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I. Call to Order
The Chair of the 45th Senate, Ray Levitt, called the first meeting of Winter Quarter to order at 3:15 PM.

In attendance were 37 members, 9 ex officio members and many guests.

Chair Levitt opened the session with some good news: “Please join me in congratulating Coach David Shaw and the Stanford football team for their Rose Bowl win over Wisconsin, the first since 1972!

[ Applause ]

“And we have more good news on the faculty award front: please join me in congratulating fellow senator Lucy Shapiro, and Sidney Drell, former director of SLAC, who have been awarded the National Medal of Science, the nation's most prestigious award for scientists, engineers and inventors. They will receive the award from President Obama later this month.”

[ Applause ]

II. Approval of Minutes – (SenD#6701)
The minutes of the December 6, 2012, meeting of Senate XLV were approved.

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

IV. Report on Conferral of Baccalaureate and Advanced Degrees for Autumn Quarter 2012
Five years ago, the Senate approved a plan for the Steering Committee in online administrative action to approve the degree conferral lists electronically for the Autumn, Winter and Summer conferrals. The Senate continues to vote on the Spring Quarter degree conferrals at the June meeting.

By this administrative action all degrees can be posted with the formal voting having taken place in a timely manner.

The list of degrees conferred was sent to all senators as an email attachment. The full list is also available on the Faculty Senate website; there are also limited handouts at the end of the aisles.
V. Standing Reports
   A. Memorial Resolutions:

   1. Chair Levitt invited Martin Hellman, Professor of Electrical Engineering, Emeritus, to present a brief memorial statement in honor of Gene Franklin, Professor of Electrical Engineering, Emeritus. The full-length memorial resolution was included in the Senators’ packets (SenD#6708) and will be linked to in the Stanford Report. In attendance was Professor Franklin’s daughter, Carole Franklin Grace.

   Professor Hellman began his presentation.

   **Gene Franklin (1927-2012) SenD#6708**

   Gene F. Franklin, Professor Emeritus of electrical engineering, passed away unexpectedly on August 9, 2012, at Stanford Hospital. He was 85 and active until a few days before his death. Gene was one of Fred Terman’s “steeples of excellence,” having pioneered the area of digital control in the 1950’s. Digital control made possible a wide range of devices, ranging from pollution control in automobiles to high capacity disk drives.

   Professor Franklin made a number of important contributions to the growth of the university, serving as Associate Provost for Computing, as well as on a campus-wide committee convened by the Provost to improve science education for non-majors. He also served as Acting Chairman of our department, a founding member of our System Theory Laboratory, and Director of our Information Systems Laboratory. He taught courses and supervised research in our department for the impressive span of 47 years, from 1957 to 2004.

   Professor Franklin’s many awards include the Richard Bellman Control Heritage Award, the highest award of the American Automatic Control Council; the John R. Ragazzini Award, the highest teaching recognition of that same Council; Fellow of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE); and the 1994 Bode Lecture of the IEEE Control Systems Society.

   But more than awards and honors, we remember Gene as a wonderful human being and true gentleman. He will be sorely missed.

   Mr. Chairman, I have the honor, on behalf of a committee consisting of Stephen Boyd and myself, Martin Hellman, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a Resolution in memory of the late Gene Farthing Franklin, Professor of Electrical Engineering in the School of Engineering.

   At Chair Levitt’s invitation, everyone stood for a moment of silence in tribute.

   Chair Levitt thanked Professors Hellman and Boyd.
A. Steering Committee
Chair Levitt turned to the Steering Committee announcements.

“February 7th: We will hear from the new Director of Athletics, Bernard Muir. Also, the Committee on Committees will present its revisions to the charge of C-RUM, the Committee on Review of Undergraduate Majors.

February 21st: We’ll hear related reports on the future of federal sponsored research at Stanford as well as the future of indirect cost rates.

March 7th: Vice Provost for Graduate Education, Patti Gumport, will present her annual report, and Claude Steele, Dean of the Graduate School of Education, will report on new initiatives in the GSE.”

Topic Ideas for the Senate
Chair Levitt turned to a list of possible topics for the Senate suggested anonymously by members to determine what topics the Senate might like to have discussed at future meetings.

• What factors have contributed to the rapid increase in the cost of college education—most specifically the cost at Stanford vs. peer institutions? What is Stanford doing to decrease the rate of increase?

Chair Levitt reminded the Senate that this topic has been previously discussed, including the factors that contribute to rapid increase in cost of college education, how we’re doing against peer institutions, and what we’re doing to try to slow this rate of increase.

Provost Etchemendy commented, “The presupposition that Stanford’s undergraduate tuition costs have been rising is false and is instead declining through most of the 2000s, in net tuition cost, because of financial aid. Currently the costs are about the same as they were in 1994-1995.”

• Update on implementation of curriculum changes, number and types of new courses — Thinking Matters & Seminars.

Chair Levitt suggested that the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Harry Elam could address this topic as an update in the Spring.

• Athletics, and the importance of creating engaged faculty oversight.

Chair Levitt reminded the Senate that at the next session the Director of Athletics would give a report.
• How do we increase the number of students getting degrees in STEM [science, technology, engineering and math] at Stanford?

• Course examinations.

• CourseRank.
Professor James Campbell explained that this is a system created and operated by the students to check the grade distribution of courses. It is not an official university website. The students self-report their grades. “If what I hear from students is correct, they use it primarily, if not exclusively, in selecting General Education Requirements, because they don’t want to have their GPA affected by a course outside their major.”

