

FAS-SEAS Senate Meeting

April 16, 2026

Closed meeting - Senators Only – 3:30 PM – 4 PM

Open Meeting – 4 PM – 5:30 PM

Luce Hall 203, 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:

Kim?, Shane ?, Ghazia Abbas, Alexandria Appolloni, Tim Barron, Ramia Bedoui, Jessica Brantley, Christian Cammarota, Richard Deming, Natalie Dietterich, Kevin Ennis, Hussein Fancy, Sarah Glenski, Shiri Goren, Derek Green, Gundula Kreuzer, Ted Kreiner, Megann Licskai, Jane Lynch, Christopher McGowan, John Mangan, Mark Mooseker, Elisa Morrison, Elka KN, Luna Najera, Catherine Pomposi, Nathan Roberts, Ian Russell, Michael Shah, Constance Sherak, Steve Shoemaker, Camille Thomasson, Julia Titus, Steven Wilkinson, Nancy Yousef, Tayla Zemach-Bersin

Closed Session – 3:30 PM – 3:45 PM:

FAS-SEAS Senate Chair **Marijeta Bozovic** called the closed portion of the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting to order at 3:30 PM. **Ms. Bozovic** presented the minutes from the February 19, 2026, and March 24, 2026, Senate meetings for approval. A vote was taken and the minutes for the February 19, 2026, and March 24, 2026 meetings were approved.

Robert Wooster spoke about the upcoming FAS-SEAS Senate election and said the Senate's Elections and Outreach Committee has contacted senators whose terms are ending and are eligible to run and asked if they will run again. The committee sent an email to all FAS and SEAS faculty who are eligible to vote asking for nominations. They are awaiting responses. He said the nomination process ends in one week with the election to take place when the committee completes a list of candidates who have agreed to run. **Alessandro Giammei** suggested that when the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting schedule is set, that senators receive the year's schedule so they can plan accordingly. **Michael Fischer** suggested that the procedures for counting votes be reviewed by the next Elections and Outreach Committee and revise if necessary and share this detailed information with the next committee on the process. The Elections Committee will continue soliciting nominations for Senate elections until the end of next week, then run the

election. They will also work on writing a script or program to systematize the vote counting process for Senate elections, reducing reliance on individual knowledge.

Open Session – 3:45 PM – 5:30 PM:

FAS-SEAS Senate Chair **Marijeta Bozovic** began the open portion of the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting at 3:45 PM. **Cynthia DeRoma** reported that the Committee on Instructional Faculty and Faculty Support is working on a preliminary report on the findings of their recent poll and is preparing to share this information with the Senate.

Ms. Bozovic introduced FAS Dean **Steven Wilkinson** to discuss the Teaching Resource Advisory Committee (TRAC) process and budget constraints. **Dean Wilkinson** noted that he could not address details about specific individuals or department decisions as CT Labor Law does not allow it, and will talk in a general sense about the instructional faculty, the growth in instructional faculty over the years, and this year's TRAC process, what's been done and what's not been done. He was joined by **John Mangan**, Senior Associate Dean who oversees the TRAC process who spoke about requests for short-term appointments and said because of the internal workings of TRAC and confidentiality, he is limited on specifics and said the committee pays attention to its review process and evaluates all resource requests at the same time. He said we allocate resources for those requests that seem to address the most essential, and pressing curricular needs, and it's important to note we are in active discussion and consultation with department and program chairs, and TRAC considers several factors when evaluating a short-term resource request and try to be holistic in our approach with curricular need central among them. He said TRAC asks if a given course is essential for ensuring that students can meet all the requirements for their majors and degrees, or if there are other opportunities to fulfill such requirements and we always ask if a particular course were not offered, is there anyone who would be in danger of not graduating. We ask if a course is part of an ordered progression of courses and is essential for distribution and pay attention to enrollments but not as a sole determining factor as to whether we will approve a request. **Mr. Mangan** said because TRAC works within a fixed budget, the specific or projected cost of a proposed appointment is a relevant data point in our review process. He said as chair of TRAC, he never lets the committee lose sight of the fact that there are real people with real lives at the other end of every decision that we make, and said we try to listen carefully to department and program chairs and try to be as humane as possible in every aspect of the committee's work. **Mr. Wilkinson** talked about the TRAC budget constraints and explained that a 4% FTE reduction (approximately 12.5 positions) was implemented through non-renewals of one-year contracts primarily affecting part-time faculty. He discussed the significant growth in instructional faculty at Yale in recent years, reaching 318 full-time equivalents, the highest number in university history. He explained that the FAS instructional faculty budget is heavily endowment-dependent, with 70% of spending coming from endowment funds. He highlighted the challenge of a \$300 million endowment tax next year that will significantly impact the university's budget and noted that while ladder faculty hiring has reached its target size, the instructional faculty budget faces constraints, requiring tough decisions about which curricular needs are most urgent to address. He noted the TRAC process, which evaluates proposals based on curricular need, must now compare proposals simultaneously due to limited resources, making prioritization essential.

