

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

Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate Meeting
Thursday, January 16, 2020
4 PM – 6 PM
CT Hall, Rm. 201, 1071 Chapel Street
APPROVED

In attendance:

Senators: John Geanakoplos, Chair; Valerie Horsley, Acting Deputy Chair; Sybil Alexandrov; Arielle Baskin-Sommers; Howard Bloch; Jill Campbell; Emily Erikson; Joseph Fischel; Alessandro Gomez; Shiri Goren; Ruth Koizim; Rajit Manohar; Nikhil Padmanabhan; William Nordhaus; Theresa Schenker; Charles Schmuttenmaer; Ian Shapiro; Paul Van Tassel
FASS Program Coordinator, Rose Rita Riccitelli

Absent: Senators: Ruzica Piskac; Jennifer Klein; Matthew Jacobson; H el ene Landemore-Jelaca

Guests: Nicholas Christakis, Michael Fischer, Tamar Gendler, Alan Gerber, Larry Gladney, Joel Rosenbaum, Jonathan Wyrzten, Karen von Kunes

John Geanakoplos, chair of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS), opened the meeting at 4:04 PM. He noted that FASS Deputy Chair **Jennifer Klein** was not present for today’s meeting, and in her absence **Valerie Horsley** would serve as Deputy Chair. He welcomed **Rajit Manohar** to the FASS noting that Mr. Manohar is serving as senator during the spring term to replace Senator Timothy Newhouse who is on paternal leave.

Mr. Geanakoplos presented the minutes from the FASS December 10, 2019 meeting for review, comments, changes and approval. There were no changes. **Valarie Horsley** made a motion that the minutes from the December 10, 2019 FASS meeting be accepted. **Charles Schmuttenmaer** seconded the motion. Senators voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the December 10, 2019 FASS meeting.

Mr. Geanakoplos asked for reports from FASS committee chairs.

Emily Erikson reported on the Faculty Advancement Committee and said that the committee is planning on talking with various department chair regarding the issue of faculty size.

Jill Campbell reported that the Budget Committee had a very informative meeting with **Steve Murphy** (Yale’s Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer) and he agreed to work closely with the committee on making the budget more transparent and understood by all. **Mr.**

Murphy requested that the committee provide him with specific areas on which the committee would like him to focus.

The Instructional Faculty Committee will present a report later in the meeting.

There was no update from the Diversity Committee.

There was no update from the Science & Engineering Committee.

Shiri Goren reported on the Undergraduate Admissions and Education Committee noting that all committee members (Mr. Geanakoplos, Ms. Goren, Matthew Jacobson, Ruth Koizim, Ruzica Piskac, Paul Van Tassel) have been asked to serve on the Yale College Admissions Committee.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer reported on the Outreach, Nominations, and Committee on Committees Committee. He reminded senators of the upcoming FASS reception to be held on Thursday, February 13, 2020 and asked that each senator attend the full event and bring at least one colleague with them. He said that all past senate chairs have agreed to attend and that there will be presentations throughout the event by various speakers who will talk about the senate and its past accomplishments and current and future initiatives. **Mr. Schmuttenmaer** will be interviewed by the *Yale Daily News*. The committee is working on a complete list of all FAS faculty. The committee is also working on a list of nominations and asked people to contact the committee with suggestions. He said they still need to get three non-senators on the committee and asked for suggestions of who to invite to join. He noted that **Dean Gendler** invited him to speak to department chairs about the upcoming senate election so that they can bring this information to their respective departments.

Arielle-Baskin Summers reported on the Peer Advisory and Ombudsperson Committee. She said the committee has had three meetings with **FAS Dean Tamar Gendler** and various others to discuss the committee's proposal for an ombuds office at Yale. The next step is to meet again with **Dean Gendler** to discuss next steps and for her to take the proposal to President Salovey.

