

FAS Senate

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

FAS Senate Meeting
Thursday, December 16, 2021
3:30 PM – 5:30 PM via Zoom
APPROVED

Present: Valerie Horsley, Chair; Aimee Cox, Deputy Chair; Sybil Alexandrov, R. Howard Bloch, Elisa Celis, Nicholas Christakis, Marta Figlerowicz, Miki Havlickova, Alessandro Gomez, Matthew Jacobson, Gerald Jaynes, Maria Piñango, Ruzica Piskac, Larry Samuelson, Kathryn Slanski, Jason Stanley, Rebecca Toseland, Meg Urry, Paul Van Tassel

Staff: Rose Rita Riccitelli

Absent: David Bercovici, Gerald Jaynes, Hélène Landemore, Paul North

Guests:

Alhassid, Yoram; Bennett; Beth; Bromwich, David; Chalioti, Eva; Elka ?; Fair, Ray; Feimster, Crystal; Fischer, Michael; Geanakoplos, John; Gehlker, Marion; Gendler, Tamar; Gerber, Alan; Goren, Shiri; Guinnane, Timothy; Guo, Shangqin; Heeger, Karsten; Jackson, Kenneth David; Kalimbou, Maria; Kao, Grace; Klevorick, Al; Koundi, Sourmia; Kugler, Sharon; Lee-Smith, Angela; Liang, Ninghui; Maruyama, Reina; Messeri, Lisa; Promey, Sally; Schiffer, Peter; Slade, Stephen; Solomon, Mark; Spangler, Stephanie; Strolovitch, Dara; Tang, Hong; von Kunes, Karen; Wang, Yu-Lin; Weimin, Zhongramu; Wilkinson, Steven; Wood, Elisabeth; Yamaguchi, Mika; Yan, Jing; Yang, Xiaoyong; Yeret, Orit; Zhang, Lingxin; Zhong, Weimin

OPEN SESSION 4:00 – 5:30 PM

The open session of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) meeting was called to order by its Chair **Valerie Horsley** at 4:03 PM. **Ms. Horsley** presented the minutes from the November 18, 2021 FASS meeting and made a motion to approve the minutes. **Larry Samuelson** seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and it was unanimous to approve the minutes from the FASS November 18, 2021 meeting.

Ms. Horsley talked about the topic of academic freedom and gift policies at Yale and said that the FASS has been working on this issues after learning of what happened with the “Grand Strategy Program.” She said that the FASS Executive Council (EC) had several meetings with **President Salovey** where we discussed our concerns about the lack of a gift policy and a clear statement to donors and to faculty on what we are trying to protect when donors give money to the University. More recently, she said, the EC met with the General Counsel’s Office and the

Development Office and learned that they have drafted a gift policy. She said we received a draft of the policy, which she believes is a good first draft of a policy that could be useful in establishing these types of standards for future gifts to the University. She noted that in October 2021 the FASS issued a resolution that requested that **President Salovey** establish a faculty driven committee to assess this gift policy and to insert language into the Faculty Handbook that protects academic freedom for faculty. We learned this week that the President intends to establish this committee that will be faculty led and will address three points:

- 1) To review the policy that the General Counsel's Office and the Development Office has created and note if there is anything else that needs to be added or changed.
- 2) To consider the point that language should be added to the Faculty Handbook.
- 3) To create procedures if faculty feel that they are pressured and who they turn to if they are being pressured, and how can they get support from the University.

Ms. Horsley noted that the FASS will be submitting names of people we believe would be good to serve on this committee and asked that if anyone is interested in serving or has a nomination of someone you think would be a good member of this committee, to please send her that information to her Yale email address or to the FASS email address. She said that we believe that that committee will be established before the end of January 2022 and that its work will be completed before the end of the spring 2022 semester. **Michael Fischer** raised the hope that the academic freedom policy will address other concerns including the patent policy that requires a kind of pre-publication of inventions before they can be published and feels that this is a problem he hopes that the committee will address. **Ms. Horsley** said she will make sure that this issue is mentioned to the committee for them to include in their process. She also noted that the FASS was instrumental in making this a priority and for the formation of this committee.

