I. Introduction

A. Background and Glossary

The Academic Review Committee (ARC) prepared this report in response to an August 2012 request from then-Provost Peter Salovey to carry forward the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Resources and Budgeting for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (also known as the “Nordhaus Committee”). The Provost charged the committee with reviewing “the allocation of faculty positions across divisions and departments” and with recommending any necessary changes in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS). This charge excluded the School of Engineering & Applied Science (SEAS) and the West Campus. The Provost also asked the ARC to follow up on recommendations of the Nordhaus Committee concerning the accounting and management of faculty positions.

The membership of the ARC is as follows:

- Steven Berry, James Burrows Moffatt Professor of Economics and [now former] Director of the Division of Social Sciences, Chair
- Julia Adams, Professor and [now former] Chair of Sociology [current Deputy Provost for the Social Sciences and Faculty Development and Director of the Division of Social Sciences]
- Michael Donoghue, Sterling Professor of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
- Jack Dovidio, Carl Iver Hovland Professor of Psychology
- Jonathan Ellman, Eugene Higgins Professor of Chemistry, Professor of Pharmacology and Director of the Division of Physical Sciences and Engineering
- Donald Engelman, Eugene Higgins Professor of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry and Director of the Division of Biological Sciences
- Tamar Gendler, Vincent J. Scully Professor of Philosophy, Professor of Psychology and Cognitive Science and [now former] Chair of Philosophy [current Deputy Provost for the Humanities and Initiatives]
- Jonathan Holloway, Professor of History, African American Studies, and American Studies and Chair of African American Studies
- Lawrence Manley, William R. Kenan Jr. Professor of English and Director of the Division of the Humanities
- Mary Miller, Dean of Yale College and Sterling Professor of History of Art
- Tom Pollard, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Sterling Professor of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology, and Professor of Cell Biology and of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry
- Ramamurti Shankar, John Randolph Huffman Professor of Physics and Applied Physics
- Ian Shapiro, Sterling Professor of Political Science and Henry R. Luce Director of the MacMillan Center for International and Area Studies
- Jing Tsu, Professor of Modern Chinese Literature and Culture

In addition, Lloyd Suttle, Deputy Provost for Academic Resources, served as liaison with the Office of the Provost.
The Yale FAS faculty operates under a “slot” accounting system. Each full-time FAS faculty position consists of one slot (or two half-slots). This report discusses four kinds of slots:

(1) **Department slots**, managed by the departments and altered only by formal review.
(2) **FAS slots**, centrally managed by a committee of FAS faculty. Such slots are typically allocated to departments on a for-incumbent basis, and typically return to the pool upon the departure of their incumbent.
(3) **Incremental slots**, issued in the boom years. The status of these slots lies in between Department and FAS slots. Incremental slots will receive extra scrutiny and may be reclassified as Department or FAS slots (or remain identified as Incremental slots) after review.
(4) **Mortgaged slots**, issued to a department on a short-term basis under specified repayment conditions. These temporary FAS slots will typically be repaid by means of the first departmental vacancy, or, in certain cases, under other specified conditions.

N.B.: This report often uses the term **department** to refer to any academic unit or program that controls faculty slots, including departments, programs, centers, etc.

**FAS**: FAS refers to the Yale Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

**FASTAP**: This acronym is used to describe the current FAS tenure and promotion system as articulated in the 2007 Report of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Appointments Policy Committee.

**ARC or Academic Review Committee**: The Academic Review Committee (ARC) is the author of this report; the committee’s charge is described above. The ARC will also be referred to in this report as **the committee** and occasionally as **we**.

**Nordhaus Committee**: The Nordhaus Committee refers to the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Resources and Budgeting for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, chaired by Sterling Professor of Economics William Nordhaus, whose 2012 report recommended the creation of the Academic Review Committee (ARC).

The **overhang** is a term coined by the Nordhaus Committee to describe the difference between the number of authorized faculty slots on the books and the budgeted number of slots which has been adjusted for vacancies. The existence of the overhang meant that even Department slots had to be fully managed by a central committee.

**FRC or Faculty Resource Committee**: The FAS Faculty Resource Committee (FRC) is the committee proposed in the ARC report to oversee the future allocation of FAS faculty searches and slots.

**FRP or Faculty Resource Pool**: The Faculty Resource Pool (FRP) is a proposed pool of slots to be collected from and distributed to departments by the FRC according to the principles described in the report below.
The ARC met weekly or bi-weekly over the course of academic year 2012-13 and fall 2013, with further meetings in spring 2014. The committee interviewed former and current provosts, various past and current deputy provosts and other administrators. Divisional Directors organized reviews of their departments and reported the results of those reviews to the ARC. The FAS Faculty Forum discussed the issues under consideration and provided input in fall 2012. The ARC chair also sought input from the Educational Policy Committee of the Yale Corporation in fall terms 2012 and 2013. In both April 2013 and December 2013, the ARC chair made formal presentations to the Joint Board of Permanent Officers of the FAS. An open session was held on April 17, 2014, with the committee and the FAS faculty to discuss a preliminary version of this report. At this writing, a Special FAS Faculty Meeting is scheduled for May 8, 2014, at which the Provost will ask the ladder faculty of the FAS for their advice and guidance on the ARC recommendations.

