

**TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
THIRTY-FIRST SENATE REPORT No. 7**

**Summary of Actions Taken by the Senate
March 4, 1999**

At its meeting of Thursday, March 4, 1999, the Senate of the Academic Council heard reports but took no actions.

**MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-FIRST SENATE
OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

March 4, 1999

Call to Order

Chair Brad Efron called the Senate to order at 3:20 p.m. There were 40 voting members, 14 *ex-officio* members, and several guests in attendance. Efron welcomed back to Senate Professor Rob Polhemus (English), “a wily veteran,” replacing Professor Debra Satz for the remainder of the year.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February 4, 1999 meeting of Senate XXXI of the Academic Council (SenD#4906) were approved. The Academic Secretary indicated that Professor Traugott had asked for a change in the title of the table attached to her Individual Opinion statement, to reflect distribution of “Courses Taught” not of “Lecturers.”

Memorial Resolutions

The Chair introduced Professor Barton Lane to present a memorial statement in honor of **Norman Blank**, on behalf of a committee consisting of himself and Professors Herbert L. Abrams, Henry H. Jones, Gary M. Glazer, and Leslie M. Zatz. [The full text of the resolution was provided in Senate packets and will be published in the *Stanford Report*.] Members of the Senate stood for the traditional moment of silence.

Dr. Norman Blank, Professor Emeritus of Radiology in the School of Medicine, died at his home August 28, 1998 at the age of 73. Dr. Blank had received his M.D. degree from Western Reserve University in 1952 and was among the first of the radiologists to join the new Medical School in Palo Alto as an Assistant Professor in 1962. He served the remainder of his distinguished career in the Department of Radiology at Stanford, becoming full professor in 1973 and Professor Emeritus, active, in 1988. Dr. Blank was a legendary thoracic radiologist and among the most honored and respected teachers in the School of Medicine. He won teaching awards no less than 11 times. He was also Director of Medical School admissions from 1986 until 1998, the year of his death. He will be fondly remembered for his outstanding clinical skills and contributions to generations of medical students and radiology residents.

Efron next introduced Professor Larry Mathers to present a memorial statement in honor of **Kao Liang Chow**, on behalf of a committee consisting of Professors Philip Schwartzkroin, David Prince, William Mobley, and himself. Efron also welcomed Mrs. Margaret Chow and members of the family. [The full text of the memorial resolution was mailed in Senate packets and will be published in the *Stanford Report*.] The Senate recognized their colleague by standing for a moment of silence.

Kao Liang Chow, Professor of Neurology and Neurological Sciences, died on August 29, 1998 at the age of 80. Known affectionately as Chow to his students and colleagues, he led the scientific explosion in the neurosciences in the latter half of this century. He was a pioneer in bringing together behavioral sciences and human anatomy in the continuing effort to understand the workings of the human nervous system. He brought great distinction to the School of Medicine and proved the validity of the belief that scientists can blend the very best of academic scholarship with the training of future generations of scientifically sophisticated physicians. He had genuine concern for humanity. Much of his family remained in China from the 1940s onward and he stayed close through very private contact with his family throughout that time. Later when relations between the U. S. and China warmed in the late 1970s, Chow was among the very first distinguished Americans to visit China. He remained an active member of the Departments of Neurology and Neurological Sciences until shortly before his death.

Report from the Senate Steering Committee

The Chair reminded everyone that elections were under way for the next year's Senate and for two Advisory Board groups, urging all faculty members to vote before the March 18 deadline. "You even get to vote often, the way we run the elections," he joked. Warning that Senate would be busy in Spring Quarter, he drew attention to upcoming agenda items including, on April 1, an Area One implementation progress report and proposals for undergraduate and graduate degrees from the two new departments of Anthropology; on April 15, recommendations from the President's Task Force on faculty grievance policy and a report from the Stanford Learning Lab; on April 29, a broad discussion of junior faculty issues, stimulated by Senators' suggestions on the "yellow sheets" at the start of the year; and the Spring Quarter informal executive session set for May 13.

