

Minutes for Yale Faculty of Arts and Science Senate Meeting
Thursday, May 19, 2016
HGS 211, 320 York Street
4:00 PM – 6:00 PM
APPROVED

In attendance: Chair Beverly Gage, Deputy Chair/Secretary William Nordhaus, John Geanakoplos, Shiri Goren, Emily Greenwood, John Harris, Ruth Koizim, Christina Kraus, Katie Lofton, Reina Maruyama, Yair Minsky, Mark Mooseker, William Rankin, Douglas Rogers, Charles Schmuttenmaer, Vesla Weaver, Karen Wynn

Staff: Rose Rita Riccitelli

Absent: David Bercovici, Jill Campbell, Matthew Jacobson, Katie Trumpener, Ian Shapiro

Guests: Julia Adams, Sociology; Dana Angluin, Computer Science; Richard Cohn, Department of Music; Jack Dovidio, Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Psychology; Sally Promey, American Studies; Stan Eisenstat, Computer Science; Ben Foster, Near Eastern Languages and Civilization; Milette Gaifman, History of Art and Classics; Tamar Gendler, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and Vincent J. Scully Professor of Philosophy and Professor of Psychology and Cognitive Sciences; Zareena Grewal, American Studies; Amy Hungerford, Professor of English and Divisional Director of Humanities; Ian Quinn, Music Department; Joel Rosenbaum, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology; Karen Von Kunes, Slavic Languages; Bethany Zemba, FAS Dean's Office Chief of Staff

FAS Senate (FASS) Chair Beverly Gage called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM, thanked everyone who attended the FASS's first annual "State of the FAS" event and those who encouraged their colleagues to attend, and announced that President Salovey has agreed to do a similar event in the fall with a date set for Thursday, September 22nd. She announced that Emily Greenwood is the FASS newly elected chair and Doug Rogers its newly elected deputy chair, and that there was an election to select a new Executive Council (EC) and there will be an announcement of the new EC members once votes are tabulated.

Ms. Gage noted that the transition of chair and deputy chair will happen between June 15th and July 1st, that the summer is downtime for the FASS, and that the EC will be available to address any Senate-related issues and business that come up during this time.

Ms. Gage presented the minutes from the April 14, 2016 meeting for review. There was no discussion and Ruth Koizim moved that the minutes be approved with Ms. Greenwood seconding the motion. A vote was taken and the minutes of the April 14, 2016 meeting were approved without objection.

Ms. Gage called on Committee chairs for updates:

Elections Committee: Vesla Weaver thanked Richard Cohn and his external committee - Valerie Horsley and Steven Wilkinson - who ran the FASS election, and both she and Mr. Nordhaus remarked that they

could not have done this process without them. She said that the elections ran smoothly and newly elected members of the FASS EC will be announced shortly. She noted that in the future there would not be three separate rounds, and that Mr. Cohn and his committee will provide notes on how the election process went and offer recommendations for conducting future elections. She noted the next FASS election is planned for the spring, 2017.

Committee on Committees: Mark Mooseker reported that he was in contact with the Yale College Expansion Committee and that they have met at least six times and are moving along with the process. He noted that there are 4 non-ladder faculty on that committee who have been very important to the process. He mentioned the Committee on the Economic Status of Faculty (CESOF) and asked FAS Dean Tamar Gendler if she had any comments. Dean Gendler thanked the FASS Committee on Committees for their recommendations and noted that the goal is to have CESOF up and running by next year.

Ms. Gage reported that the Yale College Expansion Committee met with Deans Gendler, Cooley and Holloway, but there has not been a lot of movement in terms of the expansion. However the committee has not been in touch with Lloyd Suttle who is in charge of space planning and time schedule planning and that there has been a lot of activity in these areas.

Karen Wynn reported that the Faculty Advancement Committee will take on the FASTAP report and that she and John Geanakoplos continue to investigate ways of assessing the overall status and health of the FAS faculty by being in touch with various areas in the administration.

Ms. Lofton reported on the Conduct Standards and said that she is consulting with Dean Gendler on the next step for organizing a new committee to rethink the Conduct Standards and Procedures.

