

**FAS-SEAS Senate Meeting**  
**March 24, 2026**  
**Closed Meeting - Senators Only**  
**3:30 PM – 4:00 PM**  
**Open Meeting – 4 PM. – 5:30 PM**  
**203 Luce Hall, 34 Hillhouse Avenue**  
**Minutes**  
**APPROVED**

**Present:**

Chair Marijeta Bozovic and Deputy Chair Maria Piñango, Dinny Aletheiani, Cynthia DeRoma, Casey Dunn, Michael Farina, Michael Fischer, Beverly Gage, Alessandro Giammei, Amir Haji-Akbari, Sonam Kachru, Michael Loewenberg, Rourke O'Brien, David Post, Claire Roosien, Stephen Slade, Kathryn Slanski, Brett Smith, Mark Solomon, Meg Urry, Robert Wooster, Jing Yan

**Absent:**

Alison Sweeney

**Guests:**

Julia Adams, Tarren Andrews, Alexia Belperron, Jeffrey Brock, Nicholas Christakis, Alexy Fedorov, John Geanakoplos, Christopher McGowan, Sohrab Ismail-Beigi, Roy Lederman, Daniel Martinez-HoSang, Mark Mooseker, Julian Posada, Dara Strolovitch, David Watts, Steven Wilkinson, Fadzilah Yahaya, Yoshitaka Yamamoto, Julie Zimmerman

**Closed session: (3:30 PM – 4 PM)**

FAS-SEAS Senate Chair **Marijeta Bozovic** opened the closed portion of the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting at 3:30 PM. She spoke on instructional faculty hiring and what we know so far on personal, individual, and local levels. She noted that FAS Dean **Steven Wilkinson** communicated to chairs how the new track request system would work, and that chairs are trying to minimize damage. **Ms. Bozovic** asked the group what the minimized damage looks like, what kind of information gathering we want to do, and what will be the ongoing effects of the budget cuts? She noted the Instructional Faculty and Outreach Committee's recent report and said we should take advantage of the meeting's open session conversation with the co-chairs of the Committee on Trust in Higher Education (Julia Adams and Beverly Gage) to discuss instructional faculty issues and concerns. **Ms. Bozovic** suggested that we use the Senate's April 16, 2026 meeting to address instructional faculty budgeting issues with Provost **Scott Strobel** who will be at that meeting to discuss FAS and SEAS budget issues. **Ms. Bozovic** said the Senate's May 2026 meeting can be a closed meeting where we can brainstorm on what the Senate has accomplished this year and what we want to do in the upcoming year, and to discuss a university-wide senate and what steps in that direction would be needed. She noted that a university-wide senate has been discussed by FAS and SEAS deans and has not received much support, however it is worth thinking about again. Alternatively, we can discuss a plan to

