

FAS Senate

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

FAS Senate Meeting
Thursday, February 17, 2022
3:30 PM – 5:30 PM
APPROVED

Present: Valerie Horsley, Chair; Aimee Cox, Deputy Chair; Sybil Alexandrov, David Bercovici, R. Howard Bloch, Marta Figlerowicz, Miki Havlickova, Alessandro Gomez, Matthew Jacobson, Gerald Jaynes, Paul North, Maria Piñango, Ruzica Piskac, Kathryn Slanski, Jason Stanley, Rebecca Toseland, Meg Urry, Paul Van Tassel

Staff: Rose Rita Riccitelli

Absent: Elisa Celis, Nicholas Christakis, H el ene Landemore, Larry Samuelson

Guests: Alhassid, Yoram; Baynes-Ross, Felisa; Belperron, Alexia; Radev, Dragomir; Faison, Michael; Fischer, Michael; Geanakoplos, John; Gehiker, Marion; Gendler, Tamar; Gladney, Larry; Greco, Daniel; Hall, John; Holland, Patrick; Kaufman, Ronit; Margolin, Deborah; Nagai, Daisuke, Najera, Luna; Nishimura, Hiroyo; Pickett, Casey; Schiffer, Peter; Slade, Stephen, Solomon, Mark; Staver, Carla; Tassiulas, Leandros; Trumpener, Katie; Von Kunes, Karen; Wang, Yu Lin; Yamaguci, Mika; Zilm, Kurt

Ms. Horsley adjourned the closed session of the FASS meeting at 4 PM.

OPEN SESSION 4:00 – 5:30 PM

The open session of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) meeting was called to order by its Chair **Valerie Horsley** at 4:03 PM. Ms. Horsley reminded the group that on February 24, 2022, there is a meeting of the Joint Board of Permanent Officers (JBPO) and that body will address the FAS Mission Statement which was two years in the making and was twice voted upon and approved by FAS Senate and the FAS faculty at large. She urged everyone who is eligible to vote to attend the JBPO with the hope that the FAS Mission Statement will pass and we will have a statement that drives our mission. She thanked **Howard Bloch** for setting up that meeting and that process.

She called on **Paul VanTassel** who is chairing the FASS Nominations Committee. **Mr. VanTassel** said that nominations for the FASS are open for the upcoming election and everyone should have already received an email inviting nominations and also asking that if you are interested in running, please ask your colleagues to nominate you for an open position. He said that nominations will be open until February 28th, followed by a period of contacting those who are

nominated to determine if they want to run, and ultimately we plan to have the election during the last two weeks in April. He noted that there are 22 senators and this year there are 9 open positions. **Ms. Horsley** encouraged people to run, saying that being on the FASS is very rewarding, you get to interact with other amazing colleagues from around the University who try to push forward issues that you care about, and she noted that we need fierce and caring people to serve.

