John Geanakoplos, chair of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS), opened the meeting at 4:05 PM. He presented the minutes from the FASS meeting of November 21, 2019 for review and asked for a vote of approval.

Approval of Minutes from FASS meeting on November 21, 2019

William Nordhaus pointed out that in the minutes of the November 21, 2019 FASS meeting, Mr. Berry stated that the Provost decided the size of faculty to be 700. William Nordhaus clarified that setting the target size of the FAS ladder faculty at 700 was originally determined prior to the time at which Ben Polak was Provost.

1) Mr. Geanakoplos presented the minutes from the November 21, 2019 FASS meeting for approval with noted changes. They were unanimously approved with noted changes to be incorporated.

2) Reports of the current FASS Committees:

Faculty Advancement Committee

Emily Erikson reported on the committee’s deliverable goals by June 2020. The committee’s
main issues to address this year will be faculty size and the administrative service burden for faculty. Other issues they will address are the tuition benefit and issues with IT services. Mr. Geanakoplos asked if the committee is thinking about conducting a survey about the service issue. Ms. Erikson said that it is possible at a later date, however the committee wants to make sure that they think carefully about the issues and what to include on a survey so it is not on their agenda right now.

Governance Committee
Mr. Nordhaus reported on this committee. Major issues for this committee are the FASS committee on the decanal structure and FAS budget autonomy. He noted that the budget issue poses a problem because currently the FAS Dean’s office does not have staff with expertise in this field to take on budgeting.

Mr. Geanakoplos said, as a point of information, FAS Dean Tamar Gendler has claimed that there isn’t much room for redistribution or re-allotment of funds because there are very little free funds to work with.

Mr. Geanakoplos raised an additional question of governance: what substantive role will the FASS have with the President and Provost regarding appointment of committees and selection of top administrative positions such as provost and divisional deans? Mr. Geanakoplos is preparing a letter to the President and FAS Dean on this issue and will ask the Governance Committee to review the letter before he sends it.

Budget Committee
Jill Campbell reported on this committee and said that the committee plans to meet with Steve Murphy, VP of Finance, in order to gain more knowledge of the FAS budget and how it relates to faculty size and salaries.

Committee on Instructional Faculty and Academic Support
Sybil Alexandrov reported on this committee and noted that the committee report in 2017 made 28 recommendations with only 5 being addressed. This year the committee will work on deliverables and especially focus on the parenting leave for instructional faculty. She said that they have been led to believe that the prospect of phased retirement for instructional faculty is more hopeful. Ms. Alexandrov will provide the Senate with the list of the five areas that have been addressed.

Diversity Committee
Valerie Horsley reported on this committee. She reported that the committee has three deliverables they are working on this year: 1) to produce a best practices document for FAS Faculty by creating classroom environments that are inclusive and collaborate with the Center for Teaching and Learning. They are working with Larry Gladney to create a one-page document that will help faculty know how to do this effectively; 2) Next semester they plan to hold an interactive workshop, together with Dean Gladney, where best practices will be discussed along with issues that span across departments, and how we can learn from each other on how we are addressing issues across the FAS regarding diversity; 3) support diversity hiring in FAS Departments, understanding that this is a priority for Dean Gladney for this year. Howard Bloch noted that the Graduate School just finished a survey that has information on these areas and can
provide information to this committee. Shiri Goren said there is information on diversity teaching that the Center for Teaching and Learning can provide. Matthew Jacobson said the committee is meeting with Jerimiah Quinlan and Larry Gladney this Friday to discuss best practices within the undergraduate admissions process that can be mobilized for graduate admissions.

Science and Engineering Committee
Alessandro Gomez, speaking for the committee, reported on a meeting with Scott Strobel and Jeff Brock that was quite informative. The Science & Engineering Committee wants to form an oversight committee that will focus on the implementation of the University’s Science Strategy Report and initiative. Mr. Gomez noted that Scott Strobel had been in charge of implementation. Now that he has been appointed Provost, we do not know who will assume responsibility for implementation of the Science Strategy Initiative. The committee’s goal is to have greater transparency as this initiative develops. He spoke of the need to increase faculty in this area. There are also issues specific to engineering that need to be considered; they therefore intend to consult with Dean Brock about convening a committee for engineering.

Mr. Geanakoplos noted Senator Timothy Newhouse’s absence and said that he will be absent for the entire spring semester owing to parental leave. He asked the group to consider having former senator Rajit Manohar sit in for Mr. Newhouse in his absence, noting that Mr. Manohar has experience as a senator and is willing to serve. Mr. Geanakoplos said that this was discussed at the Executive Council meeting, and all members of the EC agreed to present Mr. Manohar as a replacement for Mr. Newhouse for the spring of 2020. There was a motion to appoint Mr. Manohar as a replacement for Mr. Newhouse. Senators unanimously voted to approve Mr. Manohar to serve on the FASS for the spring 2020.

Ad Hoc Undergraduate Admissions and Education Committee
Mr. Geanakoplos reported on this committee. The committee will focus its preliminary efforts on finding out what is being offered to the diverse group of students who are admitted to Yale and do not have the training in certain areas to do the work that is expected of them, and what kinds of help they are being offered. He talked about the time he spent on the admissions committee as an observer.

Mr. Geanakoplos encouraged people to take part in Yale College admissions. It’s enjoyable and individual faculty can make a difference in the process. He said that one of the deliverables of this committee would be to provide a list of student assistance resources to faculty so that faculty know where to send students if they notice that they are in need of help. Ms. Goren said that being part of the process provides a voice for the faculty perspective. We will advertise all of the resources where faculty can refer students to get help if they need it.
- Strive to have two times the number of candidate names for open slots on the FASS of all FAS faculty who are eligible to be nominated and who can vote.
- Still need three non-senators on the Nominations committee
- Have a social gathering to promote FASS. Dates proposed: January 30th or February 6th. For this to be a successful event, we need full participation from senators. Matthew Jacobson suggested reaching out to chairs to promote event. Mr. Nordhaus suggested having John or others talk about what the FASS is all about during the event.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer also commented on the FASS meeting time and made a suggestion to change the starting time of meetings to an earlier time in order to accommodate those who have childcare.