Cynthia DeRoma, chair of The Instructional Faculty Committee, talked about the faculty climate survey results that revealed significant concerns among instructional faculty about job

security, respect, and recognition within the institution. The committee shared concerning survey results showing low response rates and negative perceptions among instructional faculty regarding feeling respected, secure, and included in university decisions. The discussion focused on concerns about instructional faculty precarity, including rumors about multi-year contracts being phased out and non-renewals of successful faculty members. **Dean Wilkinson** and **Mr. Mangan** acknowledged these concerns and committed to addressing issues of disrespect within departments and noting the number of instructional faculty would be the highest ever next year. Members of the committee said they are working on a report to be presented to the Senate that will include feedback on the TRAC process.

Ms. Bozovic introduced **Sandra Enimil**, Director of Scholarly Communication and Collection Strategy, and **Daniel Dollar**, Associate University Library for Scholarly Resource, to talk about the implementation of an open access policy for faculty publications. **Ms. Enimil** discussed two key questions: the start date, and whether to use an opt-out or opt-in approach. She presented a draft policy that would give faculty more rights over their publications while granting the university a non-exclusive license. The group discussed concerns about the July 1st start date potentially being too soon, with some suggesting January 1, 2027 as a feasible option to allow for better faculty education. **Mr. Dollar** shared the policy document on screen noting this policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with faculty authors under the existing Yale University copyright policy, and is designed to use the university to shield your scholarship while protecting your rights to your own scholarship. The policy was confirmed to be an opt-out approach, meaning faculty would automatically participate unless they request to opt out, and it would apply only to FAS and no other schools (Medical School, etc). The FAS-SEAS Senate approved the policy for FAS. The Library and the General Counsel's Office will finalize and communicate the author rights policy implementation, including opt-out process and support for faculty, with a start date of July 1st. The Library will provide guidance and support to faculty regarding publisher negotiations and manuscript deposit into Eli Scholar under the new author rights policy. **Ms. Bozovic** called for a vote from senators present with a July 1, 2026 start date. There were 15 yes's, one no, and no abstentions. The Senate approved an opt-out author rights policy starting July 1st, 2026, which allows faculty to retain more control over their publications while granting the university a non-exclusive license.

Ms. Bozovic called on **Rourke O'Brien** to talk about the FASTAP16 review findings. **Mr. O'Brien** said that the Senate's Faculty Advancement Committee did fact-finding work, talking with faculty who had been through the FASTAP 2016 review process, and heard of issues around tenure clock treatment, graduate student feedback inclusion, and post-tenure support. In turn they shared information gathered with the current FASTAP Committee. He mentioned a persistent issue with how years spent on the tenure clock elsewhere are treated at Yale, and the standard policy is you get this clock reset that is confusing about how those years are treated – you might have been on the tenure track 8, 10, or 12 years, and in Yale's eyes it's still considered early. He noted concern that if you go up early and have been at Yale for 4 years, but you've been on the tenure track a total of 12, this is considered early in Yale's eyes, and are you being held to a different standard? There's also the notion that the tenure committee does not want people to go up early and how this can lead to a very different kind of bar that people are being held to. He noted that there were procedural questions raised including how graduate student feedback is included in the process, who gets to what point in the process, if that feedback is considered, and