Professor Pat Burchat commented that students use CourseRank, “…because it’s one way that they can get comments on the effectiveness of the instructor. Since our [university] end-of-quarter evaluations are not public—only the numerical part and not the comment part—it’s the one opportunity that the students have to get first-hand information from other students about whether [the course is] worth their time and their units. So I think there are benefits to the students. And I sometimes use it in advising students, to go look at it.”

Further discussion led to Chair Levitt’s decision to have this topic discussed by the Steering Committee.

• Clarification of copyright policy on classes and course syllabi.

• Copyright and captured video.

Professor Kathryn Moler commented, “I didn’t [suggest this topic] but I do think there’s a lot of confusion about copyright issues and how they affect education in the modern era. I was looking for a statement on copyright issues to guide me in preparing my lectures, and what I found was a form where people could submit complaints about people using Stanford IT resources.”

• Undergraduate admissions policies.

Professor David Spiegel commented. “The data we get from the admissions committee are about students, as they enter. The Senate would like to track the success of the students throughout their education at Stanford in relation to the admissions policies.” There were comments that that information had been presented to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, which could be presented to the Senate. Professor Tom Wasow, former chair of C-UAFA, added, “We specifically had asked to check for correlations between the scores that the admissions officers gave and quantifiable measures of success once they were students here.”
• Cheating.

• Future of the Ph.D. degree.

• Non-construction noise on campus

B. Committee on Committees (CoC)
   There was no report.

C. President
   The President had no comment and there were no questions.

   Provost
   Other than correcting the statement regarding the cost of education at Stanford (see above), the Provost had no comment and there were no questions.

VI. Other Reports
A. Managing Classroom Scheduling
   Chair Levitt introduced the first report. “We were asked earlier in the year to talk about classroom scheduling and the way in which classrooms are utilized and allocated. Registrar Tom Black has gone to considerable effort to prepare some proposals for a new way of scheduling classes that would reduce the number of conflicts.”

   With the aid of slides, Registrar Black began his presentation. “Thank you. Simply stated, the most egregious problem we have is forced scheduling conflicts; students can’t get courses that they want without scheduling conflict. I think the SUES [Study of Undergraduate Education at Stanford] Committee uncovered this in their conversations with students.”
Legend:
Upper Panel: Distribution of class schedules for five days of the week. The left edge indicates AM or PM. The different colored bars represent class length. Yellow = 50 minutes; dark green = 75 or 90 minutes; light green = 110 minutes; blue = 170 minutes.

Lower Panel: One example of a serious conflict. In yellow are two classes the student enrolled in that are held at the same time.

Registrar Black continued, “The deans of the schools responsible for undergraduate education and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education asked me to take up this topic about a year ago. I learned that in any given quarter over a thousand students have schedule conflicts. I also have discovered the three main culprits. The primary culprit is structural, and the other two are practice.

“This slide [above] shows our established meeting patterns, the ones that we encourage faculty to schedule into. You can see that it is complex and structurally promotes conflict.

“The bottom part of this slide is one student’s schedule. I tried to pick the most egregious situation where there was a head-to-head conflict and this one surfaced, it was completely random. The student, a HumBio [Human Biology] major, chose to
take HumBio and Bio [Biology] at the same time. This is not an athlete who’s trying to clear out an afternoon. There were other sections the student could have taken. “So this person chose this schedule—a ‘practice’ conflict. The results were disastrous because in those two courses this person received a C minus and D. In the other courses the student received a B.

“The other practice problem is that the established schedule has 26 set meeting patterns. There are many more meeting patterns that exist. In other words, we don’t enforce scheduling within the matrix. So there are many opportunities for conflict because there’s no policing over when people are scheduling their courses.

“As you walk around the quad, you’ll go to a classroom and you’ll see a note from a teacher on the door indicating the class time has been changed. So the nature of the problem is that we allow faculty to schedule classes without any oversight.

“It’s ironic that the Graduate School of Business (GSB) doesn’t allow students to schedule for any conflicting course schedules, and arguably, GSB students are a more mature audience. Here we allow undergraduates to do it freely, without consultation.

“Another scheduling problem is that too many classes are compacted in the 10:00 AM-2:00 PM sector. Part of that might be because we know that students don’t get up early, so we don’t start classes until 10 AM. And we know that many students are off doing other activities in the afternoon, for example, many of our 900 athletes are in practice and so we are trying to make schedules to accommodate them.

“This compaction results in inefficient classroom use. Another problem is that I don’t sense that the departments are communicating well within a school, as well as within departments, at least with regard to trying to solve this particular problem.

“Finally, one of the outcomes is that we have exam conflicts. What is ironic is that of all the reasons you can reschedule a final exam, course schedule conflict is not one of the permissible ones.

“Our goals were to see if we can eliminate the overlapping schedule patterns, review our policies and practices, spread the courses beyond prime time, accommodate special scheduling arrangements, and promote more efficient use of classroom space.

“So we looked at over 20 different class schedules.”
“They range from very simple to very complex. We’ve been looking at this for about a year and we’ve had over a dozen departmental administrators and school representatives helping us. We hired a consultant to help us with the analysis and shared it among the departmental administrators and other stakeholders like RD&E [Residential Dining & Enterprises]. And we would like to propose a simple schedule on the next slide.”
“We’re starting the day at 8:30 AM and classes start on the half-hour. You can schedule into the next block if you need more time for your class. We will publish the beginning and ending times of your class.

“Am I concerned about proposing this? Yes. It would affect everyone. Perhaps 20,000 people will either hate it, love it or have varying reasons for not endorsing it. I am concerned about whether students will embrace such a program in which we’re trying to capture the early morning. But if we were to do so, in the Monday/Wednesday/Friday pattern, we would have five meeting periods that would be available for cohorts like the athletes. We could benefit key groups.

