

Report of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate Implementation Committee

Yale University

November 21, 2014

Introduction

The FAS Senate Implementation Committee was appointed on March 27, 2014, by the president and provost, after they accepted the FAS vote in December 2013 recommending the creation of a Faculty of Arts and Sciences senate. In their charge, the president and provost asked the committee to develop rules for an advisory Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS), and also a plan for communication with the faculty, deans, and administration. The committee was asked to pay particular attention to areas of overlap with existing bodies, and to make suggestions to eliminate such overlap where possible. The committee was also asked to make sure that the new body represents the FAS alone, and does not claim to represent Yale's eleven other schools, each of which has a separate system of governance with its own means of deliberation.

The committee has developed its rules and procedures for the new FAS senate with the following general principles and observations in mind:

1. As the previous ad hoc Faculty Input committee pointed out, a representative FAS senate holds the promise of providing something that existing faculty meetings lack: a faculty run body consisting of a representative group of faculty to advise and deliberate on a range of FAS issues.¹
2. For the body to be effective it must have substantive agendas, including items currently done by some existing bodies, otherwise it cannot succeed.
3. For the FASS to be effective it must be genuinely representative, in terms of divisional distribution and the intellectual interests of the faculty, and also in terms of rank, gender, ethnicity, and other important aspects of diversity.
4. FAS faculty, deans, and administrators are all increasingly busy and overscheduled, with the pace of daily work ever more intense because of the speed of communication by email. Our committee aims to reduce the overall obligation of Yale faculty to attend FAS meetings, but to ensure that those who do attend and vote are more representative of the faculty's diversity and scholarly interests, and that the meetings that do occur represent more genuine opportunities for deliberation and substantive input into decisions affecting the FAS. The elected representative model we recommend here is a departure for Yale, where faculty meetings have traditionally used a town meeting format, where all eligible faculty may attend and speak, even though most of the time they do not. In our drafting of rules for the new body, we have tried to strike a balance between the old and new, by preserving the ability of those faculty who wish to attend, listen, and also offer their insights, while also ensuring that most of the FASS discussion and any votes taken *in* the FASS reflect the views of a representative group of faculty.

¹ As of October 2014 the existing faculty bodies are the Joint Board of Permanent Officers (444 full professors eligible to attend), the Faculty Forum (679), the Yale College Faculty Meeting (892), and the full meeting of the FAS (679), which in the past decade was called very infrequently, but has been called four times in the past two years, to discuss the reports of the Nordhaus Committee, the FAS Input Committee, the FAS Committee on Decanal Structures, and the FAS Academic Review Committee.

5. Many FAS members are interested in what goes on in the FAS, but few have the time to attend meetings regularly. So the minutes and supporting materials of the FAS senate should be made available online to all FAS ladder and non-ladder faculty eligible to vote in elections to the FASS, to the fullest extent possible. That said, we feel as a committee that there is much value in face-to-face deliberation and debate and that the FASS should not be a virtual meeting. To communicate the activities of the FASS to the wider community, the chair and secretary of the FAS senate should, as the dean of Yale College does at present for the Yale College Faculty meeting (YCFM), provide an update to the *Yale Daily News* after each meeting about the general issues discussed.
6. Following practice elsewhere, we think that there should be an executive council of the FASS that will liaise with the administration and communicate with faculty. This body will run meetings of the FASS and set its agenda.
7. We are proposing initial rules for the FASS for the approval of the FAS faculty. The FAS faculty is creating the FASS, and substantive changes to the body's size, divisional distribution and electoral system must be approved by the FAS. All other changes to the rules and regulations of the FASS, however, may be approved by a 2/3 vote in the FASS. In the case of disagreement or deadlock over rule changes, these changes may be also referred back to the FAS faculty as a whole.
8. We envisage that the president and the dean of FAS will each address a meeting of the FASS once during the year, to speak on issues of concern to the FAS.

Recommendations for the December 2014 FAS Meeting

Motion: *We recommend that the FAS approve the FAS Senate rules.*

If approved, we recommend that up to three members of the FAS Senate Implementation Committee, who are neither on the initial nomination committee nor standing for election to the FASS, work to help oversee the first election for the FASS in spring 2015, and coordinate with the administration over the initial staffing and organization of the FASS.

We anticipate that nominations for the election would be gathered in March 2015 and that the first elections would be held by electronic ballot in April of 2015. The elected members would then elect from among their number a new executive council of six members, which could begin its work over the summer in preparation for the first meeting of the FASS in fall 2015.

Recommendations for the Provost

In their charge to the committee, the president and provost asked the committee to:

- Review [of] existing bodies, committees, and organizations to determine whether there is unnecessary overlap, with development of recommendations for the provost to consider related to restructuring or streamlining current bodies, and what activities the senate should replace. For example, will we continue to have meetings of the Joint Board

of Permanent Officers? Or will (the tenured) members of the senate become the group that votes the final approval of faculty appointments? Which issues currently discussed in the YCFM might in future be discussed in the FAS senate?

