

FAS-SEAS Senate Meeting
December 16, 2025
Closed Meeting - Senators Only
3:30 PM – 4:00 PM
Open Meeting – 4 PM. – 5:30 PM
100 Dow Hall, 370 Temple Street and on Zoom
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, Stephen Slade, Kathryn Slanski, Brett Smith, Mark Solomon, Robert Wooster, Jing Yan

Absent:

Claire Roosien, Alison Sweeney, Meg Urry

Guests:

Ghazia Abbas, Neta Alexander, Sean Barrett, Tim Barron, Dirk Bergemann, Jeffrey Brock, Hal Brooks, Moira Fradinger, Shiri Goren, Harry Jain, Jutta Joormann, Theodore Kim, Christopher McGowan, Lisa Messeri, Yair Minsky, Elka Knaggi, Dina Roginsky, Ian Russell, Marta Sanvido, Sarah Stillman, Dara Strolovitch, Julia Titus, Lisa Voight, David Watts, Steven Wilkinson, Leslie Gross-Wyrtzen, Jonathan Wyrtzen, Yoshitaka Yamamoto, Orit Yeret, Nancy Yousef

Closed session:

Chair of the FAS-SEAS Senate **Marijeta Bozovic** began the closed portion of the meeting at 4:05 PM. **Ms. Bozovic** noted the dates and venue for the spring semester:

-Thursday, January 16 in Luce Hall 203

-Thursday, February 19 in Luce Hall 203

-Tuesday, March 24 in Luce Hall 203

-Thursday, April 16 in Luce Hall

-Tuesday, May 5 in Luce Hall (closed meeting or open meeting as needed) Ms. Bozovic asked that each committee provide an overview on what the committee is doing:

- **David Post** spoke for the Budget Committee and said they will be meetings with FAS Dean **Steven Wilkinson** and SEAS Dean **Jeffrey Brock** to review new budgets and address the transparency issue. He does not anticipate that the committee will present a report or resolution this year, however this might change if there are unanswered questions.
- **Mark Solomon** spoke for the Governance Committee. He noted that the *Faculty Handbook* topic is on pause, and the committee is waiting for a response to their letter

regarding academic freedom. He said this committee is ready to collaborate with the Budget Committee if need be.

- **Ms. Bozovic** noted that there has been a response from Provost **Scott Strobel** regarding the academic freedom letter and that **Provost Strobel** said he carefully reviewed the Senate report and agrees with his faculty colleagues on the Senate that academic freedom is the bedrock principle at Yale. He said that both he and **President McInnis** are committed to ensuring that the spirit of free inquiry is safeguarded at the University, and in the coming semester he will continue to discuss the recommendations contained in the Senate report with **President McGinnis**, the Deans of the schools, and colleagues in the General Counsels and Provost offices. He said in the spring semester he will report on the status of these deliberations and what actions will best address the concerns the Senate outlines in its report.
- **Rourke O'Brien** spoke for the Faculty Advancement Committee and said they will review FASTAP, interview faculty who have recently gone through the system, and interview chairs and former chairs who have had experience with the FASTAP system. They will write a report sometime in the spring on the information they receive.
- **Cynthia DeRoma** spoke for the Instructional Faculty Committee and noted they are planning a Town Hall meeting on January 29 to look at perceived or real impacts from budget cuts on instructional faculty. They will try to get information on the recent Faculty Climate survey because the committee's next project will be for an Instructional Faculty Climate Survey. They will work on getting results from previous reports from 2023 and before in order to begin tracking goals and progress towards goals. **Ms. Bozovic** noted that there is a chance that the size of the instructional faculty may be diminished over the next year and this is something to investigate.
- **Michael Loewenberg** spoke for the Student Affairs Committee and said their goal is to get information on graduate admissions and how things are being done for graduate admissions. He wants to talk with **Michelle Nearon**, Senior Associate Dean for Graduate Student Engagement and Development, and is waiting to schedule an appointment with her. He said he is interested how we got to doing graduate admissions the way it's being done, which is completely different from one department to the next and appears to be governed by whomever happens to be doing it. He wants to see how we got here, if people are happy with the results they are getting, and the committee will conduct a survey to determine where we go from here. **Ms. Bozovic** mentioned the news today that the incoming admission cycle for graduate students is flagged that citizens of Cuba, Iran, North Korea, or Russia, which affects some of us, will need to be reviewed by Export Controls, and we need to notify **Mark Stomski**, Director of Export Controls, with a cc to **Robert Harper-Mangels** as soon as possible if you intend to invite someone from one of these countries. **Ms. Bozovic** asked if she should invite **Mark Stromski** to speak at a Senate meeting. **Beverly Gage** said she thinks the Senate can play an important role as graduate admissions are being reduced, that it is happening in a piecemeal manner, and there is a centralized understanding of what's going on that is not necessarily being shared and conveyed to us. She would like to see the focus on what is happening in the reductions from