“This proposal might also help commuting parents, maybe 8:30 AM would enable the faculty to get their children off to school and perhaps take that first period.”

Registrar Black listed some concerns others had expressed about this schedule. “The schedule does not allow non-academic meetings with faculty and students. Departments are used to scheduling meetings at the noon-hour.

“The Music Department indicated that the new schedule would destroy the “Music Hour.” That was a surprise to me because I didn’t know there was a music hour. It is time when students are performing recitals for public enjoyment. I think we can get at that.
“I’m concerned that the faculty will not use this as an opportunity to increase their communications in their department and with other departments.”

Registrar Black having concluded his presentation, the floor was opened for discussion.

Professor Debra Satz commented: “I think simplifying the schedule is a great idea; we can get behind it. But this doesn’t address the issue of students double-enrolling. How is it that students are able to enroll for two courses that meet at the same time? We need to stop that.”

Registrar Black replied, “We have not been authorized to use our policing mechanism with our student information system. We could prevent this through the system. However, I fear doing that, for students would not be able to get the classes they wanted because they are packed within a few periods. So we have to do this all together. We can turn on the system that monitors course conflict, but we also have to look at where we’re placing those courses so students will be able to add them to their schedule. Both have to occur in order to make this work.”

Professor Margaret Fuller noted, “If you’re worried about the students not wanting to come in at 8:30 AM you could just shift this same pattern later by half an hour. That gets rid of that problem and gives you a faculty lunch hour.”

Registrar Black nodded, “Yes. It’s a possibility, just so long as the first period is all together. It wouldn’t give us those additional blocks for athletes.”

Professor Josh Landy recalled, “When I was in college I had a lot of friends who were on the crew and they got up at 5:00 in the morning to practice rowing and did not resent it, which I found strange. That’s just me. On the other hand they did resent morning classes.”

[ Laughter ]

Professor Landy continued, “I’m not addressing the rationales, I’m just reporting a fact. Did anybody raise the possibility that practice [for athletes] could be moved to an earlier time, keeping the afternoon free for classes?”

Registrar Black clarified, “So have practice when, in the morning? Well, I’ll let the Department of Athletics look at it. We shared this with them and so we’re going to ask them to make some adjustments. Each sport chooses different times for practice. I do see the athletes up in the morning when I arrive.”

Dean Richard Saller was next to comment. “I don’t think we ought to be reluctant to do the 8:30 AM starting times. I checked with Paul Fisher in HumBio; they’re ready to schedule their core course at 8:30 AM in Winter and Spring quarters.”
Professor Andrea Goldsmith wondered, “Why don’t you have 80-minute blocks on Monday/Wednesday/Friday, because that would add flexibility, unless you’re worried about the conflicts? You said the most popular time periods are 10 AM–2 PM; okay so maybe the goal should be to see if we can get classes scheduled at 9-10 AM, as opposed to trying to go to 8:30 AM. With the exception of some core courses that have the clout to schedule a class at 8:30 AM, I think it’s going to be hard to fill an 8:30-9:30 AM slots because you’re not seeing 9-10 AM slot filled. So I would recommend starting on the hour.

“Having scheduled meetings in my department, I think taking away lunch hours for meetings is going to cause a lot of problems.”

Registrar Black replied, “You don’t have to move too many classes to get a good deal of benefit. Departments could select a handful of popular classes and put them [at the 8:30 AM times] and then allow them to rotate. That could also change the culture in terms of scheduling. You could put in some prerequisites, particularly those commonly used, and that will also affect the culture.

“Insofar as department meetings, it’s a matter of how strongly you feel about that. It strikes me that yes, you may have departmental meetings but are your entire faculty expected to be in those meetings? But if it’s a strong enough inclination then we could look at the schedule in that light.”

Professor Pat Burchat liked the new schedule. “Please do me the favor of moving towards a rationalized schedule. I think there may be a disruption in the short term, but in the long run you’ll look back and say—how did you ever tolerate the mess? In terms of the lunchtime, we tend to spend longer times at home, catching up on our email, so I think moving the lunchtime meetings to 12:30-1:00 PM slot is still quite good there because it doesn’t have as much conflict.

“It would be very helpful if there was encouragement from the top, the bottom, and the sides for departments to rationalize their schedules and not continue with schedules just because we’ve always done it this way. For example, the Colloquium in Physics is always on Tuesdays in the late afternoon, and the faculty meeting is on Wednesdays, late afternoon, so when we’re trying to put our physics courses together we don’t schedule our faculty to teach MWF, or T/Th, because of these historical meeting times. So we should change those times.”

Professor Martha Cyert was concerned about the lunch hour and whether the new class schedule was going to apply to the Medical School. “Because my concern is that this 12-1 PM slot is traditionally the time for a lot of research seminars with outside speakers coming in. And in Biology we go to a lot of those that are really organized by the Medical School.”

Registrar Black nodded. “I’ve asked them to consider it. I know that the Business School and the Law School are.”
Professor Campbell commented, “I like this; it will make a big difference. One of the things you haven’t mentioned is not simply reclaiming morning, but reclaiming Friday, because there’s a kind of tacit agreement among the faculty and students that we’re going to a four-day week. Moving more classes onto a Monday/Wednesday/Friday axis is going to make an enormous difference. You may find that the group that’s going to give you the most difficulty is not the students at all, it’s the faculty.”

[ Laughter ]

Registrar Black acknowledged the point. “One way to incentivize the [earlier class time and on Fridays, too] is that we could give faculty that follow these patterns a priority in the scheduling, getting preferred rooms. If you permit me to do that, these patterns perhaps will be more closely observed.”