Report from the Committee on Committees

CoC Chair Thomas advised that his committee had completed the roster of 1999/2000 nominations for each of the seven Academic Council committees and had started working on nominations for University committees, to which they would return after the quarter break.

Reports from the President and the Provost

President Casper expressed his congratulations to Coach Montgomery and the men's basketball team for winning the Pac 10 championship. "I am particularly pleased because their winning the championship coincides with the beginning of my term as Chair of the Pac 10. I can now walk the 'virtual corridors' of the Pac 10 with my head held high," he joked. The Senate responded with applause, which Efron made plain was "for the basketball team."

Professor Greely (Law) asked to speak briefly about the selection of Professor Kathleen Sullivan as the next dean of the Law School. He noted that four extraordinary faculty members had been willing to be considered for dean, none of whom would have been a bad choice. Sullivan, he indicated, is a spectacular teacher, an important scholar, and an important public figure. Though she is the third constitutional law scholar in a row to become dean, her selection is path breaking

because “for the very first time Stanford Law School will have an Irish-American dean,” he quipped, adding that of course it is even more important that she is Stanford’s first female dean and one of the first female deans at a major American law school. He expressed his belief that Sullivan will be a “fresh breeze” in the Law School and that the entire faculty looks forward to working with her.

Having said “the easy part,” Greely went on to state that he and a number of his colleagues were deeply unhappy about the selection process. He commended the Provost on assembling a first-rate search committee, which she co-chaired, and which worked very hard. The complaint, he said, was that the rest of the Law School faculty was deprived of having an appropriate voice in discussion of issues concerning future directions for the school and assessment of the candidates. Greely described three unsatisfactory interactions with a search committee member or candidate due to an apparent “anti-campaigning” rule invoked by the Provost that prevented answers to questions about exactly who the internal or outside candidates were and what plans they might have for the school. He said that the dean selection model used previously in Law and preferred by most, though not all, of his colleagues was one where the candidates made presentations to and were questioned by the faculty. He expressed disagreement with the Provost’s decision to reject that model and with the President’s explanation that the Law School was being treated just like every other school. A school of 45 faculty members with very distinct and separate traditions might appropriately be treated differently than a school of 450 or 500 faculty members with many departments, he said, suggesting further that even if identical treatment were necessary then a more open dean selection process throughout the university would be a better solution. Reiterating that he believed the selection itself was excellent, Greely stressed that the process had strained relationships with the administration and he predicted that “the next time a Law School dean is selected the Law faculty will not acquiesce so quietly in such an extraordinarily closed process.”

Provost Rice replied that she believes the normal dean selection process does work well throughout the university. She explained that most faculty members don’t exactly want the job and have to be recruited, so putting people through a “beauty contest” can be bruising. The prior dean selection in Law had produced tremendously bruised feelings, she asserted, and should not now be viewed through rose-colored glasses. Making a final point, Rice said that in addition to having an excellent, representative search committee, she also met personally with five different groups of school faculty members. She expressed confidence in the committee members’ interactions with the faculty and in their ability to convey faculty views about the candidates. “This was a representative process, not a direct election of the dean,” Rice stated. President Casper added that in his view the process had generated the highest possible quality of information, with extremely powerful and direct assessments of the pros and cons of each candidate. He reminded everyone that one of the few powers the President has is to select deans.

Professor Simon (Law) made clear his agreement with the opinions expressed by Greely. He suggested that a much more collaborative and open process could have been designed, without the element of “campaigning”. The process used was not organized to maximize good information

to the President and Provost about faculty views, he said, and more importantly it did not give faculty members an opportunity to think and talk about the selection of the dean in the context of the faculty's vision for the school.

Chair Efron stated that the selection of deans is obviously an important subject in which the Senate has full interest, and that the Steering Committee would be open to advice about whether to pursue it at a future meeting. The Provost said she had no report. There were no further questions for the President or the Provost.