occasionally convene a body of elected faculty across the university that we can reach out to in times of emergency or when we want consultation, information, and feedback beyond FAS and SEAS. At the request of **Dinny Aletheiani**, **Ms. Bozovic** explained the new track system for instructional faculty. She said what changed this year in response to budget cuts pertaining to instructional faculty, is that all temporary hires requests (not instructional faculty who are in multi-year appointments or those who are in one-year appointments including postdocs paid on institutional funds) be submitted through a centralized system called track, and requests were due in early December 2025. She noted that over spring break, it was announced that several of the positions requested and were expected to be renewed were not. She noted that the overall picture does not appear to be bad, however it is affecting different units in different ways which is very bad for some and not others. **Ms. Bozovic** said that in addition to the situation with instructional faculty not being rehired, it has been announced that several graduate student TF positions that have been historically slotted as TF 20's, have been changed to TF10's, which means that these individuals will be teaching twice as much for the same salary. **Michael Fischer** said that he is most concerned that who gets one-year appointments has been moved out of departments to a central planning committee that does not know the needs of individual departments. He feels that pulling power away from departments and giving it to central administration is something the Senate should be monitoring and pushing back against. **Ms. Bozovic** agreed with **Mr. Fischer** and said that the information we have been given is that these decisions are being made based on curricular need – and asked who is determining that need – it is not coming from departmental or program levels. **Stephen Slade** asked if we have information on the cumulative cuts and **Ms. Bozovic** responded that at this time, we do not have that information and **Dean Wilkinson** said he would be sharing information with chairs at the next chairs meeting. **Michael Farina** said that it is difficult to determine how many instructional faculty there are because there are 17 categories and noted they count emeritus faculty and visiting professors as instructional faculty, so we need more information of the numbers from year to year. **David Post** pointed out that the number of instructional faculty are not accurately represented because those who teach one or two courses are included in the numbers. He said in Singapore, he had 140 FTE's and actually had 160 individual people included in that number. **Ms. Bozovic** said we need to find stories of how these individuals are being impacted and said the humanities program is especially impacted. **Mr. Post** asked who has been informing individuals that their position is gone and **Ms. Bozovic** said she believes it's the chairs, and to her knowledge, there was no formal letter from the Dean's office or any offer of support for individuals being impacted by the cuts. **Mark Solomon** suggested that there may be information we can get from individual chairs on what the impact has been on departments and individuals. The group agreed that we need to get information on the numbers and impacts this has had case by case and **Ms. Bozovic** said we should be able to get this information from the FAS Dean's Office. She will also contact chairs in small departments and ask if they have had track requests unexpectedly turned down and what impact they had to their department. Also, were these individuals communicated to and is there any system in place for supporting them if they lose their healthcare. She asked the group what other information they want and how we can go about receiving it. **Mr. Post** noted that in these positions, there is not a guarantee that they will be renewed once their contract is up. However, the human side is giving them some warning and as they leave offering support and

ask if there is anything we can do to help. **Meg Urry** talked about what the Senate's role can be in addressing this issue as there are many aspects and impacts it is having. She said we can't address all these issues and asked what we can take on as a Senate. She said one is collecting data – from chairs, from the FAS Dean, and do a quick survey where we ask people what their situation is. **Kathryn Slanski** said that as faculty, we can go to curriculum need that are best determined by departments. She said that we should try to find out what the constraints were that track was placed under for making these decisions. **Ms. Slanski** noted that there is no renewal for instructional faculty and when we wish to be reviewed and reappointed, we submit a request and write a statement of our interest in being reappointed and said this shows how the university diminishes this category of faculty. She noted that this speaks to decisions that are being centrally made without considering the humans who are affected by them. **Ms. Slanski** said that the Instructional Faculty and Outreach Committee has a survey ready to be distributed, however they fear there will be a very low response rate and because instructional faculty fear retaliation if they complete the survey and somehow can be identified as the responder. **Ms. Bozovic** adjourned the closed portion of the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting and noted that she, deputy Chair Maria Pinango, and the EC, welcome any suggestions about addressing the instructional faculty hiring issues and how they relate to the overall budget with a goal to have more information to share at the April Senate meeting.

#### **Next Steps:**

- Instructional Faculty and Outreach Committee: Send out the instructional faculty survey, including a new question about non-reappointment, and finalizing survey at their next meeting.
- Instructional Faculty and Outreach Committee members (esp. those in contact with chairs/departments): Gather information from chairs of small departments about unexpected track request denials, their impact on individuals, and if there are any support systems in place.
- Relevant Senate/Committee members: Request cumulative data on instructional faculty cuts and numbers from FAS Dean at the next chairs meeting.
- Instructional Faculty and Outreach Committee: Track and summarize recommendations from previous reports (e.g., off-the-ladder report) and compare to current findings for an end-of-year summary document.
- Senate leadership/EC: Prepare a summary document at the end of the academic year on instructional faculty needs, past recommendations, and status to hand off to next year's Senate.