B. Guiding Principles

In its deliberations, the ARC emphasized the fundamental academic consideration that faculty resources be managed to preserve and enhance overall research and teaching excellence at Yale. Critical to this goal are eminence in scholarship and teaching, faculty diversity, a vibrant junior faculty, and the timely pursuit of new initiatives and opportunities. Achieving excellence requires careful long-term planning that still allows for shorter-term flexibility. The process for allocating faculty resources should lodge decisions and responsibilities where the best information is available. Our recommendations are intended to enhance the faculty’s collective capacity to shape the future of the University in a manner that is rational, fair, effective and transparent.

Above all, the committee has tried to set a course for the future by reestablishing secure and predictable departmental management of faculty resources while also providing for budgeted central initiatives and for the ability of the FAS to adjust its profile in response to changes in intellectual terrain and in the teaching mission of the University.

The committee interpreted its charge as a call to establish a new and better system by which to build and renew an outstanding faculty, flexibly determine academic priorities, and adjust to emerging opportunities. The ARC chose not to propose a specific list of faculty positions to be reallocated, but rather focused on a process that will allow for the ongoing renewal of the University. Consistent with the instructions of the current Provost, Benjamin Polak, the recommendations hold the size of the faculty, as measured by occupied faculty slots, constant.

In spring 2014, the ARC unanimously endorsed a set of principles currently being implemented by the Provost to eliminate the overhang (see below: “Dealing with the Overhang”). The implementation of these principles leaves the faculty size (in terms of occupied slots) at its current level while reducing the vacancy rate to a historically normal level of roughly ten percent, in contrast to a much higher level during recent years. This resolution allowed the ARC to focus on the future management of faculty resources.

The ARC’s recommendations, summarized on the following two pages, follow from its charge and its guiding principles. Further details and explanation can be found in the body of this report.

II. Summary of ARC Recommendations

We believe that the process that governs the allocation of faculty resources should be driven by academic excellence, with decisions made and overseen by members of the FAS faculty.

1. A new FAS Faculty Resource Committee (FRC), guided by the divisional committees, will make final decisions on search requests. The committee will consist of four experienced faculty
members, the Divisional Directors, the FAS deans and the Provost; it will be chaired by the FAS Dean. The committee will base its decisions on a range of considerations, including academic excellence and opportunities, needs for quality teaching and mentoring, and success in meeting departmental goals.

Our next recommendation follows the Nordhaus Committee’s call for “secure and predictable departmental control over faculty resources.”

2. Departments and other academic units will once again manage their own Department slots under appropriate traditional guidance. The FRC should approve high-quality search requests on Department slots. However, to achieve an appropriate slot vacancy level, the FRC may have to delay some search requests to a subsequent year.

We agree with the Nordhaus Committee’s call for academic renewal and for a process that meets the academic challenges of today and the future.

3. The FRC will manage a new pool of common faculty slots (Faculty Resource Pool), strategically deploying half-slots to meet FAS faculty priorities.

We propose a process by which the flow of resources into and out of the slot pool is kept in balance. A high rate of flow into the pool would allow for more change, while a lower rate would allow for increased departmental planning and responsibility. We recommend a target rate of contributions to the pool that is near the middle of possible proposed extremes.

4. The ARC currently recommends a target rate of flow into the pool equal to one half of the expected rate of senior faculty departures, which average about one percent of total FAS senior Department slots per year. Over a decade this implies a target contribution, for each department, of seven percent of total Department slots. All these slots are to be reallocated back to FAS academic units. Ordinarily, departments will retain the slots under junior departures from Department slots, as well as from failed searches on Department slots.

This rate of flow is familiar from the Yale system that was formally in place from the early 1990s to the early 2000s. In that system, the rate of flow into “divisional pools” was equal to one half of each senior departure.

We also make the following recommendations:

5. The ARC recognizes that academic excellence requires faculty diversity. Therefore, the FAS Faculty Resource Pool will provide a significant number of half-slot resources for this purpose.

6. Search requests from academic units are always evaluated with respect to bedrock principles of academic excellence. Search requests from academic units that are systematically failing to meet benchmarks on important goals -- such as faculty diversity, undergraduate and graduate needs for classes, and high-quality teaching and mentoring -- will face particular scrutiny.

7. The ARC also recognizes the important role of junior faculty at the University, as well as the budgetary consequences of senior hiring. The ARC recommends senior/junior hiring guidelines with built-in flexibility, similar to those recommended by the Nordhaus Committee.

8. We agree with the Nordhaus Committee’s insistence that we not return to a situation of unbudgeted slots. Moving forward, any new additions to the FAS faculty slot list should be fully
budgeted and should be vetted for their academic contributions to the FAS by the divisional committees and the FAS Faculty Resource Committee.

9. Any larger changes in the allocation of FAS faculty resources should take place in the context of a reinvigorated process of ongoing academic reviews.

III. A Common Resource Pool for Faculty Priorities

A primary goal of the Academic Review Committee is to create a system to distribute faculty resources across departments and programs in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in a fair and responsive way.

