

**TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
FORTY-FOURTH SENATE REPORT No. 2**

**Summary of Actions Taken by the Senate
October 27, 2011**

1. *By a unanimous voice vote, the Senate passed the recommendation from the Committee for Graduate Studies for the adoption of the revised language, as detailed in Item number III in Senate document number 6535, for Doctoral Reading and Orals Committees, effective September 1, 2011 without limit of time.*

“For the Dissertation Reading Committees, the changes include:

- *Committees will be at least three but no more than five members, all of whom must sign off on the dissertation (the signing-off requirement remains the same as before).*
- *Emeritus Faculty are now counted as the same as current Academic Council faculty, rather than as non-Academic Council members.*
- *An exception to the policy that a co-advisor who is an Academic Council member must be appointed if the principal dissertation advisor is an emeritus member of the Academic Council has been added. A co-adviser is not required during the first two years following retirement for emeritus Academic Council members who are recalled to active service.*
- *Non-Academic Council readers can be appointed to the Reading Committee if they hold a PhD (this allows efficient use of affiliated and consulting faculty who possess expertise in the dissertation field as well as representatives from industry or other university faculties), as long as the majority of Committee members are Academic Council faculty.*

For the Orals Committees:

- *Emeritus members of the Academic Council may serve on Oral Exam Committees, and are not considered “non-Academic Council members.”*
- *The numbers of non-Academic Council members allowed was also made specific for committees larger than four examiners (“one of four or five examiners or two of six or seven examiners”).”*

Rex L. Jamison, MD
Academic Secretary to the University
Professor of Medicine, Emeritus

**MINUTES OF THE FORTY-FOURTH SENATE
OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
October 27, 2011**

I. Call to Order

The Chair of the 44th Senate, Rosemary Knight, called the second meeting of the 44th Senate to order at 3:20 PM. In attendance were 31 members and 6 *ex officio* members and many guests.

II. Approval of Minutes – (SenD#6533)

The minutes of the October 13, 2011, meeting of Senate XLIII were approved.

III. Action Calendar: There were no items on the Action Calendar.

IV. Standing Reports

A. Memorial Resolutions:

1. Chair Knight invited Juliana Barr, Associate Professor of Anesthesia at the Palo Alto Veterans Affairs Health Care System, to present the memorial resolution for Eran Geller, Professor of Anesthesia, Emeritus. Ronald Pearl, Professor and Chair of the Department of Anesthesia, was in attendance.

Eran Geller (1937-2009) SenD#6537



Eran Geller, Professor Emeritus of Anesthesia, and, by courtesy of Surgery, died on May 11, 2009 at the age of 71. Dr. Geller joined the Stanford Anesthesia Department in 1993, and retired in 2008.

Dr. Geller was a world-renowned clinician, educator, and investigator. In 1993, he was recruited to Stanford and the Veterans Administration Palo Alto Health Care System from his position as Chair of Anesthesiology and Critical Care at Tel-Aviv Medical Center, in order to create a multidisciplinary Intensive Care Unit service at the VA. He served as the ICU Medical Director until his illness with pancreatic cancer forced him to step down in 2007. With his passion and commitment to critical care medicine, Eran was a visionary leader in critical care and was responsible for adoption of many technologies, which are now considered the standard of practice in critical care medicine. These included the use of state-of-the-art patient ventilators, bedside monitoring systems, electronic medical record and bar code medication administration systems, and wireless laptops for use by clinicians. He was one of the chief architects of an ICU Data Warehouse, a central repository for clinical data captured electronically on all ICU patients throughout our VA Region, and now the largest such database in the United States. This powerful database allows clinicians to determine relationships between clinical events and patient outcomes in the ICU. Under the leadership of Dr. Geller, the ICU Service at the VA Palo Alto Medical Center is now the top performing VA ICU in the nation. Eran was also a

devoted teacher, and helped mentor and train over 60 critical care fellows and junior faculty who will carry on his legacy in critical care.

Madam Chair, I have the honor, on behalf of a committee consisting of Ronald Pearl, Edward Bertaccini, and myself, Juli Barr, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a resolution in the memory of the late Eran Geller, Professor of Anesthesia, Emeritus, in the School of Medicine.