Michael Fischer, a non-senate member of the Elections Committee and Co-chair, gave a report on that committee. He noted that running an election is far more complicated than anyone can realize and that he has a great deal of respect for the initial implementation committee who ran the first senate election in 2014. This year the committee is discussing the need for a definitive and complete description of the election procedure. He identified the procedural areas that need to be reviewed and revised. Comments from previous committees have highlighted areas that work well and areas that need to be improved. At this juncture, it's important that the Senate creates and maintains a system that will help it to hold elections with consistency over the long-term. Mr. Fischer explained the single transfer of vote and how it works and questioned if it is the best system to use. He proposed that the FASS set up an ad hoc committee to study the system and offer recommendations for improvement. **Mr. Geanakoplos** summarized **Mr. Fischer's** comments, emphasized the need for greater documentation, and concurred that the rules of voting should be reviewed and revised where necessary. One electoral rule that needs reexamination is the procedure of choosing the at-large Senators before choosing the Divisional Senators, because it is possible that all the social scientist candidates might be assigned first to the at-large category, leaving none to fill the mandated social science divisional slots. **Mr.**

Geanakoplos proposed that the Senate chair appoint two or three more members to that committee to work on these issues and submit a proposal at the February 2020 FASS meeting. All agreed. **Mr. Nordhaus** agreed with **Mr. Fischer's** comments, noted that the main issue with the elections is not the algorithms, and asked that the Elections Committee revisit all the issues in its report to the FASS.

Mr. Geanakoplos introduced the new Yale **Provost Scott Strobel** to address the FASS. Geanakoplos said that within seconds (actually fourtenn minutes) of receiving President Salovey's announcement of the new Provost, he got an email from **Mr. Strobel** asking to visit the Senate. That gesture itself endeared the Provost to the Senate.

Mr. Strobel said in addition to his new role as Yale Provost, he is still a Yale Professor, still teaches, mentors and sees himself as a member of the faculty. He noted that Yale is an institution of shared governance and feels that it is a collection of neighborhoods, and as provost, he wants to learn about all of the neighborhoods that comprise Yale. Upon learning of his appointment as Provost, he immediately sought the opportunity to meet with the Senate to signal that he would like to develop a more positive working relationship between the Provost and the FASS.

The Provost, **FAS Dean**, and FASS can learn news ways of working together as a team.

Mr. Geanakoplos noted that Yale indeed had a tradition of shared governance-- a partnership between the faculty and the provost, president, and administration. We seek to rebuild that. He noted that FASS senators are not out to pursue their own self interest, but are elected, dedicated and committed to making Yale the best it can be in the long term. He said that Mr. Strobel would hear four speakers, who would make four points. First, Yale has fallen well behind its peers in allocating resources to recruit an excellent and diverse faculty; we need to commit resources to this end through proper compensation, greater administrative support for the faculty, and growth of the FAS faculty size. Second, we also need to ensure shared governance by way of informed faculty input on important decisions and trade-offs that the administration has to make (e.g. faculty support vs. buildings student support). Third, the FASS needs data and transparency; the faculty cannot give meaningful input without data and transparency. Fourth, Yale needs to maintain and further develop the humanities and social sciences, as well as the sciences.

Mr. Geanakoplos introduced **William Nordhaus**. **Mr. Nordhaus** welcomed the Provost's comments on shared governance and hopes this will in the end enhance teaching and research at Yale. Mr. Nordhaus had two primary points to address. First, regarding the fiscal support of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), we have noted with alarm the declining financial support for the FAS. This underinvestment can be seen in the salary gap and sharp decline in Yale salaries relative to Yale's major competitors; the stagnation in the size of the ladder faculty, while the faculty at our major competitors has grown 15% larger than at Yale; and the declining share of university funds that has gone to FAS - down 2 1/2 points in the last 5 years, which is equivalent to \$55 million. He noted that the structure of the FAS is vastly different from a decade ago: the administrative structure is in the three FAS decanal offices, however the budget is not included. There is a committee looking into this structure that will be presenting a report on its findings. His second major issue is that of budget independence. Mr. Nordhaus contended that greater budget authority would resolve many of the fiscal issues faced by FAS by allowing greater focus and allowing the administration of FAS to make decisions about trade-offs-- which is not possible today with the current system.