In Appendix C of this report we recommend that the Faculty Forum be formally abolished, and that the JBPO streamline its proceedings, adopting a consent agenda, with the time saved being used to create a space for the FASS to operate.

Members of the Committee:

Steven Wilkinson, Nilekani Professor of Indian and South Asian Studies and Chair of Political Science (committee chair)

Jay Emerson, Associate Professor (Adjunct) and DGS of Statistics

Kirk Freudenburg, Professor and Chair of Classics

Beverly Gage, Professor and DUS of History (Prior to Summer 2014)

Valerie Horsley, Maxine F. Singer, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology

Nuno Monteiro, Assistant Professor of Political Science

Mark Saltzman, Goizueta Foundation Professor of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering and Chair of Biomedical Engineering

Paul Tipton, Professor and Chair of Physics

Katie Trumpener, Emily Sanford Professor of Comparative Literature and English

Meg Urry, Israel Munson Professor of Physics and Astronomy

Ebonya Washington, Professor of Economics

Martha Highsmith, senior advisor to the president, and Pilar Montalvo, director of administrative affairs from the president's office staffed the committee.

Appendix A

Proposed bylaws of the FAS senate

1. Purpose

As an elected body created by and representative of the FAS faculty, the advisory FAS senate (FASS) is intended to facilitate faculty input into FAS policies and practices. The FAS senate provides a clear voice for FAS faculty and serves as a forum and deliberative body for the discussion of FAS issues. It also creates a formal conduit between the administration and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The FAS senate serves as a forum for the president, provost, the dean of the FAS, and other deans to present on issues that affect the FAS, with the intention of improving transparency, communications, and the quality of decision-making. The FAS senate operates with the assumption that major initiatives and policies affecting FAS faculty will be brought for discussion to the FAS senate in a timely manner.

The FAS senate should fully represent the FAS faculty in terms of divisional distribution, gender and ethnicity, as well as other important aspects of diversity. Divisional and rank representation is built into the FASS seat allocation, while the nomination committee for the FASS should also consider other aspects of diversity in encouraging faculty to run for election.

The FAS senate speaks only for the FAS, not for Yale's other schools, though the FAS senate may consider university policies to the extent that they affect FAS members.

2. Constituency

The FAS Senate is the representative body of the FAS faculty. This includes all ladder faculty in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, as well as full-time adjuncts in all ranks, full-time senior lecturers and senior lecturers, full-time lecturers and lecturers with appointments of more than one year, and full-time FAS research scientists and senior research scientists who also hold multi-year teaching appointments as lecturer or senior lecturer.

3. Membership of the elected senate

The FAS senate shall consist of 22 members, with six at-large representatives and the other sixteen members distributed according to the proportion of ladder faculty in each division:

- 6 senators elected from the Division of Humanities.
- 6 senators elected from the Division of Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Engineering.
- 4 senators elected from the Division of Social Sciences.
- 6 senators elected at-large.

The president, provost, and deans of the FAS, Yale College, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering and Applied Science may attend as ex officio non-voting members of the FASS. Ordinary members of the FAS ladder and non-ladder faculty eligible to vote in FASS elections may also attend in a non-voting capacity. The FASS may, however, choose to meet in closed session at the discretion of its executive council or by the majority vote of its elected members.

Recognizing that the size and distribution of the FAS faculty may change over time, the committee on elections (see below) shall review and if necessary recommend adjustments to the proportional representation across divisions and the size of the senate every five years. Such decisions shall be subject to the approval of the FAS faculty as described in section 17.

Tenured faculty as well as untenured and non-ladder faculty members with a current appointment longer than one year (as defined in section 2) are eligible for election to the FAS senate. There shall be one junior faculty seat reserved for an untenured member of the ladder faculty in each of the three divisions, and one such seat for a non-ladder faculty member reserved in the at-large category. When one of these seats falls vacant, the highest polling junior in each division and the highest polling non-ladder faculty in the at-large category, as required will be elected to fill the vacancy.

4. Nomination process

For the initial organizing year, the slate will be prepared by a committee of five people, none of whom may stand for election to the FASS, drawn from: one member of either our Ad Hoc Senate Implementation Committee (AHSIC) or the previous Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Input; one senior member of the faculty from each division, nominated by the AHSIC; and one FAS member of the Women Faculty Forum (WFF), chosen by the FAS members of the WFF. All of these appointments should be approved at the February 2015 meeting of the JBPO.