Discussion of Faculty Housing

Senate Chair Efron explained that the remainder of the meeting would be devoted to a discussion of faculty housing issues, reminding everyone that housing had emerged as a subject on the minds of many Senators when asked early in the year to identify potential Senate agenda topics. The discussion was planned before the administration put forth its specific proposals to build additional housing on the so-called infill sites, he noted. Efron said the Steering Committee's "perhaps wishful" plan for the afternoon was to divide the discussion into two parts: first, general issues, introduced by President Casper, and later the infill housing proposal. He noted that several members of the Senate had asked to make prepared remarks, and they would be recognized to speak before others.

President Casper began by informing those present that the Santa Clara County Planning Commission was meeting at the same time as was the Senate to discuss development of a successor to Stanford's 1989 General Use Permit, which would expire in about two years. "Stanford University has a special relationship to the land on which it has been built," Casper stated, quoting Senator Stanford's reasoning for bequeathing the lands and his foresight in prohibiting their alienation. He noted that Stanford is less wealthy in financial endowment than its major competitors, but described the Stanford lands as its "other endowment", the management of which "requires disciplined planning, foresight, and unwavering adherence to the primary principle that University land must first and foremost support Stanford's academic and related needs."

The President outlined briefly the uses of Stanford's 8,180 acres, emphasizing that 5,400 acres (two-thirds) are open or lightly used. "Despite or perhaps because of this history of conservation, we find ourselves today in an environment where every new use of Stanford land is the subject of intense scrutiny and, frequently, opposition," he stated. The University Trustees had twice rejected proposals for land development during periods of financial pressures, Casper said, and had designated the bulk of Stanford's undeveloped lands as an educational rather than financial resource. "Will our predecessors' good stewardship now be turned against them by the "let's freeze Stanford" attitude?" he asked. The President stated that the University has a long tradition of careful, responsible, finely calibrated planning for its lands. "The results speak for themselves," he asserted. "The campus works well for academic purposes and provides resources to the public, ranging from the best in medical care, to the Stanford Museum, to athletic

events, to tax revenues that support civic services and infrastructure It is ironic, to say the least, that some now suggest the need to protect the community from Stanford.”

Casper set forth seven principles that guide Stanford’s use of its lands: 1.) Stanford does not seek growth for its own sake; 2.) The University has consolidated both academic and residential construction in already developed areas instead of moving onto undeveloped lands; 3.) Since its beginning Stanford has been a residential university; 4.) Stanford will continue to use land selectively to provide economic support for the academic purposes of the University, revenue for the City, and contributions to the economy of the region; 5.) Stanford will continue to be a good neighbor, working with the surrounding communities on issues of mutual concern; 6.) Stanford will not sacrifice the long-term interests of the University in order to achieve short-term gains; and 7.) Stanford cannot allow others to gain improper control over the lands that form the bedrock of the institution.

Turning to the specific issue of faculty housing on campus, Casper addressed the criticism that the proposed development on infill sites will make so little difference that it should be abandoned in favor of larger efforts elsewhere. “Simply because we cannot do everything does not mean we should do nothing,” he said, advising that the proposed homes would be a significant addition to the stock of critically needed, moderately priced housing. He also explained that Stanford is attempting to move forward on development of 250 homes in the west campus, but based upon responses from the County and City believes that this will take four to five years or more. Responding to arguments that “the comity of the University is threatened by the proposals for infill housing or by the process leading to a decision,” Casper described his view of how the debate had become so quickly polarized and indicated that the administration had been trying to do better through the joint housing task force and neighborhood meetings. “This consultation on development plans is far more extensive than a homeowner could expect in any municipality,” he insisted. “Stanford University is an institution of higher learning. It is a trust, not a political entity. Everybody who chose to move onto the University’s lands knew this. I am not a mayor. My responsibility as President of this University is quite different.” Stating that he believed the individuals whose views had been seen in print represented only a portion of campus leaseholders, he reminded everyone that campus leaseholders are only a portion of the entire faculty. The President read an excerpt from a tenured faculty member’s letter, including the quote, “Vociferous and well organized senior faculty living on campus are setting up a situation in which their own junior colleagues must press their noses up against the candy shop window hoping for a handout.” Expressing appreciation to those who had taken the time to make their views known to him, President Casper said that he is duty-bound to act in what he believes to be the best interests of the University, and that he looked forward to hearing the views of the Senate. [The full text of President Casper’s prepared statement will be printed in the *Stanford Report*.]