Mr. Geanakoplos introduced **Alessandro Gomez** to talk about the *Science Initiative*. Mr. Gomez noted the issue of greater transparency and said that as this initiative takes form, the FAS faculty want to be able to contribute and participate in discussions and provide input before decisions are made. He too raised the issue of shared governance, reiterating that it is a main concern of the FASS. Regarding shared governance relating to the science initiative, we would like to have a committee formed that will look at the overall picture of the *Science Initiative* and that would include people who are not connected to the sciences so they can offer an outside perspective on the subject. **Mr. Gomez** noted that the report of the present committee was largely silent regarding the engineering component; therefore Jeff Brock was asked to come up with engineering priorities for the *Science Initiative*. He said it is critical that the President appoint a replacement for Mr. Strobel to head the *Science Initiative* as soon as possible and a replacement for Peter Schiffer on the cross campus strategies.

Mr. Geanakoplos introduced **Emily Erikson** speaking as co-chair of the FASS Faculty Advancement Committee and its mission to convey faculty concerns to the administration and also to convey the administration's concerns to the faculty. She emphasized that there is considerable concern among FAS faculty about resources and faculty size. While other areas of the college continue to grow, especially the size of our student body, our faculty size has remained steady and has even shrunk at certain points in time. The stagnant faculty size and the growth of the university overall has increased the burden put on the faculty in a way that impinges on their research and disproportionately impacts certain populations of faculty, especially minorities and women, reducing their research impact when we desperately need their voices. She noted on the positive side that faculty are happy about the *Science Initiative* and its commitment to the expansion of the University; nonetheless, the social sciences and humanities need continued support throughout the expansion.

Mr. Geanakoplos introduced **Sybil Alexandrov** to speak about Instructional Faculty. She commented on the Provost's reference to "neighborhoods" and said that being a member of the FAS Senate has given her the opportunity to go beyond her familiar neighborhood and learn about other neighborhoods at Yale, and that she wishes this for others who are not familiar with all of the neighborhoods that comprise Yale. She said that getting to know the neighborhoods promotes a culture of inclusivity – a matter that needs some attention, especially for instructional faculty. In the *FASS Report on Diversity and Inclusivity* over half of instructional faculty reported they did not feel as equal partners in the intellectual community at Yale. Some strides have been made, but there are more issues to be addressed. Detailed information can be found in the *FASS Report on the Status, Pay and Condition of Non-Ladder Faculty*. Ms. Alexandrov identified the following concerns: parenting leave; phased retirement; review and transparency of compensation; transparency of facts and figures; budgetary support for professional and/or program development; and automatic eligibility for paid leave. She noted that ladder faculty and graduate students are eligible for a full semester of parenting leave while instructional faculty have eight weeks, which poses problems of continuity within classes because a semester is more than 8 weeks. The FAS Senate has brought the parenting leave for instructional faculty to the attention of the administration in three separate reports. Ms. Alexandrov also referred to the issue of phased retirement, raised in a 2017 FASS report. The report proposed a phased retirement plan for instructional faculty who have worked full-time for 10 or more years at Yale by age 65. She referred to looking at the review and compensation and transparency of salary

scale for instructional faculty. Regarding support for professional programs as development, there are wide discrepancies on how support is given out. The final issue, she said is the issue of automatic eligibility for paid leave.