In addition, candidates who wish to stand for election to the initial FASS may petition the nominating committee or the interim nominating committee directly, they may be nominated by departments, and/or the nominating committee or the interim nominating committee may recruit nominees. Individual nominations should be supported by the signatures of the candidate and eight other people eligible to vote in the FASS elections, or roughly 1% of the voters for the FASS. To ensure a broad slate, no person may nominate more than five candidates.

After the initial organizational year, the FAS senate shall each year have a nominating committee charged with preparing a slate of candidates for annual elections, in which seven or eight senators (depending on the year of the cycle) are elected. The committee will have five people, none of whom are standing in the upcoming election, including: one outgoing member of the FASS; one senior non-FASS member of the faculty from each division, approved by the FASS; and one FAS member of the Women Faculty Forum. This procedure – a five person nominating committee, from

across divisions, none of whom may stand for election – will also be followed in subsequent years to try to generate a broad list of candidates for the FASS, reflective of divisional and other important aspects of FAS faculty diversity.

In addition, nominations will always be open to faculty who are not directly contacted by the nomination committee. Candidates may petition the nominating committee directly, they may be nominated by departments, and/or the nominating committee or the interim nominating committee may recruit nominees. Individual nominations should be supported by the signatures of the candidate and eight other people eligible to vote in the FASS elections, or roughly 1% of the voters for the FASS. To ensure a broad slate, no person may nominate more than five candidates.

No faculty member appointed to a full time administrative role [i.e. the president, provost, and deans] may simultaneously serve as a member of the FAS senate, or vote in the meetings. All other FAS ladder and non-ladder faculty are eligible to vote in elections and serve as members. Chairs, divisional directors and others serving in part-time administrative roles may also serve as members of the FASS.

5. Term of FASS members and timing of elections

Terms will be for two years, with no representative being able to serve more than three consecutive terms. For the initial election to the FASS, terms of two or three years will be randomly assigned to elected senators after the election in order to provide for the subsequent staggered election and rotation of senators, as well as to ensure some continuity during the first few years of the FASS.

Elections for the FASS shall be held each spring, with nominations being gathered and solicited in March, the elections being held in April, and the new senators taking office on September 1 the following fall. The elections will be by secure electronic ballot. A five-member election committee shall be appointed by the executive council to oversee the process, which may be comprised of both senators and other FAS faculty.

In the summer recess the FASS will not be in session but the executive council of the FASS will continue to liaise with the administration on matters of common interest.

6. Conduct of elections for the FASS

Voting for the FASS shall be by electronic secure ballot. The voting is to be conducted over the course of no more than fifteen days, with provision for electronic reminders. To encourage people to stand, and in accordance with practice elsewhere, the FASS shall announce the names of those elected, but not the names or vote counts of those who were unsuccessful, though these shall be available for consultation by any voter who wishes to examine them in person at the FASS secretary.

The FASS shall use the single transferable vote system (STV), for the election of both divisional representatives and at-large representatives. The way this system will work at Yale is described in Appendix B to this report.

7. Executive council

The executive council shall call meetings, determine the agenda of the FAS senate, appoint committees to assist with the FASS's work, and organize elections. FASS meetings shall be run in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

The executive council serves as liaison to the administration, and has the power to act on behalf of the Senate in matters arising between meetings.

The executive council will also appoint a committee on committees from the FASS's members to perform two functions. First, to help identify potential faculty members to serve on certain standing FAS committees, and, where appropriate, to discuss those planned committee appointments with the provost and deans appointing the committees. Second, to consult with the provost and deans when they are forming ad hoc committees that include issues of broad concern to the FAS faculty, excluding personnel and confidential issues. In the case of provostially appointed committees that extend beyond the FAS, the FASS will have input into the identification of potential FAS members for those committees. The FASS has no jurisdiction over broader university-wide committees. This process of consultation will allow FAS-related committees appointed by the provost and deans to be considered representative of the FAS faculty.

The six member executive council of the senate will be elected by the FASS members directly, from among the elected FASS members. Vacancies created by outgoing members will be voted on after the yearly FASS elections, and as vacancies arise during the year. The executive council shall consist of the chair, secretary, and four others. For the initial FASS, council members will be elected to the council for their full initial terms, whether two or three years. After this initial period, executive council members will serve for a term of two years, renewable as in the case of FASS members for up to a total of three terms. At least five of the executive council members should be tenured faculty members.

The chair of the executive council chairs the meetings of the senate and is an ex officio member of all the senate's committees. The secretary will prepare minutes of meetings that shall be available in electronic form for all members of the FAS. If the chair will be absent, she or he should appoint another member of the council to chair the meeting.

8. Faculty leave

A recognized off-campus university leave (triennial faculty leave, parental leave, medical leave, etc.) not exceeding one semester will not invalidate the term of a FASS member. However FASS members will be expected to attend monthly meetings during the semester on which they are on

leave when they are in the New Haven area. The expectation that members attend all senate meetings whether or not on leave, unless they are away from the New Haven area, is a central responsibility of membership.

