussion board. The Senate still is looking for a staff person; the position has been posted but not yet filled. The Chair was hopeful it might be filled by the beginning of the next term.

Secretary William Nordhaus presented the Chair with the official Senate Gavel, in gratitude for her effective and inspired leadership. He also asked for comments on the minutes of the November 19 meeting. The minutes were approved by a show of hands.

The next item on the agenda was Committee updates.

Committee on Yale Committees. Chair Mark Mooseker was not available to report, but had asked Ms. Gage to report in his absence. The Senate has submitted a slate of 6 faculty members, including non-ladder faculty, to pursue discussions about classroom needs in light of the Yale College expansion. The committee will be chaired by Lloyd Suttle. The second committee for which recommendations have been made is CESOF, the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. There were many nominations and thorough vetting. Mr. Mooseker submitted a list of 10 or 11 faculty, all of whom had agreed to serve. The list was submitted to Dean Gendler. In remarks from the floor, Dean Gendler said the charge to CESOF was evolving. It had been focused on salary, Dean Gendler said, adding she expected to meet with Mr. Nordhaus shortly to discuss the committee's charge, in light of the creation of the Senate. The third committee is the Presidential Taskforce on Inclusion and Diversity which is being formed by President Salovey from a broad cross section of people from across the university. There was a tight deadline for recommendations. The President had asked for 2 or 3 recommendations but the committee came up with slate of 15.

Committee on Elections and Nominations. Vesla Weaver reported that the committee met with Jay Emerson about the computer program for deciding elections to understand the code. Ms. Weaver noted that senators might start thinking about encouraging faculty colleagues to consider running for the Senate; nominations will be due November of 2016.

Peer Advisory Committee. Emily Greenwood reported that its work was ongoing. The committee was struggling with the problem of having to provide advice without access to particular reports.

Committee on Budget and Finance. Mr. Nordhaus reported that the committee was looking into three areas. (1) The Senate had a report on the diversion of restricted funds to cover departments' general appropriations budgets. Since that report, he had spoken to several department chairs present and past to get an idea of the scope of this practice. (2) He is working to organize a meeting of the Senate's Budget and Finance Committee with Dean Gendler in January to review the FAS budget. (3) The committee is engaged in discussions to improve access to information on the FAS and University budgets. At present, virtually no information on budget trends or staffing levels is available. There was, in Mr. Nordhaus's opinion, no sound reason to keep the budget from the faculty. He hoped informal discussions with administrators would yield better access.

Committee on Faculty Advancement. Karen Wynn reported for the committee in the absence of its chair, David Bercovici. She mentioned three subjects of study for the group. In the near term, the committee would focus on parental and family care/leave policies. This has entailed discussions with peer institutions, as well as soliciting input from faculty about areas for improvement. A draft of findings would be distributed prior to the January 28 Senate meeting. Additionally, there was discussion of diversity issues and the role of the committee as well as that of the Senate, not only in recruiting but in retaining diverse faculty, including improvements in mentoring. In the longer run, the committee was concerned as a cornerstone of its activities with better measures to assess the quality of the FAS faculty as a whole.

The next item on the agenda was faculty comments.

Jim Berger spoke to the notion of faculty standards, which he described as misguided and coercive; he thought that they should be opposed. He hoped the Senate would broaden its focus to economic issues in the City of New Haven. It should take a look at the University's and Yale-New Haven Hospital's need to hire more local people at wages beyond the minimum living wage, referring to a demonstration the week before of New Haven residents pressing for more and better paying jobs.

Kathryn Lofton, head of the Study Group on Faculty Conduct, Standards, and Procedures, presented the preliminary report that had been drafted by the group and circulated to the Senate. [The report is available on the Senate website at <http://fassenate.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/FASS-Procedures%20Report-AMENDED%2011-25.pdf>.] Ms. Lofton said that there is some question as to whether the standards, currently in the *Faculty Handbook*, are open to major revisions. The procedures, discussed in the November Senate meeting, were the live question on which the

administration had encouraged comments, she said. Ms. Lofton proposed that the Study Group should be made a committee because there was more work to be done.

John Geanakoplos wondered how the Senate might intervene should it decide that the standards or procedures were defective and recommend they should be scrapped. It would, Ms. Lofton suggested, be an interesting test case for the usefulness of the FAS Senate. She was confident that, if a group of faculty speaks strongly in a coherent manner, it would be heard and recognized, particularly on issues of faculty self-governance.

Mr. Nordhaus strongly supported the creation of the committee. With regard to the review of the standards, he urged the committee to obtain copies of faculty comments on the standards submitted to the administration in early 2015. He also urged that the committee or another group of faculty conduct a line-by-line review of and comment on the standards.

Katie Trumpener said that it was pressing to review the standards themselves, even though they are in place, as well as the procedures. She also wondered whether other schools had taken interest in the standards, particularly the Law School, and she urged the committee to meet with faculty from the Law School. Ms. Lofton stated that those who had designed the standards felt that due process had been done in consulting the faculty. Ms. Wynn stated that the major issue was the process by which the standards were adopted, since the faculty did not have a full voice in their design or adoption.

The following resolution was moved by Yair Minsky and seconded by Shiri Goren:

Resolved. The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Conduct, Standards, and Procedures will monitor the implementation of the resolution on this subject passed at the November 2015 meeting of the FAS Senate.

