

FAS Senate

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

Minutes for the FAS Senate Meeting

Thursday, March 9, 2017

HGS 211

APPROVED

In attendance: Chair Emily Greenwood, Deputy Chair/Secretary Doug Rogers, David Bercovici, Jill Campbell, Shiri Goren, Matthew Jacobson, Ruth Koizim, Christina Kraus, Kathryn Lofton, Reina Maruyama, Mark Mooseker, William Rankin, Charles Schmuttenmaer, Katie Trumpener

Absent: Beverly Gage, John Geanakoplos, John Harris, Yair Minsky, William Nordhaus, Ian Shapiro, Vesla Weaver, Karen Wynn

Guests: Sybil Alexandrov, Adel Allouche, Victor Bers, Ed Bolton, Bob Burger, Rudiger Campe, Richard Deming, Marion Gehlker, Tamar Gendler, Marie-Hélène Girard, Andrea Gloria-Soria, Jan L. Hagens, Margaret Homans, Amy Hungerford, Krystyna Illakowicz, Soumia Koundi, Angela Lee-Smith, John Mangan, Pam Newton, Hiroyo Nishimora, Lauren Pinzka, Rona Ramos, Tim Robinson, Dina Roginsky, Joel Rosenbaum, Lourdes Sabé, Aoi Saito, Theresa Schenker, Jonathan Reuning-Scherer, Françoise Schneider, Kathryn Slanski, Julie Titus, Shawkat Toorawa, Sonia Valle, Karen von Kunes, Joseph Wolenski, Orit Yeret, Talya Zemach-Bensin, Bethany Zemba

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) Chair, Emily Greenwood, called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM. Ms. Greenwood noted apologies from senators who were unable to attend due to other obligations: Beverly Gage, John Geanakoplos, John Harris, Yair Minsky, William Nordhaus, Ian Shapiro, Vesla Weaver and Karen Wynn. Ms. Greenwood explained that the meeting would be hearing a presentation from the ad hoc committee on the data from the FASS survey on the status, pay and conditions of non-ladder faculty in FAS. In addition, the FASS would be holding two Town Hall meetings on the Monday and Tuesday after Spring break so that faculty who want to provide additional feedback on the findings of the survey can do so. Ms. Greenwood provided an update on FASS elections, explaining that when the FASS was founded in 2015, half of the senators were elected to an initial three-year term, and the other half to a two-year term. She said that the senators elected on two-year terms will be finishing their terms this year, and that these seats will be up for election. She noted that the FASS Executive Council (EC) is in the process of finalizing the membership of the Nominations Committee whose job is to make sure there is a representative slate of candidates standing for election, and she noted that the elections will take place in the beginning of May 2017. Ms. Greenwood said that the FASS by-laws state that the FASS, as a body, needs to approve the membership of the Nominations Committee and she noted that the slate she is presenting for approval is still missing a representative from the Social Sciences. Therefore, Ms. Greenwood asked for FASS approval of four members of the five member Nominations Committee who are: Charles Schmuttenmaer, representing the FASS, Valerie Horsley, representing the Women's Faculty Forum, Larry Manley, representing the Humanities, and Holly Rushmeier representing the Sciences. Katie Trumpener made a motion to vote on the four names proposed by the EC for membership on the Nominations Committee, with a fifth member to be confirmed later, and the motion was seconded by Matthew Jacobson. A vote was taken and the four members, with a fifth from the Social Sciences to be named later, were unanimously approved.

Ms. Greenwood then presented the minutes of the February 19, 2017 FASS meeting, noting that the minutes are brief because that meeting consisted of a panel discussion on the role of the university and academic expertise in the current political climate and the discussion was deliberately not minuted. Ruth Koizim made a motion for approval and a vote was taken. The minutes from the February 19, 2017 FASS meeting were unanimously approved.