Ms. Horsley opened the floor to a faculty discussion on looking beyond COVID surges and what is the new “normal” for teaching and research in the FAS. She explained that this is a community building as well as a brainstorming exercise and **Ms. Cox** will explain the process. **Ms. Cox** explained that everyone will be assigned to a virtual break out meeting room to brainstorm with their group on the topic, including: what stays, what has changed that is good and beneficial that should stay, what have we lost sight of and should be reinstated, what we are totally missing from the conversation today in terms of teaching, research and service and as a global community, and also our relationship to New Haven. Everyone present was assigned to a breakout room for a period of 10 minutes and one person was designated to gather points of their discussions to report to the group after returning to the FASS meeting. **Ms. Urry** spoke for her group and said that what we need after the pandemic is ways to build community among faculty across departments across the University. She said that modeled on an experience she had at Oxford, they provide a “high quality” lunch for faculty who sit at a large table and you sit and introduce yourself to whomever is sitting next to you, meeting someone you didn’t know before and having a really interesting conversations and exchanging ideas. Sybil Alexandrov said that we all had to retool and learn how to use technology in different ways. She said there are things that we learned and tools that we used that we should keep to use on occasion and we are not interested in using Zoom 5 days a week, however an occasional virtual class could be very beneficial. **Jason Stanley** spoke for his group who discussed specific changes that happened with the technology. He said the group was divided on whether office hours were better in person or on Zoom, but we are unified in thinking that the administration should leave that choice up to the faculty member. The group, he said, preferred to have administrative meetings, FAS Senate meetings, and faculty meetings held on Zoom because it appears Zoom brings in a larger attendance. Also, to allow large classes of 140 and more to have certain sections on Zoom. **Katy Trumpener** spoke for her group and said that on the one hand, the hybrid talk and conference was great, allowing a much larger audience to attend. She noted that one concern was that if the University announces that we are going back to “normal,” we can see that some of our students are not adjusting well, so it is actually not over, and for some of us who are immune compromised it may or may not ever be over, and there was a story in the YDN of Dean **Marvin Chun** saying to a student that all immune compromised students should consider taking a leave of absence. The question, she said, is “until when?” so there has to be planning to consider seriously differential abilities of both faculty and students regardless of what the ongoing situation is going to be. She noted that as of last summer, the disabilities office was interested in a model, which is clearly not the way Yale decided to play it, that would be that some sub-section of classes be taught on Zoom both because faculty had to and that it would help students in a variety of physical and other situations. So, she said, can we continue to think about our communal life in terms that are hybrid enough to accommodate people who need that option.

Ruzica Piskac spoke for her group and said that this group agreed that Zoom is both good and bad in a sense that we are all missing this community part of communal chats before and after meetings, and just meeting others and being able to connect with them. The group did notice that for the FASS, meetings are much more convenient to attend on Zoom and therefore meetings attendance is much higher on Zoom than in-person meetings. They also felt that hybrid meetings offered in-person and on Zoom would be the best solution. **Kathryn Slanski** said that her group thought that instead of talking about things being over, that it is time to embrace the “new normal” and that there is going to continue to be high anxiety and to be able to be more flexible will be really valuable. **Mr. VanTassel** said that job interviews via Zoom seemed to be working out well in his department, however we are missing the social interactions of smaller meetings. She said perhaps we could record large lectures and then be able to take more advantage of in-person opportunities that would be more meaningful. **Rebecca Toseland** spoke for her group and a number of members expressed missing meetings with their students – both graduate and undergraduate students, whether it was meeting off campus for dinner or in the dining halls, or taking students on field trips as part of classes, and these are some of the situations that we are looking forward to resuming post-pandemic. **Ms. Horsley** noted that there were suggestions of continuing virtual conferences, with some in-person conferences, in order to continue to keep in touch with scholars globally. **Mr. Gomez** commented that perhaps this model of hybridization within certain things that we were forced to adopt and rejecting others, might work also for the support staff with having them work from home one day a week, and this might work miracles for their mental health. **Ms. Horsley** added this suggestion to the document she is creating on the brainstorming session and encouraged people to send her additional comments that she can add with hopes to keep these suggestions in the forefront of our minds as we move forward through this pandemic.

Ms. Horsley moved to the next agenda item – a discussion about FAS diversity initiatives with **Dean Larry Gladney** who will talk about the work that he and colleagues have done to create a plan. Dean Gladney thanked the FAS Senate for inviting him and noted that the pandemic has given him the time to think about moving forward at Yale and thinking about the “Belonging at Yale” initiative of which the FAS Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging Plan (DEIB) is a part. He said that the origins and aspects of the plan are online [here](#). He said that President Salovey and Provost Strobel have made it clear that the idea for increasing belonging at the University is tied directly to the ability for Yale to fulfill the University’s stated mission and advancing that mission of creating a vibrant community life in which members encounter and appraise a broader array of ideas. This, he said, requires us to have an expectation that we will all be treated with dignity and respect and that we will feel welcome in the interaction that comes to us in that community life. To understand how this can happen to improve on what’s been true in the past, he said we need to begin by thinking about how we can make it possible to have a more diverse community and adding to the plurality of backgrounds, perspectives, and experiences that are key to deciding what are interesting research topics that we are going to pursue, what are the interesting things to be teaching to students, and delivering services. He said that the key to excellence has been defined in terms of this improvement on diversity, equity, and inclusion, and it starts with recruiting faculty, staff, students, and engaging all of our alumni who add to our cognitive diversity that makes for the life blood of the University, and noted that nurturing and