A leave of longer than a semester is incompatible with continued senate service. Junior faculty members should plan their two-year terms so that they do not conflict with their anticipated junior faculty year-long research leaves.

9. Resignation or inability to fulfill the obligations of an elected member

If an elected member should resign or otherwise be unable to fulfill the obligations of a member of the FASS, for example by taking a leave of more than one semester, or missing three or more meetings during a year in which there is no official leave, the executive committee of the FASS is empowered to appoint a temporary replacement member to serve until the next spring election. These members should be chosen from a list of alternates, the runner-up vote-getters for the divisional or at-large seats in the previous FASS election or, if the number of candidates on the list is insufficient, from the previous two FASS elections. If the number of such previous candidate alternates is still insufficient to fill the vacancies, members may be nominated by the executive council from among the FAS faculty subject to the approval of the senate.

10. Committees

The senate shall have the following standing committees, in addition to other committees that may be appointed by the executive council or by majority vote of the FASS.

a) Committee on Committees

This committee will liaise and consult with the administration to help identify potential FAS faculty to serve on committees with the aim of ensuring that FAS members appointed to FAS-relevant committees by the provost and deans are broadly representative of the FAS faculty, for example in the case of newly arrived faculty who may not yet be widely known on campus. This committee will also consult with the administration to help select the FAS faculty representatives to the faculty resource committee. These should be a representative group of faculty at the rank of full professor, who need not be elected members of the senate.²

b) Nominating Committee

This committee will nominate candidates to run for election each year. In its search for good candidates the committee will try to ensure appropriate diversity in divisional distribution

² At the spring 2014 FAS meeting to approve the FRC process, the provost indicated that, after a transitional period, the FAS senate would help select the faculty members of the FRC. One of the five faculty representatives on the FRC during 2014-15 is from the FAS senate implementation committee.

and the intellectual interests of the faculty, and also in terms of gender, ethnicity, and other important aspects of diversity.

c) Committee on Elections

This committee will oversee the annual elections of the senate, as well as periodically make recommendations to the FAS that it approve changes to the divisional representation and size of the body, if required. After the initial term of the FASS, the expectation is that members of this committee be in their final term, to avoid any possible conflict of interest.

d) By-Laws Committee

This committee, which we anticipate will be especially useful in the first few years of the FASS, will be in charge of recommending changes to the by-laws. These changes to be approved by a 2/3 majority of the FASS.

11. Staffing and budget

The FAS senate executive council should have sufficient dedicated staff support to help coordinate the activities of the executive council, communicate with members, and run the elections and other activities of the senate.

The FAS dean's office and the provost's office (where appropriate) should cooperate with technical and logistical support, as well as access to sufficient logistical support and institutional research, to enable the FASS to carry out its role.

The FASS should have sufficient financial support to enable it to carry out its functions. The FASS budget will be presented to members and all FAS faculty annually.

12. Schedule of meetings

The FASS shall hold one meeting each fall, preferably in October, at which the president shall give a report on the state of the university as it affects the FAS.

In addition, the deans of the FAS, Yale College, School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (as it affects the FAS) and the FAS divisional directors, shall present annually on the opportunities and challenges facing their areas of responsibility.

Meetings shall take place once a month during the academic year. Additional meetings may be scheduled at the discretion of the executive council or by a vote of the senate.

All members of the FAS senate, as well as those eligible to vote for the FAS senate shall receive a written notice of the FAS meeting schedule at the beginning of each semester. The agenda for each meeting, as well as relevant supporting documents, should be sent out and posted online to all those eligible to vote at least one week before each meeting.

By a majority vote of the FASS the executive council may also call for a meeting of the FAS as a whole. This meeting will be presided over by the dean of the FAS.

13. Voting in FASS meetings

Motions and votes of the FASS shall be decided by a majority, provided that at least 13 senators are present. Except that changes to FASS rules shall require a two thirds majority.

Voting in FASS meetings shall be by secret ballot. Members who are absent but are participating electronically may not vote, or count for purposes of quorum.

14. Minutes of meetings

Minutes will be posted at least one week before the subsequent meeting for faculty approval. Comments or revisions offered in communications to the FAS senate secretary in advance of the meeting will be noted at the meeting (and posted online); and the approval will be a simple vote on these materials. The minutes shall be as detailed as possible, subject to privacy policies and concerns.

15. Conduct of FAS senate meetings

Unless otherwise determined prior to meetings, all meetings of the FAS senate shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order. The chair and/or secretary of the executive council shall preside and set the agenda for the meeting. FASS members as well as non-members may submit a written request for new agenda items to the executive council no later than three weeks before a regular business meeting. In addition, a FASS member may request the inclusion of an agenda item for future discussion by making a motion under new business at any regular meeting. Such a motion requires majority vote of the FASS members.