In addition to meeting the specific needs of departments and programs, the system for allocating faculty resources needs to be responsive, within the parameters of available resources, to general institutional goals and priorities; it should also be equitable, transparent in process, balanced and sufficiently nimble to ensure timely responses. ARC discussions identified several key elements of a system that would enable departments to maintain predictable control over faculty resources while also creating a pool of faculty positions to be allocated toward the changing needs of departments, programs and the University.

The system we propose involves compromises among desirable features. Perhaps the most critical one, as the Nordhaus Committee foresaw, concerns the potential conflict between the need for predictable and reliable departmental resources and the need for oversight and reallocation toward emerging fields and other communal priorities. We have sought a fair and reasonable balance between these potentially conflicting objectives.

A. Flow Into and Out of a Pool

The general idea behind a common FAS Faculty Resource Pool (FRP) is that a pool of half-slots, drawn from a fraction of newly vacant faculty slots, will be available in each year to departments and academic units to match with their own half-slot resources. These resources can be used to support diversity or spousal hires, to support new initiatives, to help meet teaching needs, to help underpin the appointment of targets of special eminence, and to support general academic excellence. Slots in the pool would not be lost to the FAS, but would be available to meet the changing needs of departments and the long-term goals of the University.

The return to the pool of a fraction of newly vacant Department slots is reminiscent of the Junior Faculty Equivalent (JFE) system previously in use at Yale, but there is a crucial difference: in the past, departments were expected to locate a second JFE to support the promotion of a junior faculty member to tenure. The present plan instead preserves the 2007 FASTAP rules for promotion: the necessary full slot is in place, for both junior and senior faculty, at the time of hire.

A Faculty Resource Committee (FRC), consisting of FAS faculty and FAS faculty deans, would make final decisions on the allocation of slots from the pool to departments and to other academic programs and units that manage slots. The FRC would seek the counsel of divisional committees and would give heavy weight to the opinions of departmental faculty, who have the greatest knowledge and expertise in particular fields of study. We describe this process in more detail below.

A Pool in Balance. At any given faculty size, the number of slots flowing out of the pool to departments and programs must match the number of slots flowing from vacated existing positions
into the pool. 1 This essential balance creates some tension. Faculty who seek greater responsiveness to intellectual trends and opportunities or larger slot-incentives for diversity hiring are likely to argue for greater flow into and out of the pool. Faculty who seek to preserve departmental control are likely to favor a lower flow into and out of the pool.

The ARC proposes a system that balances this tension, creating enough liquidity for change over time while providing a mechanism that allows departments to retain, deploy and expand the resources available to them. A process that gives the faculty a strong role in shaping future academic priorities at the University will thereby be created.

**B. The Allocation of Slots from the Pool**

1. **Overview of Slot Allocation**

We envision that in each year academic units will be invited to make proposals for the use of pool slot resources. These resources will be intended to support overall academic excellence, including new academic fields of inquiry, faculty diversity and spousal initiatives, areas of intense teaching need, interdisciplinary academic activity and targets of opportunity.

The appropriate divisional committee (or committees) will review these proposals and will offer specific advice, and a ranking of priorities, to the new Faculty Resource Committee. The next section of this report discusses in more detail the composition and operation of the Faculty Resource Committee, the role of the divisional committees working with departmental faculty, and the process for search requests on both pool and Department slots.

**Half-slots.** Ordinarily, resources from the pool will be offered in the form of half-slots. There are many advantages in the use of half-slots. Offering half-slot incentives from a central pool to departments for FAS-wide goals such as faculty diversity or new initiatives would conserve resources while preserving departmental incentives for high-quality hiring. A half-slot currency would also encourage collaboration across departments, since two departments might make a joint offer using a half-slot from each department. Most importantly, an accounting system based on half-slot units would aid the creation of a common pool of FAS resources to balance stability of departments and programs with opportunities for change.

Half-slots from the pool may be allotted outright as Department slots or designated as FAS slots for eventual return in full to the pool. An FAS slot could be allocated for the duration of the faculty appointment at Yale, or could be returned to the pool (as with a “mortgage”) contingent on another departure. As noted, it is also possible that new Incremental slots could be issued, contingent on review at the next search.

While the pool will typically issue single half-slots, there might be circumstances in which the Faculty Resource Committee will want to allocate a pair of half-slots to a department or program so as to make a particularly excellent hire at a time when a department or program lacks any vacant half-slots of its own. For example, a time-limited opportunity to make an excellent diversity appointment (or other exceptional target of opportunity) might arise unexpectedly. In such circumstances, half of the full slot allocated to the relevant department or program should be returned to the pool upon the next departure from a senior slot.

---

1 More precisely, a half-slot can be allocated from the pool only as long as there is a balance of at least one half-slot in the pool.
Department slots would likely be issued when a successful and growing academic unit requires more certainty with respect to hiring plans and the fulfillment of teaching and research needs. FAS slots would almost surely continue to be issued for person-specific proposals, such as diversity hiring. FAS or Incremental slots could be used for hiring in fields whose future is exciting but uncertain.

2. Diversity and Slot Allocation

Academic excellence in both scholarship and teaching requires diversity and so the common FAS Faculty Resource Pool will provide substantial resources for this endeavor.

Achieving and supporting diversity is a joint responsibility shared by the University and its individual departments and programs. This endeavor requires sustained commitment and an equal measure of flexibility to pursue timely opportunities, including, when deemed appropriate, other initiatives such as spousal hires. The resources in the FAS Faculty Resource Pool that are allocated for diversity will ordinarily be in the form of half-slots that can be combined with Department or other half-slots for targeted opportunity hires that enhance diversity.

