2021 DEAN’S ANNUAL REPORT
BUT WE’VE LEARNED MORE, ABOUT WHO WE ARE AND WHAT WE CAN DO. THAT WE ARE NOT ONLY AN OLD AND VENERABLE INSTITUTION BUT ALSO A FAST-MOVING AND NIMBLE ONE. THAT BROAD ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE OFFERS NOT ONLY SCHOLARLY DIVERSITY AND OPPORTUNITY BUT ALSO A DEEP WELL OF INSIGHT FROM WHICH WE CAN DRAW TO CHART OUR COURSE.

CLAUDINE GAY
Dear Colleagues,

In the following pages, I reflect on the past year's efforts to build and sustain a strong faculty and advance the pursuit of our teaching and research mission. This report, and the analysis it provides, attempts to unpack key aspects of a year in the life of our big, ambitious, and intellectually diverse academic community. Ordinarily, it is an opportunity to celebrate past accomplishments and seek to understand the challenges before us as we start a new academic year. But last year was in no way ordinary. It was our “pandemic year,” and both the accomplishments and the learnings feel quite different.

Like colleges and universities across the country, this was a year in which we put planning into practice and pursued our teaching and research mission in a manner fully adapted to the conditions of a global pandemic. Our students, whether living in our small, campus-based cohort or far away from Cambridge, joined their faculty and classmates online and together found new ways of creating connection and intellectual community. Our research mission gradually expanded campus-based activities and defined new means of convening and creating space for the interplay of perspectives and ideas that drives the advancement of knowledge. This year demanded that we learn to move forward in profoundly changed circumstances, and I am deeply grateful to every member of our community for their efforts as we navigated the challenges of this year.

This context makes the path-breaking achievements of our faculty even more extraordinary. In “Intergenerational Humanities Initiative Launches” (PAGE 9), we explore how a group of new programs are bringing the critical resources of humanistic inquiry to issues of social justice, climate change, political polarization, and more. Students, through laboratory and fieldwork approaches more commonly seen in the sciences, learn critical interpretation as a means of strengthening the impact they can have in the world. We also celebrate the creation of a pioneering new doctoral program in quantum science and engineering (PAGE 10). The program serves as the foundation of an interdisciplinary community designed to push the boundaries of how we acquire, process, and communicate information and interact with the world around us. These are just two examples of how, across disciplines, faculty are harnessing the power of connection, collaboration, and broad academic excellence to engage society’s big questions and to make the world better.
Our operations are also a place for faculty innovation. A faculty-led study of our financial condition has yielded a new framework for analysis that puts our annual results in a long-term context, revealing important dynamics and sensitivities in how we fund our activities. This new model, together with strong endowment performance, set the stage for more informed financial decision-making as well as future efforts to create enhanced financial and organizational flexibility across FAS as part of our ongoing pursuit of long-term academic excellence.

Initiatives to support faculty, particularly tenure-track faculty and parents of all ranks, continued last year (PAGE 12) and were informed by the results of surveys conducted on faculty and researcher well-being. Changes ranged from added flexibility in the time to review and expanded childcare support. Professional development opportunities also expanded, with new workshops on topics such as writing productivity and time management, dedicated coaching, and opportunities to present work publicly at mini-symposia. We paid a price, however, for the curtailment of faculty search activities early in the pandemic; though search activities have resumed, the drop of total faculty numbers (PAGE 13) is one of the more painful repercussions of this pandemic.

Thinking of 2021 as our “pandemic year” is, for me, an act of hope. It holds within it the idea that the year ahead is one of new equilibrium, where our “new normal” might take root. The return to in-person teaching this fall has already felt like a profound restoration. The chance to talk together—even through a mask—is something we know to treasure and fight to preserve. Of course, the virus itself is not going away, and managing risk will continue to shape the choices we make. But we’ve learned more, about who we are and what we can do. That we are not only an old and venerable institution but also a fast-moving and nimble one. That broad academic excellence offers not only scholarly diversity and opportunity but also a deep well of insight from which we can draw to chart our course. I am eager not just to “get back to normal” but to build toward an even better version of who we can be with the benefit of the hard-won insights of this year.

Sincerely,

Claudine Gay
Edgerley Family Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Wilbur A. Cowett Professor of Government and of African and African American Studies
INTERGENERATIONAL HUMANITIES INITIATIVE LAUNCHES

Division of Arts & Humanities and Mahindra Humanities Center Collaborate on Teaching and Research Program

“Portrait of Asia-Imani, Gabriella-Esnae, and Kaya Palmer” by Kehinde Wiley, American (Los Angeles, California, born 1977), is discussed by Jennifer Roberts (left) during HUMAN 90: “Making It: Mahindra Scholars Seminar.”
The Intergenerational Humanities (I-HUM) Project and the Undergraduate Scholars Initiative (USI) launched this fall to bring together an intergenerational and interdisciplinary group of students, faculty, and postdoctoral scholars to explore how the humanities may engage the lives of students and the pressing issues of the day.

The separate but overlapping programs are part of a broader effort to amplify the ways in which the humanities contribute to public discourse on such pressing matters as social justice, migration, climate change, and the future of democracy. The initiative was announced in May by the Arts and Humanities Division and the Mahindra Humanities Center.

“Our students are inheriting a turbulent world,” said Robin Kelsey, dean of arts and humanities and Shirley Carter Burden Professor of Photography. “From climate disruption to political polarization, unsettling changes are demanding that we reconsider how we live and what we value. And when I say ‘what we value,’ I don’t just mean what we tell ourselves we value but also what our laws, institutions, and habits say we value. In this reconsideration, the humanities are an essential resource. They are a storehouse of ideas, reflections, and creative answers. They are a way of discovering meanings that lie beyond convenience and self-flattery.”