department to department, what impact is happening now, and what we can expect into the future. **Mr. Post** said in following up on **Ms. Gage's** comment and thinking about different committees, he feels one role we can play is to push senior administrators into being more transparent in general and ask for them to articulate the philosophy behind any cuts that we're seeing. He also wants to ask if there are going to be cuts in the instructional faculty, what's underlying the overall cut, how is that going to be, and how it's going to be implemented at the division, department, and unit level. And what is the philosophy behind the cuts already being made to graduate programs. He noted there was a big difference between and among divisions, but he hasn't heard why. He said that one of the big problems we face is that in this budget crisis, senior administrators are spinning to get things handled but may not be fully articulating the underlying principles used in making these decisions, and he feels it's important for us to hold them to account. **Mr. Solomon** said that last year there was a lot of concern and stress among international graduate students, and he wonders if GSA has reached out to the committee with any concerns or suggestions for topics of shared interest. **Mr. Loewenberg** said this has not happened this year, it did happen last year in his department, and it is a good idea to do it again this year.

- **Dinny Aletheiani** spoke about the Peer Advisory and Ombuds Committee and said we celebrate the decision to hire an Ombudsperson, and our committee will work with the members of the Ombudsperson Search Advisory Committee, and we anticipate meeting the candidates and have exclusive time with each of them to ask questions. We plan to reach out to ombudspersons at other universities to learn what questions we can incorporate in our meetings with candidates.

Next steps:

- **Ms. Bozovic:** To send email to **Deans Wilkinson** and **Brock** to schedule meetings with the Budget Committee to discuss budget transparency.
- **Mr. O'Brien:** Recruit additional Senate members to assist with FASTAP 2016 review interviews; share interview guide and coordinate interview assignments aiming for completion early in the spring semester.
- **Mr. O'Brien:** Consider organizing listening sessions (possibly at Senate lunches) for faculty to discuss FASTAP experiences.
- **Mr. O'Brien:** Request list of recently tenured faculty in FASTAP 2016 from relevant staff for interview purposes.
- **Ms. DeRoma:** Plan and organize Town Hall event for instructional faculty on January 29th, including setup for anonymous question submission and upvoting.
- **Ms. DeRoma:** Track goals and progress from previous instructional faculty climate reports and prepare documentation for the Town Hall.
- **Mr. Loewenberg:** Arrange to meet with Michelle Nearon (graduate student office) and/or Lynn Cooley to discuss current graduate admissions processes; consider surveying departments about graduate admissions practices.

- **Ms. Bozovic:** Invite **Mark Stomski** from Export Controls to a Senate meeting to discuss new export control requirements for graduate admissions.
- **Ms. Aletheiani:** Coordinate with Ombudsperson Search Advisory Committee co-chairs to schedule time for Senate to meet with ombudsperson candidates.
- **Ms. Aletheiani:** Meet with Peer Advisory and Ombuds Committee members to discuss possible extension of new roles for the committee.
- **Ms. Bozovic:** Invite **Dean Cooley** (Graduate School) and **Dean Lewis** (Yale College) to January Senate meeting for discussion of graduate admissions, undergraduate financial aid, and budget cuts.
- **Ms. Bozovic:** Circulate email to Budget Committee regarding upcoming meetings with **Deans Wilkinson** and **Brock** to discuss transparency issues.