entertaining the best thinkers and practitioners requires us to build trust – the emphasis can't be on just the words “diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging.” He said that is has to be on improving our ability to carry out what we think is the most exciting scholarship and understanding that is key to being able to carry out that most exciting scholarship, and being able to do so in a vibrant community that is diverse and inclusive. This, he said, requires us to talk about and make it clear to everyone who comes to our community, that they are not only appreciated for the scholarship that they bring, but that they are appreciated for their gifts and that they will have a fair hearing – we don't have to agree on everything, but we do have to agree not only to be respectable in how we treat each other, but to be more empathetic and understanding when people feel that they are not being treated in a way that is inclusive, or when they feel that their sense of belonging has been impacted not necessarily in the words that are said but in the way the words are said. He said this requires us to think creatively and innovatively on how we communicate with each other in ways we have not necessarily done before. He said gave key points to belonging and defined some of the principles necessary for any plan that improves the equity, inclusion, and belonging going forward to have a decent shot of making progress:

- Belonging: Yale Initiative Committee understands that we have an enormously privileged position to be here which carries with it responsibilities, and some of that responsibility is that access to the treasuries of knowledge and expertise that are available here requires us to work really hard to understand how to make it possible to be expansive in who gets to share in those treasures. We have to take responsibility for our own learning, but we also have to take responsibility for making sure that the learning of others is not impeded by some of those processes, procedures, and habits that we have.
- Promoting equity and accessibility, and protecting free and open expression, preventing, and responding to discrimination, coercion, intimidation, and harassment, wherever it occurs is part of that responsibility of making sure that we are appropriately taking the full measure of our duty to promote the tremendous storehouse of knowledge and skills that is available here.
- Making sure that we are enabling the best scholarship going forward that is going to enable the next generation to take advantage of exactly the kinds of things that we are able to teach here.

Mr. Gladney noted that we understand that there are things that are protected by the 1st Amendment and there are things that are protected by the speech that are protected by policies that are in place at the University, and these are there not simply to protect people and to protect their employment, but are there to make sure that we can actually have more speech, more open expression. Consequently, he said, some of the things that we might think about is what it means to protect free and open expression that has to do with the fact that some of the ways we express ourselves can actually reduce the possibility because of things like power differentials, and ensure that everybody gets to contribute who wants to contribute to the conversations that are going on. He said that it is important for us to understand that the responsibility for free and open expression is not just the protection of it, but the enabling of it, not only through the way that we say things but for the actual words and images that we bring to mind as part of our open expression. He said in addition to these principles, there is a set of priorities that were developed