Mr. Geanakoplos introduced **Howard Bloch** to speak from the perspective of the humanities. Mr. Bloch began by noting that Yale has historically been a leading voice in the humanities in the United States, and these continue to be our top ranked programs. He said that the humanities lie at the root core of what Yale College has been and stood for over the years: offer undergraduates a grounding in humanities and something else, and they will go on to connect us to the past so that we might wisely live in the present and plan for the future. He said that the humanities have changed country-wide and at Yale - the advent of programs in film and media studies, women gender and sexuality studies, ethnicity, race and migration, environmental humanities, along with the digital humanities lab - are all relatively new, and they thrive alongside the traditional strengths in English, history, philosophy, classics, art history, music, religious studies, languages and literatures, which have also evolved internally with the times. While Yale continues to develop its strength in the sciences, the humanities remain an essential to raising and responding to social, ethical, and political issues of the role and findings of science and technology. Humanists are specialists in the most distinctly human activity there is - upon which all other disciplines rely and on which we daily depend consciously or not in everything we do - interpretation, the making and assessment of meaning, and the communication of meaning. Explorations of meaning shape the world of the arts, inform all understandings of the law, guide the application of pure science to the human condition and to our everyday lives, and lay at the center of politics and diplomacy. He gave the example of Yale's Robert Shiller who insists upon the power of narrative to shape economic behavior - a matter of perception and psychology as well as metrics. He said that even though science can tell us what we can do, it cannot tell us what we should do; though medicine can prolong life, it cannot give life meaning, which is the stuff of philosophy, history, literature, religion and the arts. He said that Yale has the opportunity to combine new-found strength in the sciences with powerful departments and programs in all areas and synergy between them. He said that this will take support in both innovative and traditional humanities, not a subtraction of resources from our traditional departments and programs with long histories, but adding to these strengths. He said that the humanities serve to catalyze the imagination while they are also practical - a tremendous reservoir of information about human behavior - keys to what has worked and what not in the past and to the chances of beating certain historical cycles and odds, all of which means that if Yale is serious about improving the world today and not just making the world a more efficient place, it will continue to invest generously in the humanities which mark the ground upon which the term improvement might be understood.

Mr. Geanakoplos reviewed the themes that were discussed - about Yale's traditional strength in the humanities and its capacity to shape the world thought in social sciences and sciences. Starting from the last of the four themes he said the speakers would touch on, and which Howard spoke on so eloquently, he added that in a competitive world one has to keep track of one's trademark - one's most magnificent part - one's brand - in order to stay ahead of the competition. He said that the sciences are extraordinarily important, but we cannot lose sight of the humanities and social sciences - Yale's areas of traditional strength. He pointed out that regarding the third theme of data and transparency, time needs to be taken in the Provost's Office to understand the data to come up with budgetary answers to questions that have been

posed on why we are where we are today and how we got where we are. He spoke on the second theme of shared governance and said he is gratified to hear that the provost will look to a partnership with the faculty in the future. Finally, coming back to the first theme, he noted that it is impossible to have a great faculty without proper resources and the most urgent part is to consider the size of the faculty. To get better, even to carry out the science initiative, the faculty needs to grow and not to be restrained to a 700 figure that we have now nearly reached, and that we know was set in a time of budgetary panic after the financial crisis of 2007-09, reducing a pre-crisis target of 800 by 100, without the leisure for consideration of academic priorities.

Mr. Geanakoplos called on **Provost Strobel** to comment. **Mr. Strobel** noted that in high school he had been a debater, which required immediate responses. On these questions he really could use more time. However, on the issue of resources, **Mr. Strobel** indicated that he accepts the two premises – first, that the compensation for FAS faculty has fallen below that of our peers, and second, that the size of the faculty has not grown at the rate of our peer institutions. He noted that what to do about it is a different question, acknowledging that it is something that we need to be committed to addressing but it will take some time to develop strategic responses. It is possible to increase faculty lines in the FAS and we have begun already with a substantial gift to increase the faculty working in quantum science by 2, and clearly we need to do more. In the area of social sciences and the humanities, he said as a member of the Science Strategy Committee, he felt the artificial boundary of focusing entirely on the sciences when it was clear and evident that leveraging strength elsewhere in the University would make the priority stronger and better and more interesting. As an example, he pointed out that it would be entirely arbitrary and unconstructive to draw a hard line between so-called scientific planetary solutions (e.g. how to sequester carbon) and how to solve the political questions of policy and law, as well as humanity and art implications for what climate crisis represents. As we think about data science, which is fundamentally a social science, he noted that we need to think about how that integrates from the digital humanities across to the medical school. Further planning and creative thought needs to go into connecting integration and implementation. In relation to data transparency, he noted that the budget book is available to look at and that he is working on figuring out where the data are in the system.