Chair Efron pointed out to Senate members that there were several documents related to infill housing at their desks, and that two guests were present who might be able to help answer questions: Carolyn Sargent, Director of Faculty/Staff Housing, and Bill Phillips in real estate at

the Stanford Management Company. He also explained that the Steering Committee, after spirited debate the prior week, had decided to limit presentations and discussion to members of the Senate, and was assuming the Senate's tacit approval. Professor White (Mathematics) voiced his disappointment in that decision and made a motion that Professor James Sweeney, Co-Chair of the task force on infill housing, be allowed to participate in the discussion. Professor Bonini (Graduate School of Business) seconded, and after clarification that there did not appear to be any further such proposals planned, the motion was approved unanimously.

Professor Gordon (Biological Sciences) delivered prepared remarks regarding junior faculty concerns about the cost of housing. Using overhead transparencies, she showed that the median price of a single-family house on campus had risen from about \$200,000 in 1978/79 to over \$800,000 in 1998/99, while the median nine-month salary of an assistant professor (excluding the Medical School) was a barely rising line hugging the bottom of the graph. "What I'd like to talk about," Gordon said, "is the housing assistance programs from the perspective of a user, and what Stanford is doing and what it might do to help junior faculty who are facing this housing market." She reviewed briefly the main elements of Stanford's housing assistance programs, including HAP (a small amount of additional salary, decreasing each year), DPAP (loans for down payments), and COIN-Lathrop loans (requiring a first mortgage from a bank; interest rate starting below market and increasing at 1/3 percent per year to a recently instituted cap of 8 percent; monthly interest payments only, no repayment of principal; and upon sale or refinancing, "contingent interest" up to half the amount of appreciation, owed to Stanford in addition to repayment of the principal).

Gordon pointed out several aspects of the COIN-Lathrop loan program that have a strong effect on the housing situation of younger faculty. First, the University, like banks, calculates the price of a house that is "affordable" based on 35 percent of pre-tax income, but it comes as a shock to discover that this is more like 50 percent after tax. She urged the University to think about modifying the notion that people can really spend 50 percent of their income on their mortgage, "particularly if younger faculty members do something so reckless as to have a family and then find themselves contending with day care costs." She also expressed concern that these loans are interest-only, with interest rates above market for most older loans, and payments that never decrease. Finally, Gordon described the heavy burden represented by the "contingent interest" feature, noting for example that "if you bought the median priced house in 1985 and you sold or refinanced it in 1998, you would owe Stanford \$250,000 in contingent interest, in addition to the annual interest you've been paying on the loan and the repayment of the loan principal itself." That contingent interest is about 160 percent of the original loan amount, she indicated. The COIN/Lathrop loans make it very difficult to refinance or to move to a better house, she said, because once you pay Stanford, you can't afford a house that costs as much as the one you're already in. She said she also can't imagine how someone who held one of these loans to retirement could possibly afford to retire. "In the long term this situation puts younger faculty into a loan that is very difficult to get out of, but also very difficult to hold onto. We have to ask ourselves, does this program really help?" Gordon concluded.

Professor Simoni (Biological Sciences) expressed the view that the larger issues of the affordability of housing, on campus and elsewhere, were far more important than the issue of infill housing. Simoni made a motion, which was seconded, to postpone discussion of infill until a future meeting. Professors Lindenberger and Hinton commented that they had prepared statements about larger housing issues but would be mentioning infill. Professor Bonini (Graduate School of Business) pointed out that the President would soon be making a decision on the infill sites and should have the benefit of hearing Senate views on that topic now. Professor Pate-Cornell (Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management) suggested that more information was needed for a fruitful discussion of complex issues such as the housing programs discussed by Gordon. Provost Rice said the administration was already working on many of the important questions raised by Gordon, but advised that these were complicated issues involving Trustee policy and regulation of lenders. Rice said that she and Carolyn Sargent would be happy to discuss the loan programs at a future meeting but were not prepared to do so that day. Professor Noll (Economics), ascertaining from the Chair that there were seven more prepared statements, remarked that proceeding with those would leave very little additional time for discussion anyway. Efron explained that the Steering Committee's intention had been to hear statements and discussion on infill at the end of the meeting and to begin with general topics related to housing, defined as "everything else." Simoni's motion to postpone the infill discussion failed on a divided voice vote, and the Chair recognized the next speaker.