by the President's committee and given as suggestions to President Salovey who turned them into an underlying set of priorities that have been asked for as part of the 28-unit plans that talk about improving diversity, equity, inclusion, and a sense of belonging going forward. He noted that they deal with communication, transparency, accountability, professional and personal development, scholarship, research, practice, and teaching, and noted that there are going to be overlaps with some of these. Mr. Gladney said that it is important that the principles are reflected through the implementation of the priorities as action plans going forward. He noted that one of the ways that the President and Provost offices decided to have a common understanding of what it means to promote these priorities, is to say that there should be a common action which goes across all of the priorities that are stated, and asks for action on some priorities in the near term – in year one or year two of the five-year plan. The first is improving on professional development education and training, with an emphasis on communication and respect and what the outcomes are. He stressed that the implementation phase in all of this is vitally important and that what we actually do to carry out the priorities that we have set forward and is something that the faculty has to take the lead on and implementation has to be determined by the FAS faculty and include opinions and ideas from the staff, from the alums, and perhaps from students. However, he noted, it needs to be the FAS faculty who have to be out in front and decide how to implement whatever plan we have going forward, and has to encourage efficiency and accountability and to move to a set of actions that we take at the individual level, at the department level, and at the Dean's Office level, and that talk about how diversity, equity, and inclusion are part of the fabric of who we are and what we do and it is part of the mission and is an essential piece of the mission. He said that if we are more efficient in carrying out our mission, we will be more successful in improving diversity and the sense of belonging that all members of our community should have. Another principle for implementation, he said, is promoting transparency to the extent possible. He said he realizes that there is a lot of information we get, and he hears from this audience that you do not feel that you get responses to some of the questions that come up, and we will make an effort to improve on that and he believes that they have been doing that over the last two years. He also noted that it is necessary for the communication to be two ways. He concluded by saying that increasing the availability and transparency of data is one of the things that is also necessary, and it is going to be important for us to hear from the FAS Faculty Senate, department chairs, and from other representative leaders around campus, on what information you need to have in order for you to do what you do, better - more efficiently; on how we foster a culture in which the FAS constituents receive the appropriate respect and recognition; on how we support curricular breadth that addresses issues that have to do with things like racism and supporting diversity, equity, inclusion, and a sense of belonging. These, he noted, are things that we could depend on the administration to take the lead on, however he believes that the FAS Senate has the job of making sure that these discussions are taking place and ensuring that conversations across the FAS are being engaged at the level of the number of faculty as well as quality of discussions, and is part of what we do as part of our own accountability for improving on diversity and inclusion. These are the things that we can do to improve on diversity, equity, inclusion, and a sense of belonging. Mr. Gladney asked for suggestions and questions from the audience on what we should be doing to move forward with this initiative. Ms. Horsley commented that this focus on interactions is very important and a great step to get us to where we need to be as a community. She also asked what the motivation is for someone who does not

want to buy in to an inclusive environment. Mr. Gladney responded that during his 3 years at Yale, he has noticed that we avoid confrontation and conversations where we expect that there might be confrontation, and he noted that it is amazing to him how far spread this is throughout Yale culture. He said that when the President's committee was gathering information from people who were in leadership roles within the University on what Yale should be doing and what should you be doing in your role to improve on diversity, which is one aspect of this committee's interest, there were lots of creative answers. Then, he said, the question of why you not do that was asked and it was universally the case that people with "vice president" in their title said that they were afraid to be out in front on this and taking responsibility on improving on diversity in ways that may not be supported by others around them, and so it's better to not engage in it rather than not be supported by others around them. He also noted that people come to him and report that they have been engaged in a questionable conversation, and when he asks if they said anything, the answer is always "no." So he suggests that when these conversations take place, even privately, that one might make the comment that what was said was inappropriate and could be against the mission of the University. It is true, he said, that it may lead to a conversation that is unpleasant, but he also sees that if we actually confront people who say things that are hurtful and harmful to our ability to carry out the mission of the University, it may improve our ability to make changes in departments and programs. Ms. Cox thanked Mr. Gladney for his work on behalf of this initiative, and said that she thinks mostly about power differentials and about those who are mostly impacted by those kinds of interactions. She said it makes her want to advocate for some office or ombudsperson where these situations can be voiced, and asked if there are conversations in his office addressing this. Mr. Gladney said that these are the conversations that have been taking place in the Faculty Senate, and that we need to find a way to elevate them. He said that part of what is necessary for implementation is to say that there are particular mechanisms that we need to put into place in order to implement a plan that we have full expectation will improve on things like equity and inclusion. So, he said, if there is a strong message that says we agree with the principles, we have the priority, but in order to implement the priority there is a strong voice that says that we need to have some mechanism that we currently do not have at Yale, this is powerful and can lead to making the necessary changes, perhaps not in the short term, but certainly in the long term. And, he said, it appears that these types of conversations are taking place in two places – in the General Counsel's Office with the President and Provost, and also at FAS Senate meetings and the FAS Dean's Office, and in order for things to happen, these conversations have to come together. Mr. Gladney shared that there are tough conversations taking place and he is happy to answer questions on all kinds of information, and of course there are some things he cannot comment on. However, he noted, there is a conversation taking place on what is the Yale policy on free and open expression and that there are some people who just go to the Woodward Report and that it is simply not accepted by some parts of the University and is a document that is 45 years old, so there are questions on whether it is the best place to go to look for what our free and open expression policy ought to be in the 21st century. He noted that there are completely different categories of issues and completely different audiences on campus for that free and open expression and said that these conversations are difficult and are taking place in various places without actually coming up with how to improve, and so we are being guided mostly by inertia and less by planning. Ms. Urry thanked Mr. Gladney for his efforts in making Yale a better place and noted