Professor Moler said, “I’m also a big fan of rationalizing and simplifying the scheduling. Are you aware of any studies of how student learning is influenced by class meeting time? I have the impression that students drag themselves out of bed to show up in my 9:00 AM class, but it’s a lot easier for them to concentrate in their 11:00 AM or 1:15 PM class I was wondering if that’s been studied systematically? If you think about whether to try to reclaim the 8:30-9:30 AM hour, that might affect it.”

Registrar Black, “I have not done that.”

[ Laughter ]

Professor Eric Roberts was concerned. “I wonder if we might not be solving the wrong problem. The question is what fraction of the conflicts come from relatively few courses—the big courses that many students take—and whether there might not be a way to do centralized planning for a small number of courses, in such a way that most of the conflicts vanish, independent of the schedule. I can’t speak for everyone but if you told us when to teach the classes, we would teach them then. They might be outside the peak times, but if that would help the university scheduling, fine. But I’m not sure you can achieve the kind of pattern where you don’t have important conflicts without someone with central authority finding out where those conflicts occur. We are operating in a vacuum when we schedule.”

Registrar Black responded, “As you can see from the matrix, if they follow the 26 patterns that we have now, you will get conflicts just when courses are offered, straight away.”

Professor Burchat observed, “There was a presentation by Tom [Black] made a year ago about where the major conflicts are. The number one course in conflict was Physics 41, which, this quarter, has 600 students. Physics 21 was the second course
most in conflict. And they’re at 9:00 and 10:00 AM Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, but they are only offered one quarter. They’re required for many majors.”

Provost Etchemendy noted, “The conflicts are all over the place, a lot of thirteen-minute conflicts, where a student has to run out of class to get to the other class and comes in fifteen minutes late. So it’s not just these major conflicts. And the problem with having a central authority that decides where the courses go is that there is no way to know what are relevant conflicts, globally. Because what are relevant conflicts; depends upon the major. [If the major is] HumBio, students need to take Bio so that’s an important conflict; but it’s not an important conflict in PoliSci.

“What is really important is that the departments pay attention to what their students are taking and talk to other departments to see if they can come to agreement about when these major courses should be offered. I think that’s the way traditionally it’s been done, a sort of pair-wise, departments and department agreements.”

Professor Roberts responded, “But it’s what times faculty choose to teach their courses that creates the conflicts. And I think that’s independent of the schedule. I think I can represent the Stanford schedule in fewer bits than the Princeton Schedule. It’s the same every day. Complexity comes from the picture, not from the schedule.”

Chair Levitt weighed in, “I was at MIT earlier [in my career.] It dealt with class schedules, at least centrally, in a department manner, which is much better. But to start off here you have people choosing to teach Tuesday, Thursday, 11:00 AM to 12:15 PM, or choosing to teach class from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM on Monday and Wednesday and then have a lab Thursday from 2:00 to 5:00 PM, which knocks out about seven different times slots. If people are allowed to do that with no repercussions whatsoever, including not getting the kind of classrooms they would like to have, then there’s no incentive to avoid making up any schedule you like, especially if your department doesn’t enforce it or the Registrar doesn’t enforce it.”

Professor Roberts nodded, “I absolutely agree. If you need to, force people to do the right things through incentives.”

Chair Levitt followed up, “By a de-conflicted schedule of the sort that Tom described you eliminate structural conflicts in many cases from people who choose to follow the rules to get the rooms they want. It’s not a particularly draconian one; you get first choice of rooms if you fit the normal schedule. If you don’t, good luck to you. And the extent to which your departments choose to coordinate within your school, and with other departments, is something that could be done by the Provost and Deans, and Chairs and faculty.”

Professor Campbell asked, “What’s the default here? If a person wants to go off the schedule, do they have to go through some procedure to [explain why] case and then they’re given some dispensation? Or are you saying we can still just schedule our class whenever we want without paying any attention?”
Registrar Black replied, “I presented this to the Committee on Graduate Studies (C-GS) and I asked C-GS and the Committee on Undergraduate Standards and Policy to form a subcommittee that would look at these conflicts, and more or less set the rules of the schedule.”

Chair Levitt ended the discussion. “Okay, we will receive a report from that subcommittee with their recommendations at which time the Senate will discuss this again, probably early in the Spring Quarter. So thank you very much to Registrar Black.

[ Applause ]

B. Faculty Gains and Losses and Status of Women Faculty

Chair Levitt turned to the next report.

“Please join me in welcoming Professor Karen Cook, Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity, to present her annual report to the Senate. Joining her is Professor Hannah Valantine, Senior Associate Dean for Diversity and Leadership in the School of Medicine, who will talk about strategies to enhance faculty development and diversity at the medical school.”

Using slides, Professor Cook began her presentation. “Let me first tell you what’s at your seat, which is the annual report on gains and losses. I’m not going to go through that report; instead, I’m going to hit the high-level overview. Then we’ll be happy to answer questions. I asked Hannah to join me because her office in the School of Medicine is engaged in a number of significant initiatives. I thought we should, over time, highlight the initiatives in various schools that are successful in helping us recruit women and faculty of color.”

The first slide contained this quotation: “For many years Stanford University has had a commitment to enhancing the diversity of its faculty. This commitment is based, first and foremost, on the belief that a more diverse faculty enhances the breadth, depth and quality of our research and teaching by increasing the variety of experiences, perspectives and scholarly interests among the faculty. A diverse faculty also provides a variety of role models and mentors for our increasingly diverse student population, which helps us to attract, retain and graduate such populations more successfully.”