I-HUM is the research arm of the two programs and makes its debut with a three-year project on the initial theme, “Place and Planet.” The inaugural theme on the environmental humanities was chosen as a pressing intergenerational issue that crosses many different disciplines and requires just as many solutions, especially with the climate crisis looming. It launches this fall with a team of four faculty leaders led by Joyce Chaplin, James Duncan Phillips Professor of Early American History. A new cohort of Mahindra postdoctoral fellows is being recruited to join the research effort next year, and graduate students working in the environmental humanities will have opportunities to apply for funding to add a public humanities dimension to their research. Faculty in the I-HUM project will teach one of the two courses in the USI program. This research-intensive course, which is taught in the spring semester, will give USI undergraduates research experience early in their college careers.
“Place and Planet’ evokes multiple scales, from local to global, from the human body to the cosmic,” said Bruno Carvalho, professor of Romance languages and literatures and of African and African American studies, who is part of the group designing the three-year project. “I think such a capacious framing can encourage us to stretch the limits of the thinkable and, for example, reimagine some of the given scales of governance that don’t seem conducive to addressing environmental challenges.”

Suzannah Clark, director of the Mahindra Center, where I-HUM will be hosted, added: “One of the things that often happens is that society’s knee-jerk reaction to pressing issues of the day, such as the environmental crisis, is to turn to science and technology for solutions. Genuine solutions need holistic thinking. What humanists can do is teach people how to think in ways that question the norm, that question the accepted wisdom and delve into how value systems developed around environmental justice or food and water justice or animal sentience or sustainability. How do we go about shaping new value systems for a better future?”

USI, designed specifically as a one-year program for sophomores, is a way for students to broaden their exposure and understanding of the humanities, as well as to learn how to foster their creativity and heighten their original thinking. The goal is to show students the importance of taking a humanistic approach in different fields and to highlight skills of humanists, including critical thinking, information gathering, storytelling, and the interpretation of history and human behavior.

The two-course program will start in the fall with 12 undergraduate students taking a seminar called “Making It” co-taught by Kelsey and Jennifer L. Roberts, Elizabeth Cary Agassiz Professor of the Humanities.
“The Undergraduate Scholars Program is a magnet for those who want to delve quite deeply into the humanities no matter what their concentration,” said Clark, also the Morton B. Knafel Professor of Music and Harvard College Professor. “This will really help their intellectual curiosity, and it can also open them to things beyond their own concentration.”

“Making It” focuses on critical interpretation, understanding the humanities, and how humanists make the world meaningful. It serves as an introduction to the humanities and thinking across different creative forms, such as poetry, theater, photography, and music. Guests from across the FAS and the University will lecture on how the humanities can be vocational and applied in different careers, including law, speechwriting, policy research, and journalism.

“We very much hope that the students come to see how the humanities not only can enrich their personal lives, which is a familiar value that people associate with the humanities, but also the extent to which the humanities can actually enable them to be more effective in the world,” Kelsey said. “This is a quality of the humanities that receives far too little attention. Understood correctly, I believe learning the humanities is learning how to live in ways that enable one to contribute to society in a full and thoughtful way.”

The second course in the USI program is a lab to launch in the spring. Called the “Scholars Lab,” it will be co-taught by Sarah Dimick, assistant professor of English, and Chaplin, who is also an affiliate of the Department of Landscape Architecture at the Graduate School of Design. The inaugural seminar will focus on phenology, the study of nature’s timing.
The lab course is intended to give students the type of experiences that are seen as common in the sciences, such as conducting field visits and working together on a research project. Content wise, the course is meant to give students a heightened awareness of the natural world, both what it used to do and what it is doing now—knowledge that was once commonplace and not only considered the domain of scientists.

“Phenology—a big, fancy term for what becomes a science in the 19th century—but once upon a time, it’s what everyone knew,” Chaplin said. “Peasants would have to decide ‘When are we going to plant? When are we going to harvest? And when might birds return from their seasonal migration.’ . . . This was natural knowledge, which modern science is part of.”

The initiatives were launched during the 10th anniversary year of the Mahindra Center and designed by Kelsey, Clark, and American Council of Learned Societies Emerging Voices Fellow Caitlin Gunn, after years of consultation about curricular initiatives with faculty across arts and humanities’ departments.

Dimick, Chaplin, and Carvalho will be joined by Tiya Miles, professor of history and Radcliffe Alumnae Professor, in the initial cohort of I-HUM faculty. Kelsey said the programs are meant to counter the idea that humanists work in solitude and are simply buried in their books.

“The humanities really are driven by conversation and collaboration,” Kelsey said. “The ambition of both projects is to get the humanities out of their shell, so to speak. I-HUM promotes collaboration of faculty in the humanities across the Division in the FAS, and the USI program involves faculty from across Harvard’s various schools. For the undergraduates, USI is a bridge to the world that they will need to shape anew.”
This year, Harvard announced one of the world’s first PhD programs in quantum science and engineering, a new intellectual discipline at the nexus of physics, chemistry, computer science, and electrical engineering, with the promise to profoundly transform the way we acquire, process, and communicate information and interact with the world around us.

“The Quantum Science and Engineering PhD program is yet another example of Harvard’s commitment to building and fostering a strong community of students, faculty, and inventors who will collaborate across disciplines to push the boundaries of quantum science,” said Evelyn L. Hu, the Tarr-Coyne Professor of Applied Physics and of Electrical Engineering at SEAS and co-director of the Harvard Quantum Initiative (HQI). “Since its announcement, the QSE PhD program has generated a lot of excitement and anticipation and positioned Harvard as a leader in the field.”

