

Minutes of Yale Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate Meeting
November 19, 2015
Connecticut Hall Faculty Room

Attending: David Bercovici, Jill Campbell, Beverly Gage, John Geanakoplos, Shiri Goren, Emily Greenwood, John Harris, Matt Jacobson, Ruth Koizim, Kathryn Lofton, Reina Maruyama, Mark Mooseker, William Nordhaus, William Rankin, Charles Schmuttenmaer, Ian Shapiro, Katie Trumpener, Vesla Weaver, Karen Wynn

Invited Guests: Kirk Freudenburg (Classics) and David Bromwich (English)

Beverly Gage (Chair of FAS Senate) called the meeting to order and welcomed all to the third meeting of the Senate. She began by reviewing Senate procedures. She reminded the group that the Senate is operating under a set of provisional procedures agreed to in September 2015 that will be revisited in January 2016. Under the current rules, the agenda includes a space for faculty comments for faculty who signed up in advance to speak for two minutes on any issue of concern. The rest of the meeting, they would discuss two important issues: first, the faculty conduct standards and procedures and second the campus racial climate possible Senate action.

William Nordhaus discussed the minutes from the last meeting. Mr. Nordhaus started with a reminder on the procedure of the minutes. The philosophy of the minutes is that they are not verbatim, but a summary of the major points with the names associated with them. After the meeting, he sends the comments that people made to those people to make sure they are accurate before the minutes are finalized. He also noted that they make two audio recordings to ensure the accuracy of the minutes, and the recordings are deleted after the minutes are approved by the Senate. In addition, Senators may include additional remarks. These remarks are included at the end of the minutes but are not formal deliberations of or approved by the Senate. A motion was made to approve the minutes, the motion was seconded, and they were unanimously approved.

Mr. Nordhaus noted that, while the minutes are accurate, one issue discussed at the last minute was based on incorrect information. In the discussion about voting procedures, it was not noted that the bylaws of the Senate indicate that votes should be by secret ballot. He suggested the Senate should clarify this issue. Mark Mooseker made a motion:

Resolved, that the Senate reserves the request for secret ballots, but that routine votes should be with a show of hands.

The motion was seconded. Without objection as to voting by hands, the Senate approved the motion with a show of hands.

Ms. Gage then moved to hear the reports of the committees. There are six committees currently operating. The Elections Committee will not report because the Senate is not currently holding elections. Mr. Mooseker, the Chair of the Committee on Yale Committees, was the first to report. At the last meeting, he reported that he had met with Lloyd Suttle and suggested a slate of candidates for the committee on classroom planning for the expansion of Yale College. The FAS Dean asked their committee to come up with a slate of

seven suggested candidates for staffing CESOF (the Committee on the Economics Status of the Faculty). There have been many recommendations from

FAS Senate Minutes of November 19, 2015 Page 1 FASS-draft-Minutes-111915-v5b.docx

Senators and other faculty. Shiri Goren asked how many non-ladder faculty are on the current list. Mr. Mooseker responded that there are three non-ladder faculty on the current list.

As the Chair of the Committee on Expansion of Yale College, Ms. Gage reported that the committee had conducted an online survey among the FAS Faculty determine faculty opinion. It was sent to approximately 780 faculty members, which includes all ladder FAS faculty as well as lecturers and non-ladder faculty on long-term contracts. Of those 780 people, about 320 have responded to date. The survey gives a good picture of faculty concerns. The committee will present its preliminary report at the next Senate meeting on December 17, 2015.

Emily Greenwood, the Chair of the Peer Advisory Committee, presented next. Ms. Greenwood reported that their Committee consists of five members. The committee had primarily been working on guidelines with a view of sending an announcement to all FAS faculty about how to consult the Committee as well as the activities of the committee.

David Bercovici reported on the Faculty Advancement Committee. They met for the first time on October 27, 2015 and focused on issues of faculty excellence and livelihood, specifically those items that support faculty excellence. They have two goals this year: first, Karen Wynn and John Geanakoplos propose to collect data on the trends of faculty excellence, especially as these are reflected in national rankings; and second they plan to look at the development, promotion, and mentoring of junior faculty up to and including the Associate Professor ranks.

To investigate these questions, the committee will look at the upcoming FASTAP review and gather some departmental best practices with regard to promoting and mentoring junior faculty; consider the balancing of administrative and service workloads among junior faculty and diversity faculty; and review parental leave policies with an emphasis on providing them with more time to carry out their research.