Mr. Nordhaus reported that the Budget Committee is preparing a report to the FASS on the committee's deliberations on forming a strategy for improving the FAS, and on its reflections on the status of the FAS, to be done within the next month.

Ms. Greenwood reported that the Peer Advisory Committee has been working on 5 different cases this semester, with some requiring more time than others.

Charles Schmuttenmaer talked about his and Shiri Goren's trip to Yale NUS and said that there were copies of their written report available that includes additional information that was requested at the last meeting.

Ms. Gage introduced Ben Foster to deliver a faculty comment. Mr. Foster noted that most faculty consider the University Library to be the heart of the University and use the library's printed material for research and asked whether FAS thinks that the library considers FAS research as one of its main priorities, and if so, how it's addressing those priorities. He noted that at the end of the tenure of the previous University Librarian, when Yale was undergoing a budget crisis, Sterling Medical Library (SML) was hit with largest budget cut of any library in the entire Ivy League and was forced to shed 50 employees in the first year alone. He said that when the university librarian departed, a job description was posted stating that previous experience working in a library was not necessary to hold this position. He stated that one of the practices of the new regime was to back away from comprehensive collecting, which they determined was no longer feasible, and went into purchasing what people want now with no view for future needs. Many library professionals, including curators and bibliographers, were

encouraged to take early retirement. Now, approval purchases are the norm and booksellers have replaced library bibliographers. The library claims that it will purchase titles that faculty recommend, however Mr. Foster sees this as just one more case of outsourcing to the faculty, tasks that were formally done by staff. Also, there has been an immense expansion of electronic purchasing, and he believes that over 75% of the library's acquisition budget goes to electronic media of various kinds, with an unknown shelf life, and cannot compare with an investment in printed or manuscript material. Electronic scientific periodicals can cost thousands of dollars, and many publishers require libraries to buy subscriptions in bundles rather than purchase a selection. A typical humanities periodical may run \$250 annually, so a dozen humanities periodicals must be scraped to take one bundle of a scientific periodical. Regular users of the stacks will notice how many printed periodical subscriptions have been allowed to lapse that in some cases Yale has taken for 150 years and now no more – and these gaps can never be filled. E-books are further limited because they are largely restricted to the English-speaking world and most continental, Latin American, Eastern European and South Asian publishers do not issue e-books. Mr. Foster commented that in the world of professional librarians, Yale was always noted for her extraordinary richness of her collections, though considered backward in public services. Now Yale seems to be pushing public services and giving up on the richness of its collections. At the same time, circulation has dropped precipitously and continues to do so. Circulation for graduate students decreased 51% from 2011 to 2015, and for undergraduates, 47% from 2006 to 2015. Mr. Foster believes that there are no such figures available to the faculty. He noted that French Statesmen Georges Clemenceau said, "War is too important to be left to generals." Mr. Foster believes that it may likewise be true that the future of research libraries is too important to be left to librarians. He gave an example that in the 1930's, the University of Pennsylvania's library was given one of the largest collections of books, periodicals and newspapers ever assembled by and for black Americans and the library staff discarded the entire collection acting on the belief that nobody would ever want to read or do research on such material. Thus Mr. Foster worries that one or two people, who don't use the collections, are deciding the direction of a great research library like SML, and talk only to their own kind who think the same way. He does not understand why the current agendas should be the major and defining factors in deciding the future of our libraries. He went on to say that Yale has been the largest user of the borrow-direct system since it began. Does this tell us something important about Yale's holdings, and especially about recent publications? Mr. Foster submits that FAS Faculty need to know more than we do now about the policies and directions of the library, especially as they relate to faculty research. He respectfully urges the FASS to appoint a committee to enlighten the Yale faculty at large on whether the library is still the heart of the University, and what this means today.

Ms. Gage thanked Mr. Foster for his comments and noted that Professor Foster is not the first faculty member to raise this issue with the FASS, that there have been a number of faculty from various departments who are similarly concerned and this will be an issue that the FASS may consider.

Ms. Gage asked Mr. Nordhaus to present the FASS By-Laws and Rules for consideration. Mr. Nordhaus noted that Ms. Gage primarily prepared the document with his input and reviewed the major changes from the original bylaws passed by the faculty. Mr. Geanakoplos asked for clarification on how a secret ballot is decided. Mark Mooseker said that he originally asked for a provision for a secret ballot with the intent that when taking a vote, anyone requesting a secret ballot should be granted the request. Ms. Gage asked Mr. Mooseker to propose language for changing this section.