The PhD program will welcome its first cohort of students to campus in fall 2022. Recruitment is underway to attract a diverse pool of students from around the globe, who will become the leaders and innovators in the emerging field of quantum science and engineering.

“A vibrant and inclusive community is essential for bringing the benefits of quantum research to different fields of science and society,” said Mikhail Lukin, George Vasmer Leverett Professor of Physics and co-director of HQI. “The students who will arrive on campus next year will be the next generation of scientists and engineers working across the borders of traditional disciplines to push science and innovation.”

The Quantum Physics and Engineering PhD program will draw faculty from the entire Harvard QSE community, including the Department of Physics, the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, and SEAS. Leadership is developing a curriculum that includes both new and adapted courses.
THE QUANTUM SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING PHD PROGRAM IS YET ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF HARVARD’S COMMITMENT TO BUILDING AND FOSTERING A STRONG COMMUNITY OF STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND INVENTORS WHO WILL COLLABORATE ACROSS DISCIPLINES TO PUSH THE BOUNDARIES OF QUANTUM SCIENCE,

EVELYN L. HU
THE TARR-COYNE PROFESSOR OF APPLIED PHYSICS AND OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING AT SEAS AND CO-DIRECTOR OF THE HARVARD QUANTUM INITIATIVE (HQUALITY)

“Being at—and sometimes defining—the frontier of research keeps our education vibrant and meaningful to students,” said John Doyle, the Henry B. Silsbee Professor of Physics and co-director of HQI. “We are developing a new approach to interdisciplinary scholarship that would embrace and enhance the study, education, and progress of quantum science and technology. The PhD program will play a critical role in opening new intellectual frontiers in QSE at Harvard while training future leaders in the field.”

The new degree is the latest step in the University’s commitment as both a leader in research and an innovator in teaching in the field of quantum science and engineering. Harvard launched HQI in 2018 to foster and grow this new scientific community.

Earlier this year, the University announced plans for the comprehensive renovation of 60 Oxford Street into a new quantum hub—a shared resource for the quantum community, with instructional and research labs, seminar and workshop spaces, and meeting spaces for students and faculty as well as visiting researchers and collaborators. The quantum headquarters will integrate the educational, research, and translational aspects of the diverse field of quantum science and engineering in an architecturally cohesive way.
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Faculty Trends

As of fall 2021, FAS is comprised of 1,222 faculty (1,037 full-time equivalents [FTEs]). The table below illustrates how these faculty are distributed across different types of appointments.

Figure 1: Faculty Counts in the FAS, Fall 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Category</th>
<th>2021 Head Count</th>
<th>2021 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Faculty</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Professor *</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Professor</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor in Residence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Non-Ladder Faculty</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of the Practice</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Preceptor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ladder Faculty</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Faculty</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,222</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,037</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Tenured Professor" includes University Professors.

Of the 1,222 faculty in the FAS, 39 percent are women and 26 percent are faculty of color. Faculty who identified as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or two-or-more races represent 12 percent of the faculty.

The FAS currently includes 711 ladder faculty, a decrease from last year’s count of 728. The reason for the decrease is twofold. First, the FAS suspended ladder-faculty searches in April 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Although modest search activity resumed in AY 2020–2021, our usually steady pipeline of faculty arrivals was effectively shut off. (In addition, as is the case each year, not all faculty who accept offers arrive on campus the following year). Second, there was a high number of departures (34) last year.

1 "Faculty of color" includes: Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx (of any race), Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or two-or-more races. As a federal contractor, Harvard is required to maintain records on the race and ethnicity of each employee. As such, Harvard uses the federally designated race and ethnicity categories provided by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP).

2 Hispanic or Latinx faculty include all faculty who identify as “Hispanic/Latino,” regardless of the race with which they identify.

3 The ladder-faculty ranks include Convertible Instructor; Assistant Professor; Associate Professor; Tenured Professor; Professor in Residence, and University Professor.
Of the 34 departures, 12 were faculty who retired, 11 were faculty who took positions at other institutions (8 tenured faculty, 3 tenure-track faculty), 7 were faculty whose promotion review was unsuccessful (a mix of 2019–2020 and 2020–2021 reviews), and 4 were faculty who passed away. Women represented 29 percent of departures, and faculty of color represented 17 percent of departures.

Currently, the ladder faculty is composed of 231 women (up from 230 last year) and 178 faculty of color (down from 179 last year). Women represent 32 percent of the ladder faculty and 49 percent of the tenure-track faculty. Faculty of color represent 25 percent of the ladder faculty and 37 percent of the tenure-track faculty. Faculty from historically underrepresented groups, i.e., those who identified as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or two-or-more races, represent 10 percent of the ladder faculty and 14 percent of the tenure-track faculty.
Promotions
Twenty tenure-track faculty were scheduled to be reviewed for promotion to tenure during AY 2020–2021. Of those 20 cases, 18 reviews were completed and 2 faculty chose not to stand for their review.

Of the 18 completed tenure reviews, 16 (or 89 percent) were successful. The success rate for women was 100 percent, and the success rate for men was 83 percent. The success rate for faculty of color was 100 percent.

Overall, the tenure promotion rate for faculty who stood for promotion from AY 2008–2009 to AY 2020–2021 (the largest set of cohorts for whom we have this data) was 71 percent: 72 percent for women and 71 percent for men; 69 percent for white faculty; and 80 percent for faculty who identified as Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or two-or-more races.