Valerie Horsley commented that as the faculty becomes less diverse, especially in FAS, the diverse undergraduate population is becoming dramatically more diverse. We should be concerned that this may cause a divide between the students and the University; we should address it as an imperative. She pointed to the diversity money that was recently awarded, and said that there needs to be transparency and real effort, not just flourishes, by the University. She noted that the Medical School efforts that were enacted by the Provost's Office have worked and faculty there are starting to experience a genuine change in climate. We need to pursue similar efforts here in the FAS to improve the culture for minority faculty and female faculty. She asked that **Mr. Strobel**, in his role as Provost, would commit to ensuring that the West Campus becomes more diverse and that we get more diversity initiatives here in the FAS.

Mr. Strobel noted a 5-year extension of the *Faculty Excellence and Diversity Initiative* (FEDI) award, which is an \$85 million initiative to assist schools across the whole campus doing faculty hiring (including but not limited to FAS). The funds can be used for senior hires and for faculty start-ups in the sciences where that type of incentive is needed. He noted that there will always be a lag between the diversity of faculty and the diversity of students – there is a turnover of

students every four years and for faculty, the turnover is more like 40 years so that every hire needs to be considered for what it means for excellence and what it means for diversity.

Shiri Goren addressed shared governance and noted that it is an area that will take a long time. She highlighted issues of instructional faculty that were discussed by Ms. Alexandrov earlier in the meeting, yet were not commented on by the Provost. We recognize there are complexities for some of the issues; nonetheless, some are not so complicated and can be addressed easily.

Mr. Strobel said that instructional faculty issues are ones that he is not familiar with, and in some instances he was hearing about them for the first time. Therefore, he said, he was not prepared to comment on them at this time.

Ian Shapiro thanked the Provost for coming to talk with the FASS in the beginning of his role as Provost. **Mr. Shapiro** mentioned the skepticism and alienation of the faculty towards the administration that he feels needs to be addressed and that the relationship between the FAS Senate and the administration reflects the relationship between the faculty and the administration. He said that there is something of a credibility gap and a sense of alarm among the faculty that the quality of the faculty has declined over a long period of time. Moreover, a sufficient amount of data exists. Dean Lynn Cooley constituted a two-year committee examining the graduate school, comparing departments and divisions to peer institutions. He argued that the number of top-draw departments that Yale has is frighteningly small. Additionally, faculty are alarmed that the administration's response tends to deal with questions on the margin and avoid the scale of the problem and necessary responses. Many faculty believe that this is a moment of great opportunity. In the wake of the crash, we took \$350 million out of the operating budget, a very substantial amount of money. But in real dollars the endowment is now back to where it was before the crash. So now that we are back to where we were before, **Mr. Shapiro asked**, where is the \$350 million that was removed from the operating budget? There should be resources at this point to make some qualitative leaps in addressing the faculty situation. Yet, we have not heard from the administration regarding plans for qualitative big leaps rather than tinkering on the margins.

Mr. Strobel stressed that \$350 million is not hiding somewhere that we are able to suddenly produce and spend. He pointed once again to the announcement two weeks ago that there is an \$85 million initiative to increase faculty diversity, which should be taken as a big initiative, and hopefully there can be more.

Mr. Geanakoplos noted that we have fallen behind our competition in size and in compensation. The question remains: what have we done with the money that we didn't spend on faculty – where has it gone? This is a pertinent data question that we hope will be high on the Provost's agenda.