Open Session:

Chair of the FAS-SEAS Senate **Marijeta Bozovic** started the open portion of the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting at 4 PM. **Ms. Bozovic** noted the two areas to be discussed: AI on campus and topics to raise for the Strategic Review Committee; budget cuts and evaluating their impact with FAS **Dean Steven Wilkinson**. Regarding the Strategic Review Committee topics, she said the committee will give a presentation to the Senate this spring and are asking faculty to share their largest concerns. **Ms. Bozovic** referred to an article “*AI is Destroying the University and Learning Itself.*” She noted the article suggests that AI is undermining the purpose of universities by turning education into a system focused on automation, efficiency, and corporate partnerships rather than deep learning. She said we have moved from faculty panic about generative AI being used for cheating, to administrations deeply embracing AI tools with expensive deals. She noted a case study example of the California State University system partnering with OpenAI, even as faculty are being reduced at the same school and entire programs eliminated which also leads to issues such as superficial learning, grading automation, and degrees that may have little value. She noted this information is taken from a current affairs article that criticizes how this shift reflects broader institutional priorities in many places, and administrators are chasing metrics and tech solutions while outsourcing teaching labor and eroding students' and teachers' capacity for critical thought. **Beverly Gage** asked about the Strategic Review Committee, its charge and capacities, and its membership. **Ms. Bozovic** said The Strategic Review Committee is tasked with providing the FAS and the university with recommendations of how we may better achieve our goal of supporting a world-class faculty in pursuit of Yale's research and teaching mission in Yale College, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and related units, and how we can provide the best possible organization in pursuit of that goal. Its members: Chair, **Maureen Long**, Earth and Planetary Sciences; **Derk Bergemann**, Economics, Computer Science, and Management; **Damon Clark**, MCDB, Physics, and Neuroscience; **Sarah Demers**, Physics; **Ericka Edwards**, Black Studies; **Milette Gaifman**, Classics and the History of Art; **John Hall**, Mathematics; **Alice Kaplan**, French; **Wendy Barry Mendes**, Psychology; **Alan Mikhail**, History; **Douglas Rogers**, Anthropology; **Jas Sekhon**, Political Science, Statistics and Data Science, Institution for Social and Policy Studies. **Stephen Slade** spoke about AI and its threat to academia and noted that recently he went to Yale's AI platform to check on the recent shootings at