#### **Open Session: (4 PM – 5:45 PM)**

FAS-SEAS Senate Chair **Marijeta Bozovic** began the open portion of the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting at 4:05 PM. **Julia Adams** and **Beverly Gage**, co-chairs of the Committee on Trust in Higher Education presented their findings on public and internal trust issues, identifying three key areas: cost and value of higher education, admissions processes, and political bias perceptions. The committee recommended addressing grade inflation through renorming and creating a student leadership committee to address campus culture and technology use in classrooms, while emphasizing the need to recenter the academic mission and address different educational goals across disciplines. **Ms. Adams** noted the committee of 10 was

formed in April 2025 by **President McInnis** with five members from FAS and five from the professional schools, and it represents different views and opinions, backgrounds, disciplines, methodological approaches, etc. She said the committee was tasked with diagnosing and making recommendations around the decline in trust in US higher education and offer recommendations in a report that they plan to release before the end of this academic year.

**Ms. Adams** said the committee is focused on external and internal trust, trust among constituencies (between faculty and administration, and faculty and students), trust of the public pertaining to higher education, especially zeroing in on research universities and Ivy's.

**Ms. Adams** said the committee met with many people, on and outside of campus, and with various constituencies. **Ms. Gage** said she and **Ms. Adams** asked for feedback from faculty on: **Public trust issues** – the cost and price of public education; how the public perceives Yale as unaffordable, a place for rich kids; questions about admissions and who gets in by special consideration; questions about political bias, speech on campus, self-censorship, protest policy, (and whether real or perceived, faculty at Yale are more liberal than most of the population at large); questions about free speech policy, inviting speakers to campus who feel comfortable speaking in the classroom and who feels that they are censoring themselves.

- **Internal trust issues** – academic life and do people have faith and trust in what we are doing, and if faculty trust the students in doing the work they are assigned and what effect does AI have in this issue; do students trust faculty to show up, do their best job, and pay attention; how does technology affect these bonds of trust within and outside of the classroom; are we teaching the right things with a shared place for common knowledge and civic education that could be a shared place of trust and conversation; the sense that the classroom be re-centered with the university culture as the most essential thing in teaching and research that we do.
- **Governance** – who gets to make decisions and do the various decision-makers trust each other.

**Ms. Gage** said the committee tried to focus on the fundamental academic mission of the university - *the creation and dissemination of knowledge through research and teaching* - and the committee feels we need to focus on the core mission. She said that teaching and research and learning is what we really do, and to think about ways to make recommendations or considerations around trust questions that are grounded in that fundamental academic mission.

**Ms. Gage** asked for questions or comments from faculty. **Meg Urry** asked if the committee is addressing the grade issue. **Ms. Adams** said the committee has heard about issues with grade inflation and grade compression in colleges and universities and that at the recent instructional faculty town hall event, instructional faculty said it is very difficult to grade the way they want because under current conditions they would be directly penalized in student evaluations which then play a critical role especially for instructional faculty. She said this made a big impression on the committee to pay attention to this problem and they are thinking about the general challenge of renorming grading happening at many institutions, and also the challenge of