The degree of diversity in departments will be benchmarked against the diversity levels of those departments’ counterparts in peer institutions. As always, slots allocated from the FAS Faculty Resource Pool for diversity will return to the pool if the candidate is not successfully recruited or if the position is subsequently vacated by the candidate who was hired. The Faculty Resource Committee may consider the potential scholarly or teaching need or impact of the position as well as the current diversity degree and diversity efforts of the relevant department or program when allocating slots from the Faculty Resource Pool for diversity.

3. Faculty Spouses and Partners

The FAS Faculty Resource Pool will also, when appropriate, provide FAS (possibly Mortgaged) half-slot resources for the hiring of faculty spouses and partners to provide departments, programs and the University with the flexibility to benefit from unanticipated hiring opportunities. Allocating resources for this purpose from a central pool will help Yale recruit outstanding faculty and place high-quality new faculty across departments and programs without requiring that these departments and programs forego other opportunities. The hiring of faculty spouses and partners could also be supported by an interested department “lending” a slot or half-slot to another unit, with the loan carefully recorded so that the slot is eventually returned to its original departmental home.

A single department hiring a faculty couple will typically put up all the slot resources for the hiring as that department will bear the full gain. In cases where two full Department slots are not immediately available, granting of a temporary Mortgaged slot may be appropriate, though this is contingent as always on other demands on the pool. When a department proposes that a spouse be hired by another department, the initiating department will typically put one and a half slots under the proposed couple.

Importantly, none of the conditions noted in the paragraph above affect the ability of the FRC to issue FAS half-slots to support candidates who increase faculty diversity.

4. The Flow of Slots into the Pool

The flow of slots into the pool will come from the sources which follow:
- FAS slots, all of which will flow back into the pool;
- Mortgaged slots, which flow back into the pool when specified conditions are met;
- Incremental slots, which will be subject to a non-presumptive review as to whether they should flow into the pool; and
- Vacant senior Department slots, of which a target portion will flow into the pool, with the remainder left to departmental management.

**FAS Slots.** The Nordhaus Committee noted the role of FAS slots in helping to meet the needs of the overall FAS. Following on that report, all slots formerly classified as “temporary for incumbent” were renamed FAS (or “University”) slots. In the present system, these slots are intended to revert to the control of the central FAS leadership when either [i] the incumbent in the slot departs Yale, or [ii] some other condition is met. This other condition is sometimes referred to as a “mortgage” on some other resource. For example, in many cases, the FAS slot is intended to return to the center on the retirement of a senior faculty member; the Department slot under the departing senior then replaces the FAS slot.

Our new pool mechanism builds on the existing system of FAS slots. All FAS slots will flow back into the pool when the incumbent leaves Yale or the other appropriate condition is met. This is not a trivial flow, but it limits the degree to which a common pool can work to reshape the University.²

**Incremental Slots.** During the boom years, the number of promised slots in the FAS faculty grew quite rapidly. Some of these were “temporary” (now “FAS”) slots that were created to support diversity hires and spousal appointments, but also in some cases to allow departments to expand on at least a temporary basis (sometimes involving a “mortgage” on a future departure). Other slots were created with the express purpose of expanding departments to support teaching needs and/or to support research-oriented academic initiatives. Some of these slots were in support of presidential initiatives, such as the globalization of Yale. A fraction of the new positions involved new endowment funding.

The slots created were all justified by academic arguments that were accepted as valid and important by the then-President and provosts. In this sense, these Incremental slots have been academically justified more recently than some slots that have been allocated to departments for a long period of time without serious review. On the other hand, there was no strong and systematic review process for new slots and the allocation of slots as “FAS” or “Department” was sometimes arbitrary. Some departments and programs received approved slots just before the financial crash while other similarly situated departments hoped and expected to benefit from new slots after an outside academic review that ultimately did not take place before the crash.

We propose that all Department slots created between 2005 and the present be treated as a category of Incremental slots that have an intermediate status between FAS slots and Department slots. Each Incremental slot should undergo a review when it is next raised by a search request to

---

² As of fall 2013, about ten percent of all slots in the “slot book” were designated as University (now FAS) slots; that is, about eighty slots. In the last five years, the actual flow of these slots back to the center has averaged about eight slots per year. This is a high rate of turnover as compared to the overall five percent rate of departure from all slots. The high rate may reflect the use of shorter-term “mortgages” and the use of FAS slots for junior positions which experience higher turnover. If the current rate of vacancies continues, this would put about eight FAS slots (sixteen half-slots) back into the pool each year. If the departure rate out of FAS slots declined to the average of five percent, then only four slots (eight half-slots) would flow into the common pool.
see if the allocation still makes sense. This is the type of review that all new slots should undergo. In many cases, the slots will have been well-justified and they will be returned as Department slots. In other cases, the number of slots allocated to a particular incremental initiative may appear to be, in light of subsequent events, too large, and so those slots may be reallocated to the pool. In some cases, it might seem best to allow a search on the slot, but to convert the slot to a FAS slot that will return to the pool when it becomes vacant.