At Chair Knight's invitation, everyone stood for a moment of silence in tribute.

Chair Knight thanked Professors Barr, Pearl and Bertaccini.

2. Chair Knight invited John Roberts, the John H. Scully Professor of Economics, Strategic Management, & International Business, to present the memorial resolution for Gerald Meier, *Konosuke Matsushita Professor in the Graduate School of Business, Emeritus.*

Gerald Meier (1923-2011) SenD#6538



Gerald "Jerry" Meier, the Konosuke Matshushita Professor of International Economics and Policy Analysis, Emeritus, at the Stanford University Graduate School of Business, was one of the leading development economists of the past 50 years. He died in his home at Stanford on June 21, 2011, at age 88.

Born in Tacoma, Washington, in 1923, Meier graduated from Reed College, studied economics at Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar and received a PhD in that field from Harvard in 1953. In 1954 he married Gretl Slote who survives him along with their four sons.

Meier taught at Oxford, Williams, Wesleyan and Yale before coming to Stanford in 1964, making him possibly the first development economist appointed to a business school faculty. He was a prolific author of more than 30 books, including a path-breaking text that has gone through eight editions and translation into seven languages. His teaching of international economics and development economics, which continued until 2005, long after his formal retirement, inspired generations of students. Meanwhile, the arguments he made years ago in favor of export-oriented, trade- and business-friendly growth and development strategies, which were completely contrary to the conventional wisdom and prevailing practice in economic development, have proven right, first in the "Four Little Dragons" of east Asia and now in India and China.

Known for his good humor, his love of travel and his ever-glorious tan, Jerry Meier was a dedicated scholar and teacher who was constantly motivated by a desire to improve the lot of the world's poorest inhabitants and who imparted that to his students.

Madam Chair, on behalf of a committee consisting of David Kreps, Henry Rowen and myself, I am honored to lay before the Senate this resolution in memory of the late Gerald M. Meier, Konosuke Matshushita Professor of International Economics and Policy Analysis, Emeritus, in the Graduate School of Business.

At Chair Knight's invitation, everyone stood for a moment of silence in tribute.

Chair Knight thanked Professors Roberts, Kreps and Rowen.

B. Steering Committee

Chair Knight gave the report of the StC.

1. The StC is working on agenda items for Fall, Winter and Spring Senate meetings, both Regular and Executive Sessions.
2. A few senators filled out the "yellow sheets" suggesting some interesting agenda topics. The Steering Committee will use that information to plan future Senate agenda. In case you have thought of a topic or an issue that you would like to hear more about, the "yellow sheets" are at your seats again today.
3. At the bottom of today's agenda, under "Forthcoming Senate Agenda," you will see that on --"

November 10: In regular session, the Senate will hear two reports: Patricia Gumport, Vice Provost for Graduate Education, will present her annual report, deferred from Spring Quarter, and Julie Lythcott-Haims, Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of Freshmen, will present a report on Undergraduate Advising.

December 2nd: This will be the final Fall Quarter meeting and will be held in Executive Session. These sessions are attended by voting and *ex officio* Senate members only.

Prior to the executive session, the StC will meet on behalf of the Senate in Administrative Session to receive several items that do not require the full Senate's attention. [All senators are welcome to attend; the meeting is in this room at 2:15 p.m.]

The first Winter Quarter meeting is scheduled for --

January 26th, 2012: At this meeting we will hear the final report and recommendations from the co-chairs of the Task Force on the Study of Undergraduate at Stanford (SUES). This will be an opportunity for the Senate to provide input on the various recommendations that will be reviewed by the Academic Council Committee on Undergraduate Standards and Policy (C-USP).

Following review and any revisions, C-USP will bring the recommendations to the Senate for its approval.

There will probably be other items that require a Senate vote, as well as those that won't require a vote, but that Senate will want to discuss. Thus the agendas of several future Senate meetings in 2012 will contain recommendations from SUES.

C. Committee on Committees (CoC)

There was no report from the CoC.

D. President and Provost

Both the President and the Provost were away.