transition to a new reality and what the mechanisms would be. She noted this issue has multiple pieces over time that we and other committees are working on. **Ms. Urry** noted that people should feel free to give the grades they feel appropriate, however in the modern pedagogical framework, there's a movement away from harsh and stressful assessments to giving people rubrics ahead of time and judging them accordingly. She said in her classes, if students do the work and do it well, they earn A's. **Ms. Gage** said the goal in thinking about grade inflation from a trust perspective is that grades are understood to mean something and are a communication mechanism between faculty and students, and if the student masters the material, and how it compares with others in the classroom. She said that grades are also an external signal when applying for graduate school and jobs, and the current concern is they have lost their power and people don't trust that a grade represents a certain mastery of material and doing hard work. She said there are some places within Yale where this is true, and others where it is problematic and not true, and the question is how to create a meaningful signal of what you want grades to represent. She said the committee is thinking about various ways to make grades meaningful both outside and inside of Yale. **Jing Yan** spoke about the external trust issue and noted that the public does not understand why government is taking taxpayer's money to fund research at Yale because when research output is successful, Yale owns the research and gains financially from the output. He said the public sees that Yale has the highest indirect costs and student stipends are the highest, and what he hears from colleagues is why money goes to Yale instead of other places where research is less costly and can potentially produce similar results. He said internally, there are questions about indirect cost, and it is unclear how and for what it is used, which causes much internal trust issues. **Ms. Adams** noted on the internal trust issue, there have been increases in compliance procedures and legal procedures that is affecting the growth of bureaucratic processes, and there are also endogenous reasons for that growth which is difficult to distinguish, which is the issue and how they are related, and this is a transparency problem that leads to a loss of trust. **Nicholas Christakis** noted that when the committee was established, he suggested that Yale publicize (to faculty and publicly) its IDC calculations that they already have and have already shared with the federal government on how we spend the money. FAS Dean **Steven Wilkinson** asked if other institutions publish this information and how they do their indirect cost calculations. **David Post** replied some do share this information. **Ms. Adams** asked if there are any who do this best. **Mr. Post** said he does not know specifically, however he suspects they are public universities. **Ms. Gage** noted that the theme "transparency" runs through many of the things we are talking and thinking about like admissions, budgets, and it's an important mechanism for building trust and getting better information out. **Sonam Kachru** asked if the committee has found any evidence of a divide between what academics and non-academic participants took the purpose of a modern university to be, and if so, what has influenced responses on the varieties of trust? **Ms. Gage** said that the university needs to distinguish between the things that they need to defend and support at all costs, and those that respond to public critique, and these are important and vital. She noted that the committee feels that this is a moment that has come up repeatedly in the history of universities where we want to adapt and respond and rethink what we are doing. She noted that there is a want for containing the price of higher education and making it less expensive, and for an education that serves a set of public needs.

**Ms. Gage** said that Yale, right or wrong, is understood to be self-interested and the spirit of the report is to think about ways to make what we do useful and legible to more people, to think about what people want from us in the range of things that a university and a faculty ought to be doing. **John Geanakoplos** thanked **Ms. Adams** and **Ms. Gage** for their summary of issues that the committee found, however said he did not hear recommendations and asked if the goal of the committee is to identify issues and create a narrative of issues without making recommendations. **Ms. Adams** said that we are making recommendations. **Ms. Gage** noted that the question of the political orientation of university campuses is one of the big challenges of trust. She said the Republican Party does not think it has much of a constituency on elite campuses and is therefore gaining some political points by going after these universities. Additionally, she said there are real questions about the intellectual range of the faculty and what we're teaching and who we're hiring, and we want to take seriously some of these public concerns. It is a moment, she noted, to think about how the university relates to the broader American society and what is being taught and who is here on campus. **Ms. Gage** said the committee's impulse is to cast a wide net and she said that no university, elite or not, has gotten this exactly right and we want to empower faculty to take up this set of questions and figure it out for ourselves through self-study, looking at curriculum, and other things like opening up opportunities for co-teaching with visiting practitioners who might bring different perspectives to campus. She noted that this issue has received the most divided feedback from within and outside of Yale by people who do not feel we need to address this issue, to others who feel that this is the only question that fundamentally matters at this moment. She said the question for us is how to think about this in a way that is in accord with our own academic mission and priorities and that promotes the intellectual life of the campus and is responsive to a very broad and widely held public critique. She said this is the most urgent matter in almost any survey that you see on this set of questions. **Casey Dunn** asked if there is empirical information available about the political makeup of the faculty and the makeup of the pool that is applying. He knows that it is illegal to apply a political litmus test, however he wonders if people with a certain political persuasion don't apply and don't feel welcome. **Ms. Gage** said it has been clear that there are students who count themselves out from applying to PhD programs. She said there are many students who are counseled out of applying to elite universities because they will not be able to do the kind of work they want to in those places, and whether this is true or not, it's still the perception of many people. **Ms. Adams** said we face challenges as a committee because we want to take these critiques seriously but don't want to fall in the trap of arguing that ideas have political valences or belongingness's, and we want to take these things seriously but respect academic freedom. Speaking as a committee member, **Ms. Bozovic** said the survey data might limit the range of responses one may give and limit the range of political opinions that could be expressed and might miss various important data and data points - she feels we need much better surveys. **Ms. Gage** said it is worth differentiating things that get lumped in together and we've done work to try to do this. One, she said, is about the composition of the faculty, one about the idea of self-censorship which is a pretty broad category. She said there is a set of questions about what happens in the classroom, about what classes are being taught, and what range of ideas we offer students to prepare them to enter into and understand the world they're entering in to. She said there are also a set