Ms. Horsley introduced the topic of the China Initiative and its impact on faculty and students that focuses on restrictions for science and STEM faculty. And, she noted, it also has a broader reaching impact on Chinese and Chinese Americans in the US and is impacting folks in their communities on whether they can get a visa, etc., and whether they can do their studies. She introduced two assistant professors– **Jing Yan** from Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology (MCDB) and **Yu He** from Applied Physics to talk about this and about sending a letter to US Attorney General **Merrick B. Garland**. **Mr. Yan** noted that the China Initiative is a project of the Department of Justice (DOJ) under the **Trump** administration and was installed on November 20, 2018, and was inherited by the **Biden** administration. He noted that its original goal was to investigate economic espionage and trade secret theft from the People's Republic of China (PRC) and it tries to develop informant strategy to counter so-called “non-traditional collectors,” students/scientists. **Mr. Yan** presented a graph that showed the number of cases that have been opened. He said that more importantly the majority of these cases have fallen apart. Also, he said, since 2019, the cases have strayed away from its initial mission and started to invade academic freedom and have begun to be an umbrella term for any cases with almost any connection to China. He noted that different funding agencies have responded differently and as an example, NIH has begun to investigate 180 scientists as of February 2020 and it is unclear what the outcome is from these investigations because NIH has refused to share information when the House of Representatives sent a letter of inquiry. More broadly, the Initiative has promoted a pervasive societal indoctrination that brews prejudice from within our education

system. **Mr. Yan** quoted **Maggie Lewis**, Professor of Law at Seton Hall University, who said “the China” as used in the DOJ’s “China Initiative” conflates government party, national origin, and ethnicity into an amorphous threat. “China” itself is anthropomorphized into a villain that steals and cheats.” He said as a consequence of the hostile environment created by the China Initiative, there is also a Presidential Proclamation 10043 that was signed by **President Trump** in 2020, that suspends entry of certain Chinese students and researchers from an “ever changing” list of universities. He said it has and will keep causing a lot of visa disruptions annually, and it has broadly impacted fields far beyond STEM and has caused increasing scrutiny/unwarranted harassment of students and scholars at airports. He said that we have received a letter from a 3rd year PhD student in Computer Science who was denied entry because of this initiative. He noted why the China Initiative is ungrounded:

- The current moves have been characterized as “racial profiling.”
- Racial profiling is both illegal and corrosive to our democracy.
- No person should be viewed by our government as more suspicious because of the individual’s race.

He quoted **Randy Howard Katz**, Vice Chancellor for Research at Berkeley: “These investigations have been conducted in a manner that does not adhere to our American values; an open and transparent process, an assumption of innocence until proven guilty, and the right to an appeal.”

Mr. Yan gave two cases where there were investigations where the two people were found innocent of the offenses they were charged with **Mr. He** said that the first thing he notes about the China Initiative is that it is straight-up racial profiling.” He noted that out of the 148 individuals charged under the China Initiative, 130 of them – 88% - are of Chinese heritage, and only 5% of them were found guilty, so this initiative remains nebulous in its definition and has created a chilling environment for researchers with a Chinese heritage or with Chinese collaboration. He highlighted two surveys conducted this year: one by the University of Michigan and one by the University of Arizona. The Michigan survey showed that among 369 faculty respondents, those who don’t feel safe doing research in the US said leading causes are investigations of Chinese researchers (91%), anti-Asian violence in the US (90%), and US officials attacking Chinese government or policies (41%). Also, respondents might not seek US grants – afraid of liability for paperwork mistakes (88%), collaborations with China would create suspicion (60%). He said in the survey conducted by the University of Arizona 73% of respondents (~2000) agree that there is value in collaborations with China. However, in the last few years, 40% with a Chinese heritage now avoid Chinese collaborations and 61% said this is due to the China Initiative and 39% said this is due to the travel ban and visa challenges. **Mr. He** said that when asked respondents if they would seek career moves outside the US due to the China Initiative, 42% of respondents of Chinese heritage agreed with this statement, and only 7% with non-Chinese heritage agreed. He noted that these figures point to the racial profiling nature of the China Initiative and the consequences it has created for those of Chinese heritage.