Professor Lindenberger (English and Comparative Literature) spoke to Senate as a member of the humanities faculty for 30 years and as the owner of a Stanford house that he built when he arrived. Invoking that "distant time" he described Stanford in 1969 as having ample lots on which to build and offering clearly subsidized loans at five percent. "My assistant professor colleagues in the humanities, then and now at the bottom of the salary scale prevailing within American universities", he said, "were able to buy and build on-campus houses. Not so anymore." Lindenberger quoted figures indicating that the proposed infill housing would not be affordable to junior faculty in the humanities, and observed that larger campus houses rarely sell to humanities professors but instead to those in fields with higher salaries and opportunities for consulting income. Commenting on the infill housing controversy, Lindenberger urged that this be treated as an opportunity to rethink housing as a whole and the role the faculty should play in instituting new policy. He posed several questions: Why has the University long shied away from offering subsidized housing as Columbia and other universities in high cost areas have done? Why has the University insisted on developing land at market prices during the past two decades even though this has meant the potential loss of faculty recruits who might bring considerable academic honor to the institution? Why must interest rate subsidies be out of the question today? Might we consider instituting a system, for at least new houses, such as Princeton's in which the university buys back the property? As a faculty member likely to retire in the next few years, Lindenberger also asked questions about the proposed senior housing project at Stanford West, suggesting that the faculty should play a role in its development in order to insure its attractiveness to the large number of emeriti and surviving spouses on campus, and thus to free up many of those homes for faculty currently teaching.

“There is obviously fundamental rethinking to be done and faculty must become actively engaged in this process,” Lindenberger stated. “It might promote more trust. But since housing is related to recruitment, the whole faculty, not just campus residents, must be involved. And I suggest that the Senate, whether by means of a current or new committee, insist on playing a role. The quality of our research and teaching, and the academic prestige of our departments, are at stake in this housing crisis.” Noting that it used to be common to speak of “the Stanford family”, he said that the term invites consternation and laughter today. Even if trust is no longer possible, he appealed for the establishment of mechanisms to negotiate in a rational and orderly manner.

Professor Hinton (Music) described the current crisis not from the perspective of a few green spaces being filled in on campus but rather from the perspective of a department chair trying to attract and retain faculty for whom the prospect of decent housing on or near campus was becoming more and more remote. He said only one of the 16 tenure track professors in Music owns a house on campus, and he will become emeritus in a year. A very few live in the condominiums “where we will presumably stay while at Stanford” unless something quite unlikely happens in the housing market. It is a gloomy picture, Hinton said, where Stanford can attract the very best faculty but cannot get them to come because of the housing market, except when enormous sums are spent to assist senior hires. “Any way we can help deserves serious consideration. Time is of the essence. If this can include some emeriti giving back a little, in the way that alumni often do, then that deserves consideration too.” Stanford’s housing stock is of extremely mixed quality architecturally-speaking, Hinton commented, and some well designed new structures could actually enhance the populated parts of campus, increasing the density near the center and preventing urban sprawl on the edges.

Vice Provost Cox reviewed in abbreviated form the information he and staff colleagues had been presenting at seven neighborhood meetings about the infill housing proposals. He displayed a chart showing a marked decrease in the past three years in the number of campus homes and condominiums for sale. This is an all-time low point in the number of units available, Cox said, and supply is the number one problem. A serious spike in prices also occurred about the time supply was drying up, and today’s median price of over \$800,000 is well out of reach of many faculty members. In addition to not being able to find housing on campus, assistant and associate professors are being pushed farther and farther away, Cox reported, changing the campus for newcomers from a residential university to a “commuter school.” He showed maps of the residential subdivisions and briefly described the three options in the “Faculty Housing Development Proposals” booklet (SenD#4917, placed at desks) for combinations of single family or multi-family units on the Frenchman’s Triangle, Dolores, Mayfield, and Gerona/Junipero Serra Boulevard sites.