Ms. Greenwood asked for an update from the various FASS committees. There was no update from the Elections Committee due to the absence of its chair Ms. Weaver. There was no new business from the Expansion Committee, and Ruth Koizim noted that there was nothing to report and that there is still no unified informational website about the college expansion. Ms. Koizim said she contacted Paul McKinley after yesterday's article in the Yale Daily News (YDN) that reported 250 students in the new colleges in the first wave, instead of 200, and Mr. McKinley assured Ms. Koizim that there will be 200 new students with an additional 50 existing students moving into the new residential colleges to ease overcrowding in the present residential colleges. Jill Campbell reported on the Committee on Budget and Finance in the absence of its chair Mr. Nordhaus, and noted that the letter from the committee and the FASS Chair Ms. Greenwood, along with the Report on Budget Transparency, was mailed to FAS Chairs via Campus Mail. Ms. Greenwood also mentioned that Mr. Nordhaus had received approval from President Peter Salovey to send the Report on Budget Transparency to the Yale Corporation via the President's office. Ms. Campbell reported on the Peer Advisory Committee and said that there has been a recurrence of certain issues that the committee worked quite hard to address last year, and that the committee is looking into the situation to try to come up with practical ways to address these issues, particularly relating to non-ladder faculty. There was no report from the Faculty Advisory Committee, however William Rankin noted that there should be a new draft of the survey that the committee is working on sometime in the future. Charles Schmuttenmaer reported on the Committee for Diversity and Inclusivity, and said that the committee met to discuss what it was looking for in the presentation by Richard Bribiescas which was to occur at this meeting, and which he noted had to be postponed. He said that their next plan is to write a brief report on what has occurred over this year in response to the report that the committee wrote last spring, and this report will be submitted at the May 2017 FASS meeting. Ms. Greenwood noted that, due to Mr. Bribiescas being called away on an urgent matter, his presentation on Faculty Excellence and Diversity Initiative had been postponed to a later date.

Because Ms. Greenwood sits on the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS, along with Shiri Goren, Jonathan Reuning-Scherer, Ms. Koizim, Rona Ramos, Mr. Schmuttenmaer and Joseph Wolenski, she turned the chair over to Doug Rogers. Rogers introduced Mr. Reuning-Scherer to present a report on the survey conducted by this committee. Mr. Reuning-Scherer thanked all who participated in the survey and noted that the survey was sent to 418 people. The committee received 237 responses for a response rate of 57%. He said that people spent quite a bit of time thinking about their responses – an average of 28 minutes, with a median of 24 minutes. He noted that his report today is a first look at the dataset and that the committee will continue to mine the data for trends and significant results, as well as double check the figures presented today. The committee will present an updated report on the findings as part of the committee's full report and recommendations to the Senate. He said that of the people who filled out the survey, 50% were male, 45% female, and 5% did not respond to this question. 60% were in households with 2 wage earners, 39% in households with one wage earner, and the median persons per household was 2, with a mean of 2.4. Regarding the racial identity of the people who took the survey, 57% identified as white, 13% as other, and 21% did not answer this question, with 4% identifying as Hispanic or Latina/o, 1% as bi-racial, 11% Asian, only 1 person as American Indian or Alaska Native, and no one identified themselves as black or

African American. In the chart he showed on all divisions and schools listed for respondents, he noted that a number of people listed more than one category so that they showed up on the chart more than once. He noted that the largest list of respondents was in the humanities, with 54%, followed by physical sciences, with 16%, and biological sciences, with 11%. He said that one of the things the committee wanted to do was make comparisons between divisions, so they assigned people a division they were affiliated with. There were 47% from the humanities, 14% from the physical sciences, 14% from multiple schools representing people who were affiliated with more than one place, 8% from social sciences, 7% from biological sciences, 6% who did not list an affiliation, and 5% from the School of Engineering. There was a question asking people what department they were in, and he said, from the responses, most respondents – 31% - had no response. He explained in detail what a box plot indicates - that it provides a sense of numeric data and any unusual outliers (unusually large or small observations). He also showed a Mean/Confidence Location Plot, which shows the level of confidence in the true middle of the information gathered, and gives a quick visual comparison of whether the true middle of a distribution tends to vary between different groups. He gave position characteristics which indicated that 8 people, or 3% of respondents, hold an official administrative position and that these people were excluded from the initial analysis. However, he said, there were 83 respondents (35%), who reported holding major administrative duties. 85% of respondents are full-time employees and were included in the initial analysis. He then said that they looked at contract length and found that most people have a three-year contract, followed by a one-year contract, with a range of one year to more than six years depending on position, and this is current contract length and not about how long people have been here. The survey found that contract lengths are somewhat shorter in the social sciences, engineering, and biology, which may reflect the fact that there are more individuals in those departments who have not been at Yale as long. The next chart showed how long people have been at Yale, and the median is six years representing more than half of the respondents, and the average length of time people have been in full-time employment is nine years. Looking at total years at Yale, he said that more than half of the people have been here for eight years, which may include time spent on a part-time basis, and on average, people have been here for ten years. Mr. Schmuttenmaer pointed out that there was someone here for sixty years, and Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that he checked this out and it is true. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that they also look at the different types of positions and gave an overview of the types of non-ladder positions that exist (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer; Lector, Senior Lector I, Senior Lector II; Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist, Senior Research Scientist).