that some people want to set up a debate between “freedom of speech” and “correct speech” or “respectful speech” – whatever already has a judgement in it. However, she said, underneath this there seems to be a fair amount of resistance and a lot of people think of diversity, equity, and inclusion weakening the University and not strengthening it. She thinks that a lot of people, including herself, think it is essential for the strength of University. However, there are certainly a number of people who think that the old Yale is better, and asked what his strategy is for addressing this. Mr. Gladney said that he needs suggestions from anyone who has ideas. He also wants to make a suggestion to all department chairs that at least at one faculty meeting a year of every academic year, there is a discussion around these very important issues, and ultimately (hopefully) as these meeting progress, everyone will come into these conversations. Mr. Jacobson said he is grateful for the work that Mr. Gladney is doing, and is especially grateful for the talk he just gave that, in his opinion, is a milestone because it is the first time that a diversity presentation of any kind has really centered words like implementation and accountability that has been totally missing from diversity speeches at Yale and the American university in general, and he feels that this is getting us onto the right track in an important way. He asked that as much as the current set of diversity initiatives has departed from the old, failed models, is Mr. Gladney satisfied that this current team is aware enough of the power differentials that are at work here that are crucial to unpacking this issue? Mr. Gladney responded that he is hopeful about it for the following reasons: that we can begin with things that we do from the Dean’s Office that we have some control over – selection of chairs and the orientation that takes place with department chairs; we should be clear that we expect that having understanding of power differential and how it plays into the roadblocks that are there for improving on inclusion need to be addressed; there are lots of responsibilities to being a chair that we expect, and we expect that having at least an interest in, and some understanding of, and some willingness to learn more around issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion, is part of that responsibility and taken seriously as a conversation that we will have every year and going through what the department has been doing and what has been taking place. And just the fact that these conversations are taken place is an important part of the ongoing process to make these issues an important part of Yale.

Ms. Horsley thanked **Mr. Gladney** and said we work on how to implement this work on the ground and in future meetings.

Ms. Horsley called on **Casey Pickett**, Planetary Solutions Project Director and Director of the Carbon Charge to talk about “Sustainable Yale: Yale Carbon Charge.” **Mr. Pickett** said that we have putting a lot of greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere and this has had a very significant effect on global temperatures, and temperatures have risen dramatically in the last 8 years, which is the warmest 8 years on record. He noted that the tie to greenhouse gasses is really important and that a key member of the FASS, **William Nordhaus**, developed the idea of the social cost of carbon, and this is a core principle of the way that the carbon charge at Yale works. He said that we know that climate change is causing: heat waves, floods, wildfires, crop decline, infectious disease spread, and violence and conflict, and it harms people’s health, property, animals, and ecosystems, and all of this has a cost – real people have to pay real money because of the changing in climate. In 2014, he noted, **Mr. Nordhaus** was on a panel that asked how we could reduce emissions enough globally to avert the crisis, and he replied that we could charge