The review should involve faculty in the relevant program and related fields and should also rely on the advice of appropriate divisional committees, with the final decision made by the Faculty Resource Committee.

A Flow of Department Slots. In addition to the flow of existing FAS slots, we propose to create an additional flow of current Department slots into the pool, where they will become available for reallocation to FAS academic units. This flow will increase the resources available to the pool and allow for the natural possibility that the sizes of some departments will ebb and flow over time. The volume of this flow is intended to balance the competing objectives of departmental predictability, responsibility and control with the need to allow for FAS-wide priorities and for a changing academic landscape.

Specifically, we propose that each department be allocated a target contribution to the common resource pool. The target contribution for each department or academic unit would be set to represent about one half of the FAS-wide average rate of senior retirements per year. To accomplish this, the specific target for each academic unit is recommended to be about seven percent of total Department slots, which would be planned to flow over the course of a decade into the pool. Contributions to the pool would typically be made in half-slot increments and decade-long targets would be rounded to the nearest half-slot.

For very small departments the FRC could choose to set a goal of either zero or one half. In general, the FRC could round either up or down to the nearest half-slot when the seven percent goal is near the middle of half-slot rounding points.

Note that the target contribution for a department would not depend on actual retirements, promotions or departures. This means that departments with high turnover are not penalized, nor are incentives created to strategically delay retirement or to attempt to manipulate the tenure process. In practice, since only vacant slots can be allocated to the pool, the path to meeting the target contribution will depend on the timing of vacancies and departures.

Departments could either propose a plan for meeting the target contribution or else, by default, one half of each departing senior slot would be transferred into the pool until the target is met. Departments would work out plans with cognizant members of the FAS leadership, working

---

3 Note that in recent years the retirement rate has averaged about two percent of senior faculty. One half of this rate is one percent of senior faculty per year, or ten percent per decade. Since the FAS faculty is about seventy percent senior, this is equivalent to a contribution rate that equals about seven percent of total (senior and junior) slots per decade.

4 What should the default contribution to the pool be for a senior faculty member whose position is supported by two half-slots from different units? We recommend that in such cases, a unit will contribute a half-slot to the pool if and only if it has not met its target (as specified in the plan it has worked out with the FRC). So such a departure might result in a contribution of no half-slots (if both departments have already met their specified targets), one half-slot (if one department has met its specified target and the other has not), or two half-slots (if neither has met their specified target). Details of a particular case would be settled by the Faculty Resource Committee.
with the advice of divisional committees and with the final approval of the Faculty Resource Committee.

In the absence of an approved plan for contributing to the pool, there would be a presumption that one half of each senior retirement would flow into the pool. In contrast, it would be more common for mid-career senior departures to be returned directly to departments. In departments that face a particularly low rate of senior departures, both halves of a senior departure might sometimes need to flow into the pool.

Departments might try to delay contributions until disproportionately late in the decade, but this would prevent the pool from operating properly in earlier years and so such plans would not typically be approved. Instead, to stock the pool in its initial years, and to maintain equity across departments, departments would typically be required either to [a] make an early contribution to the pool out of a vacant slot or, for vacancy-constrained departments, to [b] commit to a specific plan for a contribution relatively early in the decade.

The normal expectation is that junior departures involving a position supported by a Department slot would not flow into the pool. For Department slots, this would reduce any tendency to promote to tenure as a means of avoiding a contribution to the pool. It is important to recall that all FAS slots, including junior-occupied FAS slots, automatically flow back into the pool on departure. Department slots supporting failed searches would also return to departments. This practice would encourage offers to highly qualified outside faculty.

The unit responsibility for contributions is a nuanced issue. We propose that if a slot is actively managed by an academic unit, then that unit is responsible for the contribution. If an endowed slot is effectively constrained to a particular department, then we propose that these slots go into the "base" of the department, which will then have to make its contribution out of unencumbered slots. Not all details of slot contributions can be determined in advance, and some situations may be left to the discretion of the FRC acting as usual with the advice of the divisional committees.

IV. Further Mechanisms for Change

The pool mechanism provides a steady flow of resources that can support continuous incremental improvement in the FAS faculty. However, there are situations where a more fundamental or discrete change may be appropriate. The ARC proposes a process of reinvigorated academic reviews to address these issues. These reviews should include members of the Yale faculty, might include outside expert faculty, and could address academic areas ranging from departments to entire divisions.

The University already has a process of periodic outside academic review for departments. While useful in some respects, these reviews often support growth in the department under review without offering specific guidelines for improvement. We propose that these reviews be enhanced using the best practices of other universities, which often request that review committees address more particular and difficult questions.

In addition to departments, broader areas of academic concern should be addressed. There might be a review of an entire division, of a grouping of academic interests that cross departments, divisions or schools, or of a proposal for a new initiative or academic unit.

Reviews should typically arise from the concerns of Yale faculty and faculty leadership and should be carefully considered by divisional committees, with a final decision on reviews made by the
Faculty Resource Committee. As has been traditional, a careful faculty-driven academic review could result in a reallocation of Department slots and/or the redefinition of departmental or divisional boundaries.

V. Implementation and Process

The allocation of faculty resources across the FAS guides the evolution of the faculty as it maintains academic excellence and improves diversity while responding to the new challenges that arise from emerging fields of knowledge, changing student needs and interests, and shifting employment opportunities.