Mr. Reuning-Scherer noted that the Faculty Handbook has other non-ladder positions that have not been discussed, noting that there is a Professor of the Practice and that there are not very many of them. He observed that the most common position from respondents was Lecturer at 25%, followed by Senior Lector I at 16%, Associate Research Scientist at 12%, unknown at 10%, Senior Lecturer at 9%, Research Scientist at 8%, Lector at 6%, Senior Research Scientist at 5%, Adjunct Faculty at 3%, other at 3%, and Senior Lector II at 2%. Mr. Rankin asked what the difference is between Senior Lector I and II. Mr. Reuning-Scherer responded that he thinks it is status and theoretically pay, to recognize career advancement. Katie Trumpener asked if there were faculty included in this survey who are here as spousal hires and visiting professors. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said yes to spousal hires, and regarding visiting professors, they are not necessarily in the non-ladder ranks so the survey was not sent to this group. Ms. Koizim noted that any faculty member who is a spousal hire and who holds a non-ladder appointment in FAS would have been included in the survey distribution. Dean Tamar Gendler explained that the title of Visiting Professor is used for people visiting who are professors at other institutions and who are here on a short-term visit. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that people were asked “how did you get here?” He said that only about 10% of people listed themselves as spousal hires, 40% said they applied for a position listed, followed by 20% who said they were invited to apply for an official position, which means that more than 60% of people are applying for official positions and these are positions that are

advertised and which people seek out. He noted that only 6% of people said that they could not get a tenure position and that is why they took a position here. He next spoke on work distribution, and typically people responded that they worked about 45 to 50 hours per week. He noted that this was for people who reported that they were full-time employees, and part-time employees were not listed for this particular analysis. He spoke on the percentages of how people spend their time, with the top being classroom teaching and getting ready to teach, followed by research. He pointed out that there are lots of areas where people spend their time being productive. The number one activity by the respondents was activities relating to teaching, followed by research, followed by actual time spent in the classroom. The teaching part accounts for 40% of time spent, with 60% of their time spent on a variety of other Yale-serving activities. He spoke on the teaching load, noting that, on average, people are teaching three courses per year. He said they also wanted to get a sense of the annual teaching load, and found that, on average, respondents saw about 83 students per year. Mr. Reuning-Scherer noted that the survey data reveal that there is a lot of teaching being done here at Yale by non-ladder faculty. He said the survey also wanted to get a sense of what other activities people were involved in, in the last three years. Faculty who responded reported that they had an average of three and a half publications in a year, either in articles, books, or textbooks, with the median of one publication. In the area of presentations and lectures, faculty taking the survey reported an average of 5.3 presentations in a year, with a median of three presentations. Looking at committees, he said that people sat on an average of three committees, with a median of one. He asked if there were any questions, and Theresa Schenker from the German Department asked if there was information on the average number of courses taught by Division. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said this information will be forthcoming after all of the data is looked at more closely.

He then moved to talking about the survey results on the topic of compensation. He said that three-quarters of respondents said that they were eligible for subsidized benefits, and one-half of respondents said that they could apply for funding but it was not necessarily guaranteed for their research. One-half said that they have access to some kind of administrative support. He said that only one-third of respondents said that they were invited to faculty meetings and one-third said that they could apply for development leave. He said that one-quarter received funding for conferences, 17% received research/development funding, and 11% received honors/awards. He went back to the professional leave question, and when asked how many professional leaves they have had, 91% of respondents said they have not received a professional leave even though technically one-half of respondents would be eligible to apply for a professional leave. Bob Burger from the FAS Dean's Office noted that only teaching faculty are eligible for professional leave and researchers are covered by grants and therefore not eligible for this type of leave. Mr. Reuning-Scherer noted that this is probably why there is a discrepancy with the numbers, but it is interesting to note the 30% who could apply for leaves versus the 10% who actually received leaves. Dean Gendler noted that grant-funded faculty are not funded by Yale and as a consequence, are not eligible for Yale leaves, and Mr. Reuning-Scherer said he would take this information into consideration as he looks at these percentages going forward. Mr. Schmuttenmaer said he realizes that people who have outside funding do confound the numbers, however if you take this information into consideration and remove those people, the percentages that are reported will be very similar. Dean Gendler said that remains to be seen, and she noted that the survey makes clear that the FAS Dean's Office is not properly conveying information about policies to this community. Mr. Reuning-Scherer spoke on the next question that asked people where they spent their time - 63% said they have a private office, and most of the rest of the respondents said that have shared space. He then talked about the distribution of reported salaries, which included only people who reported that they worked full-time, excluded the eight people who said that they were "officially" full-time administrators in the Provost's Office, and included full-time respondents who have some administrative duties. He said that