Diversifying the Faculty: Underutilizing the PhD Pipeline
Diversifying the faculty is a priority of the FAS. In last year’s annual report (https://www.fas.harvard.edu/files/fas/files/fas_deans_ar_2020_finalv2.pdf?m=1604083233), we analyzed several metrics by gender and race/ethnicity to understand areas in which we need to improve our practices. We looked at utilization of the PhD pipeline in tenure-track searches, the distribution of offers, and acceptance rates. These analyses identified one glaring area for improvement: tenure-track applicant pools do not reflect the distribution of talent among historically underrepresented groups. As shown in the tables below, this trend continued in AY 2020–2021 in the Arts and Humanities and Science divisions and in SEAS. The Social Sciences division has increased the representation of its applicant pools, although the sample size is small.

Based on data obtained from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), 16.7 percent of domestic U.S. doctoral degree recipients from arts and sciences fields in 2020 identified as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or two-or-more races. In addition, 15.6 percent of doctorates received at R1 institutions in the Association of American Universities (AAU) are comprised of these groups.

### Figure 3: Percentage of Domestic U.S. Doctoral Recipients in 2020 who Identified as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or Two-or-More Races

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>IPEDS</th>
<th>AAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAS</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences Total</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in 2021, only 9.6 percent of applicants to FAS tenure-track positions identified as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or two-or-more races. We are significantly underrepresenting the pipeline.

### Figure 4: Percentage of Applicants to FAS Tenure-track Positions in 2021 who Identified as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or Two-or-More Races

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAS</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS Total</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The picture has improved over last year when the percentage of FAS applicants for tenure-track positions was 6.5 percent, but we are still significantly underrepresenting the PhD pipeline. These analyses clearly show that we must do more to engage with the pipeline, attract diverse applicants, and create inclusive pools.

---

4 IPEDS degree completion data does not include the race or ethnicity of nonresident aliens.
Recruiting and retaining traditionally underrepresented faculty is an attainable goal that involves, at its core, what Daryl G. Smith and colleagues have referred to as “interrupting the usual” (2004, p. 153). This involves moving beyond the narrative about the difficulty of hiring underrepresented faculty and approaching recruitment with rigor and creativity. Passivity in the search process increases the likelihood of failure in diversifying the applicant pool. Successful recruitment occurs when we employ a multidimensional approach that goes beyond placing a job advertisement and waiting to see which applicants emerge.

We encourage FAS faculty to revisit some of the best practices summarized in “Building a Deep Candidate Pool, to Identify Outstanding Faculty.” As that document notes, one of the best ways to build a robust pool is to deeply learn fields, their emerging areas, and the outstanding people in those areas on an ongoing basis and well before a search is authorized. Knowing the field well will advantage your search request, and actively building relationships with scholars in non-search years will help when a search actually occurs. Consciously moving beyond your usual networks to scout for talent and to advertise are also some strategies to help build inclusive pools.

To the extent possible, we encourage departments to build strategic partnerships with historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and professional academic organizations geared toward scholars from historically underrepresented groups. Although HBCUs make up 3 percent of America’s higher education institutions, they graduate a disproportionate number of Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, and American Indian or Native Alaskan.

In terms of racial and ethnic diversity, 6 (55 percent) of the 11 offers were made to faculty of color, including 2 offers (18 percent) that were made to candidates who identified as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, and American Indian or Native Alaskan.

For the FAS to make further progress in building a strong, diverse faculty, the FAS asks faculty colleagues to continue to implement best practices at each stage of a search, as noted in such documents as “Recommendations for Ensuring the Integrity of Faculty Searches.”

Distribution of Service Workload

Hiring a more diverse faculty is only one step toward creating a more diverse and inclusive campus. The FAS also needs to ensure that, once faculty are at Harvard, everyone has the opportunity to do their best work, including equal time for research. Achieving this goal can be impeded by unequal distribution of workload. Literature, such as the American Council on Education’s 2021 report, “Equity-Minded Workloads: What We Can and Should Do Now” (https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf), cites trends that can interfere with equity in the academic environment, such as women undertaking more service than men and members of historically minoritized groups doing more mentoring and diversity-related work than white colleagues.

Using Faculty Activity Report (FAR) data from 2020, the Office for Faculty Affairs undertook a first-pass analysis of whether these trends are apparent in the FAS. We note that this is just a first analysis, as FAR is not yet an optimal tool for understanding “invisible labor.”

Preliminary findings:

- Female assistant and associate professors report, on average, serving on more committees than their male colleagues (3.75 vs. 2.53 for assistant professors and 4.22 vs. 2.37 for associate professors), with differences mostly in departmental committees (and University committees for associate professors). These differences are statistically significant.

---


6 According to “Retaining Women Faculty: The Problem of Invisible Labor,” “Invisible labor consists of student-initiated mentorship, in which faculty provide ‘hands-on attention’ to ‘serve as role models, mentors, and even surrogate parents.’” (https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/political-science-and-politics/article/retaining-women-faculty-the-problem-of-invisible-labor/236B88E11BDDDF04FC7F6DEC46C501)
• Female tenured professors report, on average, serving on more committees than their tenured male colleagues (6.7 vs. 5.2), with the differences mostly in departmental, FAS-level, and “other” committees. This difference is statistically significant.

• There is no statistically significant difference in the number of committees chaired by male and female tenured professors.

• In terms of race and ethnicity, we find similar levels of committee service among tenure-track faculty (3.12 for white faculty, 3.18 for Asian faculty, 3.27 for faculty identifying as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or two-or-more races). However, these figures, and those cited in the bullet below, do not take into account forms of “invisible labor” related to mentoring and advising.

• Tenured faculty identifying as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or two-or-more races report, on average, serving on more committees than their counterparts (5.65 for white faculty, 5.00 for Asian faculty, and 6.72 for faculty identifying as Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, American Indian or Native Alaskan, or two-or-more races). These differences are not statistically significant.

