

FAS Senate

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

FAS Senate Meeting

March 18, 2021

Open Session from 3:30 PM – 5:30 PM via Zoom

APPROVED

Present: Matthew Jacobson, Sybil Alexandrov, David Bercovici, Howard Bloch, Nicholas Christakis, Aimee Cox, Emily Erikson, Joseph Fischel, John Geanakoplos, Alessandro Gomez, Miki Havlickova, Valerie Horsley, Jennifer Klein, Timothy Newhouse, William Nordhaus, Ruzica Piskac, Kathryn Slanski, Meg Urry, Paul Van Tassel, Steven Wilkinson

Rose Rita Riccitelli, Staff

Absent: H el ene Landemore

Guests:

Ague, Jay; Andrews, Donald; Angluin, Dana; Asensio, Pilar; Basu, Sarbani; Baynes-Ross, Felisa; Belperron, Alexia; Bergemann, Dirk; Berry, Steven; Bowerman, Claire; Brainard, William; Brantley, Jessica; Brock, Jeff; Chang, Joseph; Chun, Marvin; Coates, Emily; Dollar, Aaron; Eisenberg, Ziv; Engelman, Donald; Fair, Ray; Feimster, Crystal; Fischer, Michael; Forscher, Paul; Gehiker, Marion; Gendler, Tamar; Gerber, Alan; Gilbert, Wendy; Gladney, Larry; Goren, Shiri; Hawkins, William; Heeger, Karsten; Homans, Margaret; Huber, Gregory; Iacov...., Anna; Irish, Vivian; Jackson, Kenneth; Jaynes, Gerald; Joormann, Jutta; Kaliambou, Maria; Kamens, Edward; Karell, Daniel; Koundi, Soumia; Kraus, Chris; KristoNagy, Elka; Lim, Hyunsung; Marcus, Ivan; Menon, Alka; Messeri, Lisa; Minsky, Yair; Nagai, Daisuke; Nasrallah, Laura; Pi ango, Maria; Pinzka, Lauren; Poland, David; Pomer, Alysa; Powell, Jeffrey; Prum, Richard; Radov, Dragomir; Ramos-Ruano, Juliana; Rankin, Bill; Rizvi, Kishwar; Roberts, Nathan; Rosenbaum, Joel; Salovey, Peter; Samuelson, Larry; Scassellati, Brian; Schiffer, Peter; Schilling, Kate; Schotland, John; Schwarz, Udo; Sherak, Constance; Silberschatz, Avi; Slade, Stephen; Smith, Tony; Solomon, Mark; Strobel, Scott; Toseland, Rebecca; Tucci, Serena; Valle, Sonia; Vanderlick, Kyle; von Kunes, Karen; Warner, John; Washington, Ebonya; Wetters, Kirk; Yamaguchi, Mika; Yeret, Orit; Yiengpruksawan, Mimi; Zinn, Robert

The meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate (FASS) was called to order at by Chair **Matthew Jacobson** at 3:33 PM. **Mr. Jacobson** thanked everyone who has agreed to run for a senate seat and asked that they get their materials in for the Voter's Guide no later than March 31st.

Mr. Jacobson introduced **Larry Gladney**, Dean of Diversity and Faculty Development, to lead a discussion on the new faculty excellence and diversity initiative. **Mr. Gladney** noted that there are ways in which we should all be publicly conscious and remind ourselves, as we go through these next two months, that what we are talking about is diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging, and moving forward with the belonging at Yale initiative, and this is meant to be categorically different than what we have talked about before. He said the focus is on understanding and modifying as necessary the climate that people are having as individuals, whether it be staff, students, faculty, or