of questions about campus culture, and more student-driven questions that don't have much to do with faculty. And, she said, there is a set of questions about the kind of speech and the protest policy which has already been worked on. **David Watts** asked why we should evaluate our curricula in response to outside political pressure. **Ms. Adams** said she is not opposed to paying attention to public opinion, and there are many faculty inside Yale who feel strongly about this as well. She said this is a place where external and internal are not so easily divisible demographically and we are taking both seriously. And she noted that **Ms. Bozovic's** assessment of the surveys is right – they are of variable quality, and the committee is distinguishing which are real surveys and which are not. **Ms. Urry** noted that in the sciences, we have no idea of someone's politics when we hire them, as opposed to departments in which politics is part of research. Therefore, she said it is a misconception that we are hiring politically, and she would like the committee to strongly make this point. **Ms. Gage** agreed with **Ms. Urry** and noted that there is not going to be a one-size-fits-all set of solutions to this question, and opening the question to different departments and schools to consider will get a wide-range of outcomes because there is a wide range of practices and orientations to consider. **Mr. Solomon** said he wonders if public perception of us being left leaning isn't literally our politics and who we donate to, but the existence of certain topics being taught from a conservative perspective. He noted that the public perception, even if a professor gives completely tolerant views on controversial topic, is that because the topic is left-leaning, the university is seen as promoting a left-leaning point of view. **Ms. Gage** said that the committee has had to discern what the perception and communication questions are and what are substance questions which we want to consider change around. She said we can show what happens on campus, and that there are controversial things that universities are going to do and teach that need to be protected, and if we're not doing this, we're not doing anything. She noted that we can blame that all the issues are coming from the current administration in DC, however these ideas are much more widely held than that, and the decline in trust did not start in the last couple of years – it's a much longer story. **Rourke O'Brien** noted we must be careful how we respond to some of these criticisms lest we reify them that they are accurate. He said it's not that the composition of the faculty has changed, but that the world has changed, and reacting to issues raised might elevate issues to being worthy of our reaction to them. He said we can acknowledge them and said that we understand that in the polls people say these things without defending the issues raised. **Ms. Gage** agreed with **Mr. O'Brien**, however noted that there are people making these critiques that are not acting in good faith, noting that there are people who care about Yale and who care about higher education. **Ms. Adams** said that when we invited our external critics, we cast our net very broadly but did not invite anyone who wanted to simply destroy the university. **Michael Fischer** said that an overarching question that impacts several of the issues – the value of education, grade inflation, the politicizing of the faculty – is that he doesn't think there is a widespread agreement on what teaching should be and what the purpose is of an education. He said some are here to learn the material so that they can get a good job, and others have a different set of goals, and he would like to see the committee point out the various goals for education that different constituents have. **Ms. Adams** noted that this has been a theme for this committee for the entire year and one that appears in the declared mission of the university that over the