Mr. He listed just some of the impacts this initiative has had on the Yale campus:

- Faculty losing grants (e.g., NIH)
- Research groups rush to find costly collaboration alternatives
- Increasing administrative burden of reporting for everyone
- Prominent scientists leaving Yale, postdocs not pursuing jobs in the US
- New students not able to come to Yale, additional financial responsibilities to PIs

- Existing Chinese students can hardly travel
- Chinese Scholar Council graduate program being stymied
- Potential impact on Humanities and Social Sciences
- Yale image for undergrads (two YDN articles)

Mr. He said that he encourages everyone to join the recent nation-wide movement to stop this initiative: Stanford, Berkeley, Temple, Princeton, U of Michigan (among others) by:

- Collecting Yale signatures to endorse the Stanford open letter (protesting China Initiative)
- Call senators and congressmen/women to voice your concern
- Call for Yale commitment to support students who experience related difficulties
- Call for Yale commitment to future legal support in defense of retrospective investigation

Ms. Horsley thanked **Mr. Yan** and **Mr. He** for sharing this important information on the China Initiative. **Paul Van Tassel** said that it was mentioned that the Biden Administration has inherited this policy, and asked if anyone knows if the current administration has commented on the policy and is working on reforming the policy? **Mr. He** commented (but does not want to be quoted) that from a recent report, **Attorney General Garland** reiterated their determination to counter scientific espionage and actually doubled-down on the investigation on Civil Fusion Strategy from China, but there is no statement in regard to what we consider over risk to academia – they don't give an explicit statement on that. Recently, he noted, there has been a push in Congress to approve a bill that gives scientists an opportunity to make amends to previously failed disclosures due to inconsistent instructions, however it has not been supported by the Republicans and this is why this open letter has been written. **Ms. Horsley** thanked **Mr. He** for this information and noted that she has spoken with people who are concerned about if they study in China or if they need to go to China to do their research that it is causing difficulties throughout the University. **Mr. Jacobson** said that it is obvious that scientists are taking the lead on this but he wants to urge our colleagues in the Humanities and Social Sciences to be concerned – we know that profiling is bad policing and we also know that profiling is good politics and is probably why the Biden administration has stuck with it. It is also, he said, really important that people across the divisions support this effort. **Ms. Horsley** said that she has a graduate student from China who has not been able to go home, and she is very sad. She also noted that we have lost a large pool of graduate students from China in the biological sciences. **Mr. Weimin Zhong** said that among his friends at Yale, several had their NIH grants stripped away and at least one of them had to give up his tenure at Yale because he no longer could do his research and had to return to China. He said this is forcing tenured faculty to give up tenure at Yale because of conditions in China and the University has not really given information on the numbers of Yale faculty who have had their NIH grants stripped away, and at the very least, Yale should give the numbers of how many have been affected by this initiative. **Ms. Horsley** encouraged everyone to consider signing the letter – the link is in the chat. **Mr. He** said the goal is to finish collecting signatures to the letter by the end of December to **Attorney General Garland**. **Ms. Horsley** also said she would facilitate getting the information to our elected officials in CT. and it was noted that this is a great opportunity to get our voice out like other schools like Stanford has already done and we need to reach out to the broader Yale Community to let them know that this initiative is going on because only a small section of the Yale

community is aware of this problem. **Ms. Horsley** mentioned that the letter was already sent to the FAS faculty and she will send it out one more time with the summary of this meeting.

Ms. Horsley called for FASS Committee reports.

Larry Samuelson spoke for the Budget Committee and reported that a sub-committee has been formed with members **Gerald Jaynes**, himself, **Rebecca Toseland**, **Paul North**, and possibly others. He noted that the goal of this committee is to accumulate information and make recommendations for how the University might constructively respond to the budget implications of the change in the value of the endowment. He said we hope to have the bulk of that work done soon and to have some focus to the division of the budgetary implications between faculty, administration, and other uses. **Ms. Horsley** noted that the committee will reach out to chairs and other leaders in the University so we can understand what priorities will be useful for the FAS, and in collaboration with **Dean Gendler's** office, we hope to be able to make recommendations to **Provost Strobel**.

Nicholas Christakis spoke for the Governance Committee and said that they have almost completed a draft of its report regarding the growth and the size of the bureaucracy of the administration in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and that the draft will be circulated to the other members and ultimately released in January or February 2022 subject to the Executive Committee's decision.

David Watts asked what the FASS is trying to do with the budget. He is grateful to receive the news that faculty will be receiving a salary increase. He said he recommends that the FASS urgently put pressure to increase funding for the Graduate School, and at the very least to increase funding for teaching fellowships and expand what is currently available. He noted that right now there are no positions, except in extreme circumstances, for people who are not in teaching years or have not gotten extensions to be able to teach in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. He often said it not enough to meet our needs and in his Department of Anthropology, we have often benefited by having students from the Law School, the School of Public Health, or the School of the Environment, who are able to teach and meet our needs, and they cannot do that now. **Ms. Horsley** noted that this issue is something that the FASS raises regularly with the administration. **Mr. Christakis** said that the problem with the Graduate School is one that many faculty have encountered, including himself, and it is not just a budgetary matter but also has to do with the new procedures in place for pre-registering for classes, and decanal level decisions not to release funds to hire people from the Public Health School or wherever. He said it is unclear how we are going to honor promises that we make to students when they come to Yale – take anything in the Blue Book, learn anything you want – when we continue to restrict class enrollment because there are not enough TF's. He said he wonders if the FASS would consider a special sub-committee on this topic. **Ms. Horsley** asked if it would be good to have focused discussion on this topic perhaps at our January 2022 meeting to consider what can be done that would be fruitful? She also noted that all of the committees are hard at work and we look forward to hearing updates from each of them next semester.