Ms. Gage commented that most of the changes in FASS By-laws are a codification of the ways in which

the FASS has been behaving in practice but were not articulated in the original By-laws. She asked that typographical errors and clarifications be sent to her electronically and the revised document will be sent by e-mail. She asked if there were any comments on substance. Mr. Mooseker made a motion to change the voting at meetings referred to in Section 13 to read "Voting at FASS meetings is by voice or hand vote, however any member has the option to call for a secret ballot." Doug Rogers revised the sentence and made the motion to replace the sentence in Section 13 that reads, "If a member calls for a secret ballot, this will be decided by a vote of two-thirds of senators present and voting," with the sentence, "A vote will be by secret ballot at the request of any senator." The motion was unanimously adopted.

Ms. Gage asked if there were any other issues with substantive content of the document.

Shiri Goren raised the question of the makeup of the EC. Ms. Gage said that this was discussed at the March meeting and decided that for this year, we will reserve one of the six positions for a non-tenured/non-ladder faculty. She proposed that we wait until the Elections Committee makes their recommendation for language changes after this round of elections for the EC is completed. Ms. Gage noted that while we are asking the body to vote on the By-Laws, that we recognize that we need to take up the issue of the FASS's internal elections in the fall. Mr. Nordhaus made a motion to accept the By-Laws with amendments. John Harris seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the revised By-Laws were unanimously approved.

Ms. Gage introduced a discussion on the FASTAP reform proposals, noting that the FASS will plans to offer comments and suggestions to help shape FASTAP rather than create a Senate report. She introduced Karen Wynn to represent the FASS Faculty Advancement Committee and give a brief account of some of the changes that have been proposed and what role her committee has played in this process.

Ms. Wynn said that the FASTAP report is a work-in-progress and that its review committee has met with several faculty and with the FASS's committee on Faculty Advancement. She said that revisions have been made as a result of these conversations and she referred to some that were suggested: The original FASTAP system had four different reviews for faculty hired at the assistant professor level, with a three-year review just for reappointment; a review involving external letters for associate professor on term; a review for tenure, and depending on the department when a faculty received tenure, that might be a straight line to full professor, or there might be a fourth review later for promotion from associate professor with tenure to full professor with tenure. And if there were all those four, three of them involved soliciting outside letters. The new system being proposed would involve requiring three reviews – a fourth year review that would be an internal review for reappointment at the assistant professor level that might or might not have external letters required for it; a review that would occur in the seventh year that would be the tenure review that would have external letters associated with it, and that would result in being moved from an assistant professor to an associate professor with tenure; and a review that would take place at varying levels of time from associate professor with tenure to full professor with tenure. The current system has a maximum time of nine years without being tenured, and the new system has a period of 8 years to bring it up-to-date with other institutions in the United States.

Ms. Wynn noted another proposed change in the leave allotments within those nine or eight years. Currently junior faculty have four semesters of leave during those nine years before promoted and

getting tenure. Since the clock is being shortened from nine years to eight years, the leave has been shortened from four semesters of leave to three semesters of leave. Currently we have four possible ranks – assistant professor, associate professor on term, associate professor with tenure, and full professor with tenure, and the proposed changes would eliminate the associate professor on term. The issues that were discussed at the last FASS Faculty Advancement committee meeting with Amy Hungerford and Jack Divideo revolved around two issues. The first was regarding the precise nature of the fourth year reappointment review. Another issue was in the details of promotion from associate professor with tenure to full professor with tenure. Ms. Wynn noted that the FASTAP committee has been very eager to hear all comments and suggestions from all corners of the University in order to have the best set of procedures for FASTAP for faculty.

Amy Hungerford mentioned what has been changed since the Town Hall meeting in the recent FASTAP draft. One change referred to an objection to having a prestigious outside fellowship for the fourth term, so this has been eliminated. Another was to look again at the language of the tenure standards because there was still some discussion about the clarity of associate with tenure and full professor and the difference between the two. The promotion within the tenured ranks is something that got very little attention at the public meetings, so they welcome a public discussion.