alums, when they encounter the Yale environment. He said he's not saying that the climate is bad, however it is the case that the word we heard most in the President's committee was respect – the staff mentioned numerous times that even though they didn't feel outright oppression, at times they did feel that there was a lack of respect on the part of faculty and how they communicated and worked with them. He said students, particularly graduate students, mentioned lack of respect with some of their encounters with faculty, and wanted us to focus on recommendations to the President that would improve particular kinds of interaction around mentoring and take into account that the way in which faculty do mentoring has to explicitly counter the lack of respect, or the feeling of lack of respect, that some of our students feel. He said while this was common, it was particularly acute for both staff and students and those who have been minoritized historically. He posed the question of what ways we can have faculty as moral leaders as well as intellectual leaders in the Yale environment, and deal with issues where this lack of respect comes about. He said we want to have a sense of inclusion in formulating the plan itself, but many of the minoritized faculty and students and staff as well, feel that things which might be considered as having the most impact on them in terms of their intellectual life, tend to avoid or somehow miss getting their particular input, and they perceive this as a lack of respect of either the leadership, or by the process that is put into place to account for how we are supposed to receive information and what needs to improve. And, he said, and in what ways we might measure that improvement. **Mr. Gladney** put out the question to the audience – how could we ensure that those who typically have not had a voice in the planning processes that have taken place on various issues, on diversity and inclusiveness in particular, feel as though they are being heard and recognized as understanding the solution without making them feel as though the burden of explaining yet again what Yale needs to do to be better? This, he said, falls particularly on them and consequently they feel as though again we have said these things before, and we do expect at some point the majority of the leadership (faculty specifically) take up (and not put the responsibility on those who have suffered the burdens of exclusion and bias in the past). **Mr. Jacobson** commented that at an event he attended where a Navajo artist was displaying her work, she said “What we don't need any more is allies, what we need is accomplices.” He said he really likes this idea, as the meaning of allies has been vacated of some of its most important meanings in this setting, and he like the idea of accomplices which means being an outspoken ally – getting involved and speaking up and being active on the issue. **Valerie Horsley** said she has thought about this, as chair of the FASS's Diversity Committee as well as being a faculty member and a woman in science. She said that respect is also a trust issue – do we trust that Yale will address these issues. She noted that trust is built when people and the administration serves its word, and when initiatives are put forth that address the issues and concerns of the community. She said that the fact that he (**Mr. Gladney**) has a position in the FAS due to initiatives that were set forth decades ago at Yale, is something Yale has done. She said that there are a lot of other areas, in her opinion, where Yale has not kept its word, so building trust with the faculty is important. She said that she feels that the majority of faculty at Yale do not care about these issues, or they don't know what to do so are unwilling to spend time on them. And, she said, until we can rope in those who are not coming to the programs or mentoring sessions, etc., it is difficult to envision how we are going to move forward on these issues. She noted that the sciences had a discussion about belonging and inclusion, and one of her colleagues asked, “Where are the white men?” She said that the majority of the faculty in the sciences are white men, and they were not there, and we need more emphasis and more initiative on these issues from the non-minoritized faculty. **Paul VanTassel** asked what **Mr. Gladney** perceived was due to our own lack of training and background, and how much is due to a lack of interest of the faculty as a whole? **Mr. Gladney** noted his time at Yale has been only 2 years so it is difficult to assess if there is a lack of interest by faculty. He did point to the historical record of the University that goes beyond ignorance or the lack of ideas as to what to do. It

was recently pointed out to him that there have been more than 25 reports around diversity and inclusion that have been put out by Yale committees between 1972 and 2016, and noted the reports repeat the same themes over and over. He feels that it's not that we don't have ideas of what to do, or we don't know what to address and fix. He said that what **Ms. Horsley** points out as an observation is something that we can fruitfully engage with. **Mr. Jacobson** commented that he feels this is not just a Yale problem but a broader societal one because the way privilege works is for privilege not to know – it's not because people don't care, it's because people have the privilege not to know; the privilege to be obtuse, to claim the status of arbiter of what is important and what is not, and he thinks that this is one of the ways that white privilege, and in some instances male privilege is functioning here. It's as a blinder because it is keeping people from reading those reports and from absorbing those reports and recreating the situation where people of color and women have to recreate the wheel and carry the burden. **John Geanakoplos** commented that this is a wonderful initiative, and it is good to hear that things will be different this time. It is also good that the emphasis will not only be on diversity, but on anti-racism as opposed to not being racist – an active role and not just a supportive role. He asked **Mr. Gladney** if he has given thought to including in these reports a nod towards the white faculty, a nod towards the conventional faculty – for example something to make them feel more comfortable and assured that they can speak freely without fear that if they weigh in on these issues they are going to be embarrassed or humiliated or drummed out of the University. He asked if there is some way that it might be useful to the cause to make the majority of the faculty feel more comfortable. **Mr. Gladney** said that he has thought about it and has been asked this question before. He said all of us have to have a strong-enough ego to take feedback without assuming that it means that we are somehow labeled as not being an ally. He said he doesn't know if this is something that he can effectively do as a way of encouraging people, however we can talk about how we have difficult conversations, and implicit in that would be the message that if you say something as part of a conversation that you know is going to be difficult and you get upbraided and corrected, you take that in the spirit that we all have a lot to learn. **Mr. Gladney** noted that he does not approach the subject by saying that I'm talking about white males, and typically what happens when people ask him that question that leads to the question about white males, is that he mentions something about his own past when he has fallen short, and hopefully people take it as none of us are perfect in discussing these issues – there are societal issues which are extremely and strongly constraining in terms of our ability to think freely about how to communicate and how to act towards one another that none of us escapes. He said that we need to be more cognizant of what white males may feel and have some repression in engaging this. He said that it is a tough sell – if he talks about it in certain groups, they will point out the very many ways in which white males are not shy at all about the issues of privilege. The immediate question of how kind do we have to be in giving feedback if we are going to make it honest, is one that we have to deal with. He said he needs to learn how to deal with it because he has shortcomings and sometimes say the wrong thing, but if you say we should we make a point of bringing this up at every venue, or at many of the venues where we're talking about this, he can take that as advice, however it needs to be commonly understood that when speaking, someone may say that what was said was the wrong way to say it, and they may be right or wrong, but we have to take it as something that we believe first, and push back as we go through our conversation. He said he wants to feel that he is always in a protective space to say what he honestly feels. **Mr. Geanakoplos** commented that he is not talking about impolite or disrespectful speech, he is talking about policies. When you do something that is as comprehensive as you have – laying out principles and so on, it is very ambitious. But, he noted, it is possible that some of the principles can be tweaked, or even might be slightly wrong. He said it would be good to affirm the duty of every faculty member to challenge even the most noble enterprise like diversity. More people might become engaged if they feel that they can contribute

