

FAS Senate

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

FAS Senate Meeting
Thursday, March 10, 2022
3:30 PM – 5:30 PM via Zoom
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: Aletheiani, Dinny; Bennett, Beth; Berro, Julien;; Elka Kristo NagyFeimster, Crystal; Fischer, Michael; Geanakoplos, John; Gendler, Tamar; Gladney, Larry; Hall, John; Hatzios, Stavroula; Heeger, Karsten; Hunter, Mick; Joormann, Jutta; van Wolfswinkel, Josien; Klevatorik, Al; Liang, Ninghui; Maruyama, Reina; Nachtergaele, Siggy; Nishimura, Hiroyo; Radev, Dragomir Roemer, John; Schiffer, Peter; Sid, Yoram; Thomasson, Camille; Vasseur, David; Von Kunes, Karen; Watts, David; Yamaguchi, Mika; Yan, Jing; Yeret, Orit

CLOSED SESSION: 3:30 PM – 4 PM (Senators only)

Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) **Chair Valerie Horsley** called the closed session of the FASS meeting to order at 4 PM

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 FASS Chair **Valerie Horsley** at 4:00 PM. **Ms. Horsley** noted that the FASS voted (in the closed session) to change the FASS By-laws to ensure that we maintain our connection to SEAS. Therefore, she reported, the FASS and SEAS will be together as a Senate going forward. She reported that we also were able to have the FAS Mission Statement approved at the recent Joint Board of Permanent Officers (JBPO) meeting. She thanked **Howard Bloch, Nicholas Christakis, and John Geanakoplos** for their efforts on getting the FASS Mission Statement presented at the JBPO for approval. **Ms. Horsley** presented the minutes from the December 17, 2021 FASS meeting for approval, and the motion was seconded by **Aimee Cox**. A vote was taken and the

minutes from the December 17, 2021 FASS meeting were unanimously approved.

Ms. Horsley introduced **David Vasseur** and **Mick Hunter**, co-chairs of the Yale College Executive Committee. **Ms. Horsley** noted that given the changes we have seen in how we are conducting exams in Yale College during the pandemic, there have been concerns expressed on how this impacts the evaluation of students and in particular cheating. She noted that Yale College sees the cases of faculty who raise concerns on ethical behavior of students, and **Mr. Vasseur** and **Mr. Hunter** will describe what the committee's work is and how we as faculty can help support our students going forward. **Mr. Vasseur** noted that this is his third year as the chair of the Yale College Executive Committee, and that he is joined today by **Mick Hunter** who is in his second year as the Vice Chair of this committee. He noted that the role of this committee is to oversee alleged violations of the undergraduate regulations by our students and said there is a broad range of different categories of violations. Today, he said, he will focus on academic dishonesty and misconduct, and noted that faculty tend to have a central role in these areas. He noted that the work begins when a member of the community submits a complaint to the secretary or chair of the committee, with evidence that they have about the situation, and the Committee tries to work back and forth with the faculty member to make sure we have everything that we require for the case. He said we have a coordinating group that makes decisions based on the evidence presented, and they decide whether to pursue a case against a particular student, and if we do pursue a case, students are given a chance to respond in writing. The student, he said, appears at a formal hearing with their chosen advisor, and takes questions from the committee who has had a chance to review all evidence beforehand and read the student's statement. In most cases students admit their responsibility to academic dishonesty before they come to our committee and have already recognized that they have crossed a line. He explained that in these cases, our job is to educate these students about the consequences of their actions and try to encourage them to use the experience as a growth opportunity, an inflection point in the way that they engage with the community. **Mr. Vasseur** noted that one of the things they hear from faculty is that if they present a case to the committee, it will have dire or disproportionate consequences for a student, like suspension or expulsion. He was clear that the committee is very careful and deliberate about the penalty that they apply in a particular case, and consider previous problems the student might have had with academic dishonesty. He noted that there is suspension for cases that are particularly egregious and for students who have repeated offences. The majority of students are put on probation or receive a reprimand (informal warning) but one that creates a history within the Executive Committee. There is also, he said, an expectation that these students will take an active role in doing self-reflection and self-improvement and engage closely with their residential college dean or with the Poovu Center to get a better understanding of expectations. **Mr. Vasseur** noted that any penalty that is applied by the committee is independent of what a faculty member might impose on a student's grade, and we communicate the outcome of cases but generally do not communicate the penalty that the committee applies for reasons of confidentiality. The committee is always willing to provide guidance to faculty or have a conversation with faculty to help them find a penalty in their course which is both fair and consistent with what other faculty are doing in their courses. He stressed that faculty are responsible for their own syllabi and have the right to apply any grading penalty that they see is fair. **Mr. Vasseur** talked about the change in the landscape and that we have seen