Ms. Horsley introduced the next agenda item – an update on COVID. She asked **Ms. Cox** to begin the update. **Ms. Cox** said there are two major COVID updates – thinking about what is happening now with the new variant and schools closing, and thinking about next semester and what that means with the general protocols, and also how Yale will handle the accommodations

for teaching for the spring semester. **Ms. Cox** noted that some schools have already closed and are having exams remotely, and asked what this means for Yale. From a discussion the EC has had with **Dean Gendler**, it was stated that professors have the discretion to decide what to do with exams and that the administration is not going to dictate what the procedures for exams will be. **Ms. Cox** asked **Dean Gendler** to speak to what might happen for next semester as much as she feels comfortable doing as it will be speculation and nothing has yet been decided. **Ms. Cox** also said there have been several questions about accommodations and noted that she did receive a message stating that if you currently have an approved accommodation, it will automatically be extended and you do not have to do anything or reapply. New accommodations will need information from your medical provider to be filled out on the form on the Institutional Equity web site, and she said the question that she has been asked is who is deciding what the requirements are for the accommodations and beyond an individual meeting those accommodations, what it means to be a caregiver for an elderly parent or sick child, where you yourself might not need accommodation but you are impacting an entire household. **Dean Gendler** explained that Yale makes decisions on what we call a risk budget – we allocate the risk of COVID spread on the basis where we think the benefit exceeds the cost, the benefit exceeds the risk, so that produces situations that sometimes feel inconsistent. She said the basic principles that underly the risk budget is that we spend it first and foremost on in-class education for students – so the first place where we would have anything in person, would be in classes. The second place where it is spent is providing students with an as robust undergraduate student life as possible and as robust a graduate and professional student life experience as possible. It is for that reason that extra activities are not considered as much. Regarding the message sent to faculty about choosing whether to have exams in person or remotely, when that message was sent, she set aside extra funding for holding exams remotely, which is more costly than having them held in person, so this is the budgetary component of that decision. **Dean Gendler** then addressed the decision to go from in-person dining to the grab-and-go in suite dining. She said due to the spike in COVID cases in our peer institutions, we do not want to have our students gathering in large spaces, unmasked for extended periods of time, so the decision was made that dining would be restricted to grab-and-go to lessen the time students gather in an unmasked situation. **Dean Gendler** said there is a Health Policy Committee that has been meeting every morning at 7 AM since the 6th of March 2020, and it is the place where all of this information is gathered, and includes the Dean of the Med School, the Dean of the School of Nursing, various members of the School of Public Health, along with members responsible for the daily care of students and the provision of resources, and this is the committee that makes the assessment of risk and then decisions of what to do in the case of the assessment of risk and are sometimes made school by school and sometimes made centrally, for example the level of alert is a University decision made by the Provost and President. Regarding next semester, she said that we are hopeful that our students will return on January 14, 2022, and that everyone will return to New Haven on the Friday before classes begin, and that we will begin with in-person teaching on January 18, 2022, and this all depends on the public health situation and whether schools are opened and what transmission levels look like, and what percentage of our students, faculty, and staff are eligible for booster doses, and how available booster doses are. She said all of this is decision-making that will be made in real time and that we hope the semester will begin just as we have planned. She said it is also possible that there will be disruption to our plans. **Dean**

Gendler turned to the topic of accommodations and reported that the decision was made to extend accommodations that were granted for the fall 2021 semester to all who received those accommodations. These decisions are overseen by the Office of Equal Opportunities and governed by federal and state laws covering equal opportunity. The exception to these accommodations that were granted in the fall are the cases where visa status was such in the fall the faculty member could not arrive before the fall semester started, so those accommodations no longer are needed if the faculty member is back on campus. In the case of caregiver accommodations, **Dean Gendler** noted that they are overseen by a health committee associated with the Yale University Health Services and are made by the basis of a medical assessment on the risk to which the cohabitant would be put as a result of the faculty member engaging in classroom teaching, and the assessment is made, as it is in the initial case, if the faculty member is leaving the home for reasons that put them at risk which would be teaching in the classroom.