and challenge, rather than feel that they will get in the way if they don't agree with everything. **Mr. Gladney** agreed with what **Mr. Geanakoplos** said, and commented that if we come up with principles and policies, and someone says that they don't agree with whatever is presented, and they get a knee-jerk response and that means that you are not anti-racist, he thinks we should feel brave enough to continue the conversation without backing down and saying now I'm insulted or I think that you think less of me. **Ms. Klein** asked how much of what **Mr. Gladney** found and heard is embedded in institutional mechanisms and policies like course evaluations, procedures of promotions, classroom and committee assignments, and how much of it is just the unsaid daily interactions. She also asked what is it about the sensitivity training programs that don't seem to address these issues thus far? **Mr. Gladney** said the answer to her first question is that it is overwhelmingly the unsaid, daily interactions. He said the answer to the second question is more complex and asked the audience to offer their feedback rather than he give a philosophical statement about what the approach ought to be. He said the primary reason for that is that it was a push to get the process to be as open as it is, and said that the natural inclination for the administration is to say let's all do the same thing and all have the same rules applied in the same way, because that is what equity means. And, he said, the pushback he's had is that it means you will only get anodyne statements of what needs to happen going forward that will have no power behind them. He said sometimes people talk about saying we need to have bottom-up rather than top-down, but in reality what it means to him, is that if the administration imposes what we are supposed to be doing through a set of policies, and then says that you cannot challenge them, that gives people a license to do what they've been doing all along and hide behind the policies saying either it's not appropriate and everybody knows that and I'm not following it, and in cases where they justify what they're doing, they say that is the policy. He feels it is on us, as a community, and the accountability does not come from the President and Provost but comes from this community. **Yair Minsky** injected a note of optimistic realism, noting that in his department – the Math Department – they have had a study of diversity, equity and inclusion issues, and have had various events that the committee organizes with grad students, undergraduates, post docs and senior faculty, that have produced interesting discussions. The realism part, he said, is that they have not been able to get senior faculty to come to these events, however he feels that these types of events can still be beneficial even if we can't get senior faculty to be involved because in any important issue, there may be people who are not actively opposed and yet they don't want to spend any of their time being involved. He doesn't think we should take it as a sign of failure, noting that there are people who are activists and people who are passive, and we should not have to set it as a goal that every single person is equally active in this matter. He said that he feels that we can make improvements and build more interest as we progress. He noted that the younger senior faculty are more involved than the older senior faculty. **Meg Urry** noted that it is in departments where things happen, and we usually make decisions by voting and the majority rules. She said the majority in some departments is homogeneous and unchanged and she feels we have a problem that the top is not addressing when they are not in the room, and then they vote. She said we might want to have incentives and disincentives, for example someone cannot be department chair unless they are involved in these discussions because then you don't have enlightened leadership. She feels there has to be some thumb on the scale from somebody who has more power than a few votes by junior faculty, or the women faculty, or the faculty of color, who can say that we do have to change. She said that she's been at Yale for 20 years and noted that the student body has changed and that the faculty has also changed, but not nearly as much as the students, and we don't have the luxury of not changing. Yet, she said, the structure of universities is that they don't change quickly – they are on 50-year time scales, and these changes have to happen faster than that. She does not know the answer, however she feels that polite discussion by volunteers has not gotten us far enough yet. **Mr. Gladney**

concluded by agreeing with what **Mr. Minsky** noted, and saying that the critical mass that is necessary for change is probably larger than any of us expect, and noted that there is change happening. He said the critical mass is necessary to maintain enthusiasm by that set of people who are doing the work, and it's easy to see that the pace of change, like **Ms. Urry** pointed out, is too slow and consequently they lose interest and lose enthusiasm, or lose hope, and over time these can lead to a regression of the progress that was achieved before. He said he agrees that we don't need everybody, but there is probably a larger minimum than we might be thinking of who is providing the energy. He said that over time, these people will tire if they don't see that others are coming in with some effort. **Mr. Jacobson** thanked **Mr. Gladney** for this discussion, reminding him that he has a standing invitation to come to FASS meetings and continue this conversation whenever he feels it useful. He said there is a lot of work to do for anyone who will do it, and this is a conversation that we will be going on through the future. He reminded everyone that the FASS Diversity Committee is in constant conversation with **Mr. Gladney** and said if anyone has suggestions, comments, etc., to please send them to the committee who will pass them on to **Mr. Gladney**.

Mr. Jacobson introduced **Steven Berry** and **President Peter Salovey** who will report on the 5-Year Decanal Report. **Mr. Jacobson** said that it is the view of the FAS Senate that this report is released in full, and to the full faculty. He noted that this is not that report, however we hope it will come, and that **President Salovey** will comment on that. He said that this is a review of the report and is meant for faculty only and asked to please, until you hear otherwise from **Mr. Berry** or **President Salovey**, to respect the committee and the FASS that this is to be discussed among faculty members only for now. **Mr. Berry** noted that the 5-Year Decanal Review Committee was appointed in 2019, and representation included FAS faculty, one related faculty from outside FAS, and **Stephen Murphy** representing the administrative side of the University. The committee, he said, consisted of himself as chair, and members **Jennifer Hardt**, **Vivian Irish**, **Stephen Murphy**, **Ramamurti Shankar**, and **Frances Rosenbluth**. He said the committee received their charge from **President Salovey** and met jointly and individually with chairs, faculty, deans, the Provost, the VP, FAS staff, and others, to try to get a feel of what people's thoughts were, what issues were, and what issues remain to be solved. The charge was at the five-year mark, to review the "Three Deans" structure of the FAS and report back to the President on: If it works better than the old system or was the old system better? And, if we found that the new system is working, to ask how might it be improved? He said the report was not a review of the current Deans and had nothing to do with personnel, but rather was a forward-looking discussion of the structure itself. **Mr. Berry** said the committee began with a general principle: Decisions should rest at the level where the best information resides. Decisions should be pushed down to the local level – which has more detailed information – when decisions affect primarily local concerns, but should be pushed up to a higher level when broader institutional concerns are involved. **Mr. Berry** spoke about the current structure:

-The new structure features independent deans of the FAS, the College and the Graduate School, each reporting to the Provost.

-This replaced a system in which the current responsibilities of the Three Deans were shared by the Provost, the Dean of Yale College and the Dean of the Graduate School.

-Day-to-day management of the FAS was previously shared by ladder faculty who served part-time as Divisional Directors (for academics) and Deputy Provosts (for funding).

-These positions have been replaced by full-time divisional Deans who report to the New Dean of the FAS.

He said the committee feels that the new structure is indeed better than the old and stated the following:

-the old system overburdened the Provost and the two Deans. The associate provost/divisional director distinction did not match decisions with information.

-The new system allows the Provost to focus on university-wide initiatives and puts faculty hiring and salaries in the hands of FAS leadership.

-The Deans of Yale College and the Graduate School, relieved of their shared burden to act as co-deans of the faculty, can focus on their respective domains.

-This change moves in the direction of placing decisions where the best information and incentives reside.

Mr. Berry noted that no system is perfect, and so the committee sees three broad remaining possible concerns:

-The FAS's place in the broader University (noted it should be playing a critical role in this institution; Is there a danger that the new system gives the FAS neither the autonomy of a large self-support school (such as Medicine, Law or Management) nor the direct personal authority and responsibility of the Provost and President (which was a given under the old system)? We are thinking of *future* Provosts and Presidents.

-How to make priority trade-offs within the Three Deans structure

-Addressing the urgent and routine needs of departments. Is there a danger in a model that requires not three, but at least six talented FAS faculty members to serve as Deans and Divisional Deans?

Any trade-offs between faculty control versus continuity in budgetary and operational know-how?

Mr. Berry asked – what do we mean by priority trade-offs? He said when you have something that is just about the College, or just about the Graduate School, or just about the faculty, it is great to have three independent deans who all report that they work well together. However, he noted:

-In areas in which tradeoffs are unnecessary, the Three Deans system has the advantages of mission clarity and legibility.

-But making tradeoffs across domains is an essential competency.

- Faculty hires in the light of undergraduate curriculum.
- Trade-offs across faculty hires, graduate student allocations, administrative budgets, non-ladder faculty, and college life.

Overlapping authority places a large burden of coordination on the Deans – many meetings and frequent one-off agreements. There is no single authority who can offer “more of X but less of Y.

Mr. Berry noted that there are a lot of things that are trade-offs across domains with budgetary implications, and they really have to be one-off negotiated across the three Deans, and some agree that it results in a lot of meetings and a lot of agreements. Everyone said they are making it work.

He noted that fundamentally, there is no single authority who could say to a department chair, *I can offer more of X or less of Y*, in a credible way. If the Dean of the Graduate School says to a department chair I think you should have one less graduate student, that is not the same person who can say, *by the way, you just got your junior faculty search approved*.

He said that these kind of trade-offs are easier to make if someone has broader control over a broader budget. He noted that there are some people who need to go to the Dean for certain decisions because they do not have any discretionary funds.

In departments without dedicated endowment funds allocated at the partial discretion of the Chair, small decisions that might best reside at the department level require Chairs to navigate a complicated landscape of higher-level Deans with different responsibilities. At the time of the committee's investigation, science chairs reported that the system frequently required time-

consuming negotiations with overlapping administrative levels. **Mr. Berry** noted that the leadership they spoke with was very much aware of this problem and expressed good will in wanting to help it.

Mr. Berry noted suggestions from the committee that are separated into Near Term, Longer Term,

and Specific to Science. He said many suggestions are broad and would require study and input from many additional levels prior to any specific implementation.

NEAR TERM: (that we can actually do pretty quickly)

-**Budgets of the Three Deans could be further integrated** to allow for easier trade-offs and better coordination. Following on our report, the units now collectively present coordinated budgets to the Provost and his Budget Advisory Group. Any further steps?

-The Yale College Dean could assume a greater role in giving advice on faculty hiring in light of the **long term curricular needs of the College**. (increased meetings with Divisional Committees or the FRC?)

-The level and composition of the **staffing model in the FAS Dean's office could be reviewed** to assess the adequacy of staffing levels as well as the mix of faculty and more specialized staff.

-Given the importance of the FAS and the College to the mission of the University, the decision-making processes for important long-run decisions, such as capital campaigns and long-run space planning, must be anchored in intimate knowledge of the FAS and College. In some areas, **the FAS Dean could be granted an increased level of (shared) representation in long-run planning**.