the average reported salary was about \$69,000 and the median was \$64,000. He said that looking at the distribution of salaries by position, which were ordered by the median, the highest compensated positions were senior research scientists, followed by senior lecturers, senior research scientists, senior lecturer II's, senior lecturers I's, lecturers, adjunct faculty, associate research scientists, and then lecturers. He reported salary by division, and that the highest salaries were in physical sciences, followed by not listed, multiple schools, social sciences, School of Engineering, humanities, and biological sciences. The highest salaries by division are physical sciences at about \$83,000 and the lowest in the humanities at about \$61,000. He said that the overall spread is not as wide division-wise as it is by position, so there tends to be more variability in salaries due to position instead of divisional affiliation. He said that he included a linear regression model to analyze significant predictors of higher salary. He said that, according to the survey data, significant predictors of higher salary include division, position, having major administrative duties, and being male, and included a correction for two observations (unusual regression outliers for two individuals who had salaries well outside of what would have been predicted). He noted two factors which turned out NOT to be significant predictors of higher salary: length of service and percentage of time devoted to research (probably confounded with position). He said there was some suggestion of interaction between length of service and position, and that salaries tend to increase with length of service for lower ranked positions, while salaries tend to decrease with length of service for higher ranked positions, and this interaction was of borderline significance and was not included in the final model. He said that the R-squared of this model was 63%: that is, 63% of the variability in salary can be accounted for by factors listed above, and the total of 153 observations had complete data and were included in the model. He talked about being in different divisions affects salary, using the School of Engineering as the baseline (having the lowest value), and being in the biological sciences, one would add \$6,400 to the estimated salary, in the humanities add \$6,600, in multiple schools add \$20,600, add \$10,700 if we did not know what the school was, add \$18,500 for physical sciences and \$17,500 for social sciences. He said that looking at positions and their effects on salary, and using the lecturer position as the baseline group, that for faculty in the humanities (and most of the lecturers are in the humanities) one would add \$6,000. He noted that the biggest effect is for senior research scientists at \$47,000, followed by senior lecturer at \$23,000, research scientist at \$23,000, senior lecturer II at \$15,000, senior lecturer I at \$8,800, adjunct faculty at \$4,800, lecturer at \$3,200, and associate research scientist at \$600. He said male vs. female has the female becoming the baseline in this case and shows the males' salaries are about \$6,700 higher, which may well be confounded by length of service as well. For those having major administrative duties, the salary difference is estimated at \$11,500. Ms. Schenker asked what is meant by having major administrative duties. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that there were two boxes to check: 1) I have an official position (like in the Dean's office), and 2) I have major administrative duties meaning that I run a center, I oversee a program, etc., and the #2 example would indicate a higher salary by \$11,500, which are predictive indicators and by no means the only indicators. Regarding additional income reported, 16% reported that they had "other" income besides working at Yale, 24% reported that they teach at Yale during the summer, followed by 18% doing writing, 10% doing consulting, and 6% doing summer teaching elsewhere.

Mr. Reuning-Scherer then turned to respondents' satisfaction, attitudes, and suggestions. He said that respondents were least satisfied with the ability to influence change, advancement, inclusion in meetings, institutional recognition, job security, and monetary support for activities. He said that the following aspects were rated in the middle of "most satisfied" and "least satisfied": departmental recognition, departmental supervision, retirement benefits, compensation, and department support. He noted that people were relatively satisfied with current benefits, their freedom to design courses, and office space. He said the survey asked people to list 5 things that are of the greatest importance to them, and the most important areas were compensation, followed by job security, advancement,