V. Other Reports

A. Residential Education

Chair Knight welcomed Deborah Golder, Associate Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Director of Residential Education to give the report on Residential Education (ResEd). Greg Boardman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs, and several others were in attendance.

With the aid of slides, Dean Golder began her presentation.

“My name is Deborah Golder and I am the Dean of Residential Education, which is a department within the division of Student Affairs. We work with the undergraduate students who live on campus (and actually, those who don't as well--Students in Washington, students overseas, and students in crises).

“ResEd oversees the people and programs, formal and informal, in the dorms. We don't do assignments, food, shelter, bricks and mortar; we work with everything ‘inside’: students, student staff, Resident Fellows, professional staff and partners who work in residences.

“Almost every Stanford undergraduate lives on campus for all four years, which is virtually unique among U.S. universities. This gives us a tremendous opportunity--and responsibility--to take full advantage of our time with them in residence. The President and Provost saw this potential, and when I came to Stanford almost 3 years ago, it was with a clear directive to raise the quality of the residential out-of-classroom experience to that of the in-class experience.”

Origins of Residential Education (ResEd) at Stanford.

From the founding of the university, a residential campus was considered desirable “...although, at the time, there actually wasn't anywhere else to live, so the calling might not be as profound as we might like to think.”

[Laughter]

“This affords us a great venue to access and engage our students. We believe there is no better way outside the classroom to capture the entirety of the student body.”

Dean Golder made that point that the residence is where students can practice responsible citizenship,

- To learn what it means to be a member of community
- To learn about themselves and others – where sometimes the simplest of exchanges can be transformative.

“We need to create opportunities where they can explore life and leadership skills, and interpersonal and intellectual development. Students need to work on their interpersonal skills; now, instead of face-to-face encounters, many of them employ ‘texting to start and end relationships.’”

“When ResEd was launched in the early 70’s in its most recent iteration, it was clear that its charge was to make a large research institution feel like a small liberal arts college. At the center was undergraduate exploration and education. This is a core value we are trying to re-invigorate.

“We work with students through crises and connect them to university resources, but a lot of what we do is less tangible – like creating an environment. Our students are creative; what we need to do is to provide space for them and get out of their way. The 2 AM conversation in the hallway may change their world view.

“The dorms are where this can happen. I think of the residences as a laboratory – a place to experiment, to practice, to explore; a place to prepare students to engage in the complexities that society faces.”

Revitalization of ResEd

The infographic is set against a dark grey background with a red header bar. It is divided into two main sections by a horizontal red line. The top section is titled 'To be known' in a white box. The bottom section is titled 'To choose, engage & learn' in a white box. The text is white and lists various statistics and goals related to residence halls.

To be known	78 Undergraduate residences
	75% of houses have <100 residents
	2/3 of undergraduates live in RF houses 1/3 live in student-led houses
To choose, engage & learn	4 Ethnic Theme Houses
	7 Academic & Language Theme Houses (3 new last year!)
	3 Focus Houses (e.g. Public Service)
	Structured Liberal Education Freshman/ Sophomore College
	9 Housed Fraternities & Sororities (29 orgs total)

“There are some great ‘bones’ to this old house – which create a foundation for program development.

1. Numerous houses. “We have 78 houses; other schools have 10-12 houses. The average house has 100 students, compared to the 400 or so at our fellow institutions. Two-thirds of our undergrads live in dorms with Residential Fellows (RFs), the rest are student led and managed.

“The RFs [consist of] faculty, instructors and senior staff who lead the life in a dorm.

These factors facilitate connections at the most local and every day level.

2. The great diversity and variety of housing options and programs allow for choice. A student can live in--
 - Ethnic theme houses
 - Academic & Language houses theme houses
 - Focus houses
 - Structured Liberal Education houses
FroSoCo (Freshman Sophomore College)
 - Fraternities or Sororities”

Dean Golder noted that when she arrived three years ago, the ResEd program had stalled. “We did not have a clear, shared sense of purpose of what we had to offer students. We are currently [in the second year] of a 3-year proposal to significantly shift our program.

“In the past two years we examined our systems, structure and processes. We’ve been working to fix long-standing problems. We are pushing the program to be dynamic; since the community is dynamic, we should be as well--to match the pace, personality and needs of our ever-changing student population.”