a rise in academic misconduct during the pandemic – approximately double the number of cases that we would have traditionally seen over the past couple of years, and these are almost always predominately academic dishonesty cases. He noted that we are hoping to return to equilibrium after the pandemic. However, he said, there are new challenges that are likely to continue to cause issues and much revolve around the use of digital technologies. One thing, he said, they have noticed recently is a rise in plagiarism in research papers, lab reports, and a variety of different assessment contacts, and many stem from the use of digital resources, and students are cutting and pasting information from what they find on web sites into documents they are creating on a particular subject. So, he said, we find that students lose track of which words are their own and which words belong to someone else, and some students fall into this trap unknowingly, as well as students who actually had the intention to plagiarize, and so we are seeing a larger reliance on digital technologies. Another area that we see happening more and more is shared study guides in a digital format involving pairs of students or groups of students all contributing to the same document, and yet none of these students have made an agreement on whose intellectual property this is, and so when the same figure shows up in many different assignments, there is a tension of who is the owner and is it plagiarism. And, it is another form of plagiarism that comes before our committee that he doesn't think students are aware of, and of the danger they are putting themselves in when working in these kinds of forms, and it is something that we're seeing quite extensively now. **Mr. Vasseur** said that another aspect of shared documents in our community is that they are creating a loophole for communication during exams via these shared documents and students may be accessing these documents during exams that allow for word processing programs to be used to answer questions without this sharing being noticed by proctors. And in some cases, he pointed out, students who were using these shared documents were not aware that they were working in shared documents and therefore violating the integrity of the exam. He also mentioned that on-line repositories are becoming extremely common and are a very dangerous source, and that our students are utilizing and copying material from them and information may turn up as plagiarism, and he said students are not aware of this. He said that courses that use recurring assessments – using the same assignments from year-to-year – have become a challenge in this environment. He noted that you can find answers to hundreds of these assignments online because they have been delivered in an open-course format. He said there is a new breed of dangers when it comes to academic dishonesty that we are seeing more and more over these past few years. **Mr. Vasseur** turned the floor over to **Mick Hunter** to talk further about recommendations. **Mr. Hunter** said there is not one-size fits all when it comes to cheating and plagiarism, and he doesn't think we are going to reduce our cases to zero any time soon. However, he noted, we have learned that there are some concrete things that faculty can do to mitigate the problems and to reduce the temptations for our students. He shared a list of best practices that the committee has learned over the last two years:

1. Exam integrity is much easier to guarantee with in-person exams. If you need to use remote exams, there should be good reasons for this choice. When conducting remote exams, we and our students have to be more vigilant in maintaining exam integrity. Faculty can use question banks using randomized questions or assigning different versions of the same exam, and professors who use these tactics have a better record of success, or of catching cheating.

2. He encourages everyone to be very explicit about expectations, outlining and detailing what is allowed and what is not. From his perspective, it is much easier to hold students responsible when instructors have been crystal clear on expectations for their assessment.
3. Think carefully about the temptations that our students are likely to face when they take an exam and to try to address those temptations as specifically as possible in your exam guidance. Spelling out these points as clearly as possible to the students helps everyone. Texting during an exam is a violation of exam integrity, accessing Canvas files during an exam is cheating, and talking to other students about an exam during a multi-day exam is cheating, and these are all things that should be stressed by faculty to their students.
4. Be as proactive as possible instead of being reactive when it comes to checking for plagiarism or cheating, and try not to wait until the end of the semester to do your checking – check early and often.
5. If you have a system for preserving exam integrity, we encourage you to tell your students to minimize the temptation for cheating.

Mr. Hunter noted that “Turn it In” is a plagiarism detection tool that Yale uses, however he noted that this tool only highlights possible areas of plagiarism and that it is your responsibility to look deeper into possible plagiarism to make sure there is a valid case.