current benefits, course design freedom, monetary support, office space, departmental support, ability to influence change, departmental recognition, retirement benefits, departmental supervision, administrative support, inclusion in meetings, inclusion in communications and inclusion in events. He noted that in the top three priorities that people listed, advancement was there and was also an area that people were dissatisfied with. He said when asked what were the positive aspects for being at Yale, they most definitely said that they loved the students, followed by teaching, liking their colleagues, the work that they do, etc. 64% said that they consider the students the greatest positive, 43% cited their colleagues, 19% the flexibility/freedom/autonomy that their position entails, 18% the libraries and collections, 17% the intellectual community, 13% the culture of excellence, 10% the benefits, and 7% the department culture. He noted the greatest impediments that were mentioned: precariousness of appointment (28%), said lack of research support (25%), lack of recognition (18%), 18% said the feeling of having second class status (18%), the bureaucracy (13%), low salary (13%), alienation and exclusion (10%). He pointed out that both lists contain areas that were mentioned at least 10 times by respondents. He said, when asked what would enhance their position, the responses were –30% for recognition, 21% for higher salary, 20% for participation in department decisions, 19% for the possibility for promotion, 18% for guaranteed research funding, 17% for job security, 14% for more congeniality, 12% for consistency and transparency, and 11% for paid leave. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that, from a data point of view, the committee hopes to look into some of the things reported in more detail. Also, he said, there will be Town Hall meetings that will talk more about these results for people who were not able to attend today's presentation, and ultimately there will be a final report that will include finalized versions of these data, which should be considered preliminary until then.

Ms. Greenwood thanked Mr. Reuning-Scherer for this statistical presentation of the survey data. She said that the committee also wanted to share some of the narrative responses submitted as part of the survey. She explained that what the committee and the FASS are doing is trying to represent a portion of the faculty who, for various reasons, have not been adequately represented. She said that the committee is aware that the FAS Dean's Office is alert to this situation and has two members of its staff, John Mangan and Bob Burger, who are very much thinking about these issues. She said that the committee has already met with Mr. Mangan and Mr. Burger, is grateful for their support and collaboration, and that the committee will continue meeting with them as it works on its final draft report. The committee will continue to review the survey data and represent this community as constructively as it can. She called on individual members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status and Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS to read some of the narratives that were received.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer read a response to question #26: In your opinion, what constitutes excellence in your position? He noted that some wrote: *high ratings from students*, and another wrote: *I wish I knew, there really is no set definition in how well you work with your P.I.'s, and it is purely subjective and I am really lucky to have a good relationship with my P.I. but I feel like the rest of the section, the department and the medical school, still think that I am a postdoc and treat me like one, and there is no obvious way to change that and there is nothing that constitutes excellence that I can strive for.* Another wrote - *designing successful experimental and analytical work with different lab members – students, postdocs and faculty; teaching and advising while maintaining an active research program.* Another wrote – *teaching at the highest possible level, including training of the next generation of language teaching professionals.* Another wrote – *superior teaching, attentiveness to students, creativity in course development, professional advancement attending lectures, conferences and workshops and keeping up with research publications, doing research, writing articles, and supervising and mentoring graduate students.*

Rona Ramos, another member of the committee, shared responses to the question asking respondents to briefly describe some of the positive aspects of their work at Yale. One faculty member responded: *I deeply enjoy the seriousness with which teaching is taken at Yale and the institution's openness to the creative world and generally to the sense of community with colleagues and with students. I devote long hours to my teaching and the time with my students and find this immensely gratifying.* Another wrote that *the positive aspect is the opportunity to teach such amazing students in relative freedom, developing my own courses, further refining inherited courses, launching extra-curricular activities that provide students with further opportunities to grow, and to grow as human beings, is truly something for which I am grateful.* Another wrote, *I really appreciate the freedom to design courses in my program and the chance to work with Yale students, and office space and administrative support are excellent.* Another said *I appreciate the available resources like the library, etc., infrastructure, school quality, and institutional prestige.*

Ruth Koizim read comments on question #28 which asked to briefly describe the greatest impediment to work at Yale. One respondent wrote – *I sometimes feel like a ghost in the hallway.* Another wrote – *job insecurity and poorly defined parameters of what constitutes excellence in my position, and complete lack of recognition from either the institution or department. I have worked at Yale for 19 years and have not received a single letter of recognition either from the school or the department clearly illustrating that my service is recognized by the institution.* Another wrote – *very limited room for pay increases and even less opportunity for title advancement, for example, very difficult to be promoted from research scientist to senior research scientist, and by analogy, very difficult to be promoted from lecturer to senior lecturer.* Another wrote, *pushback from reactionary faculty unwilling to embrace change, unfair nepotism, limited support for professional development, certain grants are available to only ladder faculty.*