Meetings are normally open to any individual who is qualified to vote in FAS faculty senate elections, though the chair of the meeting should, in running the meeting, give priority to the voices of elected members. Non-senators and also non-members may be asked to attend and/or speak with the permission of the chair, secretary or (in their absence) the council member serving as chair.

The president, provost, and deans of the FAS, Yale College, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science may attend all regular meetings of the FAS senate without invitation.

However at the discretion of the executive council, or by vote of the FASS, the FASS may declare a closed session open only to elected FASS members.

16. Ongoing communication with the Yale administration

The FAS senate will have the ability to communicate directly with the FAS faculty, and this will be facilitated by the FAS dean's office, which will provide updated email lists to the FASS at the beginning of each academic year, with regular updates as necessary.

The FASS will maintain a regularly updated website, with password protected access to the minutes and other important supporting documents, providing that these do not raise confidentiality issues.

17. Major changes to the FASS constitution

The FASS has been created by the FAS faculty. Changes to the FASS in terms of its divisional distribution, total number of FASS members, and the FASS electoral system, should be referred to the FAS faculty for approval, hopefully by electronic means. All other changes to FASS rules may be approved by a 2/3 majority in the FAS senate itself, unless there is a deadlock, in which case changes shall be referred back to the FAS.

Appendix B

Description of the STV electoral system and the design of the ballot

The FASS will use the single transferable vote system.³ Under STV, voters rank candidates in their order of preference, as many or as few as they wish. Any candidate reaching or surpassing the defined threshold is elected on the first round of vote counting. The “surplus” votes of each of the candidates who surpassed the threshold are then reallocated to the remaining candidates to see if these extra votes result in any of the remaining candidates achieving the required threshold. From this round on, the surplus of the winning candidate(s) and then the votes of the lowest-scoring candidate are reallocated after each round, until all seats have been filled.

This system, sometimes called the “Hare” system, after one of its designers in the 19th century, has several advantages over first past the post (FPTP). First, it reduces the likelihood, common in first past the post systems, of there being a large number of voters whose votes are ‘wasted’ on losing candidates. Second, it reduces the likelihood of candidates being elected who do not enjoy some substantial support among a broad portion of the electorate, because it incorporates voters’ second, third, fourth and (if the counting goes that far) subsequent preferences if their first choice candidates are not elected. The system may initially seem complex compared to the first past the post system used in most US elections, but it has been successfully adopted in senate elections in several US universities, for example in the University of Chicago. It also suits elections where there are multiple members to be elected from the same constituency, as is the case in the FASS. The system has also been used very successfully in Australia, Ireland and in local elections in many countries (including in local elections in Cambridge, MA).⁴ The counting of ballots under STV, which used to be quite time consuming, has been made much easier by modern computing, and the introduction of easily available and downloadable software in recent years (e.g. <http://www.openstv.org/>).

There will be two types of seats in the FASS; divisional and at-large. Voters will vote for both their divisional representative(s) and for their at-large FAS-wide representatives, by ranking their choices within each category. Divisional representatives will be voted on only by members of their division, while everyone will vote for at-large representatives. Voters may rank as many or as few choices in each category as they wish, without regard to the number of seats available. By default, every divisional candidate will also be placed on the at-large ballot, unless she/he expresses a wish not to appear on both ballots.

Every candidate may provide a brief description (250 words or fewer) on the e-ballot explaining why they wish to run and which issues matter to them.

³ A good description of the STV election process is found in Andrew Reynolds and Ben Reilly, *The International IDEA Handbook of Electoral System Design* (Stockholm: IDEA, 1997).

⁴ For a description of the system in Australia see <http://www.eca.gov.au/systems/proportional/>.

The counting will be done first for the at-large seats, and then for the divisional seats, in order to maximize the potential for broadly-supported candidates from any division of being elected to the at-large seats. Any candidate elected in the at-large seats will have her/his votes redistributed according to the second and subsequent preferences after the first round of divisional voting. Vote surplus transfers will be done using the 'fractional transfer' method, to minimize the effect of the order of counting of the ballots in the previous round.⁵

To ensure junior representation, in the years in which there is no continuing junior representative from a division, the highest polling junior faculty member in that division will be elected to the FASS. Junior seats will be resolved first. If someone is elected as a junior and is promoted while a member of the FASS, this will create a vacant junior slot for the next election.

To ensure non-ladder representation, in the years in which there is no continuing non-ladder representative in the at-large category, the highest polling non-ladder candidate in the at-large category will be elected to the FASS.