Regarding Canvas, he cautioned that we should not rely on Canvas activity logs, and the Poorvu Center advises that Canvas is an educational software and not designed to catch cheaters and not a reliable tool for this purpose. Therefore, Canvas logs should not be used as primary evidence of cheating. **Mr. Hunter** encouraged everyone to adopt an educational mindset as opposed to a punitive or criminal justice mindset when thinking about academic integrity issues, and not to take it personally. What we’ve learned as a rule is that we professors know very little about the stresses that our students are dealing with. The standard plagiarizers or cheaters are not bad students – they are students who are overwhelmed in various aspects of their lives and probably have a high school mentality of thinking that they need to be perfect in everything that they do, so when they fall behind, they don’t realize that they can ask someone for help. And with plagiarizers, we see students who are slow to realize the meaning of academic integrity and they just don’t understand proper citation practices. The goal for academic integrity is to identify and correct problematic behaviors so that our students don’t continue making the same mistakes while at Yale and beyond when the stakes might be higher. **Mr. Hunter** noted that the committee is always in discussions on how they can do better with informing the faculty about some of these issues and to be regularly in touch with faculty, and we encourage faculty to share their ideas with the committee. He said they are thinking of updating the graduate regulations to better reflect what we’ve learned over the past few years and make some improvements. **John Geanakoplos** noted that he had to deal with this Committee last semester and said that they do a very thorough job and that their hearts are in the right place. He said that he admires the work that they put into this job which takes a lot of sympathy and thoroughness to carry out their work, and he is appreciative of their work. He noted that he does not think that faculty have thought much about the problem of cheating and he does not believe that the process we have in place is adequate. He explained that in December, he was notified the night before he was to give an in-person closed-book exam, that exams would now be online. In the course of the on-line exam, TA’s noticed 3 of the 37 students checking Canvas, so he instructed everyone to close Canvas an hour into the exam. Therefore, 3 students already had cheated. Personally, he was

stunned – he had never had anyone cheat on an exam before. He noted that the exam proctors had not seen anything during the exam – it was his TA’s that noticed what was going on. Therefore, he feels the proctoring system is not effective. He said he has spoken with many of his colleagues and asked them if they had problems with on-line cheating, and they all said “yes” – 10-15% of their students cheated, and all but one did nothing because it was too much trouble and it was not worth the consequences to the student to report the cheating. He said that the Committee sees a very small percentage of cases and he believes that there is a huge number of cases. He said that he felt that by giving his students an on-line closed-book exam, that HE put his students in harm’s way and he feels terrible about it. The cases were brought to the committee, he feels that the committee did a good job in arriving at the conclusion that there was cheating. However, there was not punishment involved and the punishment was left up to him to decide on. **Mr. Geanakoplos** noted that he had never dealt with this situation before and simply did not know what to do. He feels that there should be standard procedures in place and that each student be treated fairly and the same in similar situations, and decisions should not be left to individuals who might impart a penalty, or dismiss the act of cheating entirely. He also noted that he thinks on-line closed-book exams are a disaster and that we should not put our students in harm’s way of temptation. He wrote to the deans to express his opinion and has never received a response He said that we need standard thinking about what the just punishment is, and we must think about how we are going to deal with academic cheating. **Mr. Vasseur** said that he agrees that we need to make consequences equitable for all students. He noted that the committee applies a penalty and in some cases it follows the student for their time at Yale. He said we work very hard at equity, consistency, and fairness with those penalties. Where it becomes difficult, he said, is to try to make recommendations that are out of our domain and experience, so we might be able to assess whether there is plagiarism or cheating on a particular paper, but to understand the extent that the plagiarism may be influenced to the student’s own work and pedagogy on that assessment tool is difficult. In the case of exams, it may be a little straightforward, but in case of an individual paper it is more difficult to assess. And there are some blanket consequences but not in all cases. **Mr. Geanakoplos** said it would be best for him if the committee gave the penalty and he issued the grade that the student deserved. He noted that in his case, he knew exactly what the cheating involved, and none of it affected the grades of the students involved. He asked that the committee consider his situation and think through the process. He noted that he is greatly impressed with the work that the committee does, however he is still dissatisfied with the process and feels that it can be improved. **Ms. Urry** said the presentation was most useful. She noted that in the area of sexual harassment, there is a summary published each year by Yale that reports incidents and outcomes of what has occurred in the past year without revealing names and specifics. She suggested that the same type of information be given about cheating so that students and faculty know what is happening in this area. Also, if you grade on a curve, you are contributing to the problem and she encouraged people not to grade on a curve. **Mark Solomon** found himself in a similar position as **Mr. Geanakoplos** and some students voiced their concern about others cheating, so we set up a proctoring Zoom call where they all had to put their cameras behind them so we could see their work area and see their computer. He said a number of students said they were grateful that we did that and they felt less pressure themselves and they were happy to know that other students were less likely to cheat. **Ruzica Piskac** thanked **Mr. Vasseur** for his presentation and stressed