Three priorities of ResEd

- Systems and structure. “In order to make sustainable change, we needed to build infrastructure. We need this foundation, because we are building an unprecedented model for student engagement and learning in community.

“We have reviewed and rewritten every job description. We have been working to get the right people on the right seats on the bus. At present, 50% of the professional staff are new to their roles.

“We are working to build a stronger organization, where loyalty and morale are strengthened. We have effective partnerships across the institution and there is a culture of accountability, consistency, creativity.

“We have a strong business plan in place. We are bringing ‘...administrative and financial operations into alignment with university policies.’

- Play—whimsy and fun. “This may seem contradictory, but it is critically important: I also believe we need a lack of program. It is linked to – this notion of play, fun and whimsy.”

- Learning and development
Three areas of focus:

1. Crisis response. “In the decade prior to my arrival, we shifted away from programmatic/educational efforts to focusing on troubling and troublesome students. When this shift occurred, we were ahead of the industry. This is critically important, but we had limited ourselves by focusing on it to the exclusion of all other areas.

“We work with students who are at risk, in crisis, in difficulty. We see students with medical, alcohol, psychological, behavioral, and academic problems. We are working to develop systems that enable us not only to react well but also to react sooner and with greater effectiveness and consistency.

“One of those tools is Case Management Database. This enables us to follow trends and patterns in the aggregate.”

2. Expansion of the Arts.

Learning & Development:
Expansion of the Arts

Come home to the Arts!

RA Training 2011



Steve Bailey
Renowned bassist

Victor Wooten
Grammy Winner

Rod Taylor
Resident Fellow

“There is a long history of the fine arts in the Stanford community. We see great value in plugging into this. Arts in method and content enhances student learning and promotes mental health and wellbeing, creativity, self-awareness, and expression.”

Dean Golder gave an example of this expansion.

“We worked with the offices of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE), the Residential and Dining Enterprise (R&DE), and the Stanford Institute for Creativity and the Arts (SiCA) to create and expand spaces for the arts in the residences for ‘pianos, pottery, and performance.’ R&DE added lights and stage set ups to dining halls as performance space for after hours (or during dining).

“Returning Residential Assistants (RAs) found they were going to be in a performance, ‘The Space that Love Demands,’ which is about relationships and love. They had no preparation and no experience – and created a production that was amazing!

“Artists, led by RF Rod Taylor, Steve Bailey, Grammy & Author Victor Wooten and others – led a group of 1700 students, teaching about learning through community.”

3. Faculty Engagement.

“The cornerstone of these efforts is the RF program. While it is easy to focus on all that the faculty bring to our students in residence, interviews with Don Kennedy indicated that he thought faculty had much to learn from students as well. That was why he wanted them to live in the dorms.

- Our RFs say their teaching is better – as they have learned to understand students.
- --They really had no idea what a student experienced when they left their classroom.
- --They also say they feel more a part of Stanford, whether the ease of attending a program on campus, or just being a part of the broader community.”

Dean Golder encouraged faculty to participate in ResEd.

“Whether serving on an advisory board, or coming to a dinner, we invite you to participate an hour a month or a year. At these sessions we encourage faculty to talk about their lives, or their hobbies.”

Bridging the academic and undergraduate residential experience

“1. We have been actively participating in the Study of Undergraduate Education at Stanford (SUES) process directly through the residential and co-curricular learning sub-committee, in which I served. It is ideal timing for us that undergraduate education is under review. We are now better equipped to join these conversations and to be responsive to the SUES recommendations.

“2. We created a ResEd Cabinet consisting of VPUE Harry Elam, Vice Provost for Student Affairs (VPSA) Greg Boardman, University Manager Shirley Everett and myself—Bringing ResEd together with VPUE, Student Affairs, and R&DE.

“As the university explores and defines priorities for undergraduate education, this group is engaged in:

- Increasing of academic spaces in the residences, like seminar rooms and study space
- Increasing the status of the Resident Fellow role
- Un-crowding the houses
- Creating more residential space for undergrads
- Integrating technology operationally and programmatically
- Creating integrated learning environments (expanding Structured Liberal Education, SLE)

“3. We also have a Res Ed Task Force, charged by VPUE Harry Elam and myself and chaired by Nadeem Hussain, Associate Professor of Philosophy, to think about creating a college model for upper class students.