Shiri Goren read comments to question #29 which asked what would enhance respondents professional satisfaction here at Yale. One commented that *recognition that, although I am here as a lecturer and non-ladder, I am a leading scholar in my field who fully intends to go on to do great things so don't look down on me – treat me as an equal. Don't smirk and say that opportunities are not available to people like me. You have me advise your PhD students and their dissertations and other works, so you must think that I am good enough for something. Treat me as such.* Another wrote that *the University does not have a coherent or consistent policy for non-ladder positions, so my opinion is irrelevant.* Another wrote that *Yale should take a look at how positions for non-ladder faculty are created and nurtured at places like Caltech if it really wants to take itself seriously.*

Ms. Greenwood thanked the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty for their report and opened the floor for questions and comments. Mr. Rogers asked the members of the committee to talk in more detail about how the committee plans to proceed with working on its final report to be presented to the FASS for approval and asked for questions from the audience first and then from members of the FASS.

Dina Roginsky from NELC asked if Mr. Reuning-Scherer could provide a profile of the faculty who earn more or the highest earning vs. lowest earning – women vs. men, social and humanities vs. physical sciences. She requested two sample, illustrative profiles. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that he could certainly provide some characteristics, and when trying to create a model, the committee looked at how a whole lot of different characteristics interacted simultaneously. He said that if, for example, one looks at the overall distribution across division, there is a pretty big range in all of the divisions, and even if one looks at position, there is a wide range across different positions. He thinks it would be over-

simplifying to say that “these people get paid a lot, and these people get paid a lot less.” He said that the model, basically, tries to look at many different factors, and we can certainly talk more about that.

Theresa Schenker from the German Department asked if factors such as degree and educational background could be looked at and how these affect pay. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that one of the things that the committee has not tabulated yet is what is the highest degree attained, and they will try to look at this factor. He said that we need to be cautious when looking at very small sub-populations, as the sample sizes get very small and it is harder to have any confidence in conclusions. Ms. Schenker said she would like to be able to see what we have to do in order to get a higher salary so it would be interesting to see what these people, who are at the high end of the salary range, are doing differently so we can potentially increase our salary. Ms. Koizim noted that the committee is also very aware that there are issues of privacy and one of the challenges is to be able to work with the data but not chop it up so finely that in cases where there are very small numbers of people, it becomes easy to identify individuals.

A member of faculty from the Medical School and MB&B said that when she started at Yale, there was a clear description in the Faculty Handbook that if you were an associate research scientist, your contract was for a year, and, she thought, you had to receive a three months’ notice if your position was to be terminated. If you were a research scientist, your contract was for three years, with a six months’ notice if your position was to be terminated. She said that she recently asked someone to check on this, and as far as she knows, there is nothing in the current Faculty Handbook that describes the appointment. Right now, she said, she is on a one-year appointment and realizes that clearly this population does not know what their rights are and what the regulations and the policies of the school are. She asked if there will be some follow-up where she can become educated about these matters. Mr. Burger from the FAS Dean’s Office spoke to the question of the length of appointments for research faculty and said that for a research scientist, appointments can be from one semester up to three years, so there is not a mandate that an appointment be one-year or three-years for a research scientist. He said that there is a stipulation that one be given a six months’ notice of non-reappointment, unless the termination is funding related, and then one would be given notice of when funding would be ending, which could be less than six months. And, he said, this information is in the Faculty Handbook. The questioner said that it took two months for her to receive an answer to her question and was told there was nothing in the Faculty Handbook describing the terms for research scientists. Mr. Burger said that it is in the FAS Faculty Handbook and is very clear about these appointments and that he is not certain why this is not in the Medical School’s Faculty Handbook.

Karen von Kunes from the Slavic Department and Film Studies noted that lecturers and lectors are in a different category than other non-ladder positions, and asked how they were going to be represented in this survey and pointed out that there is much diversity and disparity in our ranks. Ms. Greenwood noted that this was a very good question and that the committee does not have a full answer as yet, however one of the things the committee found interesting was looking through the very, very wide range of narrative responses. One of the committee’s tasks is to look at general trends and patterns; one pattern that emerged was that there is a group of faculty respondents who have part-time non-ladder appointments and are not able to own or rent a home in New Haven. Some come in for two or three days a week and experience difficulty and incur lots of expenses in finding accommodation for the days when they are in New Haven. She said this is a pattern that we can describe and make a recommendation about. Another pattern was the non-inclusion of non-ladder faculty in departmental culture and departmental faculty meetings, which is a common problem in FAS, with some respondents saying *my department is so hierarchical and is never going to change*. She said that one of the things that

the FASS can do is to see if there are emerging trends and then make recommendations aimed at trying to improve the inclusion of all faculty in FAS and bolstering representation for non-ladder faculty in departments and FAS-wide. She said that FASS is looking at all of these things, and is scheduling Town Hall meetings on March 27th and March 28th, and that the committee will take more time to study the data and process it, and will ask people to attend the Town Hall meetings and let us know if it is on the right track.