The Academic Review Committee recommends creation of a new mechanism for the allocation of resources in which faculty, including faculty members in University leadership positions, will review requests for searches in the FAS. This system of review will require detailed and responsible input at the level of departments and academic units. The system presumes that FAS faculty in the departments and programs involved have the expertise and experience necessary to guide the evolving teaching and research missions of the University.

The ARC also recognizes the important role that divisional advisory committees have traditionally played in decisions about the allocation of faculty resources. The ARC proposes that the divisional committees, which are dedicated to understanding the needs and aspirations of a specific set of departments and programs, should play a central role in assessing and prioritizing search requests.

A. Faculty Resource Committee

Currently, the Expanded Executive Committee of the FAS makes decisions on FAS slot resources and search requests. This committee is chaired by the Provost and includes the three current FAS deans (College, Graduate School and Engineering), four Divisional Directors and the deputy provosts. The ARC recommends replacing this body with a new faculty committee tasked with overseeing the allocation of faculty resources across the FAS.

This Faculty Resource Committee (FRC) would consist of approximately twelve faculty members representing all academic divisions (currently Biological Sciences, Humanities, Physical Sciences & Engineering, and Social Sciences). Under the new configuration of FAS leadership, this committee would include the following individuals, and the composition would be adjusted accordingly if leadership structures are redefined in the future:

- **The four FAS deans:** The new FAS Dean will have overall responsibility for many aspects of the FAS faculty, including departmental resources, and, as such, will serve as chair of the committee. The Yale College Dean is expert in undergraduate teaching needs and the quality of teaching in each department. The Graduate School Dean is expert in applicant pools, admissions selectivity, mentoring quality, graduate student outcomes and placements. The Dean of SEAS has intimate knowledge of all aspects of that School.

- **The Divisional Directors:** Due to their service on the tenure appointments committees and their work chairing the divisional advisory committees, these faculty leaders have knowledge about the academic missions of the departments in their respective divisions and knowledge about the relationships among the divisions.

- **Four experienced faculty members who represent the breadth of the FAS:** These individuals will provide additional historical and interdisciplinary perspectives in addition to knowledge of their respective fields and divisions. They might or might not include former
chairs, former Divisional Directors or others with general knowledge about the faculty in their divisions and beyond. These individuals would serve staggered terms.

- **The Provost**: The Provost, as the chief academic officer of the University, will sit on the committee as he does on similar committees in Yale’s other schools.

## B. Search Requests

The overriding criterion for the approval of every search request must be its contribution to academic excellence according to the highest possible standards. Additional criteria for the evaluation of search requests include, but are not limited to, the following:

- need for undergraduate teaching and mentoring, both of majors and non-majors;
- need for graduate teaching and mentoring;
- quality of undergraduate and graduate programs;
- importance of research in the defined field;
- contribution of the search to the academic strength of the relevant department or program at Yale;
- balance of academic priorities within and between academic units and programs;
- viability and scope of fields and disciplines as well as opportunities to build bridges between disciplines;
- enhancement of diversity within programs and departments;
- potential availability of exceptionally qualified candidates; and
- availability of space and other non-salary resources such as laboratories and libraries.

These criteria apply to all search requests. In cases where academic units are systematically failing to meet reasonable benchmarks on important goals such as academic excellence, faculty diversity, or high-quality teaching, search requests should be subject to particular scrutiny. It should be reasonable for the divisional committees and the Faculty Resource Committee to request specific plans for improvement before less critical search requests are granted.

### 1. Role of Departments in Search Requests

Faculty in departments and programs are the best qualified to define search priorities within their disciplines, subject to oversight and review in the context of the broader University. In keeping with current practice, search requests would originate with departments and other academic units that manage slots. As part of the request, the department would indicate the resource basis for the request. A department could propose to use a full and vacant Department slot, or it could request that a pool half-slot be matched with a Department half-slot. Two departments or units could propose a joint offer based on a half-slot from each unit.

Successful management of pool resources will require good management of Department slots, beginning with the annual formulation of search priorities within departments and programs early in the spring term of the academic year. Obviously, some plans may be contingent and subject to change, and some targets of opportunity will arise as the year progresses.

### 2. Role of Divisional Committees in Search Requests

Typically, the relevant divisional committee will consider search requests and give detailed advice and recommendations to the Faculty Resource Committee. In some cases, blended divisional committees made up of members across divisions or divisional committees augmented by *ad hoc* Yale faculty experts might be convened.
To ensure high-quality advice, and to enable rapid decision-making when search requests are time-sensitive, divisional committees should strive to remain informed of the priorities, strengths and weaknesses of each academic unit in their purview. The practice of some committees has been to meet annually with all the departments in the division, and to also meet with smaller programs and units on a regular (perhaps less frequent than annual) basis. In the current Humanities division, which contains many departments and programs, this might require that the divisional committee break into subcommittees or involve additional faculty in some discussions.

The divisional committees should in a timely fashion advise the Faculty Resource Committee regarding which search requests are the most obviously appropriate and which require further scrutiny. The divisional committees must offer critical assistance to the Faculty Resource Committee in order to determine which searches meet departmental and University priorities and which do not. In some cases, it may be appropriate for the Faculty Resource Committee to ask divisional committees to rank search requests in order of priority.