Mr. Nordhaus reported on the Budget and Finance Committee. The committee had one meeting so far with Steve Murphy, Yale's Vice President in charge of the budget and Yale's Chief Financial Officer. Mr. Murphy gave them a very helpful and informative session. He provided an analytic view of the budgets of the various schools, an overview of the major sources of incomes and expenses, and the bottom lines of the different schools. Mr. Nordhaus reported on an email from Senator Yair Minsky, who was struck by the fact that FAS salaries were such a tiny number, about 5% of the total budget for the University.

Mr. Nordhaus reported on discussions in the committee. It is felt that one of the most important issues is to understand the role of the FAS in the overall university budget, and particularly the budget history – where the FAS is, where it's been, what the different components of income and expenses have been, and what is growing and what is not

growing. He further emphasized that budgets at Yale are viewed as confidential. It will clearly be difficult to understand the issues involved in FAS budgets unless the committee can get the full picture provided by current and past budget documents. He stated that the Budget Committee will address access to information in the near future.

Ms. Gage moved to the next item on the agenda, which was for the two-minute prepared faculty comments.

Kirk Freudenburg (Classics) spoke first and referenced the document that he circulated before the meeting, which represents all he would have said if he had time to say it. As the document shows, he believes that the Classics Department has been severely hurt by an aggressive near ten-year

FAS Senate Minutes of November 19, 2015 Page 2 FASS-draft-Minutes-111915-v5b.docx

draw on its restricted funds. The results represent opportunities lost, including one faculty member lost to competitors in part because of diversion of restricted funds; undergraduate majors lost, not because of any general demographic shift away from the Humanities, but because once grand opportunities have been curtailed; conferences not held; and great and innovative ideas that were necessarily declined. These losses resulted from financial decisions taken by the top administrators by loading former GA (general appropriation) expenses onto departmental restricted funds on a permanent basis. In earlier times, the departmental Chair would work with the administration on the best use of restricted funds. Today, Chairs are simply notified of how their funds will be spent in the coming year. Mr. Freudenburg asked the FAS Senate to take these matters seriously. He pointed out that these issues affect all faculty, and yet the faculty has no say in them. Now that the University's endowment has recovered nicely, it is time for them to return all of the funds taken from restricted funds to the Departments from which they've been taken.

David Bromwich (English) addressed concerns that were raised by Glenda Gilmore at the last meeting of the FAS Senate about faculty standards and procedures. The main questions have arisen from the difficulty of getting a precise idea of what actions may constitute a violation of the standards of faculty conduct. How can one know what counts as an infraction and how can one understand the punishment affixed to a given violation? Mr. Bromwich stressed the need for clarity with respect to penalties, such as the failure to appear at prescribed office hours and delays in supplying a letter of recommendation or an official progress report. Furthermore, he said that the conduct standards need to be brought into line with the ordinary expectations on campus.

Mr. Bromwich suggested that penalties ought to be reserved for an intense, single violation or a deep pattern of recurrent irresponsible conduct. He suggested four revisions in the draft procedures: (1) Revise the draft to say that: "Both the complainant and the respondent are permitted to be accompanied by an adviser and the advisers can participate in the process in the same manner and to the same extent." (2) Revise it to say that: "Not only the panel's findings, but also its recommendations will be furnished alike to the complainant and the respondent." (3) Revise it to say: "The Dean will convey her decision to the complainant, the respondent, and the panel, and will also explain the reasons for her decisions." (4) Insert this sentence in the draft procedures: "A transcript will be made of the

panel proceedings which can be consulted by the complainant or the respondent for the purpose of appeal.”

The next order of business was a full Senate discussion of the Conduct Standards and Procedures. Ms. Gage gave a few updates. The first was that several departments in FAS (English, History, American Studies, and African-American Studies) voted to send the draft procedures back for review. The second was that Ms. Gilmore reached out to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) to solicit their views on the draft conduct procedures. The AAUP, in turn, sent a letter to Ms. Gilmore in which they analyze the procedures and raise some objections about the procedures in light of the AAUP’s standards of academic freedom and due process. Lastly, the Senate has been in contact with Dean Gendler over the past few weeks while this report was being prepared. Dean Gendler has agreed to many of the proposals that would be discussed later in the meeting.