“4. In the coming year we will be exploring how to bring intellectual life into the dorms more comprehensively and how the notions of liberal education can manifest residentially.

Summary

“We are building a new culture in ResEd and experimenting. Our residences afford us the opportunity to know students, to build meaningful relationships as a foundation for learning.

“We find great power in this [opportunity]. We are trying to harness it by combining the very best of the academy with all we know about student development to truly engage the whole student. We are working to have every undergraduate residence be a dynamic place where students live, play and learn in community.”

“Thank you.”

[Applause]

Chair Knight invited VPSA Greg Boardman to comment:

He responded, “In the 2½ years she has been at Stanford, Deborah has done a wonderful job. She has focused first on the infrastructure. She appreciates those faculty who are RF’s. Faculty can be involved in other ways. ResEd is the cornerstone of our Stanford education, since 97% of our students live in residences on campus. It is critical that it be first class.”

Chair Knight invited James Campbell, Co-Chair of SUES to comment.

Professor Campbell observed, “Stanford’s commitment to house our students all four years makes Stanford unique, but this has had the disadvantage of taking away space for students to meet in groups to have discussions. Do you have a comment?”

Dean Golder replied, “The Stanford Master Plan solved 70% of the [space limitation], but we still have a ways to go. We have been trying to unclog space so that we have elbow room for students to mix among themselves, have discussions and play.”

Professor Carolyn Lougee Chappell commented to Dean Golder, “As someone who has tried for years to bridge academic and residential [experiences] with great difficulty, I think that you and your colleagues have been more responsive to a partnership with the academic values of the university than any group I have seen over the years.”

Chair Knight congratulated Dean Golder and her staff for their efforts.

[Applause]

B. Committee on Graduate Studies: Annual Report 2010/11 SenD#6534

Chair Knight welcomed Professor Richard Roberts, who is serving his third year as chair of the Committee on Graduate Studies, to present highlights from the 2010-11 annual C-GS Report. Several members of C-GS were in attendance.

Professor Roberts introduced his report by stating, “This is an active and feisty committee composed of a truly dedicated faculty and graduate student and a cadre of staff very familiar with the graduate studies throughout the university. It’s good that it is feisty because otherwise it can sometimes be boring.”

[Laughter]

“C-GS also works closely with the office of VPGE.”

Professor Roberts, noted that the C-GS had had a busy year and cited a few highlights from the C-GS report.

“We recommended approval of two joint degrees with the Law School, one with the Graduate School of Business [JD-MBA] and one with the School of Medicine [JD-MD]. The Law School has made a major effort to integrate itself with the university and the joint degrees it has established have been a major service to the students.

“C-GS recommended approval of a new graduate degree in new IDP Stem Cell Biology and Regenerative Medicine.

“It is C-GS practice to review carefully proposals for both new IDP’s and existing ones with an eye to improving programs, sharpening the rigor of the core curriculum and encouraging the best practice in student advising. With that in mind, C-GS recommended approval of nine existing IDP’s for varying periods.

“We recommended renewal of degree-nominating authority for the Interdisciplinary Master of Liberal Arts Program for a period of two years because it was in the midst of a major reassessment of its curriculum.

“We recommended renewal of the degree-nominating authority for the MA degree program in the Interdisciplinary Program in Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies (MA) for a period of three years with encouragement to strengthen the rigor of its programs.

“C-GS thought the remainder of the programs were sufficiently robust to warrant approval for five years.”

That concluded Professor Roberts’ presentation.

Professor Stephen Stedman commented, “The Master of Liberal Arts has been a very successful long standing program. Despite this they have decided they want to overhaul their curriculum. Yet the approval by C-GS is for only 2 years, which puts a lot of pressure on an IDP [because soon after it begins it has to apply for approval again], suggests C-GS does not have confidence in this program, despite its long track record of success.”