⁵ See <http://www.openstv.org/votingmethods/fractional> for a description of the advantages of this method, which makes sure that the transferred ballots reflect the average preferences of all the voters who voted for a particular candidate, rather than just the preferences of the (perhaps unrepresentative) number of surplus ballots that are transferred in a subsequent round.

Example of a ballot for a voter from the Humanities, for a year in which 2 candidates are to be elected from the Humanities, and 2 from the FAS-wide at-large category.

Divisional Ballot for the Humanities

Instructions to voter: Vote for as many candidates as you wish, in order of your preference, from the candidates for the Humanities division. Mark your first preference 1, your second 2, and so on.

<u>Candidate Name</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
<u>Angelou</u>	
<u>Aristotle</u>	
<u>Baldwin</u>	
<u>Dickinson</u>	
<u>de Beauvoir</u>	
<u>Goethe</u>	
<u>Plato</u>	
<u>Sartre</u>	
<u>Woolf</u>	

So the voter might like only four candidates, and express his/her preferences in the following way:

Divisional Ballot for the Humanities

<u>Candidate Name</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
<u>Angelou</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Aristotle</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Baldwin</u>	
<u>Dickinson</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>de Beauvoir</u>	
<u>Goethe</u>	
<u>Plato</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Sartre</u>	
<u>Woolf</u>	

Now for the at-large ballot. This ballot mingles at-large candidates from the Humanities, Social Sciences, Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Engineering.

At-Large Ballot

Instructions to voter: Vote for as many candidates as you wish, in order of your preference, from the at-large categories. Mark your first preference 1, your second 2, and so on.

<u>Candidate Name</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
<u>Angelou</u>	
<u>Aristotle</u>	
<u>Baldwin</u>	
<u>Brunel</u>	
<u>Crick</u>	
<u>Curie</u>	
<u>de Beauvoir</u>	
<u>Dickinson</u>	
<u>Goethe</u>	
<u>Greider</u>	
<u>Hodgkin</u>	
<u>Krugman</u>	
<u>Lovelace</u>	
<u>Ostrom</u>	
<u>Pauling</u>	
<u>Plato</u>	
<u>Sartre</u>	
<u>Sen</u>	
<u>Tirole</u>	
<u>Watson</u>	
<u>Woolf</u>	
<u>Wu</u>	

The voter might like six candidates, and therefore she/he will mark the ballot in the following way, voting for both people from the Humanities (Goethe and Woolf) and people from other disciplines (Krugman, Curie, Wu, Pauling).

At-Large Ballot

Instructions to voter: Vote for as many candidates as you wish, in order of your preference, from the at-large categories. Mark your first preference 1, your second 2, and so on

<u>Candidate Name</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
<u>Angelou</u>	
<u>Aristotle</u>	
<u>Baldwin</u>	
<u>Brunel</u>	
<u>Crick</u>	
<u>Curie</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>de Beauvoir</u>	
<u>Dickinson</u>	
<u>Goethe</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Greider</u>	
<u>Hodgkin</u>	
<u>Krugman</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Lovelace</u>	
<u>Ostrom</u>	
<u>Pauling</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Plato</u>	
<u>Sartre</u>	
<u>Sen</u>	
<u>Tirole</u>	
<u>Watson</u>	
<u>Woolf</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Wu</u>	<u>3</u>

Counting

When counting votes STV establishes a threshold (usually termed a 'quota') for election, the formula for which is:

$$Quota = \frac{votes}{seats + 1} + 1$$

So in the at-large election example above, if we have 100 votes and 4 seats that need to be filled, the threshold for election would be 21, calculated as following:

$$Quota = \frac{100 \text{ votes}}{4 \text{ seats} + 1} + 1$$

After the first round, the number of candidates whose first preference votes reach or exceed the threshold of 21 would be elected. If insufficient candidates are elected to fill the number of vacancies, the count would then move to a second round, in which the 'surplus' ballots of the winning candidates in the first round would be transferred to other candidates, according to those voters' second preferences. If this fails to put a sufficient number of the remaining candidates at or over the threshold to fill the number of vacancies, then the lowest scoring candidate will be eliminated, and his or her votes redistributed. These votes will be redistributed using the 'fractional transfer' method. The count continues in this way, first distributing surplus votes from candidates who have been elected in each round, and then (if no surplus votes are available) redistributing the votes of the lowest preference candidates, until sufficient candidates meet the required threshold and all the vacancies have been filled.⁶

⁶ A good description of the counting method is provided on the website of the Government of New Zealand, another country that uses the STV method of election (for local elections). <http://www.stv.govt.nz/stv/morethanonevacancy.htm>.

Appendix C

Overlap and interaction with other bodies and issues to be discussed in the FAS senate

The FAS Senate Implementation Committee is charged with making suggestions to avoid unnecessary duplication of functions and overlap among existing FAS bodies. These currently include: 1) Yale College Faculty Meeting; 2) Joint Boards of Permanent Officers; 3) the Faculty Forum established in 2012-13; 4) the full meeting of the FAS ladder faculty.