Kathryn Lofton then discussed the report of the study group on faculty standards and procedures, which was circulated to the Senate. Since the report is available, these minutes will not report on direct quotations from the report. Ms. Lofton noted the recommendations for further action. She also said that the study group decided that there is a value to having faculty standards and developing the necessarily procedures, but that the current standards and procedures were not adequately discussed and analyzed by the faculty. She drew the Senate’s attention to page four in which they make a series of recommendations, which are (1) to develop a language of rights for the

FAS Senate Minutes of November 19, 2015 Page 3 FASS-draft-Minutes-111915-v5b.docx

faculty in addition to articulating standards for behavior, (2) to articulate what the standard of an act of misconduct is, and (3) to underline that a violation must be serious and repeated acts of misconduct

Ms. Gage suggested that the Senate may want to entertain two motions, including: (1) a motion to adopt this report or adopt it with a set of amendments, and (2) a motion to formerly constitute the committee (or an expanded version of the committee) that produced this report.

Ms. Gage then opened the floor up for discussion. Mr. Geanakoplos asked how a violation of the standards is triggered. He hoped that there would be a deliberate process before a committee is formed. Ms. Lofton said that the procedures suggest that the process is inaugurated by the Dean. But they may want to reconsider the terms on which the Dean can inaugurate a complaint. Ms. Gage said that her understanding is that complaints can be offered by any member of the community, including a student, a colleague, or an anonymous person or group. If the complaint is offered anonymously, then the Dean becomes the complainant of record. She added that some are concerned it might be possible for a student to file a complaint because a faculty member did not file a letter of recommendation in time, which might then trigger a review panel.

Ian Shapiro asked if there are standards of conduct for administrators. If so, what are they and how do they compare to the faculty standards? If not, why are there no standards of administrative conduct? Ms. Gage answered that faculty who have jobs as full-time

administrators are covered by these standards of conduct, but these standards do not apply to non-faculty administrators.

Charles Schmuttenmaer referred with approval to the letter from the AAUP, specifically the section toward the end in which they suggest that they look at the procedures at Iowa State University. He urged the committee charged with reviewing these be in contact with the AAUP.

Professor Margaret Clark, chair of the committee that recommended the faculty standards and provisional procedures, speaking from the floor, noted the difference in the status between the standards and the procedures. She said that all this discussion and the period for open comments pertain to the procedures. The faculty standards are in place and the Clark committee as presently constituted is not charged to revise the faculty standards, which are in the Faculty Handbook.

Matt Jacobson asked how the Senate could engage the professional schools and the other parts of the university to make sure that other faculties are engaged in the discussion about standards and procedures.

Katie Trumpener said that she was not surprised that the majority of faculty do not know the standards of their professional groups or of the University. She noted that some disciplines have multiple organizations, or splinter organizations, so it is unclear what it means to commit to the standards of a professional organization. Therefore, it seems unviable to look to outside groups for standards of behavior in what may lead to sanctions within the university or legal proceedings. The code would need to be one that we as a faculty deliberate and agree on. Additionally, she was concerned that the Faculty Handbook has stopped being a physical object that could be read from cover to cover and underlined and is instead morphing into a website. It was not clear to her how new faculty members are to understand and subscribe to the standards. In addition, she was concerned about the mechanism whereby people would commit themselves to the standards put forward by the university.

Mr. Nordhaus said there is always some ambiguity about the role of the FAS Senate. It is clear from reading of our founding documents, the discussions of them in faculty meetings, and the President's

FAS Senate Minutes of November 19, 2015 Page 4 FASS-draft-Minutes-111915-v5b.docx

response to the proposal, he said, that the FAS Senate can engage with issues that affect the FAS but are part of the broader university. This point relates importantly to the resolution, Mr. Nordhaus continued. The first part says that the standards and draft procedures be distributed in full to the entire university faculty. The second part asks that the ad hoc committee revises the standards and procedures in light of the comments. He stated that it is recognized that the Clark committee no longer has the standards as its charge, but the resolution recommends that the President and Provost ask that committee or another group to revisit the standards in light of the comments.

Ruth Koizim noted that the standards referred to the “standards of business conduct.” This document refers to conflicts of interest, bribes, and anti-trust. The consequence of violations, she quoted the document as saying, “may carry disciplinary consequences up to and including dismissal.” She heartedly agreed that the Senate recommend a reconsideration of the standards and not just the processes. She thinks they need to go back to the drawing board on the standards.