Peer Advisory and Ombudsperson Committee
Jill Campbell spoke about the ombudsperson recommendation. She said there was a meeting on December 2, 2019 with Dean Gendler and others and there are two more meetings scheduled for January 14th and 16th to address this proposal. She is hoping that the concept of having a separate ombuds office will progress and ultimately be formed.

Elections Committee – no report for this committee.

Mr. Geanakoplos moved to the main agenda and introduced Mr. Nordhaus who spoke about the history of faculty senates. He said that as chair of the FASS last year, he was contacted by individuals from other institutions to address issues of faculty governance and wanted to organize a meeting with people from various institutions to share their experiences with senates and discuss the history, power, frustrations and successes and aspirations of faculty senates across time. While virtually every major institution has a senate, each one is highly varied in how it operates, with some being highly dominant and some virtually invisible, some are successful and some less so. There are key elements that appear to make a faculty senate effective: a) the senate is viewed by faculty as effective; (b) the administration views the senate as essential and values sharing responsibility; (c) the university’s administrative leadership actively and substantively confers with the leadership of the senate. Mr. Nordhaus said the group reached out to about 12 institutions to convene an all-day meeting, and in May of 2019, representatives from 8 major universities attended. They learned that Stanford has a 50-year history of their very successful senate. He referred to a book that Stanford has produced, and noted that it has been sent to each senator in PDF form and recommended to specifically read the 2nd chapter.

Mr. Nordhaus shared a brief history of Yale’s FAS Senate (FASS):
- FASS was established purely by faculty
- FASS serves in an advisory capacity only (with no formal powers) while other senates range from limited powers to very broad powers.
- FASS is not embraced by the administration and faces more resistance from the administration than most other senates; FASS is a functional senate and has had
successes through its reports and yet faces strong resistance from the administration. Indeed, the administration is often an impediment.

- FASS senators have dedicated substantial work hours to producing reports with few successful outcomes.

Looking forward, Mr. Nordhaus proposes that the FASS think about the senate’s authority and effectiveness and what can be done to increase these areas.

Valerie Horsley gave a presentation based on research into what other senates are doing. She found that the U.C. Berkeley senate is well organized. It has many committees addressing issues and has an award for faculty service. She mentioned that the University of Utah has a mechanism in place so that decisions go through many committees before being approved. It has a flowchart integrating the senate into governance and the university decision-making structure. Pomona College has a way of posting documents for faculty to review and make comments. Ms. Horsley showed how Southern CT State University has a system in which their senate passes a resolution and the President actually has to sign off on it.

Mr. Geanakoplos asked the group to come up with central themes the FASS wants to address this year and communicate to the faculty.

Alessandro Gomez noted that each committee has specific roles. He spoke of the Governance Committee and their role to ensure that shared governance becomes part of the FASS. He said if there is any indication of, or potential abuses of authority, he would like to establish a committee that looks into these areas.

A debate took place over whether the Senate should collect and collate a wide range of faculty grievances or whether it should target a few broad areas of cross-cutting concern.

Hélène Landemore-Jelaca proposed that the Senate could gain more constructive power by collecting greater information on the very specific concerns of faculty through an on-line tool such as “see-click-fix.” This would help the FASS identify precise problems and come up with proposals to fix problems that are identified in this way. This type of data could augment the senate’s voice and positions and thereby improve the communications all around. Ms. Landemore explained “see-click-fix” or something like it would act as a tool wherein faculty can talk with each other and make comments. Ms. Horsley is concerned that this type of on-line tool could get out of hand. Mr. Bloch suggested that the FASS come up with a finite catalogue of issues that faculty can comment on.

From a different perspective, Joseph Fischel noted that since there are senates at other institutions who have more power, it would be helpful to see a report on how they operate. Mr. Gomez added that there are some overarching issues that are concerns of the entire FASS that need to be addressed and not by a single committee. Ms. Klein said we are seeing responses to the Excellence Report; it did wake up the administration, which had not been paying attention to the declining salaries and other issues pertaining to the faculty. The follow-up question, again, is how we build the power to compel the administration to make some real changes and reinvest in FAS. Ms. Horsley said we need to galvanize faculty around the issues that are most important to
them and that there is power in numbers. **Mr. Nordhaus** feels that the FASS is doing things in right and in thoughtful ways and so the FASS needs to continue to think about how we use our influence so that we are paid attention to. We are an institution that needs to be listened to. **Mr. Geanakoplos** said that the Executive Council has a meeting with two members of the Yale Corporation.

**Paul Van Tassell** noted that the issues of faculty size, faculty excellence and where resources are going are major, broad-scale issues that need to be addressed. **Ms. Landemore** agreed that these are important issues and also included faculty size and salaries and issues regarding instructional faculty. **Ms. Erikson** noted that faculty senates are less successful when they are perceived as, and operate as, lobbying groups. **Ms. Campbell** said that she supports all of the comments made and hopes that the FASS can gain more power by being supported by our constituency. It would be good to hear from departments concerning how each one has been affected by the decrease in faculty size.

Mr. Geanakoplos thanked all for their participation in this discussion. He then presented the Proposal on Singapore for consideration and a vote of approval.

Mr. Gomez made a motion to accept the Singapore Proposal. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion.
A vote was taken and it was 15 yes, 2 abstentions.
The motion passed and the Proposal on Singapore was approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:04 PM.