Overlap with the Yale College Faculty Meeting

The Yale College Faculty Meeting is currently open to 892 voting members, including 127 non-ladder faculty and 73 administrators.⁷ On routine business days up to half of the 70-80 attendees are college administrators.

The Yale College Faculty Meeting (YCFM) deals with the many issues necessary to the running of Yale College (e.g. Course of Study Committee, Committee on Honors and Academic Standing, Teaching Learning and Advising Committee, Student Life, Committee on Majors, etc.), and has also in recent years sometimes functioned as a de facto faculty meeting, covering issues of broad FAS faculty concern, which would now be more naturally discussed in the FASS.

How much deep deliberation the YCFM provides, even on college issues, is not always clear. Discussions in the YCFM often approve the results of the high quality deliberation in the many college committees, which is where much of the hard work gets done.

This committee recommends that the issues the YCFM currently consider that affect the FAS as a whole rather than Yale College specifically be transferred to the new FASS. Examples of issues covered in the YCFM the past few years that would be better located in the FAS would include such areas as the ITS Advisory Committee (as it affects the FAS), Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, Committee on the Decanal Structures in the FAS, and the Semi-annual Report of Complaints of Sexual Misconduct. The FASS should also consider Yale College issues when they relate to larger FAS questions, such as the increased load on FAS resources given the rise in undergraduate numbers with the new colleges.

Several people have suggested that we consider merging the YCFM and the new FASS. This may be a good idea at some point. But in the next few years, especially with the huge amount of activity necessary to build and open the two new colleges in 2017, and successfully integrate them into Yale College, we recommend that the YCFM continue in its present form.

⁷ As of October 2014.

Overlap with the Joint Board of Permanent Officers

The JBPO is open to the 444 full professors of the FAS. The JBPO is nominally the governing body of the FAS, subject only to the authority of the FAS as a whole. The Yale Corporation By-laws state that:

42. The members of the faculty of each school who are Professors on permanent appointment shall be the Permanent Officers of the school and, together with the President and the Provost ex officiiis and its Dean, shall constitute its Board of Permanent Officers. The Board shall be the governing board of the school, entrusted with matters relating to the educational policy and government of the school but subject, in the case of Yale College and the Graduate School, to the authority given to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In a school with an insufficient number of Professors on permanent appointment the President may appoint a Governing Board consisting of senior members of the faculty. This Governing Board shall carry out the functions of a Board of Permanent Officers. The Board of Permanent Officers or other Governing Board of a school may in its discretion refer to the faculty of the school for action any matters except recommendations for appointments of Permanent Officers and the assignment of Permanent Officers to the school.⁸

In practice though, the JBPO has not worked as a deliberative or governing body on FAS issues for many years, and it is unclear whether it ever did. Any possibility of the JBPO as currently configured serving as a space for FAS deliberation has been crowded out by the JBPO's time-consuming role as the final body for the approval of tenure and promotion cases. Virtually all the time in JBPO meetings is spent hearing ten minute presentations on each promotion case, sometimes followed by a brief discussion, and a vote. Most faculty consequently do not even realize that the JBPO is a de facto governing body.⁹

The JBPO's proceedings take up quite a lot of senior faculty time, with some effort expended to make sure that departments nominate quorum officers and that faculty who constitute a quorum stay in the room until the meeting is finished. The quorum is 37, and chairs of departments with cases pending that week, in addition to some faculty from those departments with cases pending, are obliged to attend, despite the fact that these cases have already been evaluated at length by the departments concerned as well as the divisional committees. Most JBPO members lack expertise in the specifics of the promotions being discussed and many have not read the materials circulated in advance. Moreover the vast majority of cases in the JBPO are approved with no dissent or else with minimal dissent.

The 2007 FASTAP committee that moved Yale to a tenure-track system considered the status of the JBPO. In its report the committee argued that "The Joint Boards symbolizes the primary importance of the permanent faculty in the appointment of new tenured colleagues, suggests the significance of tenure beyond each department, and highlights community responsibility within the Faculty of Arts

⁸ Source: Yale Corporation By-Laws as Approved by the Corporation, September 28, 2013, <http://www.yale.edu/about/bylaws.html> 10/23/2013.

⁹ Formerly the Yale College and Graduate School Deans chaired the JBPO, now with the creation of the FAS Dean the Dean of the FAS chairs the meeting.

and Sciences.” Our committee agrees with the FASTAP committee on the value of this role, but we feel that, especially with the increasing load on faculty and the presence of the new FASS, the JBPO as currently constituted performs this valuable function at too high a cost in faculty time.