Ms. Greenwood thanked the study group. She was concerned about the distinction, also voiced by Ms. Lofton, between penalties for bad behavior and ethical standards. The Senate was told at its last meeting that the rationale for these standards was egregious infractions of good conduct, outrageous derelictions of duty, and harassment and bullying of colleagues. Ms. Greenwood was concerned that we have missed an opportunity to describe the kind of culture and community that we all are working towards. She wondered where such a statement might be placed, for example, about how we can ensure that pre-tenured faculty do not have unreasonable demands, or that administrative duties do not fall unfairly on women. Such standards are ones that are as important and make a huge difference to the culture of an institution.

Mr. Bercovici asked how additional committee members could be added to the committee on standards that Ms. Lofton discussed. Ms. Lofton thought that some of the recommendations are relatively minor modifications, specifications, or editorial shifts of what exists. Moreover, she recognized that the standards were not currently on the agenda of the Clark committee and furthermore involved other schools. However, her view was that the standards should be examined by the FAS. If the FAS decides that it cannot commit to the standards as written, then that could be a decision that the FAS can make on its own behalf.

Ms. Lofton read the three recommendations. Mr. Nordhaus moved the resolution in the report be adopted by the Senate. The motion was seconded. Ms. Lofton moved an amendment that the first sentence be changed to read “the current standards and draft procedures” instead of “the current draft standards and procedures.” This was accepted as a friendly amendment, and was adopted.

The following resolution was adopted by a show of hands:

Resolved by the Senate of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Yale University:

- 1) A recommendation that the current standards and draft procedures be distributed in full to the university faculty, followed by a 30-day period for faculty comment and input. Opportunities for input may be primarily written communication but should also include town hall or discussion meetings and other forms of exchange. Written and online comments should be made publicly available.
- 2) A recommendation that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Standards of Conduct revise the standards and procedures with this expanded faculty input in mind.
- 3) A recommendation that the FAS Dean should, at an appropriate time, call a meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in order to discuss and vote upon the Ad Hoc Committee’s final proposals for faculty conduct standards and procedures.

Ms. Gage inquired if the Senate wanted to constitute an ongoing committee within the Senate on this issue. It was suggested that they wait to see what the response is before doing so.

Ms. Gage moved on to the discussion of the campus racial climate, events of recent weeks, and possibilities for Senate action on this topic. She discussed activities on this front that have taken place in the Senate's Executive Council. The Executive Council concluded that it would be most useful at this point to have an open discussion at the Senate to reflect about events on the campus. She also proposed discussing the new policies that have been presented by the President and the Dean of the College, and to have a strategic conversation about the best way for the Senate to weigh in on these important issues.

Ms. Greenwood began by saying that in the past ten days, many students have asked for more timely action by the University in honoring its stated targets for diversity. Ms. Greenwood presented some statistics that Glenda Gilmore (History, African American Studies and American Studies) collected that give a snapshot of faculty diversity within the FAS. In 2012, there were 30 black professors in FAS, making up 4.5% of the tenured and tenured-track FAS faculty. By the spring of 2015, that number had fallen from 30 to 24, 3.6% of the FAS faculty. In the same period, the percentage of Latino and Latina professors fell from 25 to 13, or from 2.5% to 1.2%. In the same period, faculty who identify (or are identified) as Asian, which includes both international professors and Asian-Americans, grew from 6.5% to 8.6%, but there is problem with a discrepancy with federally mandated ways of recognizing diversity. Lastly, one Native American professor represents 0.1% of the faculty.

Ms. Greenwood stated that these statistics paint a stark picture. She suggested that the Senate might, particularly in light of the recently-announced diversity initiative, which has announced a commitment of \$25 million of centralized University resources to diversity, think about is how that will funnel through the existing faculty driven processes, especially through the Faculty Resources Committee, which is the gatekeeper for petitions for new hires. In the past few days, Ms. Greenwood has reviewed the 2012 report of the Committee on Faculty Resources, and then the 2014 Academic Review Committee report. Both of those committee reports have quite distinctive language about providing for flexibility in the allocation of centralized slots with a view to central University initiatives, one of which is diversity. But there is still a lack of clarity as to how they the FRC can move swiftly to meet diversity objectives, particularly the recent requests, while respecting faculty governance. She suggested that the Senate consider appointing a committee to work on diversity issues, to look at all of the reports that led to creation of the Faculty Resources Committee, and to think about productive and constructive guidelines that the Senate can give in this matter.

Ms. Koizim emphasized that the \$25 million diversity initiative over five years is for the entire University, not only for the FAS. She would like funds to be allocated in a way that respects student enrollments and that ensures that an appropriate share of those funds goes to FAS.