Brown and found no up-to-date information. However, he noted, he went to ChatGBT on the web and found up-to-date information on this topic. He noted that in discussing AI, it's reasonable to consider all the adverse effects of it, however many people are unaware of the opportunities and the help it can provide, including brainstorming ideas. **Ms. Bozovic** commented that with this leap in technology, many faculty are going back to using blue books when teaching writing courses, and it seems we are going backwards because of this leap in technology. **Michael Farina** noted that he taught a course on teaching and learning with ChatGPT to faculty last semester. He said he uses ChatGBT with his students to create custom GBT's for them to use and learn and agrees with **Scott Strobel's** goal to have our students be some of the best and brightest users of LLM's (Large Language Models) upon graduation. He said the biggest gap he sees is that faculty have no idea what LLM's can do, they don't know how they can use it for their research, and have no understanding of student usage of LLM's, ChatGBT, which has reached 92% levels. He noted that an anonymous survey in December was answered by 2,000 Yale students and 86% said they used ChatGPT on their finals or for their final papers (which matches a Harvard study.) He said about 91-92% of our students use it regularly and daily and it seems that it's not even a big deal to them anymore. He believes that most Yale faculty have no idea how to use it so informing them on how to use it and how students are using it is a first step we can take to fully understand AI's impact on our students. **Ms. Bozovic** said that in a *Current Affairs* article on AI, a NYU student said he had not written a single of the papers he submitted while in college, and when asked why he attended an expensive and prestigious college, his reply was to find a partner for a start-up company and a wife. **Theodore Kim**, DUS of Computer Science (CS) said he is aware that people on campus feel that we in CS think LLM's are great and that we are using them to the hilt, however that is not the case. He noted instructors in CS are reporting catastrophic learning loss in many students in the introductory course sequence, and students are failing questions in the third semester that they used to be able to answer in the first week of programming class. He said CS is trying to develop a policy for generative AI in classes and said we strongly discourage the use of generative AI tools in core CS classes as they create illusions of understanding that then collapse in advanced courses. **Lisa Messeri** said she agrees that it is essential for us to understand how students are using AI in productive and unproductive ways in their learning and in their lives. She noted that we are hearing about suicides that are connected to users, and we need to think about AI within the academic and learning context and also within the mental health context at a time when we are very sensitive to the increasing needs our students have and feels that this is a holistic problem. She noted it can work great in one context, and catastrophically in another, and it would be wonderful if we as faculty could come up with a holistic way of talking about this problem that would be successful in some of the more strategic interventions we would like to make. **Michael Fischer** noted that everyone these days is talking about AI, saying that AI is inevitable and will take over the world, and that we must train our students to be experts in AI because that's where the jobs are going to be. He feels that this is vastly exaggerated and feels there are things that AI is good for, but there are many dangers coming. He said he feels it is important for us to teach our students about the future of AI, to try to teach critical thinking so they can discern the difference between what is realistic and what are

just hyper exaggerated claims, and to understand the motivation for the promoters which is big money. And, he said, we should prepare our students broadly so that whatever outcomes happen, they will be prepared to realistically assess what is happening in their lives. With a broad education, whatever direction society goes, they will be prepared to contribute to it. He does not feel training narrow experts in using AI is our job or the right thing for us to be doing. **Ms. Bozovic** said this is a time to check in as a faculty and have broader discussions about living through a moment of technological revolution that is dramatically affecting the university and its students and faculty in every way, and we don't have consistent policies to deal with its positive and negative effects. She noted that in cases when international students use AI to rewrite their work and seminar papers, they don't learn how to speak properly which can adversely affect how they communicate orally. **Cynthia DeRoma** noted that international students are using AI for rewriting not only their papers but using it for all their communication – emails and even for scripting what they are saying when they call someone. This hinders their ability to learn how to speak and communicate on their own. She spoke about the illusion of understanding and the illusion of knowing, and to work on teaching students what is it to know as opposed to what they think they know. **Robert Wooster** said we need to think about the incentives students have in using AI -writing a perfect paper to get an A, and perhaps we need to think of incentives for them to write their own papers, making mistakes, and learning to improve their own writing skills. **Michael Loewenberg** said he is hearing that AI is here, there's not much we can do about it, we're trying to take a middle path, and maybe it's ruining the learning. He noted that in STEM tests are taken in class so they better know that they can actually do the work. They may cheat a bit with homework; however, he'd like to think that AI is a learning aid for students to check if they're right but not do the work for them. Perhaps, he said, the incentive might be that they are told that homework does not count as much. He suggested that in writing classes students be given essays that they need to write in class. **Ms. Bozovic** said one thing we could ask the Strategic Review Committee for is a list of best practices so each department can use it as a guide for the way others are handling difficult situations without having to figure out how to handle them on their own. **Mr. Wooster** shared what he did this semester regarding students giving solutions that are correct, and I know that they don't completely understand. Before this semester, homework counted for 99% of their grade with exams counting for very little. However, he said, this semester homework counted for very little of their grade and tests and exams scores counted for most of the grade. He found test and exam scores were higher. He agrees that AI can help students in some instances, but it should not take the place of core learning. **Sonam Kachru** asked what our goal is in being in conversation with the Strategic Review Committee. **Ms. Bozovic** said it is to encourage faculty participation – a faculty governance moment where faculty participate in these conversations and chances and opportunities for people like **Lisa Messeri** and **Theodore Kim**, who are experts on this topic, to continually give input as decisions are being made. **Ms. Slanski** noted that there is no all-size-fits-all solution to these problems. She attended an early semester workshop offered by the *Poorvu Center* on designing AI-resistant writing assignments and so there are already resources available and the *Poorvu Center* is a good resource to go to regarding AI. She said that part of our remit as instructors is to instruct