Chair Roberts replied, “It has been a very successful program. The MLA does a lot of reaching out in the community to unconventional students. Many of them are teachers. But the curriculum had not changed in 20 years. Given the changes in the complex world, we wanted to know more about the curriculum. We wanted to see what the new courses looked like. Their courses in the past had a very tight link to courses in Western civilization.

“But we also would like to put into place an *expedited review* for cases just like this one. Such a review will focus on core curriculum rather than administrative issues. We are working on it this year in coordination with C-RUM, on what should be considered the corpus of these reviews.

“We also wish to limit the review to 8,500 words that would provide keen, critical insight on the courses.”

There were no other questions.

Chair Knight thanked Professor Roberts for the annual report by C-GS.

C. Committee on Graduate Studies: Recommendation on Orals and Dissertation Committee Membership SenD#6535

Chair Knight commented, “The Committee on Graduate Studies is recommending Senate approval for revision of the current policy on the Membership on University Oral Examination and Doctoral Dissertation committees, effective September 1, 2011.

A Senate vote is required on the revised policy. [The motion in its entirety is presented at the end of this section.]

Professor Roberts, began by stating the he wished first, “to give a bit of history, because after all that’s my disciplinary orientation.”

[Laughter]

“It was difficult to determine when the composition of these committees was decided. We know there have been no changes since 1995. Since then there have been changes in the nature of scholarship and, in particular, the place of scholars in the wider world. Many Stanford doctoral students have become interested in the applied sciences and the broadest concept of what that means. They have become interested in having scholar-practitioners on their committees who can advise them on their knowledge and the application of their knowledge. Finally, [another factor is that] we have changed our ideas about faculty retirement--how emeritus faculty can—and should—remain part of our intellectual community.

“With these changes in mind, C-GS has proposed the following modest changes in the university orals and dissertations committees. Let me summarize them. For more details see the document distributed to you.

“1) Emeritus Faculty are to be allowed to serve on both dissertation and orals committees and are to be counted the same way as Academic Council members. This is in recognition of their continuing and vital engagement in scholarship.

“2) C-GS recognizes that at the time of their retirement, many faculty have robust research activities and robust labs involving graduate students. We have recommended that newly retired faculty who have been recalled to active duty can continue to serve as the student’s primary supervisor for two years without having a co-advisor. Beyond two years, a co-advisor is warranted in order to provide guidance and representation of graduate students within the department, once the supervisor no longer participates in departmental affairs. Some emeriti faculty may wish to continue on committees—I can’t see that—

[Laughter]

“But this is a way to provide room for the primary supervisor to continue in that role but not to the point that the student might be put in jeopardy.

“3) We have provided room for students to adjust the readers and examiners on these committees to include more representation of non-Academic Council faculty. While we consider the usual number of members to be three, we have increased the number to as many as five to allow scholar practitioners to be appointed to a committee, as long as they have a PhD and as long as the majority of the committee are Academic Council members. However, the student must understand that every member of the committee must sign off on the approval that the student has passed the examination.

“4) We have provided for an increase in the number examiners on the Orals committees from a typical number of five to as many as seven or eight. One of a committee of five or two of a committee of seven or eight may be non Academic Council, as long as they have the approval of the chair of the department or of the IDP.”

Since providing this report we have received several comments.

“Professor Iain Johnstone recommended the following change in the third paragraph under University Oral Examination to which we have agreed: [Begins on the third sentence from the bottom of the page]:

“The majority of the examiners must be current or emeritus Academic Council members; more specifically, one of four or five examiners or two of six or seven examiners may be appointed to the Oral Examination Committee by means of this petition.”

“Professor Pat Jones is concerned that this document apparently excludes IDPs. It is the intention of the C-GS that this document not exclude IDPs.

“Professor Jones’ other comment deals with the affiliation of the department of the chair of the committee. This is not an issue directly addressed by this document but it is an issue that C-GS will take up this year to clarify what it means. We now have a robust good practices which is covered in the Graduate Academic Policies (GAP), Sections 1.3 and 1.4. But C-GS will consider this further this coming year.

That ended Professor Roberts’ presentation.

Chair Knight asked that the discussion focus on the recommendations.

Professor Sheri Sheppard noted, “Currently in the Department of Engineering, we have three readers, one of which can be, for example, from NASA. Does this mean the committee will have to increase its membership to five?”