Ms. Horsley asked that if one of the committees denies a faculty member in the FAS an accommodation, what does the faculty member do if they disagree with that decision? **Dean Gendler** said she does not know the answer, and **Ms. Horsley** asked if she would recommend that they reach out to their Divisional Dean? **Dean Gendler** said she does not know the process and will find out and come back with the answer. As far as the criteria that is used to grant such an accommodation, if a faculty member is not able to leave the house at all for any reason other than doctors' appointments, then they can be granted an accommodation. If the faculty member is leaving the house for other reasons such as worship services and grocery shopping, they would be denied the accommodation. **Ms. Horsley** said that she thinks that there should be a FAS appeals process if the University does not have one. **Dean Gendler** made note of this request. **Ms. Cox** asked if there was an accommodation given in the fall 2021 based on a caregiver situation, would that accommodation also be extended into the spring 2022 semester, and **Dean Gendler** said that if that accommodation was COVID related and the situation has not changed since the fall then it would be extended. **Matthew Jacobson** thanked **Dean Gendler** for her work during the pandemic. He is however concerned that things are changing every day and will continue. **Dean Gendler** noted that decisions will be made as soon as things change and that will continue to be true. **Mr. Jacobson** noted his concern about the threshold used in determining whether someone is eligible for an accommodation based on a medical condition, noting that his condition is such that it is an extreme case because he is undergoing heavy chemotherapy, but he fears that there are others who are also at risk but do not have the same severity as he does and therefore do not qualify for an accommodation. **Dean Gendler** noted that accommodations take into consideration that the first mission of the University is to the education of its students, and that education should take place in person. This does take into consideration accommodations; however, those accommodations would be at a high threshold and not a lower threshold, and these accommodations need to be applied fairly and this is how the process works. **Kathryn Slanski** noted that she was at a meeting with **Dean Chun** last week where he noted from the Faculty Handbook that all exams will be held in person. She said that she feels that the messaging around exams has been inconsistent and that we have been asked to be compassionate and flexible, and that the exam policy statement was really late coming out. **Dean Gendler** explained that the Faculty Handbook has developed over the years and explains what faculty are asked to do as Yale faculty in order to carry out the mission of the University, and we do not make changes to the policies and practices that were formulated by faculty who are responsible

for its content. So, she noted, when **Dean Chun** came to the meeting with the Handbook and said, “here is the policy on exams” and that these are the rules that he inherited and intends to use to govern Yale College. Subsequently, when the situation was changing, the memo was sent to faculty giving them the option of having exams online because of the changing circumstances surrounding COVID and the impact it might have on students, especially those who had to travel. And, she noted, the changes were all done in a good faith attempt while operating in wildly unpredictable circumstances. **Ms. Slanski’s** point was that messaging has been inconsistent and we have been asked to be compassionate and flexible and yet that statement was really late coming out. **Dean Gendler** said this was out of respect for University governance, and that the Handbook was developed over many years in consultation with many college faculty committees who worked together over many decades to compose a Handbook that includes the policies and practices that we as a faculty with the responsibility of teaching undergraduates thought best encoded our commitments. She went on to say that we don’t make quick changes to things that are inherited policies that were formulated by faculty and by those responsible for this. So, **Dean Chun** came with the Handbook and said that here is the set of rules that he inherited and stated that these are the rules by which he runs Yale College. He then heard at a meeting the message that was sent from her office which said, “listen to your students.” She said it showed that this policy was incompatible with the principle that was meant to be embodied – which is that we want to offer the best education that we can. **Dean Gendler** noted that we are operating under wildly unpredictable circumstances and therefore the decision to consider online exams was made to match the current circumstances. **Ms. Slanski** said that she understands the long process of the accumulated generations of wisdom that went into the Handbook, but the Handbook did not anticipate COVID and this is a place where faculty input earlier in the process might have been helpful because some of us had already begun to work on remote options for our exams in case they had to go online. **Dean Gendler** noted that gathering a large group of people to attend a last-minute meeting is difficult and therefore the process is tricky. **Ms. Horsley** said that her interpretation of what happened at the DUS meeting is that it was presented as “this is what is in the Handbook, and this is what we are going to do.” And she said, we as a faculty were shocked that this message was contrary to asking us to give accommodations to our students. **Dean Gendler** asked **Ms. Slanski** if her question had been answered, and **Ms. Slanski** noted that if a large meeting to discuss changes could not be organized in this instance, perhaps the administration could turn to the FAS Senate, and in this case the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Education might have been helpful. **Michael Fischer** noted that the Yale College Faculty meetings are regularly scheduled and he believes that that would have been an appropriate place to discuss the question, not about Omicron but about the flexibility concerning the rules in the Faculty Handbook giving the disruptions in the past two years. However, many of the Yale College Faculty Meetings have been cancelled because there has been nothing to discuss, and it would be fruitful if these meetings were returned to some of their previous purposes which was to have an open conversation between faculty and the administration rather than going through channels. **Dean Gendler** pointed out that there was a Yale College Faculty meeting as recent as December 2, 2021, and as always happens at the close of the meeting, the faculty were asked if they had any questions or concerns, and because there were none the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 PM that day. **Mr. Fischer** said he attended that meeting and noted that there was no mention of exams at that meeting, however he also