years has become large and almost all things to all people in its explicit form. She said we are looking to recenter it on the academic core – research, teaching, dissemination and preservation of knowledge. She noted that this doesn't mean that other important things are not happening – like the moral education and civic education that happens in residential colleges that is crucial and wonderful. But, she said, without core, we are not a university. **Mr. Yan** asked if the report would reflect on the different goals and compositions of each area discipline, and said the educational goal is different in the sciences than in other areas of studies. **Ms. Adams** replied that it is also helpful that we think about the different uses to which knowledge is put into a second order. She mentioned that we also look at the classroom and have recommendations that are related to this in different ways that involve trying to change the default on technology in the classroom (without regulating social media outside the classroom). She said we want to recommend that undergraduate and graduate student leadership think rigorously about recentering intellectuality and civility in campus life, and that they be the main interlocutors in making recommendations for how this could work. She said the committee has talked about shifting the default on laptops, phones, iPads etc., so that we would start without these in the classroom and get away from the level of distraction they cause, with the understanding if the faculty member needs these for intellectual reasons, that they would be reintroduced into that classroom. **Ms. Gage** agreed and noted that we all have experienced the distractions caused by allowing these devices in the classroom and it has reached a critical point where we need to act with consideration for those who need special accommodations. **John Geanakoplos** said he has noticed a diminishing rate of attendance in the classroom over the years and thinks students don't think it's important to come to class. He suggested having a general questionnaire for faculty with questions like "what is your attendance like," "how can the classroom be centered more?" "What do you think about grading inflation?" "What would you do about grading inflation?" He noted you can learn much from the responses. **Ms. Gage** said this is a good idea and one that one that the implementation committee can take up. **Ms. Slanski** noted that she and other faculty have already implemented no devices during class and she has not received any push-back and notices students are more engaged and are building a stronger community within the classroom which helps them learn and be more engaged. **Casey Dunn** said he has attended classes sitting in the back and observed these distractions firsthand. However, he said it's very important to involve students in the conversations about the classroom and how we engage them because we have much to learn from their perspective on what a classroom should be. **Ms. Gage** agreed that students need to be part of the conversation of what a 21<sup>st</sup> century classroom looks like and what its standards are and what its norms are. **Mr. Solomon** said he likes the paternalistic approach, however notes that there are situations where computers are necessary for accessing course materials and taking notes. He would like to know if Wi-Fi and Internet accessibility can be turned off in classrooms so that students can only use computers when necessary in a particular class. He also is concerned about class attendance and suggested that a percentage of the grade is contingent on showing up. **Ms. Gage** said she experimented with some of these suggestions and noted that attendance improved during these classes. **Rourke O'Brien** likes the term "recentering the classroom" and the idea of having set rules where exceptions can be made if necessary. This takes the pressure from teachers to

implement their own set of rules and be thought of as the “bad guy.” He also mentioned that some of his students are involved in many extracurricular committees and organizations and cannot keep up with their classes because of this, and feels we need to be aware of how students are spending their time, especially when it impacts coming to class. **Ms. Bozovic** asked for a vote to extend the meeting by 10 minutes, which was approved. **Sohrab Ismail-Beigi** shared that he taught a class where 20 out of 60 students showed up regularly. He had a discussion with these undergrads who noted that he records his lectures, the lectures are too clear, his notes are too good, and therefore they are able to double book courses in the same slot. They also suggested to have them just solve more problems in real time and then people would show up. In other words, make the class worthy of showing up so that we get something out of it. **Mr. Ismail-Beigi** said he has used their suggestions and is and will continue to use the suggestions in his teaching. **Stephen Slade** asked if mistrust in higher education have any outliers – any institutions of higher education that are more trusted than Yale and its peers? **Ms. Adams** and **Ms. Gage** said community colleges and public universities tend to be among the most trusted, and as the categories get more elite, trust levels go down. **Ms. Gage** noted that 28% of the public think that Ivy League universities are their enemy and noted that community colleges offer accessibility in one’s own community. She said we can never compete with this aspect, however, believes that there are things we can do to be more open and accessible and more public serving without changing our essential core. **Mr. Slade** noted that some professional schools tend to have more trust, such as medical schools that are more trusted than law schools. **Mr. Yan** asked if we really need to take a parental point of view with student behavior in the classroom and post restrictions, or should we let students take responsibility for deciding when and when not to attend classes and what they wish to get out of a class. Should we make them more responsible for what and how they learn, knowing that they can expect a lower grade if they don’t meet the class’s requirements? **Ms. Adams** said there are levels of disruptions to others in a classroom to be considered and we are trying to treat students as decision makers in the recommendations we will offer and said these comments are very helpful. **Ms. Slanski** asked if there is consideration for continuing adult ed courses. **Ms. Gage** said there were many suggestions that are being considered in this area. **Mr. Post** asked what the tangible externally facing recommendations are that will fundamentally address the core issue of accessibility and access. **Ms. Adams** asked **Mr. Post** his opinion on having more campuses around the US. **Mr. Post** noted that when he came back from Singapore three years ago, he wrote to Yale College Dean **Pericles Lewis** that he was in favor of creating a second campus domestically. He noted he raised this again last year and he is in favor of doing this. He said it may help with the trust issues and attract a different demographic pool of students. He feels it is one of the mistakes made by elite universities to not open our education to a broader community. He noted that the Ivy’s are essentially concentrated in New England, and opening a campus in a different cultural part of the country would give our students a chance to experience life outside of the bubble of New Haven and provide valuable experiences. **Ms. Bozovic** asked if community colleges have a different political spectrum among the faculty and if it is dramatically different than the Ivy League, or what is it that’s dramatically different? **Mr. Post** said he feels that Yale should consider creating a separate campus domestically. He said a separate campus that may draw in a different demographic