Ms. Hungerford asked if the FASS would assist in encouraging faculty to use the comment feature on the site this summer.

Dean Gendler noted that if we miss the opportunity to vote in on FASTAP in September, new faculty hires will not be hired with new policies in place, and we'll have a full year before these policies can go into effect.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer raised the question whether a candidate would be able to take one semester leave and make it a full year leave with half time teaching. He is concerned about this aspect of taking a leave and wants to make sure that there are safe guards added that protect a junior faculty member from being coerced into this type of situation. Ms. Wynn added that if someone is on leave and popping in to do their half-time teaching, it's very easy to slip in more service work so she agrees with Mr. Schmuttenmaer's concern.

Ms. Weaver referred to the last bullet under section E, and said that she likes having full feedback and would like to add that this feedback be written so it will be part of the person's record. Also, under F, she suggested using the associate professor review to provide that feedback.

Mr. Rogers noted that there are many good features in the report, however he is most concerned about faculty development and suggested Yale offer management development workshops and also noted that mentoring is inconsistent at best, and when done, many people are not given good advice. He agrees with having high standards, however he notes that along with these high standards, we need to give junior faculty every opportunity to succeed by offering resources for successful development in their field.

Mr. Rankin asked about the logic of changing the semester leaves from four to three. Ms. Hungerford said that they did a study of peer institutions and found that they were offering less than three periods of leave, so with us offering three periods of leave, Yale would still be at the highest and best compared to our peer institutions.

Ms. Gage said that her concern is if we are we giving a shorter clock with less leave and expecting the same outcome – will the standard still look the same at tenure and how does one achieve the same outcome within these changes?

Mr. Schmuttenmaer agreed with the part of not asking for letters for the assistant to the assistant promotion. He also likes the idea of having an external evaluator, and at some point in the process to stipulate exactly what role this person would play in the process.

Mr. Geanakoplos noted that the arguments for these changes were most persuasive for some divisions and less for others, and that there are differences in what is expected of a candidate from one division to another and therefore wondered why it is essential to have this uniform schedule across all divisions.

Yair Minsky commented on the three-leave vs. the four-leave provision. He noted that there was the idea that an outside fellowship could give someone an extra leave and this was abandoned. Although he understands the reasoning, he disagrees with it because the notion that having an outside fellowship does not affect what happens to this person at Yale strikes him as counterproductive. He would like to see this point revisited.

Ms. Lofton noted that she is an advocate of getting outside letters, which gives an opportunity to hear about a candidate from a different perspective, perhaps knowing more about new fields and categories relating to that faculty member's research, instead of having a critique from someone from the candidate's department who may look at the candidate from another perspective and not always a positive one. She also agrees that having an outside examiner is one way of managing that problem positively. She noted Mr. Geanakoplos's concerns and commented that looking at peer institutions, she believes that making decisions at the associate professor level is most critical and this is where we are losing people, so we need to look closely at this area.

Ms. Weaver said that she completely agrees with keeping the external grant provision, and feels that people who do field work need to do it for a year and most times cannot do it for only one semester. She also thinks that the change from a four semester leave to a three semester leave needs to be looked at, saying that it will adversely affect some departments more than others.

In a comment from the floor, Richard Cohn raised a cautionary note on the single outside evaluator, and believes that it is asking a lot of someone to represent the entire field. He also feels that the internal department will read the work of that one external evaluator as representing the entire field and that will represent the tone on how the tenure review will be approached by the department, and sees all kinds of perverse outcomes from that.

In a comment from the floor, Milette Gaifman said that she is a survivor of the old system and has seen these changes over the years. She commented on underrepresented minorities (URM) and women on the faculty, saying that it seems that the practice and culture here has not changed and this new system can put women at a disadvantage, especially when they are in their 30s and want to start families. With only three terms of leave available, it does not give them time to do all that is required of them to receive tenure.

Ms. Hungerford noted that the childbearing leave would remain the same at one year and encouraged people to look at the CVs of faculty who have been tenured recently, noting that the two-book standard

is a myth of the tenure system. She said that when there was a ten-year tenure clock, two books was the standard; however, now she knows of few people with two books.