understands that this body is no longer a governing body and therefore the attendance has been poor and he does not recall any questions being raised to the administration in recent times. He also noted that in the past there were active discussions that were informative. He said there is an issue at these meetings with inviting discussion on issues that concern the faculty and can be anticipated to concern the faculty. **Dean Gendler** responded that **Mr. Fischer** could certainly bring up this issue at the next Yale College Faculty meeting and she will bring it up to **Dean Chun**, and she assured him that the meetings do remain open to whatever discussions are suggested. **Ms. Cox** thanked **Dean Gendler** for her work and for this conversation.

Ms. Cox introduced **Stephanie Spangler**, Vice Provost for Health Affairs & Academic Integrity; University Title IX Coordinator, to speak specifically about the new COVID variant Omicron and any information could offer in thinking ahead to next semester. **Ms. Spangler** said we are watching carefully the new COVID 19 Omicron variant and said the one thing that seems to be certain is that it is highly transmissible. She said they are still looking at whether this variant causes more serious or less serious illness, and it is still being looked at. However, she noted, from studying the cases it appears that being vaccinated is not as effective against Omicron but boosters are. She said we are pushing for everyone to receive boosters and we are opening up extra clinics to make this happen, so her message is “boost, boost, boost!” She noted that after Thanksgiving we had a rise in cases of Delta, and this week we have seen cases of Omicron among all constituencies but we have not seen clusters or classroom transmission, and this week the cases we’re seeing are employees and dependents and off-site associations and have not had workplace transmissions. She said that we are watching closely as some of our peers have had a surge in uptakes. She said that she is sending a serious message about boosting and testing, and that we are keeping an eye so we can always be ready to pivot if necessary. **Ms. Horsley** thanked **Ms. Spangler** and asked her if we are going to require boosters for return to campus. **Ms. Spangler** noted that this is a topic of conversation and asked everyone to watch her message to students that she will issue tomorrow. She said they are also watching the CDC to see if they are going to require boosters and would welcome thoughts from this group. **Ms. Horsley** said that it makes sense to her to require boosters and **Mr. Christakis** said that he thinks Yale has done a magnificent job in handling the pandemic internally, and that the team has done terrifically well. He said in his opinion he thinks that we should require boosters and he suspects, although it is hard to know given the dynamics, that we’re seeing with the Omicron variant the conditions in New Haven in January that may be such as you may decide to postpone the return of students to campus. **Ms. Slanski** thanked **Ms. Spangler** for all of the work she has done and the way she has been communicating updates. She said that the “real time” information has been calming. She said that she has spoken with a number of students since Thanksgiving, mostly undergrads, and they say that they are not so much concerned about classrooms because mask wearing is enforced by the College, but it’s in the living spaces where people are not complying with mask wearing. She asked if there is anything that can be done about this. **Ms. Spangler** said that the rules are that people need to be masked everywhere on campus except in their suites and when eating/drinking in the dining halls. The mechanism that is available for reporting violations is a hotline and we have house and safety leaders in the college – who is **Melanie Boyd** – and because of the public health risk, if people do report violations of our policies there is a rapid procedure before the Compact Review Committee to take measures to correct the infractions if students don’t comply. **Ms. Cox** again thanked **Ms. Spangler** for her work and for the work of the

committee, and for her timely messages that are so informative and so helpful. She noted that the messaging that she sends out goes a long way in terms of easing anxiety.

Ms. Horsley thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 5:30 PM.