As a next step, the FAS plans to convene a faculty committee to update FAR and other tools to better capture invisible labor and analyze whether there are differences in mentoring and advising loads. We also plan to have discussions with all interested faculty about how to create a more even distribution of workload, reward those who are carrying heavier service and teaching loads, and increase transparency around workload issues in general.

Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging: Additional Forms of Support

To further support efforts to diversify the faculty and foster an inclusive environment, the FAS launched several initiatives in AY 2020–2021.

With the conclusion in fall 2020 of Professor Mahzarin Banaji’s remarkable 11-year term as Senior Advisor to the FAS Dean on Faculty Development, FAS Dean Gay reconfigured the Senior Advisor role to consist of a team of three faculty colleagues who visit departments to discuss ideas and best practices related to inclusive hiring, as well as diversity, inclusion, and belonging more broadly. As of November 2020, the inaugural team of Senior Advisors on Faculty Development consists of Scott Edwards, Alexander Agassiz Professor of Zoology in the Museum of Comparative Zoology; Ewa Lajer-Burchardt, William Dorr Boardman Professor of Fine Arts in the Department of History of Art; and Matthew Schwartz, Professor of Physics. Sheree Ohen, Associate Dean for Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging, and Nina Zipser, Dean for Faculty Affairs and Planning, provide informational resources and guidance to the Senior Advisors.

Dean Ohen’s Office of Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging (FAS ODIB) also launched in AY 2020–2021 the Faculty Liaisons for Inclusive Excellence (FLIE). Forty-two liaisons in the three academic divisions serve as departmental representatives who are “committed to advancing sustainable inclusive excellence,” as the FLIE website describes their mission. These liaisons “bring DIB-related departmental matters to the FLIE meetings and work with their respective department(s) to help implement best practices.” According to Dean Ohen, FLIE conducted a survey of faculty and staff in the Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences divisions and identified two foci for its work last year: diversifying the faculty and decolonizing the curriculum and classroom. To initiate conversation around those topics, FAS ODIB shared scholarly articles with the liaisons related to rethinking the syllabus, inclusive hiring practices, inclusive pedagogy, and tenure.

Please also see the “Professional Development Programming” section below for events hosted by OFA and FAS ODIB during AY 2020–2021. These events helped to train faculty on inclusive practices in hiring, leading, and managing.

COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic this past year created the need for additional measures to ensure equity and support faculty members’ experience of inclusion and belonging. In particular, tenure-track faculty and faculty parents of all ranks faced special challenges.

Between spring 2020 and spring 2021, the FAS put in place several measures to address the effects of the pandemic on tenure-track faculty. These measures included:

• Two appointment extensions and postponements of promotion reviews
• One course of teaching relief (for any interested tenure-track faculty who were on the FAS tenure-track during AY 2020–2021 and who teach in departments/areas that have a typical teaching load of two courses or more per year)

• Language that tenure-track faculty could use in their CVs to explain the timing of their promotion review

• New instructions (to both internal Harvard evaluators and to external letter writers), specifying that candidates should not be penalized for any appointment extensions or teaching relief they received due to the pandemic

• An optional term of backstopped research leave.

Faculty requesting a second appointment extension were also invited to discuss in their Faculty Activity Report how COVID-19 had impacted their productivity and personal life.

In December 2020, the FAS conducted a well-being survey to better understand the impact of the pandemic on faculty and researchers. In designing the survey, the FAS benefited from valuable input from the Standing Committee on Women (SCW) and also included questions previously asked of Arts and Humanities faculty in a survey conducted by the Arts and Humanities division.

The survey results were especially illuminating about faculty parents’ experiences. Parents reported serious challenges such as feeling isolated and concerned about their family’s physical, mental, and emotional health and safety. They reported the loss of privacy, cramped quarters, and technological difficulties associated with their children learning at home. They noted the impact these conditions had on their research productivity, the extraordinary effort they put into revising their courses for online learning, the extra effort they made to advise their Harvard students, their Zoom fatigue, and their worries that Harvard may judge their productivity without taking these circumstances into account. They reported concerns about the cost and safety of childcare. And they worried that Harvard didn’t seem to understand or care.

In January 2021, the FAS—working with the University’s Office for Faculty Development and Diversity—offered enhanced childcare support for eligible ladder faculty. This included a second round of scholarship applications for ACCESS-eligible faculty, accelerated reimbursements for the ACCESS scholarship program and for deposits to Harvard’s Campus Child Care Centers (CCC), expansion of CCC hours into Harvard’s March spring break, increased COVID back-up care funds, increased Care.com days, and the reopening of the Research Enabling Grant program after the pandemic.

Professional Development Programming

In AY 2020–2021, the FAS continued to expand its offerings to support the professional development of tenure-track and tenured faculty.

As it does each August, OFA ran two orientations for new faculty. At the New Faculty Institute (NFI), an intensive orientation for tenure-track and senior faculty, speakers addressed teaching, research, the faculty and student body, civility, working with graduate students, and career development. OFA’s “Navigating Harvard” orientation, for new non-ladder faculty, highlighted teaching and advising resources.

To build on the NFI, OFA launched in fall 2020 the Faculty Enrichment Institute (FEI). We envisioned the FEI as a source of career-advancement resources for tenure-track faculty. The FEI offered three programs last fall.

• In October, a “Writing Productivity Workshop” addressed ways to maximize writing productivity. This event was led by Noël Bisson, Associate Dean of Academic Programs in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS), and Suzanne Smith, then-director of GSAS’ Fellowships and Writing Center.