“This slide (above) reminds us of our university commitment to diversity. I’m going to start by giving you an overview of the faculty growth and composition over time.
“You can tell from this chart that the growth of faculty is fairly slow. In the upper panel, the bottom line is Academic Council, the top line is all professorial faculty [including the Medical Center Line]. It’s about a 1.3% increase per year over this decade. [The bottom] panel shows over the past decade the net faculty gains and losses; you can see the effect of the hiring slowdown in 2008/2009. Since then we’ve gone back to what seems like a fairly normal replacement rate. I’m not quite sure what caused the dip [to minus 13] in 2005, except maybe the increase from 2002 to 2004 was too rapid.

“This next slide is a breakdown by school.”
“Many of us know the size of our own schools, but maybe not the size of the other schools. H&S [Humanities & Sciences] is broken into its three divisions. You can see that our professional schools are relatively small, with the exception of Medicine, and here we’ve broken out the Medical Center Line [MCL] [UTL & NTL—university tenured line and non-tenured line] where you can see the most growth over the past two decades.

“Moving to female faculty representation; how are we doing over time? This is the report for just the past decade.”
“For all ranks we’ve gone from 22% female to 26%. That’s not a very rapid increase. You can see the higher bars for assistant professors, and associate professors. I think this growth, in general, reflects people moving into the professor rank over time."
“Here’s the overall pie chart for faculty of color, including all faculty including Medical Center Line. This is all faculty who filled out faculty identification forms as of September 1, 2011.

Professor Cook showed a slide of the breakdown by underrepresented minority in the schools. “In general, you can see that university-wide, the numbers have gone up but while in some schools they’ve gone up; in some schools they’ve stayed about even, and in [some] schools there’s not as much progress as one would have liked. But some of these latter schools are fairly small.”

The next slides Professor Cook showed depicted the number of faculty receiving tenure in general and by race/ethnicity.

“The percent of those acquiring tenure by gender increased in the period 2000–2004 for women slightly more than men. Similarly, the percent of those acquiring tenure by race increased in the period 2000 – 2004, although the percent was not as high for underrepresented minorities as for non-minorities or Asian.”
Building an Excellent and Diverse Faculty

• Faculty Development Initiative (FDI) – 2007

• Faculty Incentive Fund Programs (FIF and FIF+) – mid-90’s +

• Faculty Recruitment Efforts – Distinguished Faculty Lecture Program and Distinguished Alumni Scholars Programs – 2012

• URM Follow-Up Interview Study (Quality of Life) – 2010
  – Townhall: March 7
  – Meetings with faculty, chairs, and deans

• WISE Initiative - Women in Science and Engineering – 2012/13
  – Venture Fund for innovation, research, and support programs
  – Community Building and Communications (links across schools)

“Finally, I want to mention some of the initiatives that our office—and the university in general—engage in.

“The Faculty Development Initiative, which most of you know about, has been extremely successful. We had a report from [its Chair], Al Camarillo, a few years ago and Richard Saller has talked about it a great deal. H&S has benefited from that initiative as has the School of Education.

“The Faculty Incentive Fund [FIF] Programs have been in existence for quite a while. I would encourage everyone to take advantage of those programs as much as possible. I see a slight dip in the last few years in the number of requests for FIF support from the Provost.

“Over 80 faculty have been hired using the FIF funds in the past decade, and about 90% of those people are still at Stanford. Many schools have been able to increase both the number of diverse faculty and the number of women in their schools, in particular, Engineering and the natural sciences, through this mechanism.

“The Distinguished Faculty Lecture Program is fairly new. We will partner with schools to bring in faculty you might want to look at who you might eventually want to recruit.

“The Distinguished Alumni Scholars is a program that Patti Gumport [Vice Provost for Graduate Education] and others have helped us put on, which brings back faculty of color [who are faculty elsewhere], to encourage our graduate students to go on to
get PhDs, although that links to an earlier discussion about what they might do when they get a PhD. In March we’re going to finally have the results of the underrepresented minority follow-up study. It was a fairly large interview study that was done after the quality of life survey in 2008. There will be meetings with faculty, chairs, and deans and a Town Hall meeting scheduled for March 7 to discuss the findings.

“Finally, a fairly new initiative is WISE, Women in Science and Engineering. Carol Muller is the Executive Director. It’s a set of initiatives to fund research and various support programs to build community and connections between the various programs in the schools. The focus is on encouraging women in science and engineering to enter the professoria, and to be successful.”

The next slide was a collage of photographs of 11 faculty.

“These are the faculty we’ve hired since 2008, as a result of the Faculty Development Initiative and that initiative is still going strong. Al Camarillo is still the director of this initiative and I encourage you to talk with him. I think there is a search going on this year and there may be more going forward, with the Provost continuing to support this initiative.”

Chair Levitt asked Professor Cook, “Please tell us in a sentence or two what’s the best news and what’s the worst news from what you’ve just presented?”

Professor Cook answered, “The URM faculty increase over the past decade is only about 1%. If we increase the number of URM faculty at that rate, it’s going to be a long time before we have the kind of diversity that we’d really like to see at Stanford. So we just need to be more proactive.

“The good news is that women are really climbing up the faculty ladder. About 30% of the Associate and Assistant Professors are women. The number of women has gone up by about 50 in the past decade. And in the natural sciences there have been increases. I think there are only two departments in Engineering in which there hasn’t been an increase. These are small numbers but every person counts and we have a lot of really smart young female faculty members in those departments.”

Chair Levitt commented, “Computer Science has a woman Chair, (Jennifer Widom).”

Professor Cook smiled, “Yes. And she’s great!”

Chair Levitt: “Thank you very much, Karen.”
Professor Cook introduced Professor Hannah Valantine.