-Many topics, such as the allocation of new or shared space, involve broad university interests. But even with complicated issues, it may be possible to implement our broad principle to design **greater effective FAS control in routine circumstances that do not implicate the broader institution**.

LONGER TERM: (ideas heard by the committee)

-Moving to the "Harvard model" of a near-independent FAS (largely rejected by those we spoke with)

-Moving to the Stanford model" of a stronger Provost with more control (usually thought not appropriate for Yale)

-At some point, in the long future, considering a "Dean of Yale College and FAS" (intriguing to some, but upsetting to others)

-Relocating the graduate school dean position to Vice-Provost level oversight of graduate policies and then integrating the budget for FAS graduate students to the FAS budget (intriguing to some)

SCIENCE

-As the committee was meeting, various reforms to science hiring and funding were being discussed and implemented. These reforms should be monitored to be sure that they are working as well as possible and they should be adjusted as necessary.

-The experiment of having a joint-Dean of FAS Science and the School of Engineering seemed promising to the committee.

CONCLUSION OF THE REPORT:

"Endowing departments, with adequate levels of funding for routine decisions, and empowering the FAS Dean's office with a broader remit and appropriate staffing, would align resources and information more effectively than is currently the case.

Changes in this direction would improve the functioning of the FAS and Yale College, units that are central to the University's overall reputation and mission."

Mr. Jacobson opened the floor for questions and comments. **Alessandro Gomez** noted that **Mr. Berry** reported that the idea of moving to the "Harvard model" of a near-independent FAS, was largely rejected, and that people thought that combining the Dean of Science and the Dean of Engineering was a good idea. It was **Mr. Gomez's** impression that most people did not agree with combining the Dean of Science and the Dean of

Engineering. He also asked if there was any discussion about the awkwardness of having the (Yale) School of Engineering under the FAS. **Mr. Berry** said the committee did not take the topic of the position of the School of Engineering as part of the decanal structure. He said they hoped that a coordinated dean could increase coordination and improve the strength of both sides. **David Bercovici** said that he is glad to see that the report recognizes that there are still issues with the sciences. He noted that as someone who was once chair in the old system, and is chair in the new system, and is on the FAS Senate, and has run the Science Chair Council twice, he feels he has some perspective on this. He said that when you make the comment that the new system is distinctly better than the old one, it may be true, but there are definitely certain aspects of the old system that worked much better for the science chairs. He said the issue is that when you try to make the distinction between local and upper level, a lot of times negotiations in the sciences involve all levels, and when you're dealing with multi-million dollar start-up packages, that is not part of a local level. When he was chair during the old system, discussions were rapid and decisions were made sometimes within a day, e-mails were answered immediately, and it was much, much easier to be a department chair. This is not the case now, and it takes weeks and months and multiple e-mails, and it has become almost unworkable. Also, he pointed out, when we had two deans and a deputy provost, things worked smoothly. And now we have six deans and it seems like everyone is more overworked – we have tripled the number of deans who are more overworked, and it is not entirely clear what has gone wrong. He said this situation is serious, and hopes the Decanal Report will lead some sort of consideration that this will be dealt with, and soon. **Mr. Berry** noted that in talking with chairs outside of the sciences, most people felt that not having to deal with both the divisional dean and the associate provost, and the ability of the FAS dean to think about these things, was an improvement. **Mr. Berry** said they heard a lot of stories from the science chairs of the kind that **Mr. Bercovici** suggests, and he believes that provostial level administrators heard those stories as well and took and still take them quite seriously, and this is noted in the report and may require some continual monitoring and adjustment. **Ms. Horsley** reiterated **Mr. Bercovici's** comments that the system is not working for the sciences. In the biological sciences, she said, we compete directly within Yale and the Medical School, and they have a much nimbler system where the faculty and the departments can control things like renovations that you need for dynamic research programs, and they can make offers much faster than we can. She said that it makes us lose talent and makes us less competitive within our own institution, and this is not even talking about competing internationally, which we do as well. This had led to chairs giving up and handing it back to faculty to deal with, which does not promote retention and frustrates the faculty, the labs, and frustrates everyone. She said that this system is not better for the sciences, and we have to figure it out. She said the chairs are overworked - they were overworked before and are much more now. **Mr. Jacobson** asked **Provost Strobel** if he would speak to this. **Mr. Strobel** noted that the information was reported in 2019 and we are now talking about it in 2021. He said that the recruitments that we did in 2020 were in the middle of Covid, and when we began those recruitments, there was no one in the role of Vice Provost for Research (VPR). Fortunately, **Michael Crair** took on that role and **Jeffrey Brock** took on additional roles, and we did the best we could through 2020, and in the beginning of April, **Mr. Crair** came in to the VPR role. He noted that something important happened in the summer as we shut down the University and came back, and the success in which we were able to bring the sciences back on line were key -