3. Role of Faculty Resource Committee in Approving Searches

The Faculty Resource Committee will carefully evaluate search requests submitted by departments and reviewed by the divisional committees. With the advice of the divisional committees, it will assess the contribution of the search to the academic strength of the relevant department or program in the broader context of the University. The FRC will approve, disapprove or postpone the search, or it will return the request to the department or divisional committee(s) for change or refinement.

C. Slot Management Issues

Department Slots. Department slots encourage high-quality decisions because they promote long-term planning and careful allocation of resources. These slots are assigned to a department or other academic unit and will not be reallocated without appropriate academic review. Search requests based solely on Department slots should typically be approved if they satisfy the criteria enumerated above, though in some cases such searches may need to be delayed to a subsequent year in order to maintain the FAS-wide vacancy rate.

Pool Slots. By design, pool resources are to be used for the broad benefit of the teaching and research mission of the FAS without prior expectation that they will be used to benefit any particular existing department, area or program.

Incremental Slots. As discussed above, Incremental slots allocated during the boom years of 2005-2013 will receive extra scrutiny before it is decided whether they are to be retained by departments or contributed to the pool.

Creation of New Faculty Slots. An expansion of authorized slots would be welcomed by the FAS faculty, but it is important to consider academic needs, balance and quality. The Faculty Resource Committee should be consulted during the creation of any new FAS faculty slots, including any new restricted endowed slots or slots for new University initiatives. To avoid recurrence of recent problems, all new slots should be fully funded. New slots (restricted or unrestricted) will normally be added to the common resource pool for allocation to the best academic use.

Vacancies and Budgets. The budgeted number of authorized slots assumes a vacancy rate of ten percent, conservatively based on historical experience. If the vacancy rate falls below this, the Faculty Resource Committee may have to delay into the next year some searches on Department
slots, or else retain some slots in the pool. In the event of an unexpected financial downturn, the Faculty Resource Committee could temporarily allow slots to accumulate in the pool.

**D. Faculty Balance, Size and Review**

The FRC should work to keep an appropriate balance across academic areas and divisions. Each year, the FRC should carefully consider the impact of its decisions on the overall excellence and balance of the FAS to avoid shifting resources in unintended ways as the result of making decisions on a case-by-case basis. The FRC should be mindful of maintaining a balance between Department and FAS slots. For example, if the FRC only rarely issued Department slots from the pool (issuing only FAS slots instead), departments would slowly lose their appropriate role in guiding the evolution of the faculty.

The FAS leadership including the FRC should, from time to time, consider the appropriate size of the FAS faculty and whether growth might be appropriate. Although the capacity for growth is ultimately a budgetary decision made at higher levels in the University, the FRC will have important knowledge and perspectives concerning the overall size of the FAS faculty. An historical record of the size of the faculty is included as an appendix to this report.

We recommend a careful review of the implementation of our report in five years by a committee including both FRC and non-FRC members. The FAS should make any necessary changes to the operation of the faculty resource pool, the FRC, the tenure ratio guidelines, and so forth, at that time.

**VI. Tenure Ratio Guidelines**

**A. Why Does the Tenure Ratio Matter?**

An area of concern, as noted by the Nordhaus Committee, is the increasing ratio of senior faculty in the FAS. Over the past thirty years, the ratio of senior faculty has increased from 55 percent to 69 percent, as seen in Figure 1. A significant increase took place from 1992 to 1996, following the previous restructuring, but the most significant increase occurred after the FASTAP report of 2007. Yale’s new tenure track system has a large number of advantages, including the development of vibrant faculty. Outside hiring at the senior level has obvious advantages for academic departments. However, both academic and budgetary concerns point to the importance of maintaining a balance between senior and junior faculty.
On the academic side, recently trained scholarly cohorts keep departments and students in touch with the most current scholarship. Some students see junior faculty as more approachable role models and mentors. Thus, junior faculty play a special role in the educational mission of the University. Further, Yale’s senior faculty members can be excellent mentors for junior scholars, whether those juniors go on to tenure at Yale or elsewhere. As with the teaching and mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students, the mentorship of junior scholars is an important function of the University. Given the varying demographic composition of different cohorts of scholars, hiring junior faculty can be an important route to the diversification of the faculty. A more senior faculty is likely a less diverse faculty.

On the budgetary side, in terms of salary, junior faculty cost roughly one half the amount of senior faculty. At any budget level, a higher ratio of senior faculty implies a lower total faculty count. In addition, senior faculty hold lifetime contracts whereas a fraction of junior faculty will leave, in the relatively near term, without tenure. A higher ratio of tenured faculty therefore restricts the budgetary ability of academic units to respond to future trends and pressures.

B. Recommendations for the Tenure Ratio

In accordance with a recommendation of the Nordhaus Committee, the Academic Review Committee recommends that the FAS adopt tenure ratio guidelines. The guidelines would be
applied, in a sensible and flexible way, by the Faculty Resource Committee working as usual with the advice of the divisional committees.

In particular, the ARC recommends that for each department, the Faculty Resource Committee should establish a guideline fraction of tenured to total tenure-track faculty. If the fraction of senior faculty in a department exceeds the guideline target, the presumption should be that authorized searches will be at the junior level until the target fraction is reached.