do people review that as part of the dossier? He said there is concern that the dossier that departments see and vote on might be different from the dossiers that the committee has, and we're trying to get clarity that these should be consistent. He said there are questions about how representation is considered for faculty that include a FAS department and a professional school, and under what circumstances is someone from the professional school invited to be a part of the conversation in FAS? And, he said, there are questions about how faculty are informed of "what's next for their career" for those who have received a positive tenure decision. **Ms. Bozovic** gave examples of different situations that come up during the tenure process and **Mr. O'Brien** said the committee will continue drafting the FASTAP16 review report and consider input from Senate fact-finding about tenure processes. **Ms. Bozovic** noted there were several people willing to talk to us but might not have been willing to talk to the committee. She said she feels the question of graduate student feedback is an important and interesting one that comes up around issues with mentoring, and the conversation on graduate student feedback and evaluations being included in tenure cases has been an overwhelming yes, and this is done at other institutions. She said why do we not look at undergraduate evaluations that acknowledge the hard work people do mentoring. If you have a group and not all the graduate students in your group are performing equally, not all of them are necessarily going to go on to the academic career, or career that they were hoping for. And if you've been in a position where you want to give some, tough, critical feedback, you have suddenly disincentivized that for people who are going up for tenure. She said have we made it impossible for them to be the kinds of PIs that they feel like they should be? Another question is what we do with information that is not included in the dossier but nevertheless gets brought into the discussion of tenure cases. **Ms. Bozovic** gave a made-up example of how this might be the case where we have information, and believe that information is extraneous to the dossier, but is considered, in tenure decisions. **Mark Solomon** gave an example of a case where the person was denied tenure and was not given the information that was used for the denial. **Mr. Solomon** would like all information that is used for consideration to be stated and shared. He also noted that there should not be mention of any situations where allegations have been made about a candidate without the candidate being formally charged. This information should not be part of the tenure decision. **Mr. Post** noted that there must be some mechanism that can be formally brought into the promotion and tenure process, and not informally, so it protects the due process right of the faculty member and the rest of the community. He said one of the problems with the way faculty standards of conduct are written is the deans' process is essentially an informal process, and that the provost process is almost never utilized. He said there's essentially misconduct that is recognized, documented, and even well substantiated, but because it's not formal it's difficult to bring it into the process. **Mr. Post** said we need to find a balance within our community. **Amir Haji-Akbari** said he is in favor of keeping graduate student feedback as part of the process. He said he has seen examples where graduate students have not been treated well and gave examples where some have had unreasonable expectations put on them and have been threatened. He gave an example of graduate students committing suicide because of mistreatment and these were not included in the tenure process. He said there is a great number of graduate students being abused and mistreated, and he feels this is relevant information that should be used as part of the process when a person goes up for tenure and that might incentivize good behavior and good citizenship by the faculty. **Ms. Bozovic** asked anyone who has further thoughts or questions on this topic to send them to **Mr. O'Brien**. **Casey Dunn** said that the FASTAP16 Review Committee is in the process of drafting their report, so time is of the essence.

Ms. Bozovic suggested that the final FAS-SEAS Senate meeting in May, which is usually a closed meeting, be an open meeting because there are issues that need to be discussed, including postgraduate student unionization efforts, the *Instructional Faculty Report*, the *Budget Committee Report*, and feedback from the TRAC process. **Ms. Bozovic** noted there will be discussions on: the impetus towards a university-wide senate and what the intermediate steps need to be taken; discussion on what changes need to be made to the Senate By-laws, and how the leadership model has been, and consider a two-year model for the Executive Council to improve continuity and efficiency.

Mr. Farina commented on the work done on the *Trust for Higher Education Report* and congratulated **Ms. Bozovic, Beverly Gage**, and the Committee on Trust and Higher Education for their phenomenal efforts and thousands of hours that went into creating an astounding report. He noted this report will guide the university in many decisions in the coming years.

Ms. Bozovic adjourned the meeting at 5:30 PM.