• In November, a “Time Management Panel” offered strategies for managing time effectively. Tenured professors Peter Girguis, David Johnston, Elena Kramer, and Wai-ye Li discussed ways to protect one’s work rhythm, manage meetings and email, outsource efficiency, and the art of saying “no.”

• FEI offered “Writing Accountability Groups,” where participants committed to weekly Zoom sessions with peers to facilitate their writing. To support their work (in particular, to pay for editorial services), participants were invited to draw on an award from the FAS Tenure-Track Publication Fund.
As one aspect of their professional development, tenure-track faculty have said how useful it is to gain experience in publicly presenting their work. The Standing Committee on Women’s mini-symposia, held twice a year and rotating among the divisions and SEAS, have become valuable opportunities for this. In fall 2020, four tenure-track faculty from the Arts and Humanities division presented their work and fielded questions from an audience of fellow faculty, department chairs, and deans. In spring 2021, four tenure-track faculty from the Science division and SEAS did the same.

In AY 2020–2021, OFA continued to offer professional coaching to any interested tenure-track faculty. Several faculty signed up for single sessions with certified coaches. Moving forward, the FAS will also be offering longer-term forms of coaching support.

OFA dedicated two events last year to important issues of diversity, inclusion, and belonging. Both events were led by consultant DeEtta Jones, an expert in equity, diversity, inclusion, and the workplace. In September 2020, OFA hosted a leadership workshop for tenured, tenure-track, and senior non-ladder faculty, called “Inclusive Managers: Knowledge and Practices for Today’s Academy.” This well-received workshop addressed the changing role of managers in an academic environment, including evolving expectations related to equity and inclusion. Based on the positive reception to this event, OFA and the FAS Office for Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging co-sponsored a December 2020 workshop for ladder faculty that focused on best practices for conducting faculty searches, especially with regard to diversity, inclusion, and belonging. Ms. Jones addressed issues such as how to build applicant pools and how to counteract bias during the search process. Resources from the workshop, including “Creating and Using an Equity Lens” and an “Inclusive Onboarding Checklist,” are available on the Faculty Resources website.

As part of its leadership programming, OFA also held its annual orientation for new chairs of the academic departments. This orientation included an overview of the academic year and of the role and responsibilities of chairs, as well as discussion of search and promotion processes, mentoring, professional development, Title IX, and diversity, inclusion, and belonging.

One of our ongoing goals is to provide more professional development for non-ladder faculty. In AY 2020–2021, OFA continued a program in partnership with Stephen Kargère, director of the FAS Office for Postdoctoral Affairs. Together, we hosted a workshop for non-ladder faculty, entitled “The Academic Job Search: Preparing your Academic Materials.” This interactive presentation helped non-ladder faculty to prepare and polish their academic job materials. Dr. Kargère worked with faculty on reviewing their CV, cover letter, and teaching, research, and diversity statements. The OFA will continue to partner with Dr. Kargère on events in AY 2021–2022 and to look for additional programming opportunities for non-ladder faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel Aguirre-Oteiza</th>
<th>Fiery Cushman</th>
<th>Ya-Chieh Hsu</th>
<th>Kang-Kuen Ni</th>
<th>Fernanda Viégas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ariel Amir</td>
<td>Finale Doshi-Velez</td>
<td>Joshua Kertzer</td>
<td>Susanna Rinard</td>
<td>Martin Wattenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anurag Anshu</td>
<td>Nadja Drabon</td>
<td>Katie McLaughlin</td>
<td>Julia Ryder</td>
<td>Kaya Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgane Austern</td>
<td>Sam Gershman</td>
<td>George Paul Meiu</td>
<td>Matthew Saunders</td>
<td>Philip Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania Bruguera</td>
<td>Yannai Gonzazarowski</td>
<td>Tara Menon</td>
<td>Tracy Smith</td>
<td>Robin Wordsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriella Coleman</td>
<td>Gage Hills</td>
<td>Christoph Mikulaschek</td>
<td>Winnie Van Dijk</td>
<td>Minlan Yu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Appointed to tenured professor, with appointments starting in AY 2021-2022
- Internally promoted to tenured professor, with appointments starting in AY 2021-2022
- Appointed to tenure-track positions, with appointments starting in AY 2021-2022
- Appointed to senior lecturer, with appointments starting in AY 2021-2022

At the time of publication
Professors Charles Czeisler and Frank A.J.L. Scheer (not pictured) teach “Sleep” in Sanders Theatre.
Financial Report

As has been the practice for more than a decade, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences has prepared an unaudited set of financial reports for Fiscal Year 2021, which ended on June 30, 2021. The format of this report is unchanged from prior years and incorporates results from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the John A. Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. The report presents operating results in both the Balance Sheet and the Modified Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and Management, or cash, views.

This letter provides both reflections on the annual performance outlined in the financial reports as well as a consideration of the FAS’s financial condition for the longer term. While the financial consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic began to come into view in the final quarter of Fiscal Year 2020, this year’s results provide an opportunity to assess a full year of pandemic-adapted activities. The following narrative captures a more complete view of the financial impact of the pandemic, both in Fiscal Year 2021 and beyond.

Charting a Path through a Pandemic Year

Across the world, colleges and universities confronted the challenges of adapting their teaching and research activities to pandemic conditions for the entirety of Fiscal Year 2021. In the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, an extensive scenario-planning process was launched in the spring of 2020 to develop plans for how best to resume and adapt on-campus operations during and beyond the pandemic, which brought together more than 100 faculty and administrative leaders. The process tackled a range of core topics, from scheduling and enrollment to financial planning and the preparation of residential Houses and facilities. (For more information on the scenario-planning process, see the 2020 FAS Annual Report.)