critical – for having success in being able to think that we could bring students back in the fall, and the fact that we were able to do that led to the conclusion that we could actually have an in-residence fall semester in a situation where several of our peers were not. He said we are now in a situation where we have a new system, with the arrangement of having a new VPR, with **Mr. Brock** in the role of Dean of Science and Engineering, and this is the first round where we are trying to do a normal version of science recruitment. He suggested we see how it goes and make adjustments accordingly. And, he said, based on those adjustments, we can determine whether or not we can make competitive offers in a reasonable amount of time using the system in which we now reside. **Mr. Geanakoplos** noted that the most important trade-offs that FAS has to make is between money spent on faculty and faculty recruiting, versus money spent on undergraduate financial aid, versus money spent on graduate stipends, versus money spent on athletics, versus money spent on buildings. He said he is unclear if FAS has control over any of those trade-offs, or are they all made at the Provost level? Are major trade-offs now being done at the right level? **Mr. Berry** said many of the things mentioned are not at all formally under the FAS structure and not controlled by the three deans, but are formally controlled by other people. He said that when we say that the FAS should have increased shared responsibility, these are many of the things that we're thinking of – that there should be conversations going on, however it's not like there are no conversations going on. He said we would like to move in the direction of bringing those conversations together, and you can imagine different end points along the way that will happen. He said we want to go in the direction of increased coordination, increased shared representation, and perhaps bringing something into the FAS. **Edward Kamens** asked about near term recommendations which seems to work toward raising the profile of the Yale College Dean in planning for long-term curricular needs. He said that those needs overlap with, although they are not identical with, those of the Graduate School Dean and the Graduate School. He noted that later, the report talks about being an attractive idea to some but not others in reconfiguring the position of the Graduate School Dean as a Vice Provost. He asked to hear more about why in this recommendation there is no mention of the Graduate School Dean's need to be cognizant and participating in discussions about how appointments and resources will address curricular needs of the FAS. **Mr. Berry** replied that he thinks that it could have said that, and thinks that they were imagining that the research faculty were perhaps more in touch, but that may be false. So, **Mr. Berry** said, he will take that as a good suggestion and that there may be a parallel there. **Mr. Kamens** added that it is often, on questions of the strength and maintaining the strengths of the programs and graduate programs, that departments often feel this is what their reputations ride on, wrongly. And so, he said, knowing that cognizant administrators are fully aware of those shifts and needs as they change over time, is a key concern for departments in all the divisions. **Thomas Pollard** commented that as a one who served under the two-dean structure, he feels that the system worked fabulously. He noted that he went around the country bragging how simple our administration was for the FAS, and that he and **Mary Miller** prided themselves in getting back to anyone who sent them an email on the same day, and usually they could make a decision. He said the reason it was simple is that there were so few people involved – less than a dozen people. He noted that under **Peter Salovey's** leadership at that time, we got together every week for 1 ½ hours as the FAS Steering Committee, and that group knew everything about the FAS. He noted that it was a highly informed tiny group, and this made for rapid decision-making. He

noted that with 6 deans, it has become more and more complicated, and that if we are going to keep the 3-dean system, we have to figure out ways to simplify the operations. He suggested that rather than hiring two more people, he'd probably eliminate a half a dozen so that there is a much smaller group making these decisions. **Mr. Berry** noted that they heard from a lot of people in the Humanities and Social Sciences that they found being able to go to their single divisional dean was extremely efficient. He also noted that a new system was planned for 2019, and that personnel changes, and in particular Covid, delayed the reforms until now that might have taken place earlier. He said it is our recommendation to let these reforms play out so we can begin to evaluate how they are doing, perhaps starting today. **Karsten Heeger** noted that as chair of the Science and Engineering Council, he has had many conversations with his colleagues on this topic. He thanked **Mr. Berry** and the committee for the report and all the work that went into it, and he also thanked **President Salovey** and the leadership team for their support in advancing science at Yale. He said what we have seen in recent years is the investment in infrastructure and the hiring will really deepen the impact that science can have at Yale. He personally feels that science at Yale is at a transformational moment and there are great and exciting opportunities for us, for the next decade and beyond. He said that in his role as chair, one of the exciting things is that we can hope to execute these priorities. He said he appreciates the Provost's comments that he has seen some of the structural issues and is working to improve them. He said in his role as chair and director of Wright Lab, the one single most challenge we face is decision making structures for planning and executing things at a local level, which will help us focus on our mission in science. He said that if we can find ways to make decisions in a more nimble and responsive way, it would be helpful for us at the chairs' level and in our individual units. He noted in previous years we felt that there was much time spent pursuing decisions and we could not fully focus on the mission of science that we want to do here at Yale. He is hopeful that from the comments he has heard today, the administration will consider our experiences and we can work with them to find ways to build a structure and a forward-looking culture for science at Yale that supports us to do the science that we have to do here. **Provost Strobel** asked a cold question of **Kurt Zilm** who did a search this year. The question was "how did it go, and how long was it from the time you turned in the request to the time it got approved?" **Mr. Zilm** responded that it was the fastest search ever and the package came together in about a week. He said that he identified a candidate and were able to have that candidate sign the offer and attend our first graduate student visiting day in February - it was lightning fast! **Provost Strobel** noted that this is the aspiration - he can't promise that this is how it's always going to be, but this is the goal. **Mr. Jacobson** called on **President Peter Salovey** to speak and respond to the report, and to what he has heard today. **President Salovey** responded that this feedback is very helpful and that we're trying to improve a process that is not very old and that has been encumbered by Covid and personnel rotation. He said he agrees with the Provost in giving it a chance during this hiring season - to give it a chance and to make it work in the way that everyone wants it to work, and particularly to department chairs who need it to work. He said that every dean who is on this call, and the Provost, all have the same goal to continue to be able to hire and retain fabulous faculty, and continue improvement of our faculty - everyone is on the same page in what we're trying to accomplish. He noted that the committee did a great job and he thanked **Mr. Berry** and the committee. He said that the FAS Senate actually gave recommendations for members of the committee, which we took, and that was a helpful