students on responsible use of AI and does not feel that she will be good at teaching responsible use of AI. **David Watts** commented that he feels students use AI not specifically to receive good grades, but to satisfy course requirements. He also feels that AI is valuable in some areas such as biomedical research. **Ms. Bozovic** noted a message in the chat that asked for best practices, a call for conversation, a call for continuity, a call for guidance, especially for individual faculty but maybe across departments, to think how we can be consistent with the messages that we're sending. Let us not try to reinvent the wheel but all try to be part or privy to the conversation.

Ms. Bozovic moved to the next agenda item to discuss budget cuts and noted that FAS **Dean Steven Wilkinson** and SEAS **Dean Jeffrey Brock** were present. She noted that certain information is given to departmental chairs, and then the chairs hopefully trickle this information down to faculty in their departments. She said we are creating a space to raise questions from faculty joining us today, with main topics of the cuts being made, and as changes are being made how the financial cuts are distributed and how will pay be distributed? Also, how will the administration evaluate the results of budget cuts when they are potentially grave, damaging, and potentially existential to smaller units? She pointed to specific cuts made in the graduate student admissions and how they are going to affect departments – some more than others. She asked how faculty can communicate what we are seeing and know that we want as much transparency as possible to calm faculty panic. She also asked for the Deans to share information on instructional faculty and how they will be affected by budget cuts. **Dean Wilkinson** noted that some of our peer institutions have much larger target cuts and are reducing graduate admission by 75% (mentioned U Chicago, Harvard among others). He noted that we came into this stronger and have not been targeted the same way as some of our peers, however we are going to lose \$300 million from our endowment payout that was already being fully budgeted to spend, and FAS, SEAS, the Law and Divinity Schools are very heavily reliant on the endowment, so if you tax the endowment at the equivalent of 12% of the spend (that is not due to market returns but we know will exist forever or see if the policy will change), at least for the foreseeable future we have to adjust for this situation. **Dean Wilkinson** noted that FAS needs are slower moving resulting in less cuts than other areas. He explained in detail how this is planned through FY2030/31 and said it's not where there will be no pain, however it's a better picture than many of our peers have. He noted that you as faculty members experience the FAS as a whole, however from a budget perspective, the graduate school, Yale college, and everything else are different budgets - not part of the same interlinked budget. Therefore, he said, when you have a question about the graduate school budget, it is a separate budget, and SEAS is a separate budget, and FAS has two separate budgets. He said on the staff side, we feel we can meet our targets and get where we need to be through attrition using retirement programs and are trying to meet requirements and not hurt departments. **Dean Brock** noted we have every reason and intention to be fully transparent about how we are managing these challenges. In engineering, he said, it's complicated because we are in a growth situation while also trying to pull back on the budget side. He noted that until now, SEAS has been well-resourced and well managed financially, and the number of faculty lines grew