that it is most important to educate students on academic integrity and what it means, and what is considered cheating in each particular course. **Mr. Vasseur** said that they are aware that students sometimes do not know what constitutes plagiarism in different disciplines and we heard from lots of students about their understanding of what is considered cheating in some courses. **David Watts** noted that in the past two years there has been added stresses on students in addition to the usual stresses of being a Yale college student. He would like to think about ways that we can educate ourselves, with the help of Yale college students, to understand what they are going through and to do a better job of informing ourselves about what is acceptable and what is not, and to factor into that their individual and collective circumstances. **Mr. Hunter** said he would like to have more information on this aspect of the problem. He noted that the committee hears a lot of confidential information that they are not able to share, so he would like to figure out a way to get some of this information out to faculty and students to help the situation, and noted that the Committee is open to suggestions and also encouraged faculty to consider joining the Committee. **Ms. Slanski** said she is struck by the fact that the Committee is seeing students not understanding what type of activity crosses the line into cheating or plagiarism. She said that some years ago the Poorvu Center created a self-testing module for students to learn about plagiarism that gave very clear examples of what is plagiarism. She wonders if it is time to create a new version of this module that can spell out concrete examples of the kinds of cheating and document sharing that we've heard about today. **Mr. Vasseur** said that 2 ½ years ago the Dean's Office hired someone to deal with student conduct, and part of her mission was to do some of this type of work. Then the pandemic hit and everyone was retasked and so this initiative was put on the back burner. We do, he said, envision a training module for students that would be required for all incoming students and those who need a refresher, and it would deal with these types of issues. **Ms. Horsley** thanked **Mr. Vasseur** and **Mr. Hunter** for sharing the work that their committee is doing to help our students.

Ms. Horsley introduced the topic of how Yale can support our non-tenured ladder faculty during the Covid pandemic. She said that many are dealing with childcare issues and the loss of ability to do their research because of lab closings and also because they are not able to travel. She said the impact on non-ladder faculty will reverberate for many years to come, and we want to think about what actions Yale can take to help support these faculty. She noted that **Dean Gendler** appointed the task to **Peter Schiffer**. **Mr. Schiffer** noted that the situation for pre-tenured faculty is really difficult now – they are in a special category because they have to face the tenure committee on a certain time-scale. He said that the University gave time extensions during the pandemic and has provided some childcare support, and departments have done some things to assist. However, he noted, we are 2 years plus into the pandemic and **Dean Gendler** and others in her office recognize that we need to think about doing more. He noted there are things that universities can do to make the situation better, including looking at what others are doing. **Mr. Schiffer** said he wants to hear what people are facing and what might be helpful from the FAS to address these situations to make sure we are being supportive and helpful. He recognizes that people are under much stress because of the time-scale they face, and feel that people who are evaluating them and writing recommendation letters may not appreciate what they are facing because they have not experienced the same issues. One is childcare problems and another is lack of being able to travel to conferences and network with colleagues and travel for research