Professor Bonini (Graduate School of Business) yielded his time to Professor James Sweeney (Engineering Economic Systems and Operations Research) who was co-chair of the infill housing task force appointed by the Provost. Sweeney thanked the Senate for voting to allow him to speak on behalf of members of the Stanford Campus Residential Leaseholders (SCRL) who had been thinking intensively about housing issues. Homeowners are concerned that their views are

not being seriously considered, he stated. This raises questions as to whether the Stanford residential community is simply an extension of the academic enterprise, or is it a community in itself with citizens that have rights to some degree of self-determination? “Can the community have confidence in a process in which the landowner, the mayor equivalent, and the employer are one and the same entity and are clearly articulating their authority?” he asked. There is a deep sense of disenfranchisement and frustration, Sweeney reported, leading to a search for some other way of becoming part of the decision-making process. Campus residents are communicating with the County and the media because they believe they are not being heard through Stanford’s internal processes. Sweeney said he personally views these consequences as unfortunate.

Addressing the apparent belief that adding more units to the campus housing stock will help in faculty recruiting, Sweeney asserted that the real problem is that housing is too expensive and the only way Stanford can have any effect in the larger housing market is by selling new units at a highly subsidized price. Building small, unattractive units on small lots in order to command a small market price is not the way to recruit most faculty, he remarked. Sweeney asked the President to delay a decision for at least six months in order to allow time for adequate debate and understanding of the fundamental, underlying issues.

Professor R. Fernald (Psychology) reported that he had attended one of the neighborhood meetings about the infill proposals and found the hostile tenor unsettling and discouraging. While a large number of retirees were at the meeting, the disenfranchised faculty living from Fremont to San Francisco were not there to speak about the complex lives they lead and the difficulties they face. It is unreasonable to ask only those who live on campus to determine how land should be used, Fernald stated, encouraging the administration to poll all eligible faculty members about these issues. Speaking to the “drop in the bucket” argument, he indicated that while 36 new units certainly isn’t enough, “it’s enough to hold twice the number of faculty members in Music, for example.” It is a substantial addition to the housing inventory, and we should build them quickly, he stated. Making a final point, Fernald expressed the opinion that process will always be blamed when one doesn’t get the outcome one wants. He invited anyone opposed to the 36 new units to drive a junior faculty candidate around Palo Alto, where over half of the 27 homes now for sale are priced above \$1 million, and then around the wonderful campus residential area, and try to explain why faculty don’t want more houses built on campus. There are legitimate questions of affordability, he agreed, “but it’s essential that we do something soon.”

According to Provost Rice, both the availability and the affordability problems have to be tackled. She assured everyone that the approach used in the auction of the so-called hillside lots would not be repeated in this case. Rice stated that market dynamics can be affected by targeting a specific part of the market, such as late assistant and early associate professors, and cited Ryan Court as an example where prices began and have continued to remain below other campus homes. The Provost responded to Lindenberger’s earlier suggestion by agreeing to think about how the faculty in general, not just those living on campus, might get involved in housing policy issues. She also declared that housing problems did not cause Stanford to lose a single senior faculty recruit the prior year, because the University spent extraordinary amounts of money to

make it possible to recruit each candidate. “We didn’t lose a single one. I know. I was Chief Real Estate Agent last year,” Rice joked.

Emphasizing that assistant and associate professors are the lifeblood of the institution, Professor Traugott (Linguistics) said that junior faculty with whom she has spoken not only have the burdens of child care mentioned by Gordon but so many additional financial pressures that they are teaching extra courses during the year and in the summer and are jeopardizing their chances for tenure. She warned that the laudable objective expressed on page 14 of the infill housing proposal -- to meet the demand preferences of new recruits and assistant and associate professors -was then undermined by statements on page 15 that more than half of the new units would be of interest to retirees. Traugott urged that “the infill not be used to allow retirees to move from overly expensive housing into cheaper housing, making only overly expensive housing available as a result.” A lot of effort should be put into senior housing, but not in the infill sites, she said.