process as well. He said we wanted to present these ideas and get some feedback before we took the report any further, and he was concerned that nothing in this report be read as an evaluation of any person – it had to be an evaluation of structure and organization and how to improve them. He said the report was written on the request of the President and specified as was in the documents that set up a 5-year window for getting the new system in place, and he believes that the committee met to simply set up a report to the President. He said we intend to have the report distributed. **Mr. Jacobson** said he wanted to underscore one piece of the report that has not been discussed, and that is the concern that the current structures over time might structurally disfavor the FAS. He said whether or not this is true in structural terms, there is a broad feeling on campus among the FAS that this has already begun to happen. He feels it is important for the President to know this, and our submitting a mission statement last year was part of that concern – that there is a sense that the FAS (in ethos at least) has been displaced from its former centrality in the University. **Mr. Jacobson** underscored this as a concern that the FAS Senate holds. **President Salovey** replied that there is no intention to disfavor the FAS and not recognize how important the FAS is to the success of Yale and the reputation of Yale, and that FAS is absolutely the heart of the place. And, he said, the President, the Provost, and the deans on this call are all from the FAS faculty, so we are still quite central. He said that one of the things that we were trying to fix five years ago with the three-dean structure, is to create a Provost's Office that focuses on the entire University. That focuses on strategy particularly for the long-term, and is able to bring the parts of the University together. And, he said, he was Provost for nearly 5 years, and served as two of the deans, and one of the things he noticed when playing those roles was how much of the Provost's office time was spent ignoring all parts of Yale except for serving as part of Deans of the Faculty for only the FAS, which is not an appropriate role in a University that has big professional schools. So, he said, it was very important to give the FAS its own dean, who could dean the faculty in particular, so that the Provost could spend his or her time thinking about the whole place and being the chief academic officer for the whole place. It is possible, he said, that this structural change gave a different feeling that the Provost may not be able to have the personal touch with FAS faculty that they had in the past, but in the past they had no touch with any other faculty, and that probably was not a good thing for the University. He said that with no attempt to diminish the importance of the FAS in the University, or to be less in touch with the FAS, this structure addresses the problem that existed. **Mr. Berry** commented that he agrees with what the President said, and that this is a good time to think about what kind of representation and decision-making in the University that was originally set up because the President and the Provost were running the FAS day-to-day. And, he said, some of the questions about shared responsibility should be set up now given that the Provost cannot be "dean" of the FAS. **Ms. Klein** said that regarding the proposal to have deans share the decision-making around funds and trade-offs, she is not clear on the degree in which that means that they are basically trying to make those trade-off decisions within an overall constrained amount of money that has a tight ceiling that was handed down. Or, she said, to what degree it enables FAS deans to be able to make a greater case for the FAS in terms of the overall distribution of funds. She said it seems like there was a split between authority independence - you had divisional deans and the dean of FAS gain in terms of independence of authority, but not in terms of budget independence, and that kind of gap became wider. So, she said, in coming back to that larger question of FAS and its relationship to the broader University and not experiencing

a decline in support relevant to other parts of the University, in what way would that proposal to have deans engaged in more collaborative decision-making enable the FAS to gain more authority and financial independence or budget authority and budget independence? **Mr. Berry** said first is to be able to make trade-offs in a fixed budget, that whatever budget you have, you want to be the most effective in your use of it. He said he thinks having a more integrated structure and a more integrated budget is also a way for the Provost and the President and the fundraisers to look at the FAS and say here is this complete thing and cuts have been made here and here and here, and maybe they do need more money for the following reasons and in the following places. He said there is only so much money for the University, however he does think that the integration of the budget is a way for the group to show that the money is flowing to the best place, and in the long run he thinks it is one strong argument for the FAS to be well funded. **Mr. Jacobson** thanked **Mr. Berry** for his presentation and beginning the discussion, and for all his hard work and the committee's hard work. **Mr. Berry** said that he has also learned things today and hopes the conversation continues. 1:37:57

Mr. Jacobson introduced **Stephanie Spangler**, the Vice Provost for Health, to give an update on Covid and the vaccine situation. Ms. Spangler noted concern that the number of Covid cases on campus have gone up this week, the hospital cases have gone up a bit, and we are starting to find variants in our community - the UK variant in particular. She said that the cases we're seeing are often clusters of students, or employees and dependents, or faculty, who have gathered together, which is still a high-risk activity. Regarding vaccines, she said the State is the entity that is determining vaccine eligibility and is largely responsible for receiving and distributing supplies of vaccine, and more recently there is a direct line from producers to pharmacies. She said we are beholden to whatever the State tells us we must do in terms of vaccine distribution, and in the beginning of this distribution, the State and the CDC were contemplating going with an employment-based eligibility roll-out - front line essential workers, and did start with healthcare workers. She said that at the end of February, the Governor announced that even though the CDC had a phasing plan, that the state was going to go on an aged-based eligibility. Up until that time, Yale was getting a weekly allocation of vaccines, but she said that more recently, as the Governor accelerated the aged-based eligibility phases, our supply is not meeting demand, and on the state level, there will be log-jams in terms of supply and demand and vaccine distributions are being redirected to hospitals and healthcare systems and federally funded healthcare center and community healthcare systems, and direct federal allocation to the pharmacies, and we are not certain what Yale's distribution will be beyond April. We are working with YNHH and the state to see if we are able to offer vaccinations to our students before commencement and as they leave. She said our Campus Covid Hotline will help people get vaccination information for any of the other options, and not just at Yale.