The ARC believes that in most departments an appropriate guideline would be a ratio of two-thirds senior to total tenure-track faculty, close to but not above the present average. In some science departments (where junior faculty are typically hired at a more advanced stage) the Faculty Resource Committee might sensibly choose to use a higher guideline fraction.

We emphasize that these are guidelines that should inform, but not firmly restrict, faculty allocations to departments. There may be substantive reasons to authorize senior hiring even when the fraction of senior faculty exceeds the target level. These cases might include the loss of a key senior faculty member or a particular need for faculty leadership. Departments should understand, however, that such searches will only increase the pressure to approve future searches as junior.

When authorizing hires, the overall Ph.D./doctoral cohort distribution of faculty members should be carefully considered. One example would be a department that has a large cohort of faculty nearing retirement. For this department, it might be good to add a tenured faculty member from a more recent cohort. A department containing many newly tenured faculty with recent doctorates might benefit from hiring a distinguished member of a more advanced doctoral cohort. In both examples, one can look forward to see if natural retirements and attrition will return the department to an appropriate senior/junior ratio over time, or whether decisions made today might reinforce future problems of faculty imbalance.

No internal promotion should be denied on the grounds that a department exceeds its senior faculty target. Nothing in our recommendations, therefore, changes the FASTAP procedures or standards for internal promotions.

We hope that in the initial stages the FAS leadership will be asked to engage departments in a conversation about the guidelines. Guidelines will be reviewed by divisional committees and approved by the Faculty Resource Committee. Once established, guidelines should be discussed at the annual meetings with individual chairs. The FRC will consider the effect of these guidelines as part of the usual search approval process.

C. JFE/FTE Conversion

The Nordhaus Committee asked whether any anomalies resulted from the 2007 conversion of Junior Faculty Equivalents (JFEs) to Full Time Equivalents (FTEs). The ARC found few such anomalies. However, we did find that the Physical Sciences departments outside of SEAS lost more than six FTEs in the conversion, relative to the average rate of conversion. In the first years of the pool operation, we recommend that the Faculty Resource Committee take this issue into consideration.

VII. Dealing with the Overhang

For the foreseeable future, the size of the FAS faculty will be held at its current level of about 700. In light of the large increase in promised faculty slots during the last decade, this has required a
faculty slot vacancy rate that is much higher than the historical average. To maintain this high vacancy rate, well-founded search requests based on vacant Department slots were frequently turned down. This situation was not consistent with departmental management of departmental resources.

Over the course of its first year, the ARC explored a range of strategies for eliminating the overhang. Given the size of the necessary adjustment, by fall 2013 it seemed to the ARC that the only feasible way to quickly reduce the vacancy rate to ten percent was to implement a five percent across-the-board cut in authorized slots. This preliminary recommendation was presented to the FAS JBPO in December 2013. Ensuing discussion revealed that simultaneously implementing the pool mechanism and the across-the-board overhang reduction would cause indiscriminate hardship that would be detrimental to the FAS as a whole.

In light of this discussion, early in spring semester 2014, the Office of the Provost undertook a careful historically-informed analysis of the entire FAS slot-record book, which contains the official account of each FAS slot. This slot-by-slot analysis revealed that a somewhat smaller reduction would be possible. This in turn reopened the door to the ARC’s original goal of a more principled reduction, while still leaving room for a modestly sized first-year common faculty pool.

On the basis of this analysis, in March 2014 the Provost presented to the ARC a proposal for these adjustments based on mutually agreed-upon principles. These adjustments left most, but not all, departments better off than they would have been under the five percent “haircut”. The ARC unanimously approved the proposed principles, which are described below.

In a manner consistent with earlier academic reviews at Yale, the ARC left to the Provost’s discretion the specific adjustments to be made on the basis of the approved principles.

The ARC greatly preferred this principled cut to the other main alternatives, which were either to continue with an artificially high vacancy rate managed by the center or to implement an indiscriminate five percent across-the-board cut.

### A. Principles for Eliminating the Overhang

The individual promises made to departments during the boom years are mutually unsustainable. As a result, resolution of the overhang inevitably involves reversing some of these promises to departments, as well as strictly enforcing prior departmental commitments.

In this exercise, the Provost has been guided by the following ARC-approved principles:

- unpaid mortgages (that is, special temporary slots a department has committed to repay) are to be paid, in most cases immediately;
- Incremental slots (that is, slots that were added to departmental books during the boom years) are to be reviewed for issues of equity across departments, with any fundamental failures of process redressed;
- vacant and vacated FAS slots (that is, slots designated for the incumbent rather than the department) will not be retained on departmental books.

These principles were implemented with careful and consistent bookkeeping.
This process brought resolution of the overhang to within about one percent of its goal. The final step involved some departments making early payments to the Faculty Resource Pool (for which they are receiving full “credit”).
Appendix: Historical Size of the Faculty

FAS Ladder Faculty Hires/Leaves
Fall 1982 to Fall 2013

Note: Counts are based on the locations of full-time appointments regardless of the rank or level. All positions are included. All non-faculty and postdoctoral students are excluded. FAS Faculty serving as presidents, provosts, deans and directors of research are included. FAS faculty in other schools are excluded.