substantially, especially in Computer Science which does not require lab space. However, he noted, we now must be cautious on how we move forward in areas where we have lab demands and not space to provide for this type of hiring. Regarding reduction in funding, he said engineering is used to cutting back when there is a funding deficit, so when these challenges arise, we are better able to manage in this type of situation. He noted we already had vacancies and some anticipated vacancies due to retirement, and we can plan to fill these slowly or at a lower level; our real concern is how to build the Temple Street building and to get other projects completed. **Ms. DeRoma** asked if attrition included not renewing people with one-year contracts or instructional faculty on limited terms. **Dean Wilkinson** said he was referring to staff regarding attrition. **Beverly Gage** asked if there is a grand strategic vision - an idea that for some years we're going to keep doing things as is but a little bit less of them or is it that these changes are going to produce something more fundamentally different. Also, it's not clear what is going to happen without graduate education, so she asked if these reductions are temporary. She noted that particularly in history and the humanities, a sustained, long-term substantial reduction in the number of graduate students is a fundamental change in our teaching and how we as faculty operate. She asked what the mindset is - is it that we're in a crisis now and we just must crunch and do a little less for now and see where we are in a few years, or are we looking at something bigger? **Dean Wilkinson** said we tried to determine the best plan for the next few years for the budget while protecting as much of what is core to what we do, and for our existing searches and department structures. He noted that the faculty led Strategic Review Committee, and other things we do, are the places for rethinking the way we teach, the way we're structured, and how we deal with AI. And, he said, to consult broadly with faculty while we're doing this. **Michael Fischer** said he was pleased to hear that there has been a push back on the upper administration to extend the timeline for making changes. He noted Yale's history in making hasty budget decisions and overreacting in making decisions. He gave examples including the most recent example of what happened during COVID when budget cuts were made in a hurry, followed by the realization that Yale had in fact had a million-dollar surplus during this period. He feels that Yale makes a mistake in believing that we can predict more in the future than we can, and we need to be cautious of our resources in the foreseeable future. This, he feels, means don't expand unnecessarily when things look good, don't contract too much when they look worrisome, and work carefully behind the scenes and openly, to accommodate the challenges that we are presented with. He said while graduate students are essential to our undergraduate education, the budget process doesn't reflect this, and he wonders if whomever is making these decisions has the information on how this budget is intimately tied to department budgets. He noted the information needs to be from having full information on how cuts will affect each area asked to cut, and the challenge is how to increase communication to those making these decisions. **Dean Wilkinson** said we've been given more years to meet our target, and the hard work that people have put into searches in areas that are much needed on the latter side for the curriculum and for research purposes are going forward. **Dean Wilkinson** noted that in the spirit of **John Geanakoplos**, who always reminds us that to be searching for faculty at a time when peers are not is always the best time, and we are certainly in that position now even though some searches are being staggered over

one or two years. He feels that we are carrying on in a responsible manner, however we need to meet the targets by FY31 which means there will be less searches in the years ahead. **Dean Brock** commented on how we set targets for graduate admissions, and in Computer Science and in other engineering departments we have been ambitious and able to work closely with the Graduate School to base admission targets on the state of funding, so while there is an allocation required, that allocation incorporates information about how much funding is going to be there on the back end. **Mr. Farina** asked if the deans could share the numbers of graduate student decreases across departments, what the graduate enrollments will be, and what this means strategically to our university. He also asked how the additional \$250 million in taxes will be distributed across all schools and departments. **Dean Wilkinson** suggested that the Senate ask each school and division how they handled these distributions. He noted that in FAS, we are concerned with the number of graduate students and how the reduction will affect the future supply of teachers provided by this group. **Dean Brock** said in SEAS, admitting a graduate student is a multi-year obligation. He noted that postdocs are people who know quite a bit and can do exactly what you ask of them, and the risk is that we drift towards a postdoc-focused model of research rather than a graduate student effort. **Mr. Farina** asked how much of the \$250 million is being cut from us. **Dean Wilkinson** noted that many of the FAS units were asked to make a 5% reduction. However, we are given a longer time to do this because of the hiring we're doing, so we'll be in deficit in the next few years. **David Post** spoke regarding the shift in research from graduate students to postdocs that **Dean Brock** mentioned and said that we saw that on Science Hill during the great recession because there was a flat cut in most programs that left many without graduate students to fund from grants, we already had. He said there have been discussions recently on Science Hill with junior faculty who have been advised over the last decade to put the money into postdocs, so we've already seen that and wonder how these numbers might be exacerbated by this current situation. And he asked, how we will mentor our junior colleagues as they write their first grants? He said it would be helpful to have advice from your office to chairs and DGS's and have broader conversations on how philosophically we are thinking as an institution on what all this means short and long term and how senior faculty should be mentoring junior faculty. **Dean Brock** said he agrees 100% with **Mr. Post**. He also said it comes back to the question of could we be more aggressive with fundraising around endowments to support graduate education. **Ms. Bozovic** asked what if we decided after a year or so that we actually don't want to cut from the graduate school at all and we redistribute the cuts elsewhere - is this something that you can ever imagine happening? She mentioned that cutting costs in other areas could work rather than cutting people, and is there a chance that such decisions and discussions will take place in the future? **Dean Wilkinson** described the process by which budgets are discussed and decided on, explaining that there are several steps people from finance take, and they are already being asked the kinds of questions you posed from faculty. **Dean Brock** noted that in SEAS, we are already looking for other ways to bring in funding for graduate student support. He also noted that there are ways that faculty can contribute to these conversations and give input. **Michael Loewenberg** asked if it's possible that the endowment tax will change in the foreseeable future. **Dean Wilkinson** said he did not