This planning effort was grounded in a set of guiding principles that Dean Gay articulated at the beginning of the pandemic:

• Put the health and safety of our community and of our society at large as our primary priority.

• Protect the academic enterprise, including maintaining the academic progress of our students and remaining a research-active community to the extent possible, ready to increase research activities as soon as conditions allow.

• Leverage our breadth and diversity.

• Preserve access and affordability without wavering on our leading commitment to financial aid.

With the benefit of the insights generated through that process, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences invited up to 40 percent of undergraduate students to campus in fall 2020 and gradually resumed campus-based research activities. For the spring semester, juniors and seniors were invited to be in residence on campus, as well as international students and those with learning environment needs. Instruction was conducted remotely for all students for the entire academic year.

Execution of this plan required nimbleness, partnership, and ingenuity on the part of each member of the community. Importantly, it also required investment and careful fiscal management. As outlined in last year’s report, it was anticipated that the pandemic year would present significant fiscal challenges, both in terms of revenue and expense. The Fiscal Year 2021 results confirm that revenues would be reduced due to reduced enrollment and expenses would increase for testing, masking, infrastructure investments, costs of de-densification, and supports for members of our community. But, as Dean Gay noted in last year’s report, “our financial response would not be limited to meeting the immediate costs of campus adaptations necessitated by the pandemic or the challenges of short-term lost revenue; instead, we were on a changed trajectory for the long term that we needed to understand better.”
Results in Context

As part of the scenario planning process, a financial working group—chaired by John Campbell, Morton L. and Carole S. Olshan Professor of Economics—was charged with validating the financial impacts of COVID-19, estimating the short-term costs of our campus reopening plans, and looking more broadly at FAS financial sustainability. In November 2020, the FAS Study Group was formed to build on the financial working group’s analysis and observations. Over the academic year, the FSG’s economic budgeting subcommittee further refined new financial frameworks for tackling the difficult tradeoffs embedded in the FAS financial challenge, disentangling one-time and short-term costs from long-term structural considerations. This group generated important insights in how we understand the long-term sustainability of the FAS and new tools to enable strategic decision-making in how resources are deployed to advance our academic mission.

The FSG’s Economic Budgeting subcommittee consisted of the following members:

- Stephen Blyth, Professor of the Practice of Statistics
- John Campbell, Morton L. and Carole S. Olshan Professor of Economics
- Jeremy Stein, Moise Y. Safra Professor of Economics
- Thomas Hollister, Harvard University Chief Financial Officer and Vice President for Finance
- Jay Herlihy, FAS Associate Dean for Finance

The FSG developed a framework for analysis of the long-term sustainability of the FAS that rests on three pillars. First, it focuses on actual cashflows—money received or paid out by FAS—indeed, independent of accounting choices, such as depreciation, that have been part of our annual budgeting process.

Second, the framework compares cashflows occurring at different dates by means of standard net-present-value discounting methodology, which recognizes that a dollar received one year from now is worth less than a dollar today. And the time horizon for the cashflow analysis is indefinite, recognizing that our goal is for permanent sustainability, making it not possible to defer expenditures beyond the analysis horizon.

While the analysis is sensitive to assumptions, the base case model shows that the net present value of the FAS cash flows produced a large negative number, as the amount of money generated from tuition, sponsored activities, and other non-endowment income is smaller than the expenses to run the FAS and its activities.

Finally, this negative number is compared to the market value of the existing endowment to determine financial sustainability. The analysis revealed the present value of our operating obligations still exceeds the value of all of our assets, with the net shortfall being approximately $0.5 billion. One interpretation is that if the FAS portion of the endowment were suddenly made $0.5 billion larger, the FAS would be in structural balance. Thus, even though the endowment is currently very large and benefitted from a large return in Fiscal Year 2021, it is still inadequate to handle the very substantial commitments that the FAS has taken on.

Although it is useful to have a base case to center the discussion of our long-term sustainability, it is the overall dynamic outlined in the model that is most revealing; the specific numbers are at best only imprecise estimates. The analysis also underscored the degree to which the School is dependent upon the endowment and its performance to support its operating budget. For example, if the endowment return for Fiscal Year 2021 were 8 percent less than its final amount, the forecasted shortfall would grow by $1 billion.

---

1 In the baseline analysis, we assume a nominal-dollar discount rate—or equivalently, an expected return on the endowment—of 7 percent. This corresponds to assuming that the endowment will earn an expected return of 5 percent in real terms and that there will be 2 percent inflation. The 5 percent real-return assumption is a traditional one at Harvard (and similarly at many of our peers) and is the basis for endowment payout ratios that have hovered around 5 percent in recent years. However, in the current environment of very low interest rates and elevated asset values, this assumption may be too optimistic.

2 This analysis is sensitive to the assumed discount rate and thus the assumed rate of return in the endowment. The analysis assumes a discount rate of 7 percent, but if one lowers the expected return on the endowment modestly to 6 percent—a figure that members of the FSG think may be more realistic—the present value shortfall grows dramatically, from $0.5 billion to $5.8 billion.
To begin to chart a more sustainable future, it is worth articulating how we got here. How did an institution with as much wealth as the FAS find itself facing what amounts to a potentially worrisome structural deficit? A very brief answer is that in the years preceding the global financial crisis of 2008–2009, the FAS made three key policy choices that represented long-term financial commitments: First, in this inaugural decade of the new century, the FAS constructed or acquired an additional 1.2 million square feet of space, representing an almost 15 percent increase in its existing footprint. Second, over the same period, the FAS headcount grew significantly: the ladder faculty grew by 130 members or 21 percent, and the FAS staff increased by 15 percent. And finally, the third choice that has had a significant influence on our current financial challenges is the groundbreaking enhancements that were made to the undergraduate financial aid program in the years leading up to the financial crisis.