C. Overview of Faculty Recruitment at the School of Medicine with Regard to Diversity

Professor Valantine began her presentation. “Good afternoon, everybody. I’m delighted to be here. This is a forum where I don’t often have the opportunity to present, so thank you for inviting me.”

The first slide:

Overview

- THE CASE – A national Imperative for Excellence
- STANFORD PROGRAMS AND INTERVENTIONS
- PHASE I: Structural approaches & early outcomes
- PHASE II: Culture interventions—4 pillars for success:
  - Implicit attitudes & biases
  - Stereotype threat
  - Career flexibility
  - Sponsorship & networking

“First, I will explain why we have been focused so much on diversity.

“Second, I’d like to talk about the early phases in the office of Diversity and Leadership, which were predominantly structural fixes we needed to make. I came to the conclusion that we needed to make more changes, and those are listed here under Phase II.

“But before I start, let me just tell you a little bit about myself. I came to Stanford in 1985. Perhaps from my accent you can tell that I grew up in London. I had concluded my training as a clinical cardiologist, wanting to do academic things. I was [questioned] by people who mentored me and cared a great deal about my career, [because they] wondered whether I was being realistic. They said, ‘You must be mad!’—trying to be an academic cardiologist in London in 1985, as a woman, and black, to boot.

When I set foot in Stanford it became evident that my opportunities to do research were considerably better. I actually knew about the founding charter of Stanford and what it really meant—to encourage people who couldn’t get into other types of universities where you were excluded. I say that because I’m passionate about this work and believe that Stanford is where it can happen, and where we can see major changes in diversity, particularly for women and people from minority groups.”

Professor Valantine turned to the first point of her presentation.

“Why are we doing this? Of course the social justice aspect is very important, but we’ve transcended that rationale. I think [achieving diversity is essential] to maintain our excellence in all areas. Without diversity we are not going to be able to solve
those complex problems, for example, in my own field, in health and environment. Diversity of thought and of experience at the table is going to enable us to be successful at solving those problems.

“With that in mind when I started my office in 2005, our strategic goals were to increase recruiting, retention, and leadership. We particularly focused on leadership because we believed that identifying future leaders of Stanford and sending them an explicit message that they were valued and were going to be supported here, would be the way we might improve our retention rates. So I engaged with committees early, made the case for diversity, activated networks across the country to get people to apply, and talked to search committees about the importance of diversity and, in particular, the issue of unconscious bias.

“I think we have made some progress — vis á vis gender, vis á vis underrepresented minorities (URM) we’ve increased from 34 when I started the office to now 75. With these strategies I think we’re beginning to move the needle; not nearly as fast as we would like, but certainly moving in the right direction.

“Here [see slide below] are some of these structural things that we have been doing to help faculty.”

**Faculty Retention**

- Faculty development workshops
  - Grant / scientific writing; A & P
  - Negotiation; life-work integration
- Research awards
  - Diversity faculty
  - McCormick
- Publicize flexible work policies
- Dean’s meetings with faculty

**Pediatric Mentoring Program**

- Women’s networking
- Faculty & Culture Assessments
  - AAMC/ COACHE survey
  - Stanford University QOL
  - Pre-Dean’s retreat
  - Sloan- ACE flexibility policies
- Child care taskforce
  - Financial assistance
  - Emergency Backup care
  - Onsite day care (5)

“Aside from one program, the Women’s Networking program, which gives women a place to talk about things that are particularly of interest to them, most of the programs, including the leadership programs are designed for everybody. There are
classical [categories] like research awards, which help faculty. We have one such program just for women—the McCormick Award.

“We’ve been working on flexibility in work policies, we’ve done development in novel approaches to research. We have incorporated new ideas into mentoring. We now have mentoring teams, powerful mentors, mentor training, and even mentor compensation. In collaboration with the university we’ve been diligent on the issue of childcare. In particular, emergency backup care has been well received by the faculty with use that has far exceeded what was initially [thought would be needed].

“Two of our flagship Leadership Development programs are the Faculty Fellows Program and the Stanford Leadership Program.

Faculty Leadership Development

Faculty Fellows Program:

• Significant increase in leadership knowledge; confidence
• Path to leadership; feeling connected to colleagues

96 completed – 45% women; 20% URM

Stanford Leadership Program:

• Improved leadership effectiveness
• Sense of empowerment and ability to influence
• Sense of community at work

60 completed – 30% women 10% URM

“We’re grateful to President Hennessy and Provost Etchemendy for their support of our Faculty Fellows Programs. This is a program in which, through a nomination process, twenty faculty are nominated to go though a yearlong program that has three components. One is a dinner program, where leaders in our institution talk about their leadership journey and what it takes to be successful Stanford. In this way the faculty learn about leadership styles, which is known to be a way of teaching leadership. They’re also organized into small mentoring groups; each led by a senior faculty member who has an outstanding record as a mentor. These small mentoring groups meet monthly to talk about leadership issues. They also have coaching from our organizational psychologist to help them plan their careers and to communicate better with their division chiefs and department chairs.
“You might ask, ‘Well, where is the diversity in that?’ The diversity comes in how we select members for the program. We make sure the class is diverse, in terms of gender and race/ethnicity. As you can see, 45% of the faculty served were women and 20% URMs. We’re beginning to assess the outcomes for this program and we know there’s greater retention of the faculty who have participated. The challenge is how we get this program to more people.

“The Stanford Leadership Program is organized more on the Business School curriculum. A cohort of faculty is selected and meets together over a period of a year. This time gives [them] an opportunity for building a community. (This, by the way, is at the core of both programs because before we started, our faculty told us they have a tremendous sense of isolation). In this program they learn about finance management, negotiation, and people management. They meet in groups with four or five people from our senior faculty from our own Business School, and various other areas.”