think so even if there is a change in the government, there would be other larger issues for the government to address, and so he feels it will be with us at least for the short-medium term for certain. **Dean Wilkinson** noted that in addition to the endowment tax increase, there are other factors that contribute to the uncertainty of the budget including changes in the indirect costs on grants and changes in medical reimbursement rates. **Dean Brock** noted that rather than being a question of trust in higher education, he feels there is a question of what the perception is of what we are doing. He said it seems that we're trying to do good things for society, but there is also an undercurrent of technology innovation leading to the production of enormous amounts of wealth that asks whether we should be taxed. **Ms. Bozovic** noted if individual units pitch their budgetary needs and then these cuts are decided, how do faculty give input to GSAS that we want them to push harder? She noted that the cuts in graduate student size may not be as damaging as we think, but there's much trepidation that as our undergraduate student numbers go up, and as our graduate student numbers go down, that there will be some inherent problems in teaching needs if we are not hiring more faculty, either latter or instructional, so will we be offering far fewer lecture courses and more seminars, and if yes, where do those students go? She said there may be unanticipated consequences that, within a year or two we feel strongly about, and who do we go to with these issues? **Dean Wilkinson** noted that a third of the entire university budget is endowment, and more so on our side of campus, and from his understanding, targets that each of our units were given were related to our degree of endowment dependence. He said in some cases there are graduate school endowments that are specifically for graduate education, and now the income from that is being affected with the endowment tax increase. And, he said, the targets that had been given to different schools were based on the degree of endowment reliance of the different schools, and we were asked to give feedback there. And he noted there are some university funds that are fungible which are being used to plug a variety of gaps during this very challenging time. **Dara Strolovitch** asked if there has been any discussion about a small increase in the endowment spending percentage that can be revisited. **Dean Wilkinson** noted that this decision is up to the Provost, the University Corporation, and the Endowment Committee to make that decision and commented that the endowment spending rule has served us very well over the years, and there will always be pressure from people who say, "spend more now and transfer costs in the future." He said the University has not wanted to do this because they are preserving the University now and for the future being, concerned with intergenerational fairness. Another question he has, assuming that we can get 8.25% year in and year out on average to justify our spend rate – is this actually going to be valid in the future in the way it has been in the past that might suggest a lower spend from the endowment.

Ms. Bozovic thanked **Dean Brock** and **Dean Wilkinson** for their willingness to have this discussion and said it is vital to have them in the interests of communication and transparency. She confirmed with senators that FAS **Dean Pericles Lewis** and Graduate School **Dean Lynn Cooley** will be invited to the January 2026 Senate meeting to continue the discussion. **Ms. Bozovic** adjourned the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting at 5:30 PM.