Professor Roberts, “No, the number of members on a typical committee remains three. But the non-Academic Council person has to have the approval of the chair of the department.”

Professor Stedman asked, “Is there any process for waiving the requirement that the non-Academic Council person has to have a PhD? Some very renown, scholarly people don’t have a PhD degree. For example, would you prevent Bill Gates from being appointed to a committee?”

Professor Roberts replied, “It’s my sense that you would keep Bill Gates off the committee. It’s part of our process to have people of a higher rank evaluating the student. An exception could always be requested.”

Professor Stedman rejoined, “But it should be about expertise, not just rank.”

Professor Roberts pointed out, “There is no reason the student can’t have informal, unofficial advisors.”

VPGE Patti Gumpert weighed in: “Our office receives a few requests each year for exceptions. Our office is available to advise on these matters.”

Professor Roberts added, “C-GS established a process where requests for exceptions go—not to C-GS—but to a committee composed of VPGE Gumpert and the Registrar [Tom Black].”

Professor Lougee commented, “There are two categories of faculty—emeriti and emeriti recalled to active duty. Does this mean that emeriti not recalled to active duty can do anything but be solo chairs?”

Professor Roberts nodded, “That’s correct.”

Professor Lougee, “Could you elaborate on the meaning of ‘active duty’? In my experience, that means to teach courses. So I’m wondering about that as a requirement to continue as a chair of a dissertation committee.”

Professor Roberts responded, “Let me first make clear--there is nothing wrong with having co-advisers. Having co-advisers is a particularly good idea when the committee chair is emeritus. The meaning of being recalled to active duty everywhere in the university is not quite clear. But there was some confusion about who could serve as a supervisor, so we wanted to make things clearer for both the sake of the faculty and of the grad student.”

Professor Caroline Hoxby had another perspective: “We have been focused on positive issues, as in the case of the student who is very able and wants to tap some outside people to be his or her adviser. But there are students at the opposite end of the spectrum, for whom the committee serves as a ‘disciplinary threshold’, to insure that the candidate is truly deserving. I don’t have a big concern about a student who might ‘shop’ for a person who would be less demanding but it is possible. I hope that the department would be very careful to insure that does not happen.”

Professor Roberts, “That is a very good point. I would think that the chair of the department would want to have approval of the chair of the committee of an outside adviser. By having the committees consist of a majority of Academic Council members, I think that would serve as a guard against that happening.”

Chair Knight, seeing that the discussion had concluded, called for the Vote.

“This item comes moved and seconded by the Committee on Graduate Studies.”

The Academic Secretary read the motion in full:

“The current language from *the Stanford Bulletin* is Part II of this recommendation. Part III is the new language recommended by C-GS (approved at its meetings of April 27, 2011 and October 19, 2011).

“For the Dissertation Reading Committees, the changes include:

- *Committees will be at least three but no more than five members, all of whom must sign off on the dissertation (the signing-off requirement remains the same as before).*
- *Emeritus Faculty are now counted as the same as current Academic Council faculty, rather than as non-Academic Council members.*
- *An exception to the policy that a co-advisor who is an Academic Council member must be appointed if the principal dissertation advisor is an emeritus member of the Academic Council has been added. A co-adviser is not required during the first two years following retirement for emeritus Academic Council members who are recalled to active service.*
- *Non-Academic Council readers can be appointed to the Reading Committee if they hold a PhD (this allows efficient use of affiliated and consulting faculty who possess expertise in the dissertation field as well as representatives from industry or other university faculties), as long as the majority of Committee members are Academic Council faculty.*

For the Orals Committees:

- *Emeritus members of the Academic Council may serve on Oral Exam Committees, and are not considered “non-Academic Council members.”*
- *The number/s of non-Academic Council members allowed was also made specific for committees larger than four examiners (“one of four or five examiners or two of six or seven examiners”).”*

The motion carried by unanimous voice vote without abstentions.

VI. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

VII. New Business

There was no new business.

VIII. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed unanimously. The Senate adjourned the meeting at 4:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Rex L. Jamison, MD
Academic Secretary to the University