Professor Thomas (Psychology) advised that he believed almost all of the evidence about the costs and benefits of infill development was on the table. Noting that the costs are real and should not be ignored, and the benefits are modest and will not solve the University’s housing problems, he said he nonetheless tends to discount the costs somewhat “because I find that the current living conditions on campus are very, very favorable”, and to believe that a small number of faculty appointments can have a disproportionately positive effect on the academic health of the University. “In sum ... I come down in favor of more campus housing,” Thomas stated. He added that he thought it more important to have a discussion of the principles and priorities that should govern the prices and numbers of the new units. “in the spirit of opening the campus gates to our present and future colleagues who wish to enter them.”

Professor Jacobs (Oncology) stated, “I am a leaseholder, and as a member of the silent majority, I just want to say that I have always considered it a pleasure and a privilege granted to me by the University to be able to live on the campus.”

Professor Koseff (Civil and Environmental Engineering) identified himself as being in favor of building more houses on campus. He said that his primary concern is about “sustainable affordability,” that is, not relying only on free markets but creating mechanisms to ensure that initial owners are not the only ones who get the benefit of “affordable” housing. Exploring Lindenberger’s ideas and others could make a real difference, he stated.

Earth Sciences Dean Orr indicated that he believes the future of the University is at stake and the housing problem must be attacked on all fronts: increasing supply, improving assistance programs, and including young faculty on campus. Using rough estimates of 1,600 eligible faculty and 800 current housing units, he calculated that 40 new units would be a five percent increase in supply, and enough to be significant. Though housing of retirees increases the eligible population, he said, getting to a reasonable part of 1,600 will have an impact on affordability on campus. “And that’s what I think we need to do.”

Professor Noll (Economics) pointed out that if the extraordinarily generous special housing subsidies now provided to senior faculty recruits were spent on campus homes, the University would be lending to itself, in some sense, and a given budget for faculty recruitment would go farther. Noll also advised that a small number of houses could have a significant effect if they were targeted to the newly tenured associate professor group, which is not very large.

Making housing affordable for junior faculty is the principal issue, said Professor Heller (Biological Sciences), emphasizing Gordon's point that recently tenured faculty who were single or without families when they arrived as assistant professors are likely to have had children since and to need a larger home. "I have never seen so many of our recently tenured faculty out giving job talks, and the only reason is that they cannot afford to move up to a larger home," he remarked. As a resident who lives close to a couple of the infill sites, Heller agreed with Hinton's suggestion that increased density and the real amenities of a community would be a benefit at those sites, which are not used for recreation, are not necessarily aesthetically pleasing, and are viewed more as part of the County roadway system.

University Librarian Michael Keller, one of the ten percent of leaseholders who are senior staff, said that his emeriti neighbors understand the problem and express a desire for "wind-down" homes. He also reiterated the President's point that the University must not fall into the trap of letting others outside the University influence and redirect the course of Stanford's stewardship of its lands. Leaseholders, and others, need to be careful of that, he warned.

President Casper asked to make a personal point at the end of the discussion. He reminded everyone that the faculty had applauded his 1992 reduction in the numbers of high level administrators, but stressed that the administration is very lean and had spent an enormous amount of time over the prior year discussing housing issues. They advised SCRL in December 1997 that they would engage in a feasibility study of infill sites, he said, yet "when the first surveyors showed up, the shouting began. At the University, ladies and gentlemen, process is due not only to the leaseholders. Process is due everybody, including those like deans and provosts who work in an administration that is wholly understaffed."

Chair Efron thanked all Senate members and guests for their contributions to an important debate, noting that he was sure there would be additional discussions in the future.

There was no new business. Following a motion and a second, the Senate adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan W. Schofield
Academic Secretary to the University