ourselves for carbon emissions. **Mr. Pickett** noted that the audience thought this idea silly, however a student in that audience gathered other students and wrote a paper on it for **Dan Esty's** environment class and it eventually went to **President Salovey** and then **Provost Polack** who both liked the concept. Subsequently, they asked **Mr. Nordhaus** to chair a task force to study the concept and that started with a pilot study. **Mr. Pickett**, a graduate of Yale's School of the Environment and School of Management in 2011, said he came to Yale in 2016 to help implement this policy, and starting in July of 2017, we implemented the plan into University budgets using the federal estimate of the social cost of carbon – about \$40 per ton. He said people asked why we were doing this, and the reasons are that we want to develop solutions to share with the world in a useful way, to send a price that can help guide energy decisions, and to prepare for a high carbon price future. He said that this cost applies only to emissions from building energy consumption and does not apply to travel or purchasing materials to build the building, and it is a revenue neutral system at the University-wide level. He noted that this is an important part of the University's climate commitment for research and teaching, as well as campus operations and the endowment as we try to phase out our fossil fuel investments. He noted that the University has made a commitment to use no fossil fuels and have no emissions from its on-campus operations by 2050, and our hope is to be net zero by 2035. **Mr. Pickett** described what we have learned from the first iteration of the carbon charge and how we will redesign it going forward: 1) Price between the return and charge was too low to motivate a significant amount of decisions; 2) It is difficult for planning units to reduce building emissions without help from central facilities; 3) In order to make the scheme work, we used baselines and baselines frequently felt unfair; 4) Participants wanted funds used directly for decarbonization instead of using these funds for anything. He said that based on these four lessons, we have modified the charge that will be implemented starting in July 2022 by supporting the Fund Zero Operational Emissions goal by 2050 – all the funding will be used for that purpose; we will ramp up the price over the course of three years - \$20 in FY23, \$35 in FY24, \$50 in FY25, and we are getting rid of the revenue neutral system and there will be no return and it will be emissions x charge = price. He said we will take those funds centrally and use them for investments to remove carbon emissions for campus operations. He noted that they estimated that these funds will only contribute about 10% of the total amount needed to reach the Fund Zero Operational Emissions by 2050, and the rest will come from central administration using Capital budget reallocation and debt financing. **Ms. Horsley** made a motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes, which was seconded and voted on to extend the meeting for 10 minutes. Kurt Z (?) noted that we have been trying to get control over the physical plant for years, to no avail and therefore we should put the funds directly to campus electrification and not continue to throw good money after bad. **Mr. Pickett** said this suggestion is duly noted. **Paul Van Tassel** asked if there is a possibility for giving individual faculty and staff incentives – for instance if a person bikes to work instead of taking a car – would the University consider compensating those who make this type of commitment. **Mr. Pickett** noted that this is an idea that has been considered, however it has been difficult to implement because they have not come up with a way to get reliable data. **Ms. Horsley** noted that someone put in the chat that Stanford has a good program and we will send that information on. **Ms. Urry** noted that **Mr. Nordhaus's** original suggestion was that people would be given a financial incentive for good behavior, and it sounds to her that this incentive is being removed for the people whose behavior lead to any savings, so, she asked, how do you expect people to actually perform? **Mr. Pickett** said that this is a difficult situation to figure out, and the amount of reduction we would get from behavioral techniques pales in

comparison to the amount realized from engineering fixes and policy choices. He noted that this is an experiment, and we learned things from the first iteration and will hopefully learn more from this iteration and grow from it. **Ms. Horsley** said that she wonders if the communication about the carbon charge and use – how do we know if we’re making a difference and is there a plan to communicate how each area is doing in their reducing carbon? **Mr. Pickett** said they send monthly reports to lead administrators, operations managers, and facility superintendents, and encourage them to let people in their unit know that this information is available to them. **Ms. Horsley** suggested that Mr. Pickett provide this information on his office’s web site for anyone who may be interested. **Mr. Kiln** emphasized that individuals and departments just cannot move the needle at all and that the physical plant and facilities is where the changes need to occur to make a difference. **Mr. Pickett** agreed that this is where the changes need to take place and where the second phase of the plan will concentrate on. **Ms. Horsley** thanked **Mr. Pickett** and adjourned the meeting at 5:35 PM.