Shawkat Toorawa from Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations, who said he was new to Yale, commented that one of the things that struck him as being counterproductive is having a category of people called non-something and he cannot think of any reason to operate having this as a category and feels that Yale needs to address this issue. Mr. Reuning-Scherer mentioned that among the people who responded to what they would like to be called, 13% liked non-ladder, and 60% preferred being called faculty, teaching faculty, or research faculty. Mr. Burger said that there is a reference in the Faculty Handbook to these positions as being instructional and research faculty. Ms. Goren said that the term *non-ladder* does appear in the Faculty Handbook, and this issue is not just about the non-ladder community, it is also about showcasing and educating the ladder faculty about the vast amount of different roles that non-ladder faculty fulfil at this institution, and have been doing for many, many years--10.6 years on average for full-time non-ladder faculty.

Adel Allouche from the History Department spoke on two issues. First, the part of the survey that focused on professional development leave based on classroom teaching. Mr. Allouche noted that, in the current system, a proposal based on a faculty member's research will not be looked at or considered; this had happened to him and he has been at Yale for 18 years. The second issue referred to his recent decision to retire, and when he brought this to the attention of the chair of his department, he was told that there was nothing on the books referring to retirement for his position. He said he was asked to submit a letter of resignation, although he is not resigning but simply retiring. He also was told that he would not be able to have full library privileges. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that there was a question on the survey on how people felt about retirement benefits. Mr. Burger said that library access privileges for this group revolve around licensing agreements with libraries, which are complicated issues that we are in the process of reviewing and talking about. Mr. Allouche noted that when Susan Gibbons gave her presentation on the Library, she noted that library access was not a huge issue and would not cost a lot of money, but was simply finding a mechanism that would allow retirees access to the Yale library system. Katie Trumpener noted that during the summer, senators had a long meeting with University Librarian Gibbons, and library access for retirees was one of the issues that was raised. Ms. Trumpener said that Ms. Gibbons noted that it has to do with licensing and who the University categorizes as being in which category, and said it was an inflexible issue and was forced upon the library by vendors and basically out of her hands. Ms. Trumpener said that it is handled differently at other universities and the senators who were at this meeting stressed that it should be a top priority for the administration to figure out.

Mr. Rogers asked if there were further comments or questions from the floor. There were none so he opened up the floor to senators who wished to comment.

Ms. Koizim responded to Ms. Trumpener's remarks regarding the loss of library privileges and noted that this situation predates Yale's move to extensive on-line journal holdings, so she noted it is not an issue that has arisen out of Yale's holdings of on-line journals, it is an issue that has been in place for a long time. Ms. Trumpener said that Ms. Gibbons clarified that "at the moment" anyone who wishes to, and use the books and may also check books out, and at the moment the restrictions only affect books not

owned by the library and are being leased from vendors. Ms. Schenker asked if library privileges were different for faculty vs. non-ladder faculty. Ms. Goren said “yes.”

William Rankin noted that it is his understanding that there are differences for ladder vs. non-ladder faculty, not because there are not enough ladder slots, but because there are often assumed to be two different career trajectories in the academy – one which is research and teaching, and one that is teaching only. And, he said, what we are seeing is that this does not fit the profile of the people who actually hold the non-ladder positions, who often see themselves as trying to balance teaching and research in ways quite similar to ladder faculty. It would be useful to interrogate the basic premise of having a teaching faculty that does not do any research and whether that is something that still makes sense. In terms of salaries, he said, would it be possible to compare the pool for non-ladder raises with ladder faculty raises. Dean Gendler noted that the entire pool that she has for raises – non-ladder and ladder – is 3%, and that gets divided into ladder and non-ladder and needs to cover retentions, promotions, and raises. Mr. Rankin said that it would be good to compare the dissatisfaction with raises among ladder faculty with the dissatisfaction among non-ladder faculty, and if there are different levels of dissatisfaction or the same levels, these are important facts to know. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that he will be looking deeper into the survey for more details on the statistics that are contained in this preliminary report and will have more information to share in future presentations.