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

Ms. Gage introduced the discussion on race and diversity. She turned to Emily Greenwood, who led the discussion. Ms. Greenwood said the Senate's November meeting was an extraordinary discussion of racism on campus. She noted that she along with Senators Jacobson and Weaver have been working with a group of 33 faculty who have been surveying the diversity landscape at Yale and working to put together recommendations. She reported that the Senate Executive Council recommended forming a working group. She hoped other senators would join the working group.

Mr. Jacobson called it an important moment for the Senate, a moment of crisis and opportunity, a time to broaden the discussion. He felt that many students felt underserved, while minority faculty often felt overwhelmed.

Ms. Weaver wondered just what the diversity initiative would mean and what the pledged funds were targeted to. She noted that universities that had made progress had often taken the following steps. They encouraged all departments to develop their own diversity plans; they developed ways to monitor progress; they hired in clusters; and they would not allow departments to appoint chairs who had not made progress in these areas. It seemed

these best practices were productive at other institutions which had demonstrated commitment to diversifying in the past ten years.

Ms. Gage opened the discussion of the preliminary report of the Yale College Expansion Committee, of which she was chair. She noted that it had not been distributed to the faculty since it is meant as a point of discussion for the Senate. However, the Senate does plan to distribute the report to the full faculty if and when it is voted upon and approved for distribution by the Senate. The committee also included Senators Weaver, Lofton, Koizim, Harris, and Schmuttenmaer, with administrative input from Deans Gendler, Cooley, and Holloway, as well as Pamela Schirmeister from the Graduate School and Lloyd Suttle from the Provost's Office.

Mr. Nordhaus assumed the chair so that Ms. Gage could present the report. Ms. Gage stated that the committee did not try to plan for the expansion. Rather, the committee focused on faculty views and on the current state of planning with an eye to developing resolutions about the expansion. Among the recommendations were the following. First, the committee noted that the size of the faculty was well below the target of 700 and that the faculty should at the least grow to that level. One important question was the role of teaching fellows, which is still an open question. It seemed plain that the number of non-ladder faculty would have to grow; the group felt strongly those positions should include benefits and be full-time staff. The committee believes that shopping period should be cut to no more than one week in order to accommodate an additional 800 more students. Lastly, expansion planning should not be a question of squeezing more students into the existing framework. Rather, this should be an opportunity for Yale to consider the nature of the curriculum and the campus experience.

Ms. Gage noted that, while the draft report had recommendations, it was not contemplated that there would be resolutions in this meeting. Rather, the committee was hoping to get more feedback from the Senate as to the form of the report, whether the questions raised were appropriate, and comments on the recommendations. Depending on the feedback, she thought a final report might be available by January or February 2016.

Ms. Weaver pointed to the comprehensive nature of the faculty comments and urged faculty to study them. Ms. Lofton noted that some of the alternative methods of instruction suggested in last year's report (such as undergraduate teachers) would seriously degrade the quality of teaching in the college and were not supported by the survey.

John Geanakoplos spoke about trends in the size of the faculty in the last couple of decades and the cost of some dips in faculty numbers. He suggested that the current target of 700 faculty does not reflect the timing of past faculty cuts and actually is the result of mistaken past forecasts of budget crises. The new colleges would be a means of promoting the diversity of social experience that takes place by necessity in the colleges. He also opposed the idea of curtailing the shopping period, which was unique and valuable, even if it did add a bit of chaos.

Ms. Greenwood worried about the number of teaching fellows growing, and would much prefer to see a jump in faculty ranks.

Ian Shapiro lauded the efforts of the Committee and the report. He seconded Mr. Geanakoplos's opposition to curtailing the shopping period because, he said, he did not want to be teaching a captive audience. Mr. Shapiro added that teaching by non-ladder faculty was not in itself a bad thing, but he worried about the growth of a two-tier faculty. He also was concerned that plans for expansion, and how to manage it, were difficult to evaluate because the faculty and the Senate did not have access to the relevant information on budget and staffing.

Ms. Trumpener noted that the survey underscored the view that the size of the faculty should be increased to reflect the growth of the student body, which was in her view the most pervasive response in the survey. She noted that the reasons why an increase in the size of the faculty is not possible need to be clearly and convincingly articulated by the administration. She also noted that small classes and seminars might turn out to be casualties of college expansion and an economy of scarcity, and this would fundamentally change the nature of the Yale undergraduate experience. Ms. Wynn commented on points of pressure for students, and noted that capped classes were particular problems for many students. She was concerned that the expansion would increase pressures on limited-enrollment classes if the size of the faculty was not increased. She also noted that the question of changing shopping period was, from her experience chairing a committee on teaching, complex and would need further analysis.

Mr. Nordhaus opened the meeting to comments from the floor. In a first comment, Karen von Kunes encouraged a deeper review and revision of the structure of non-ladder ranks and teachers of foreign languages, and noted that the growing number of international students would continue to promote a more diverse student body.

Michael Fischer wanted access to university budget data with regard to the expansion. He wondered if administrators were fearful that faculty would not support expansion plans should that data become public. He felt that the Senate was hamstrung in its analysis and recommendations because it does not have access to the data that are necessary to do a comprehensive analysis.

Ms. Gage said the committee would continue to seek more input from faculty on the subject of the expansion and particularly on the proposed resolutions. An important question was whether the report covered the major topics, and she noted that issues of student life were not part of the report.

Having concluded the discussion of the expansion report, Ms. Gage resumed the chair. She reminded Senators that the January 28 meeting would be devoted to operating rules for the Senate, now that it had had a couple of months to function.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 5:58 pm.

Submitted as approved,

William Nordhaus, Secretary and Deputy Chair