In a comment from the floor, Zareena Grewal commented that she just completed her tenure review and when she received written feedback, she found it most helpful, however did not feel verbal feedback was as helpful. She would like to see the role of senior faculty mentoring more defined because junior faculty do not know what to expect from their mentors, nor do they know how to ask for feedback, and at times she felt awkward and in some way was bothering senior faculty members by asking for feedback.

Mr. Rankin commented on having an external member of the review committee and that the model they had in mind was similar to the prepublication colloquium in the Humanities and how helpful junior people who have gone through it and senior people who have been part of it found it to be. Therefore we thought to put this into the tenure process in some way, and the crucial detail would be how this person is chosen.

Ms. Gage closed the discussion on FASTAP and asked Ms. Greenwood to speak on the Diversity and Inclusivity Report.

Ms. Greenwood presented the report on behalf of the committee. She said that the committee's challenge was to come up with a report by the end of the semester and that the FASS felt it most important to produce a report to address issues on diversity and inclusivity and have them worked on not because these issues have not been addressed before, but because they have been many times with no follow-through on the recommendations that have been made. Ms. Gage spoke on the historical part of the report and said that what struck her in doing this section was how many reports have actually been done in the past, and that many have been inspired by campus protests and other forms of social action.

Mr. Rogers spoke on the data section that he and Mr. Schmuttenmaer worked on. He thanked the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) and the FAS Dean's Office for providing the data for this section. Ms. Weaver spoke on the survey section of the report noting that looking at how other universities are doing, Yale is an outlier and that most universities are doing surveys around inclusivity, climate, and diversity specifically, and not just posing questions in other surveys around these issues. She noted that on every measure of satisfaction, quality of life, experiencing bad things, and asking faculty for reasons for lack of diversity or stagnating diversity within their departments, the reasons are incredibly divergent by gender – men say one thing and women see a different perceptual reality, which is concerning.

Ms. Gage opened the report up for discussion.

Christina Kraus asked what comparative work was done with peer institutions in terms of satisfaction and climate. Ms. Weaver said that she read diversity reports from about 12-15 other institutions and used a lot of the questions from these surveys. Sometimes the surveys were from 2010 and sometimes we tweaked the questions, so I don't think that we can do a straight comparison, however now that you ask, perhaps I can do so by picking our top 3 peer institutions, noting that MIT has fantastic information and she will take a look to see if she can provide this information.

Ms. Greenwood commented that it was decided that this committee was not going to sacrifice using

more of its time doing work that the University should be doing.

Mr. Rogers said that his overall impression is that aside from the comparison of Yale vs. peer institutions, we found that data collection is something that other universities are doing all the time, and for us, with the help of the OIR and FAS Dean's Office, we did it for the first time.

Ms. Weaver added that these other institutions have an entire staff that puts together these reports.

Ms. Wynn noted one impressive thing that MIT did in the late '90's was to conduct an internal investigation on how it treated women vs. men faculty in concrete ways – salary, lab space, teaching assignments and other concrete things – at the request of its faculty, and was very open about the results that it found. She asked if Yale, instead of doing things behind closed doors and reporting facts to the faculty without them knowing how these details were measured, would provide more transparency and accountability in how we are doing with diversity and inclusivity.

Ms. Greenwood noted that recommendation #5 speaks to some of Ms. Wynn's concerns.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer pointed to recommendation #6 about maintaining a dashboard of performance indicators with a clear profile of faculty broken down according to relevant diversity indicators.

Ms. Wynn noted that MIT publishes their findings and you can go to their website and see this information.

Mr. Rogers noted that the recommendations #29 and #20 detail what the University can do to improve transparency and accountability.

Jack Dovidio said he can get more information and that we do regressions looking at tenure that includes chairs, by rank, separately by division, across divisions, and noted that the database is limited. He is happy to talk with people to come up with the models the FASS wants.

Ms. Gage asked for a motion to vote on accepting the report. A motion was made by Mr. Rankin to accept the report. Ms. Wynn seconded the motion. Ms. Gage asked for a vote to adopt the report on Diversity and Inclusivity in FAS, including the friendly amendment. The vote was unanimous in approving the report.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:21 PM.