purposes. There are also supply chain delays on lab equipment, and some publications have been delayed due to a short supply of paper. Also, graduate students require more mentoring and undergraduate teaching has become harder and everything takes more time, and if you're trying to get your research off the ground, all these factors have made it more difficult. And, he said, the mental health pressures add to the difficulties mentioned. We have done a survey among the pre-tenured faculty and received good feedback from them about the situations that they are facing. **Mr. Schiffer** asked for other ideas from the floor. **Meg Urry** noted that this is going to become a big problem and we risk losing a lot of talented people. She noted that our goal is to retain the very best scholars at Yale, and they are not necessarily people who have done a lot during the pandemic but who have good ideas and are clever and are going to make a big impact. She asked, "how do we judge that?" We should ask, as we do with our undergraduate admissions, "What did they achieve relative to the opportunities that they had?" She feels that during the tenure process we have to ask the candidates for impact statements; change the letter that goes out asking for evaluations and add a sentence saying, "please take into account the impact of the pandemic on this candidate's research." And, ask for an impact letter from candidates. **Mr. Schiffer** thanked **Ms. Urry** for her suggestions and noted that there are models for these types of things in other institutions. He also said that parents of young children, women in particular, and people who have been traditionally disadvantaged in a number of ways, seem to be the ones who have been particularly impacted, and we are keeping this in mind and taking all of this into account. **Ms. Horsley** agreed with everything that **Ms. Urry** said and noted that we need to be reaching out to our faculty with children and to our non-tenured faculty to ask how we can support them now, and to recognize that it is not just the stress of the supply chain and of not traveling, it also has added other stresses to an already stressful period. She hopes that our colleagues will recognize this as they evaluate folks in the coming years. **Mr. Schiffer** added that people have noted that they don't feel of sense of community and have not been able to get to know their colleagues well. He said if you have an opportunity to say hello to junior faculty and take them out for a cup of coffee, this would be helpful. **Julien Berro** noted that the pandemic is not over and a few weeks ago he had to take care of his 1 ½ and 2 ½ year old's for three weeks because their daycare was closed because Covid hit their classroom and then hit us. During this time, he said, he could only work for 2-3 hours. He put an auto-reply on his email explaining his situation, and noted that not one of his colleagues acknowledged his situation and kept sending him work as if nothing was happening. He stressed that the pandemic is not over and we cannot go back to "business as usual" because it is not okay to do so. **Mr. Berro** said that providing extensions is not always the answer and agrees with what **Ms. Urry** suggests- to look at what the candidate has done with what they have. He suggested that some of the senior faculty whose children are grown could take on some of the teaching responsibility during these times instead of just saying work through this and do the best that you can because you will get an extension anyway. **Jason Stanley** noted that young children who have been on Zoom instead of in a classroom have fallen behind, so this puts another burden on these children and their parents even when Covid is over, and this will last for some time and he feels that the University policy should reflect this. **Ms. Cox** said that we talk about the many ways that the pandemic has forced us to make innovations in technology that we may want to hold on to. She said this is an opportunity to be a leader in how we think about evaluations in the way that **Ms. Urry** was speaking to and even in a more radical sense – the world is not going back to some supposed

normal so could we be courageous in the way that we think about the tenure process and the way that we approach evaluation and what excellence means and how we see it showing up in this dynamically changing world. She said that we are eager to talk about the way that the pandemic has taught us in these areas that don't really call us to change the things that she thinks that we hold dear and are attached to our sense of power and identity. **Ms. Horsley** noted that in her opinion, the tenure process at Yale is like a medieval torture device, and it is not helpful, and not the right system for promoting excellence in people who are excellent. She feels that we do need to have conversations about the process and especially around Covid for our junior faculty. **Ms. Horsley** thanked **Mr. Schiffer** and **Dean Gendler** for tackling this question for our non-tenured ladder faculty, and encouraged people to send their ideas and suggestions to **Mr. Schiffer**. She said that the FAS Senate will continue to think about this as we navigate these uncharted waters. **Dean Gendler** noted that there are all kinds of things that Covid has impacted and that we are engaged in thinking about the ways in which Covid can help us get unstuck in the areas that we are stuck on, and the most time sensitive of those concerns the question of what we do with our assistant professors on the tenure track. We recognize that there are other constituencies that are affected by Covid and what it has done – those include our instructional faculty and our tenured faculty, whose needs will be tended to only after we solve the problems with our tenure track faculty that has a time delineated reason for us to attend to their case first.

Ms. Horsley turned the floor over to Dean **Lynn Cooley** to speak about the priorities of the Graduate School. **Dean Cooley** first spoke about what has been done about new investments in graduate student support. She noted that this is a result of much work with the Provost and colleagues in the Graduate School, and listening carefully to what she hears from graduate students, mostly with the Graduate Student Assembly. Dean Cooley shared a slide presentation that began with what challenges are faced when preparing the Graduate School's budget, and noted that they are not aligned with the University's budget cycle because our proposals are due in March for the upcoming budget cycle. She explained that this process goes to the budget committee who makes their decisions by May. However, she further explained, that graduate student admission offers are sent in January through March, so we are making huge budget commitments before we have an approved budget. She also noted that because the budget submitted is based on historical data, there is much uncertainty in the predictions. **Dean Cooley** said that any decisions we make about financial support affects several schools, and the majority of our students are in FAS departments and we also have students across the University. Therefore, she said, any decisions we make about stipends, family subsidy, and combined awards, affect the budgets of many areas besides FAS. Another factor is that a lot of the funding for our STEM students is provided by grants and it is hard for those grants to absorb dramatic changes in the financial support of graduate students, so we need to keep this in mind. She noted that this year is different in so many ways, and one way is that we are seeing a significant return on the endowment that means we have some extra money this year. **Dean Cooley** shared a summary of how the extra funds will be used. The things that are already in progress are:

Approved stipend increases for 2022-23

Approval of a Medical Leave Hardship Fund (*one-time award up to \$3,000*)

Approved position of a GSAS Mental Health Counselor (*Job posted – Yale Health will do the hiring and person will report to GSAS and MHC*)

Increased Family Subsidy (*Increase this semester of \$750 - \$6,000 annualized. Will increase further for next year pending budget approval.*)

Increased travel fund (*added \$60K - total now \$180K from CSAS and FAS combined*)

Expanded Dean's Emerging Scholar Fellowship (*Added 5 - now 20. Stipend top-up for three years, one-time research award, relocation*)

Increased relocation funding (*All application fee waiver recipients to receive \$1,000*).

Things that are under discussion are:

U-PASS for Connecticut Transit

Expanded Dean's Emergency Fund

New position - Alumni Affairs

Subsidy for dental insurance

Regarding stipends for next year **Dean Cooley** said we are focusing on stipends that are intended to make it possible for students to live in New Haven and study full-time; we are staying competitive for recruiting students that has led to higher stipends in the sciences; the rising cost of living has meant that stipends in humanities and social sciences are now barely above the cost of living and we are trying to close the gap for these students. She noted that the goal is to bring all stipends comfortably above the cost of living in New Haven and to close the gap in stipends between humanities/social sciences students and natural sciences students. **Dean Cooley** opened the floor to questions. **Alessandro Gomez** noted that even though the stipends have increased, in his department the grants have not increased to support the larger stipends. **Dean Cooley** said they are working on a solution. **Ms. Urry** said there are people with large grants that can afford to pay the larger stipends, and some that still have small grants. She wonders if there can be a way to subsidize those who need a subsidy. **Dean Cooley** agreed that this is a good goal to consider. A question from the floor asked if there is something that can be done with the tuition. **Dean Cooley** said this is being worked on and hopes that this can be done. **Gerald Jaynes** asked about the alumni position and **Dean Cooley** said one thing they are hoping to do is to raise the visibility of the Graduate School with the Alumni Office, an office that orchestrates huge amounts of income to Yale every year, however the Graduate School has historically been invisible. She said she spends time trying to raise awareness of the Graduate School, and that we need to be thinking about the Graduate School in our fundraising efforts. This, she noted, is starting to happen so we need more help reaching out to our alumni and finding the alumni that we have not been in contact with. So, she said, this person will be helping us energize our alumni base. **Mr. Gomez** asked if the SEAS graduate students will remain in the Graduate School now that SEAS has split from FAS, and also asked about the funds that are specifically earmarked for SEAS and if they will remain supporting SEAS. **Dean Cooley** said that the PhD SEAS students will remain in the Graduate School and that the funds meant to support SEAS graduate students will continue to do so. **Drago Radev** added his concerns about some graduate students who are not able to work on their grant projects and in these cases, he has no method of transferring them to another area or giving them temporary funding until they can continue their research, and his only option is to get rid of them which he noted is very difficult to do. **Dean Cooley** said they do try to help in these specific situations and if **Mr. Radev** has a particular situation, she is happy to work on it with him. However, she agreed that these situations do pose a problem. **Ms. Horsley**

said that it seems as if tuition is a large portion of the budget and asked where the money for the Graduate School comes from. **Dean Cooley** said most comes from endowment returns, and in fact, tuition is a small part of what we need to pay for our graduate students. **Dean Gendler** added that in both the College and the Graduate School tuition is a very small part of the total budget. **Ms. Horsley** thanked **Dean Cooley** for her work to enhance the Graduate School and its students' lives. She then made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by **Ms. Cox**, and the FASS meeting adjourned at 5:40 PM.