Women Faculty (%) Prior to and after ODL Interventions

![Graph showing Women Faculty (%) Prior to and after ODL Interventions]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to 50% women full professors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanford: 28 years; Peers: 40 years; National: 48 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Here’s the good and bad news, as a result of all of that activity. We have increased the number of women faculty, significantly. The green line is the average of 26 member schools. This is the full professor rank. I like to focus on that rank, because it is the precursor to leadership. The heart of this problem is a huge general leadership gap that we are trying to solve, because faculty see who are in leadership positions. When they can’t see themselves, they are likely to have less resilience to face the
normal challenges we all face and are more likely to leave [academia]. There are a lot of data around to support that idea.

“Stanford (the red line) has surpassed our peers. However, ‘if you do the arithmetic’ (in Bill Clinton’s words), you’ll [calculate] that it will take twenty-eight years to get 50% of our full professors to be women. And it’s not as bad as the national data (48 years) or those for our peers (40 years). This is far too long; as a clinical cardiologist, I’m very impatient for more rapid activity [laughs].”

[ Laughter ]

New Directions to Accelerate the Pace of Change

• Intervention for Implicit bias-Recruitment to Expand Diversity & Excellence REDE: CTSA funded
• Identify factors that support career advancement of women—NIH Directors’ Pathfinder Award
• Faculty Career flexibility: Provost’s Funds; Dean’s operations; Sloan Foundation Award
• Sponsorship and Networking: Dean’s operations

“I want to touch on things that might help us get to 50-50 by 2020. I’m told this is a ridiculous goal, but I like to shoot high. First, I think we need to have interventions for implicit biases and implicit attitudes. These are attitudes we all hold. Some of you might have seen that outstanding paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences at the end of last year, in which science professors across the nation were asked to review blindly similar CVs of students and choose whom to work in their lab. The only difference in the CV was the name, which clearly identified the gender. More professors chose, by far, to hire the male candidates. And not only that, they offered to pay the women a lower salary.

“These were people, very well-meaning, who said, ‘We are not biased.’

“I’ll tell you a humorous story; when I first came to Stanford in 1985, as a clinical fellow, I was doing heart transplants. The wife of a heart transplant recipient asked me, ‘Dr. Valantine, do you know anything about the donor?’ I said, ‘No.’ I was actually busy trying to get the right images in my ultrasound and wasn’t really paying attention. And she said, ‘Well, you know, since he had his heart transplant he really likes watermelon.’”

[ Laughter ]

Professor Valantine continued, “The joke is that I had no idea what she was talking about. In England, I’d never heard of that stereotype.”

[ Laughter ]
“We need to figure out if we can change people’s decision-making processes, despite these stereotypes. We have a program with an educational module. We go to each department and division, and before we give the talk, we measure this implicit bias. Then we give the talk and follow up to see if we’ve changed anything. I’m finding that we are actually making some inroads.

“The second is the NIH Directors’ Pathfinder Award we were awarded a few years ago. It has to do with intervention against the threat of stereotypes. I’m not allowed to say more about that. Social scientists among us will know why we can’t talk about that kind of intervention.

“The third one is key, which has to do with career flexibility. We have a changing generation. We have a workplace that was created in the 1950s where one person was going to work and one staying at home. This is no longer the situation, and the workplaces must adjust to meet the needs of the current cohort. We have a number of pilot programs and we’re very grateful, to the President and Provost for supporting them.

“Finally, we need more creative forms of networking and mentorship. When we’re talking about mentorship in the senior domain, that area of sponsorship that goes beyond just mentoring.”

Chair Levitt, “Thank you, Hannah.”

[ Applause ]

Chair Levitt opened the floor for questions.

Professor Bruce Clemens was the first to comment. “I want to thank you both for your great presentations. I think it’s a very important area. In my experience at Stanford all the people involved are really well-meaning, but I think all also have implicit biases, and most of them are unaware of it. I know I was. I’ve used the web page called, ‘Project Implicit’, by Harvard and tested my reaction and found out I had a slight bias towards associating males with careers and females with home. My wife, who is a professor at Stanford, had a larger bias in that direction.”

[ Laughter ]

Professor Clemens continued, “So I always encourage people to take that test. One of things that strikes me is the ‘pipeline issue’ [producing sufficient numbers of graduates with doctoral degrees interested in an academic career]. There are many good programs going on at Stanford. I know the people involved are probably overcommitted already, but anything they can do to reach out to professional societies, who are also struggling with this same issue, trying to bring women and underrepresented minorities up to high levels of leadership in those societies [should
be encouraged]. Anything that is successful at Stanford that could be translated to societies, working together to learn from each other [should also be encouraged]. I was wondering if you had any suggestions how to help us as members or leaders of professional societies to learn from Stanford and vice versa?”

Professor Valantine responded, “Most of the societies and most of the institutions are looking to places like Stanford for help. I’ve just been asked to chair a NIH committee that had a grant proposal mechanism to learn how can we translate the kinds of things we’re doing here, which are experimental, more broadly. There are activities going on in professional societies but their culture and milieu make it difficult to [import] the culture of medical schools and their hiring practices. I see it as us having to push the envelope, not only here, but also across the nation.”

Professor Cook added, “With our new Women In Science and Engineering [WISE] we are working with VPGE Patti [Gumport] and VPUE Harry [Elam] to benefit not only faculty, but also graduate and undergraduate students.”