pool of students and may teach in a different way and not landlocked here in New Haven, and he feels it is a huge mistake we are making that as one of the elite universities, that we are not opening up to a broader community that touches on another part of the United States. He feels that we and other ivy leagues schools located here in New England have trust problems that other schools across the country do not have because we are not in the field with branch campuses helping with ag engineering and doing things in other communities. He said he feels that having a campus somewhere else in the US would be a big contribution to overcoming this trust problem. **Mr. Post** said students from out west can come here to Yale, however he often speaks to these students and many of them feel that coming to New Haven is very big cultural change and he feels there are many students who would like to have us have a campus somewhere else in the US. He noted it would put a campus in a different cultural part of the country. **Ms. Adams** noted that one thing they learned at a meeting they had with people from Cornell is they have very strong connections with local agriculture and commented that this made their lives easier with these community connections in various ways. **Ms. Gage** said we are also interested in exploring ways to have different forms of in-person and on-line education that would be more community facing, perhaps using West Campus. **Ms. Bozovic** thanked **Ms. Adams** and **Ms. Gage** for this discussion, and asked people to reach out to them with further thoughts and to do this soon as the committee is in the process of creating their report.

**Ms. Slanski** talked about the Instructional Faculty and Academic Support Committee's report that was circulated to the Senate and she asked for feedback. **Mr. Solomon** said it would be helpful to tie any current issues back to those from years ago to point out that they have not been addressed. **Cynthia DeRoma** noted that the committee is tracking what recommendations have been made in the past in the off-the-ladder report that have not been addressed and find out what happened to them. She said we would like to address the past and present issues in a way that future committee members can keep track of what has been recommended, what has been done, and what issues need to continue to be addressed. **Ms. Bozovic** suggested having summarizing document at the end of the year that addresses the questions that have emerged around instructional faculty needs this year amongst budget cuts, and how this pertains to ongoing recommendations and suggestions that the Faculty Senate has been making, and where we are regarding the larger and broader questions around instructional faculty at Yale at the end of academic year 2025/26 – a summary document that looks at the past and present moment to hand over to next year's Senate. **Ms. Slanski** said there is a survey prepared that is ready to send to instructional faculty, and they are hoping to get more participation than the previously survey responses.

**Ms. Bozovic** adjourned the meeting at 5:45 PM.

## Next steps

- Consider requesting that Yale publicly share indirect cost (IDC) calculations and transparency data.
- Consider recommending a general faculty questionnaire about classroom/teaching issues.

- Consider recommending formation of student-led committee (undergrad/grad) to address campus life, technology, and culture issues.
- Consider recommending changing the default policy on technology in classrooms (laptops, phones).
- Consider recommending or supporting experiments/programs in public-facing/continuing education and community access.
- Consider recommending or supporting experiments with new campus locations or extension schools.
- Consider tracking and following up on previous recommendations from the off-the-ladder report and other instructional faculty reports.
- Plan to focus April Senate meeting on budget cuts and their effects, including information gathering in advance.
- Plan for May Senate meeting to include discussion of instructional faculty report findings and possibly university-wide Senate concepts.
- Committee on Trust in Higher Education: Remain available for input/feedback from faculty via email before report finalization.
- Instructional Faculty Committee: Add to survey question about non-reappointment status as discussed.