Mr. Jacobson said that he has been part of this discussion at Yale for twenty years. He pointed to two novel elements in the past week. First, the students articulated the mismatch between diversity of the student body and the lack of diversity of the faculty, and saw this as a betrayal of them. Second was the way President Salovey rooted the discussion of diversity in the intellectual life of the University. In essence, the message is that a twenty-first century education is an anti-racist education. The crisis that was exposed at Yale starting on Halloween was an intellectual crisis that has to be met with the rigors of Yale's curriculum. The fact that the President posed it that way and responded with a set of curricular and structural educational initiatives is implicitly a request for the Senate to get involved. The Senate has a special role to play in deciding what these initiatives

FAS Senate Minutes of November 19, 2015 Page 6 FASS-draft-Minutes-111915-v5b.docx

should mean for the intellectual life of the University. Mr. Jacobson hopes the Senate will resolve to show its support for the President.

Vesla Weaver stressed that the FAS at Yale would almost need to triple its underrepresented minority faculty to get back to previous levels. She also stated that she thinks the Senate needs to take action and suggested that the Committee that looks at faculty excellence should form a subcommittee to deal with issues of diversity. She gave the Senate some context for why these numbers have eroded. Ms. Weaver is a member of the African-American Studies Department and she said that when they lose a faculty member, they often cannot hire a replacement, which leads to structural erosion.

Mr. Geanakoplos wondered if some of the pain expressed by students is caused by the social milieu, particularly the increasingly competitive/hierarchical nature of the undergraduate experience. In an earlier era (such as when he was an undergraduate) there were few exclusive organizations, and many clubs were open to all. Today, almost all of the clubs, secret societies, and fraternities are exclusive, and students have to rush, apply, and compete to enter them, and there's no guarantee they'll get into one. And often the clubs cost substantial sums of money. Everything is a competition and everything is about status and hierarchy. Once upon a time, the college system was meant to be the great equalizer, but now social life has moved outside the colleges. He wondered whether it is possible that there is another dimension, in addition to faculty diversity, that may be affecting how the students feel and their sense of belonging and their sense of status in the University.

Ms. Trumpener shared her views on issues that are on the minds of students and faculty. One enduring issue is Yale's interface with life in the city and how the University guards and arms itself, which has a long and complicated history. She spoke about her experience at the University of Chicago, where she taught a course that included a segment on the racial history of the neighborhood and the city. A similar course at Yale would help students understand how the city operates and think critically about the university in relationship to its urban environment. She would like students at Yale to take an ethnic studies course, which might include a focus on local history. Second, in her view Yale does not deal well with class issues, which often intersect with race. Furthermore, there's a wearing down of students who do not have the confidence to approach their faculty and deans and who do not have the money to join XYZ. She understands that Yale gives students funding for internships, but she asked if that was enough. Third, in the English Department, several brave graduate students spoke up last year and said that they felt misrecognized. This was

addressed by student-organized events within the department, including panelists talking about unconscious bias, collective discussion of a literary work describing microaggression (Claudia Rankine, *Citizen*), and a small group discussion. Ms. Trumpener hoped the Senate would recognize that the campus issues of race and class also affect graduate students.

Ms. Lofton addressed the issue of retention. The attrition of the faculty over recent years is connected to the inability to retain faculty. While, she said, Yale has often done a good job on recruiting people, there is less attention to what it means to retain them once they are at Yale. Retention should not be a last-ditch effort, but an ongoing feature of community-building.

Ms. Campbell addressed several of the complications within the University's recently reiterated absolute commitment to free speech. She pointed to the compromising of that commitment through Yale's collaboration on Yale-NUS with Singapore, where free expression is not possible. In response to student protests this fall, the President and other campus leaders have reasserted the fundamental role of the principle of free speech in university life, while also affirming the importance of maintaining an inclusive community in which everyone is respected and can fully engage. Rather than simply affirming these two essential commitments side by side, leaders of the

FAS Senate Minutes of November 19, 2015 Page 7 FASS-draft-Minutes-111915-v5b.docx

University need to take on the intellectual challenge of thinking about how they relate to each other. She believes that free speech is an ideal that requires certain conditions to be attained; and those conditions do not hold either in an authoritarian state or in a community in which some individuals feel that they do not have the same privilege to speak. She stressed the need to develop ways to understand how these commitments relate to each other rather than how they compete. Ms. Campbell proposed that the Senate sponsor a conference to talk about free speech in a nuanced way. She also asked that the Senate reconsider the provisional procedures so that other faculty have more opportunities to speak.