Jill Campbell said we should at least have some impressions of where the money has gone. She noted that there have been expenditures on buildings. At some point, as she recalled, there was understandably the real (and expensive) problem of deferred maintenance of buildings. It has struck her in recent years that sadly there has been a deferred maintenance of faculty. It appears that there was a resolve to protect the buildings and more gets added to that pot each year to protect Yale's expensive buildings. Where is the pot that protects the Yale faculty? She said that

she would like to see some real debate and discussion in the University on trade-offs between museum-quality buildings and maintaining the faculty. Certainly, there are trade-offs but some things are given priority and there needs to be discussion on what they are, how they are chosen, and where resources are going.

Joseph Fischel reinforced what **Ms. Alexandrov** said about instructional faculty. He commented about the parental leave issues that seem flagrantly unfair for instructional faculty and feels that it would be a relatively easy problem to fix financially.

Mr. Nordhaus spoke on a point that **Ms. Erikson** made about service and said there are only so many hours a day that one has and that one of the things we hear is the increase of service burden. He said we have the same amount of faculty but many more areas and programs add to the services required; consequently, the burden increases continuously for many faculty.

Mr. Geanakoplos said when he came to Yale 40 years ago, we all had secretarial help – he had ½ a secretary. Now he is among 15 faculty that share one administrative assistant, so he has 1/15th of that position and therefore never speaks to this person. To resolve this issue, he said he hired his own personal administrative assistant and pays for this person himself. He noted that this situation for others adds to their service burden. In a questionnaire that was sent to all faculty three years ago, time was at the top of the most important problems they have at Yale. Regarding instructional faculty, he said that they feel that they are paid so little that they cannot afford to spend the money to join professional societies, and so more attention to the areas that would cost little but make a big difference for instructional faculty's morale would be good to give attention to.

A comment from the floor came regarding the trade-off between faculty salaries and space – the commenter said that the cost of real estate in New Haven must be less than in Cambridge, and that other institutions do not have worse buildings than we have, so he is not sure if that is the right trade-off to figure in. He also said he saw a report that Yale has the highest proportion of administrative staff per faculty. He noted that we still have the second biggest endowment of any university in the nation.

Mr. Geanakoplos noted that this is a puzzle that we need to get to the bottom of.

Michael Fischer spoke about the Yale Skating Club and said that recently they were advised that they will no longer be considered a Yale-sponsored club and therefore will have to vie for ice time at the Yale Ingalls Rink. It means paying higher costs to use the rink for their activities, competing for ice time against outside organizations while also paying the higher rate for use of the rink so Yale could benefit from the extra funds earned in this way. This is yet another insult to faculty and staff who have been part of this club for many years.

Mr. Geanakoplos said that the effects of having a more brilliant or less brilliant or a bigger or smaller faculty ripple through the University and seep into undergraduate admissions. He suggested that people sit in on the admissions committee and they will see that in the sciences, Yale does not get the super stars in the sciences applying to Yale for early decision. This, he said, may change with the science initiative, but it is not true that the stature of the faculty has no

effect on admissions. He said that when all is said and done, Yale College, the heart and soul of Yale, is dependent on the status of our faculty.

Mr. Strobel commented that when Ben Polack took over as Provost, he inherited a (structural) budget deficit – ongoing negative numbers for basically years out, and he, by force of will, balanced that budget so we now have a surplus. He handed that surplus to us. What we now do with that surplus, he said, is up to us. He reiterated that there is not \$350 million but there is a surplus and there are funds to address some of the things that the FASS is asking about. He looks forward to working with the FASS to address the kinds of things that have been discussed.

Mr. Geanakoplos thanked Provost Strobel and introduced **Nicholas Christakis** to address Yale's new mission statement. Mr. Christakis said that faculty are concerned about the change, especially because no one knew about it. Moreover, they were concerned about the process by which the change was made. He said that today he wishes to speak on what the mission of the University should be and leave the question of the process for another time. **Mr. Christakis** posed the question of what should be the mission of the University and what the mission of any great university should be? He highlighted past Yale mission statements and noted that in the 1980s, Yale's mission was: *To preserve, create and disseminate knowledge.* And, he said, sometime later in the 1980s additions were made to this statement. Today, he noted, the current mission statement is: *Yale is committed to improving the world today and for future generations through outstanding research and scholarship, education, preservation, and practice. Yale educates aspiring leaders worldwide who serve all sectors of society. We carry out this mission through the free exchange of ideas in an ethical, interdependent, and diverse community of faculty, staff, students, and alumni.* He said that there are many who question the appropriateness and the length of this new mission statement and would like to have the old statement back rather than have this one. He is appearing before the FASS to ask if it will deliberate and either endorse a new mission statement or propose an alternative mission statement preferably along the lines of what we had.