Marion Gehlker from the German Department noted how phased retirement applies to ladder faculty and staff, but not to non-ladder faculty, and wonders what the thinking is on this.

Mr. Toorawa noted that he has taught in three other places in the United States and all three had the position of Professor in the Practice, or some version of it, and it solved two problems – status at the institution, and teaching vs. research. Mr. Reuning-Scherer said that Yale does have the designation of Professor in the Practice. Dean Gendler explained that Yale spent much of the last five years in negotiations across the twelve schools – the Medical School, the FAS, the four art schools, the School of Forestry & Environmental Studies, the Law School, etc. – to come up with a uniform definition of Professor in the Practice. She said it was a deeply non-trivial series of negotiations and the University made the decision University-wide to adopt the title Professor in the Practice, with no other designations within that rank, and reserve the title to those who are world-renown practitioners within a particular area of expertise. Ms. Greenwood thanked Dean Gendler for the explanation and noted that this designation was taken in isolation with respect to a group of individuals who were already very well-compensated and had much prestige within the University. Therefore, Ms. Greenwood said, it seems as though Professor in the Practice is not available for wider use for the non-ladder faculty, since it has already acquired a specific meaning at Yale as described by Dean Gendler. Therefore, she said, we are resolved to find a collective title that avoids definition by negation since negation impounds existing hierarches and causes so much dissatisfaction, as responses to the survey attested. Ms. Greenwood said that it does not help that members of the ladder community sometimes disparage non-ladder positions. Yale needs to work as a community to address these deep-seated problems and make sure that all of these positions are well-defined, that there is career advancement included, and that we can find a better form of reference for these appointments.

Ms. Trumpener said that she encourages some type of effort to talk to a focus group who are spousal hires, who are a particular sub-set of people who have left fully-launched careers to come to Yale with their spouses, and they may have some protections that perhaps others in the non-ladder category do not have, but that their position is very tied to that of their spouses and that this group deserves some attention because there are particular problems associated with this group.

Matthew Jacobson thanked the committee for their work on behalf of the non-ladder community, and he suggested that looking forward, it would be important to have some comparisons with other institutions because this is an industry-wide set of issues and not just special to Yale.

Christina Kraus asked if the committee was communicating with Mr. Burger, who is also working on these questions, and Mr. Burger assured her that they were.

Kathryn Lofton said that she was struck by the reports and quotes from the survey, which represents qualitative evidence of the dissatisfaction felt by non-ladder faculty. She said that she would like to see this report provide recommendations on how to increase morale in a practical sense for chairs to consider in departments where morale is at question.

Mr. Reuning-Scherer noted that there is a reference in the Faculty Handbook to Professor in the Field. Dean Gendler said that she believes that this is a residual category that is no longer used. She said that this reference remains in the Faculty Handbook because the School of Forestry & Environmental Studies has one person with this designation, and that it is no longer offered at the present time.

Ms. Schenker noted that there is clearly a distinction, within the non-ladder faculty, of two hierarchal categories that should be noted and have looked at more carefully in the statistical analysis, and then take more specific action as it relates to the two specific sub-groups. Ms. Koizim asked which two specific sub-groups Ms. Schenker is referring to. Ms. Schenker responded that it is the male vs. female differences in the sciences and humanities, and with people who are administrators in charge of programs or centers and people who are not.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer noted that this seven-person committee included four senators and three faculty members who do not sit on the Senate – Rona Ramos, Jonathan Reuning-Scherer and Joseph Wolenski - in an advisory capacity, and he found this arrangement to work very well. Ms. Goren noted that the committee is offering two Town Hall meetings open to everyone on March 27th and 28th. After these meetings, the committee will engage in writing a short report with a set of recommendations. She noted that the committee is in conversations with the FAS Dean's office for their input for those recommendations. She also reminded everyone that the FASS is an advisory body and that once there is a report, it will be voted on and will become public, however the FASS is not in a position to make decisions about what to do next, and this will be left to the administration. Ms. Greenwood noted that the FASS needs the help of those who gave their comments and support to the survey. Ms. Goren said that changing the culture is a long and arduous task that will take time, however the work of the committee and the survey is a good start to effecting change. Ms. Greenwood thanked everyone for their participation in this meeting and adjourned the meeting at 5:50 PM.