Mr. Nordhaus brought the discussion back a remark from Yair Minsky's email about the extreme fiscal conservatism that has characterized Yale's search decisions over the last few years. Mr. Nordhaus noted that the lack of diversity among the faculty discussed by Ms. Greenwood as well as ones I learned from Gerald Jaynes (Economics and African-American Studies) is in part due to the effects of the fiscal austerity. He said that Yale can increase its diversity primarily by new hires. So when the administration limits new searches and new hires, this shuts down the flow of potentially diverse faculty. Discussions of diversity should not overlook the importance of faculty size. The FAS faculty now is substantially smaller than its target size of 700. If we do not emphasize new hires and retention, we cannot make any progress and will continue to slide back in terms of the fraction of minorities and women, as we have over the last ten years.

Ms. Maruyama seconded Mr. Geanakoplos's comment about recognizing the pain that the students are expressing. She thinks that it is very important for the Senate to consider the diversity of the faculty, the impact of budget decisions, and the issues of faculty retention. She appreciated the open letter that was signed by many and she would also like the Senate

to take action and show the students that the Senate is aware and cares about student concerns.

Mr. Jacobson said that because there are so many interlocking issues, the simplest thing to do is for the committees of the Senate to give special prominence to this issue as they move forward.

Ms. Greenwood summarized several points and framed the discussion in terms of urgency. She noted that by its very nature, diversity is open-ended, and it is critical not to foreclose different areas. In his announcement earlier that week, the President identified the urgent need for more faculty working in the following fields: Ethnicity, Race, and Migration, Indigeneity and Women's Studies, and the study of Intersectionality – and, she added, critical race theory. They have also spoken about the dire statistics of faculty from underrepresented ethnicities and racial groups. She wanted to emphasize how interdependent those two things are. Lastly, she stressed that Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies is in a precarious position because so many of their slots have eroded. While she was encouraged by the President's promise of four more slots in these areas, she believes more is needed, and quickly. Otherwise, the university will come back to the problem of retention that Ms. Weaver identified earlier. How, she asked, do you keep your faculty if there is no critical support in terms of theoretical study and collegiality and solidarity in the faculty? Ms. Greenwood said that she would like the Senate to prepare some guidelines in a timely manner.

Ms. Trumpener wondered if they could have an open website for faculty to write in with their concrete suggestions given the time constraints of Senate meetings. Ms. Goren stressed the importance of making a public statement to show support of the students and the President's initiatives. Mr. Shapiro was skeptical about the idea of passing a resolution based on the information the Senate has at the moment. It is unclear to him where the \$50 million or even the \$25 million is coming from. If it is coming from existing resources then that is very different than if it is not coming from existing resources. He would be more comfortable passing resolutions after the Committees have done more work. Mr. Harris was concerned that no statement is a statement.

FAS Senate Minutes of November 19, 2015 Page 8 FASS-draft-Minutes-111915-v5b.docx

However, he did not think they should attempt to wordsmith a statement in such a short time. Bill Rankin suggested that the Senate should see the issues of improving diversity as part of its purview and that we commit to take it on very quickly.

Ms. Gage stated that there were no motions on the floor either to extend the meeting or to pass a resolution. Absent resolutions, she took the sense of the meeting to be as follows: That the Senate is committed to sustained engagement, to think seriously about these issues, to commit to some level of action, and to put the charge to the Executive Council and to the committees to engage with this.

Ms. Trumpener requested that when Ms. Gage talks to the Yale Daily News about their meeting that she stress that they devoted almost half of the meeting to the question of what comes next and that there is a strong feeling among the Senators that they will continue to

work on this. In this case, a soft statement is better than no statement. Mr. Mooseker agreed with Ms. Trumpener's advice on dealing with the Yale Daily News. Furthermore, he said that if they articulate the kinds of directives that they have set by working within their existing committee structures to address these issues, it shows they are taking real action and not just symbolic action.

Ms. Gage determined that, absent a formal motion at this point, they could consider themselves fully committed as a body, based on this discussion and based on the concerns of the Senators, to pushing forward with these issues and to acknowledging the seriousness of what both students and faculty of color have raised over the past few weeks. Mr. Shapiro stated that Ms. Gage should feel free to convey that as the sense of the meeting. Ms. Gage said that if there were no objections, this is what she would convey to the Yale Daily News.

Lastly, Ms. Gage asked if there was new business. No new business was raised. There was a motion to adjourn, which was seconded. The Senate then voted to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
William Nordhaus, Deputy Chair/Secretary