Joseph Fischel asked if we should consider to matching the mission statement with admissions criteria. **Mr. Christakis** said that he sat on committees at Harvard and at Yale that oversaw admissions and noticed there has been a change in focus from academic excellence to what types of clubs students belong to. He feels that the mission is to disseminate knowledge and in his view it should be connected with admissions. **Ms. Horsley** said that she has problems with the new mission statement and thinks that the mission of Yale is not to save the world, and if we are trying to save the world, we need to be doing some other things. Also, she is bothered by the inclusion of the words "*the diverse community of faculty.*" She noted that regrettably (at this stage) we do not have a diverse community of faculty, and so she said that these two points make her not prefer this current mission statement. **Mr. Nordhaus** said that he agrees with much of what **Ms. Horsley** says and asked if we know the process by which the new mission statement was generated and adopted. **Mr. Christakis** said that there is another question of who should set the mission of the University – should it be the faculty, the corporation or the administration? As far as he can tell, when **President Salovey** came on, he felt the mission statement had some notable demerits and so he proceeded to change it and had the corporation approve it. **Mr. Christakis** noted that no faculty he knows of was involved in the process or knew of it until the new statement was announced. **Mr. Geanakoplos** said that he circulated a report that included a 200-page book that **President Salovey** presented to the New England accrediting process. Every 10 years or so, Yale has to be accredited; as part of this process the administration has to explain what Yale does. In the recent report, President Salovey stated he felt did not have a good mission

statement and therefore with his cabinet (heads of the Medical School and Law School and so on) they crafted another mission statement and presented it to the trustees, who approved it. He asked **Mr. Christakis** if the change in the mission statement deemphasizes the importance of the faculty and might be linked to the parallel reduction in resources sent the faculty's way. **Mr. Christakis** seems to think yes. He also said that compared to other universities around the world, universities in the United States are amazing and there is nothing like them elsewhere in the world. However, he noted, the current mission statement seems to detract from what we all signed up for as faculty (to preserve and create the dissemination of knowledge.) **Ms. Goren** said that if we all acknowledge that higher education in this nation is currently under attack, there might be better ways to address it and she is not sure that there is something that the senate can do. **Mr. Nordhaus** proposed that the FASS have a competition and deploy the resources we have to craft a new mission statement with alternatives that represent Yale's mission better than the current one that we feel is inelegant and inaccurate; we could then present the best ones to the administration for consideration. **Mr. Schmuttenmaer** said he feels it is important to consult with the administration and the trustees (telling them of our concerns and plans) before sending an e-mail to the entire faculty asking for their input and time and effort before we know if any of it will be considered by the administration and trustees. **Ms. Horsley** asked if the Faculty of Arts and Sciences has a mission statement and **Dean Gendler** said it does not. She suggested the FASS work with the FAS Dean to craft a mission statement for FAS. **Rajit Manohar** said that he feels it is a good idea to craft a mission statement for FAS and noted that because there is not one already, we would not be trying to replace something that has already been put into place. **Dean Gendler** noted that Yale College and the Graduate School have mission statements and said that she would welcome a mission statement for the FAS. **Mr. Geanakoplos** asked for a motion to craft a mission statement for FAS – **Ms. Horsley** moved to craft a mission statement for FAS and the procedure will be recommended at the next FASS meeting by the Executive Council and work with the FAS Dean's Office in doing so. A vote was taken to accept the proposal and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Geanakoplos adjourned the meeting at 6:00 PM.