These three policy choices, along with the high costs of undergraduate House Renewal—which would almost certainly have been lower had the FAS addressed the declining state of the residential Houses earlier—more than explain the current structural deficits that we face. This is not to say that these choices were not well-aligned with our academic and teaching mission. Indeed, the enhanced financial aid program represents one of the bedrock commitments of the FAS and one of the most eloquent statements of our values as a community. But these choices have left us with a set of obligations that, absent change on other fronts, threaten to outstrip our current resources.

**Fiscal Year 2021 Summary of Results**

It is through this new lens, the analysis of our long-term financial sustainability, that we understand our Fiscal Year 2021 results. This intensive review indicates that FAS is carrying a structural mismatch between its resources and its offerings and remains highly sensitive to the market value of the endowment. Though news of this year’s excellent endowment results (outlined below) is welcome, the need remains to create greater financial sustainability and flexibility to advance our academic aspirations and maintain broad excellence for the future. With Dean Gay’s leadership, the FAS continues to engage faculty in charting a path forward for academic advancement and excellence for the future.

Fiscal Year 2021 results were better than expected, as compensation and general expenses were reduced and sponsored and philanthropic support grew. The FAS and the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences together were able to generate a GAAP surplus of $51 million or 3.3 percent of its $1.6 billion operating budget, an improvement over the $16 million GAAP deficit the schools incurred in Fiscal Year 2020.

**Figure 1:** Summary of Revenues in Fiscal Year 2021 and Fiscal Year 2020.

**Summary of Revenues**

**Net Tuition Revenue**

Much like other higher education institutions, FAS’s sources of revenue were impacted by the pandemic. This was felt most acutely in net tuition, where revenue dropped by $67 million or 22 percent in Fiscal Year 2021. Most of this impact was felt in the undergraduate population, reflecting declining enrollments and a continuing commitment to the institution’s financial aid policies. In addition to financial aid, FAS provided support that is not reflected in the financial statement. FAS has provided housing to those students who were not able to advance their studies in an off-campus environment. FAS also provided the option for fully enrolled students not invited to campus to take two Summer School courses free of charge. Offsetting these declines, net revenue from executive education grew by $12 million in Fiscal Year 2021, reflecting the nimbleness that
the Division of Continuing Education had in transitioning
to a remote learning environment.

Philanthropic Support
FAS was fortunate to be able to address this shortfall with
philanthropic support and sponsored research activity.
Philanthropic support, more than one half of the School’s
$1.6 billion operating budget, is composed of distributions
from the endowment and current-use giving. In Fiscal
Year 2021, FAS achieved its third-best year in its history for
fundraising and cash, at $595.7 million in total commit-
ments. It achieved its second-best year ever for flexible,
current-use fundraising at $57.7 million, and the best
year ever for flexible, current-use cash at $50.5 million.
This form of giving was unrestricted, allowing the Dean
the flexibility to meet the emerging needs of the pan-
demic. Overall in Fiscal Year 2021, support received from
donors increased $33.8 million or 3.6 percent. Most of the
year-over-year increase was due to engaged fundraising
efforts that yielded a $21.7 million or 20 percent increase
in current-use giving.

Sponsored Support
Following up on the guidance from the scenario-planning
group, research began to return to the campus at the begin-
ing of this fiscal year. Researchers were able to adapt to
the new protocols and environment to continue to produce
cutting-edge scholarship. As a result, sponsored revenues
 grew in Fiscal Year 2021 from $236.6 million to $248.8 mil-
lion, an increase of $12.2 million or 5 percent.

Summary of Expenses
Compensation
As people provide the instruction and conduct the research
that is the backbone of our mission, it is not surprising that
compensation typically represents one half of the School’s
operating budget. In Fiscal Year 2021, compensation costs
fell $9.7 million or 1.6 percent from Fiscal Year 2020 levels.
FAS-wide, we delayed some faculty searches, paused or
eliminated staff searches, and offered staff a Voluntary
Early Retirement Incentive Program, a set of actions that
resulted in reduced FTE counts for both faculty and staff
compared to Fiscal Year 2020 and created most of the real-
ized savings. Understanding that we faced the pandemic
together as a community, Harvard committed to support
our employees, did not pursue any staff layoffs, and contin-
ued to pay idled workers throughout the pandemic.

Non-Personnel Expenses
Compared to a pre-pandemic year, non-personnel ex-
penses showed the most change as required by the need
to respond to the pandemic safely and thoughtfully. Fiscal
discipline and adherence to the guidance of reducing
expenditures to those that are both strategic and essential
produced $39 million or 4.9 percent in savings over the
prior year levels. These savings were realized even as new
expenses were introduced to ensure a safe environment for
instruction and research. FAS invested $23 million in iPads,
remote hotspots, on-campus physical infrastructure, and
testing and tracing of COVID-19 cases.

Balance Sheet
The size of the endowment of the FAS and SEAS dominates
their financial statements. As mentioned above, distrib-
utions from the endowment provide more than one half
of the operating revenues for the schools. Of these distrib-
utions, more than two-thirds of the endowed funds are
restricted by the donors as to their use to support instruc-
tion and research. The market value of the endowment
represents more than 83 percent of the School’s total net
assets.

During Fiscal Year 2021, the Harvard Management Compa-
y (HMC) had a strong year and provided a 33.6 percent re-
turn on investments. This return, coupled with new gifts to
the endowment, enabled the School’s endowment to grow
to $23 billion. Although encouraging, the FAS is cognizant
of the volatility of the market and intends to use future
distributions to advance institutional priorities, with an
emphasis on long-term sustainability.