Mr. Jacobson introduced faculty member **Joel Rosenbaum** who asked to speak. He said what he has to say is our position as a research university rather than just a teaching college, and that research is one of our primary missions. He noted that currently, the FAS is on a 9-month contract, and we are not paid by Yale for the months of June, July and August and are under no obligation to work for Yale for those three months. He noted that some who have research grants with sufficient funds can elect to pay ourselves from our

grants for those summer months at the same salary rate we receive monthly for our services between September and May. This is common in the sciences where research grant money is more plentiful than in the humanities. The system of a 9-month salary, he said, is a historical hold-over from a time when the majority of FAS faculty took off the summer months for activities elsewhere, and now times have changed drastically and he said most of us work year-round at our profession. And, he said, if you are doing research, you are certainly doing research during the summer, and if we are not doing research in the summer, we are applying for grants to enhance our research, and especially in the sciences, we would not be able to keep up with our fields if we do not do this. And, he said, we are asked to do more and more during the summer months to prepare for the fall semester ahead. This is especially the case during Covid, but it persists even without such catastrophies. He said even for those with grants, obtaining summer salaries become more difficult because grant funds from national agencies have shrunk. He said although we may not be teaching as much in the summer, we are working hard on our Yale-related activities and he knows of no other profession staffed by PhD's, many with years of postdoctoral work before coming to Yale, who are paid for only 9 months of the year, other than high school teachers who are doing less in the summer months. He said that Yale pays its graduate school faculty and its administrators a 12-month salary, and he believes that Yale's FAS faculty is putting in as many hours per day as these colleagues during the summer months. He also mentioned that the grants we may be writing during the summer months, at least in the sciences, bring in millions of dollars in overhead funds for Yale, and much of this work is being done during the summer months without pay. Recently, the Yale administration has decided to have undergraduate course enrollments take place in the spring preceeding the fall semester, which is several months in advance. This plan, he said, has not been received positively by everyone, especially by the undergraduates. When Mr. Rosenbaum asked **College Dean Marvin Chun** why this course enrollment cannot be done during the months of June, July and August, the reply was that Yale faculty are on a 9-month contract. He replied to Dean Chun that the solution would be to pay Yale faculty for 12 months, and student councelling could easily be scheduled in June or July. He said it would also increase FAS salaries, described already by the FAS Senate Report on the same, as amongst the lowest in the Ivy's. He noted this would cost Yale more dollars in FAS salaries, but he feels it is high time that faculty salaries are substantially increased, and could be facilitated by paying faculty a 12-month salary like most other full-time professionals receive. **Mr. Jacobson** thanked **Mr. Rosenbaum** for his contribution, and noted that his topic will be taken up by the FASS Faculty Advancement Committee and the FASS Governance Committee.

Mr. Jacobson presented the minutes from the Febraury 18, 2021 for review asked if there were any corrections/edits. None were given. He took a vote for approval of the minutes as presented. The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes from the FASS meeting of February 18, 2021.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the Nominations Committee has a slate of 20 candidates who have agreed to run in the upcoming FAS Senate election. He also made the observation that interest in running for a FAS Senate seat is heavier in the humanities than it is in the Sciences and Social Sciences, and he asked for people to think about why this might be and to consider this in the coming years.

Mr. Jacobson posed the question if it should be the case if one has to be a senior faculty member to be a chair of the FASS. He said that he is in favor of this happening because it would serve the democratic ethos of the FASS to have faculty from any rank fill that position, however he also thinks that it is imperative for the sake of the FASS and its work, that we need someone who is structurally able to be unafraid. So, he said, therefore against his democratic principles, he favors making it a rule that only tenured faculty could be chair of the FASS. He asked the group for their thoughts and comments. **Emily Erikson** noted that the position of being FASS chair is one that takes an incredible amount of work and effort. She thanked **Mr. Jacobson** for putting in a huge amount of time in that position. She said that she is not sure that it is appropriate to ask a junior faculty to put that amount of time into a service position such as FASS chair. Mr. Jacobson agreed with Ms. Erikson, and said that as the FASS has become a more robust and important, the workload has gotten greater as he noted that the difference between the workload from when he was first chair and today is like night and day. He said he will take this up with the administration on whether there could be some course relief for people who are taking on major roles in the FASS. **Joseph Fischel** asked if this would include all tenured faculty, even Associate Professors with tenure. **Mr. Jacobson** agreed that this distinction would be appropriate. Ms. Horsley said would making a rule limit the possibility that some person, perhaps an instructional faculty member, would want to make that commitment. She feels before making a rule, she would like to discuss it further. **Mr. Jacobson** agreed and asked everyone to think about it and we will revisit the question again. With that pronouncement, he adjourned the meeting at 5:30 PM.