We suggest therefore that meetings of the JBPO be reorganized so that we preserve the senior faculty’s right to a) review materials on promotion cases in advance and b) deliberate and vote on cases if they wish, but without requiring that they do this in the current time consuming way for every single case.

We envisage a new system in which some or all of the following changes might be implemented to streamline the JBPO:

- 1) *Combined meetings*: a meeting of the JBPO is held separately to and before each FASS meeting to approve the cases that have been circulated among faculty for that meeting. This JBPO would be chaired by the dean of the FAS and would include the senior FASS Faculty as well as the chairs or representatives of the departments with cases pending on that particular week, as at present, and would be open to all full professors in the FAS
- 2) *Reduced quorum*: The department chairs and representatives who attend together with the full professor members of the FASS would constitute the quorum for this meeting, provided the number exceeds five percent of the number of full professors in FASS (currently 22).
- 3) *Consent agenda*: We anticipate that these cases would then be processed much more quickly than at present, on a consent agenda, though perhaps with some explanation to the assembled faculty of how individual appointments might enrich the mix of faculty and strengthen key research areas.
- 4) *Retention of full faculty’s right to call JBPO if desired*: However if a number of senior faculty (we suggest fourteen) wish to have a full discussion of any case that week, they may petition the Executive Committee of the FASS, no later than six days before the FASS meeting, which will then call a full meeting of the JBPO to discuss all the cases for that week at length, in the same way as is done at present. Discussing all the cases for that week will avoid drawing undue attention to any one case. The quorum for the full JBPO meeting will be 37, as it is by convention at present (2014). In the event that the JBPO is to hold a full meeting in any week, the regular FASS meeting could be rescheduled to accommodate this.

We allow for the possibility that some of these changes may be implemented earlier than others.

Faculty Forum

The FAS Faculty Forum was started in 2012-13 and was open only to the 679 FAS ladder faculty, including tenured full and associate professors, as well as ladder-track associate and assistant professors who are pre-tenure. But attendance was low during 2012-13, no meeting has been held since that academic year, and it was generally felt not to be a success, in part because of concerns over its role and powers. The few substantive areas the faculty forum discussed, such as Yale’s

competitiveness in science and engineering, or the university library, could all be better discussed by a more representative group of faculty in the new FASS.

We therefore recommend the Faculty Forum's formal abolition.

Full Meeting of the FAS

The full meeting of the FAS is only called to consider major policy issues affecting the FAS as a whole, such as major changes to the tenure and promotion system (2007), the Nordhaus report and Academic Review Committee, and the FAS senate. In the past the meeting was convened by the president and provost; the meeting now will presumably be convened by the dean of the FAS and the president or provost, and chaired by the dean of FAS. We recommend that a full meeting of the FAS faculty may also be called for by the FAS senate.

Interaction with the Corporation

The FASS will, we hope, have an opportunity to present FAS faculty views to some of the members of the Yale Corporation. Recognizing the many demands on the corporation's time from across the university, we suggest this happens in the following ways: a) an annual written report from the FASS to the corporation, highlighting priorities, opportunities, and possible areas of concern; b) the administration will work to provide the FASS executive council with some opportunities to present to members of the relevant corporation committees; c) the FASS members would welcome the opportunity to consult with members of the corporation during its upcoming institutional assessment review process.

Additional matters to be discussed in the new FAS senate

This list is not exhaustive, and we expect other issues that the FASS executive council, president, provost, deans of the FAS, Yale College, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and individual FAS faculty members wish to discuss will also be raised in FASS meetings.

- The FASS will provide a place for the FAS faculty to discuss and develop their own sense of FAS priorities and opportunities, and ways to improve the FAS, including working groups, its own sub-committees, etc. The FASS will provide a place to discuss these ideas and issues with members of the administration.
- The FASS will also provide a place for the deans of the FAS, Yale College, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science to discuss their policies and priorities with a representative group of FAS faculty.
- The major FAS standing committees can use the FASS as a place to solicit advice and input into their ongoing work.

- The FAS Faculty Resource Committee to discuss its priorities, choices and the management of the slot pool in the previous year.¹⁰
- The committee on the economic status of the FAS faculty to present to the FASS.
- Annual state of the FAS address by the dean of FAS and the president.
- Discussion of FAS strategy, Yale's competitiveness, and efforts to increase the quality and the diversity of FAS.
- Presentation of FAS budget and priorities for advice and discussion.
- Major changes to FAS policies and conditions of employment laid out in the Faculty Handbook.
- Organization of FAS.
- Graduate school programs and policies as they affect the FAS.
- FASS to make annual written report to the Corporation.

¹⁰ The motion that "The FRC shall present a written report to the faculty, annually, about its priorities, choices, and the management of the slot pool in the previous year." was accepted by the provost and dean as a friendly amendment at the spring 2014 FAS meeting to approve the FRC process.