Professor Debra Satz commented, “I appreciate having this report every year to focus our attention on the issue because it so easily dissipates. I was thrilled to hear about the some of the initiatives that the Medical School is doing.

“I have one question. The progress [in the rising numbers of women on the faculty] seems slow. Of course, the progress in minority faculty is much slower, but the progress in women is also very slow. I’ve been here twenty-five years. When I came the percent of women on the faculty was about 18%, if I remember correctly, and now it’s 26%. It’s a slow rise. How are other schools doing? How do we compare to our peers? Are there best practices that we can look to, is there anybody who’s more successful?”

Professor Valantine responded, “I looked at this and [assumed] our peers to be [the medical schools at] Harvard, Yale, Washington, UCSF, Johns Hopkins, and a few others. That was the basis of the graph I showed you. Our rate of change has been faster than theirs but we started behind them.”
Professor Cook showed a slide. “Compared to our peers, Stanford looks fairly good, including engineering and the natural sciences. We’re about in the middle, but they’re all about the same. In these universities—you can guess who our peers might be—there’s a mix in how much engineering they have, or how large the humanities programs are, so there’s some variation in the actual structure of the university that I think accounts for the differences, but we look similar to them. When I talk to some of my peers at what’s called the MIT 9 meetings, we share best practices and we learn that we’re often recruiting from the same circle; I call it the ‘Circle of Elites.’ We need to think more broadly about how to bring more women into the net, and when they get into the net [how to employ] the initiatives that Hannah’s talked about, making life possible in academia for everyone.”

Professor Elizabeth Hadly commented, “Being on some of those search committees, [I found that] one of the issues is that the pool of applicants is remarkably biased against female faculty, at least in my program. I wonder—is there going to be an attempt to actually see the pool of applicants to jobs here as relates to our hiring practices?”

Professor Cook nodded, “Several attempts. Every year there’s an affirmative action plan meeting. A lot of documents are put together and a consultant is used to compare availability pools with what’s called ‘utilization,’ which is actual hiring. The problem with the data is that they are not precise enough for the kinds of availability pools that we use. Some schools have done their own research—where do we actually hire from, and what do those pools look like. You’re in Biology, aren’t you? That’s, I thought, one of the better pools for women.”
Professor Hadly nodded, “Yes, but we still don’t have a 50/50 ratio of women to men in our applicant pool.”

Professor Cook continued, “Richard [Dean Saller] can talk about this but I think in H&S some of the associate deans have looked into what’s called the long short list and at what kinds of candidates are rising to the top and trying to be clear about the messages of—let’s speak broadly—about who might win. John Etchemendy is supportive of using the Faculty Incentive Program if we find somebody we’d like to hire but don’t have a slot in subfield A this year. Another part of it is being very assertive and aggressive about finding these people and then making a place for them at Stanford.”

Professor Margaret Fuller recalled, “You guys have had for the past few years an experimental program called DARE [Diversifying Academic Recruiting Excellence], where you’re taking graduate students at Stanford and trying to teach them and give them confidence and power to become faculty themselves. I’ve had two students go through that program; it’s been quite effective for both. I was wondering if that was going to continue.”

Provost Etchemendy replied, “Yes. Patti Gumport [who was not in attendance] would answer, it’s her program, and I think it’s one of the most fantastic programs on campus, and yes, we are continuing it.”

Professor Cook added, “The size of the cohort has increased and the program’s going to continue. I was a formal mentor to two of those [DARE students]. They both had five or six job offers as soon as they got their PhDs, one in my field and one in political science. They were ready to go and they were highly sought after. What Patti is trying to do is get other universities to adopt the DARE program because then we could benefit from their creating pools like this.

“Patti was head of the association of people who are Vice Provosts, etc., or Deans of Graduate Schools and she talked a lot about the DARE program. I think she’s also talked to our closest peer set which is the MIT 9 people, so if we could get more people to adopt DARE-type activities, we can benefit too. It’s a fantastic program.”

Graduate Student Council Representative Michael Shaw commented. “I want to expand on the last comment, which is that it is really a leaky pipeline in many ways. Among all the slides the one that most worried me was the one that showed the line indicating Female Faculty at the Assistant Professor level, almost [horizontal over] the entire cohort period [“Female Faculty Representation”] and I worried that the perceived advantages we’re getting at the full professor level are really just the pipeline of the last couple of years. I don’t see a path to 50% in those data. And I worry about the graduate student and the postdoctoral level. Programs like DARE are wonderful; I’ve heard anecdotally amazing stories about them. But when you talk about resources for the faculty, you’re also talking about things like career flexibility.
I know it’s important to have [other programs] like health care plans or housing possibilities, which allow for female faculty members to have families as well. But [similar programs for pre-faculty graduate students and post doctoral fellows at Stanford] are unfortunately lacking. It would be great, in looking for our future faculty, if we were to set an example for those lower ranks as well, and make it possible for people of all groups and all backgrounds to be successful academics at the graduate and post-doctoral levels here.”

Professor Jeremy Weinstein, commented, “It is fabulous for us and for the university to focus on these issues on a regular basis. One reflection, on the search processes and the challenges that we confront, is that some of the tensions are not made explicit enough. When we have senior faculty heading towards retirement, we think about seeking billets from the dean to replace them. We often think we need to hire people who’ve achieved some prominence, people who are in their mid-forties, late-forties, and early fifties, to make hires that secure and maintain the reputation of our departments. When we’re building lists in that pool that is often not where the pipeline is really changing, right? The pipeline—to the extent that all of this mentoring is an effort to diversify our graduate and our PhD’s pool—is at the Assistant Professor level. When I sit on search committees for assistant professors, I see a much more diverse pool.

“I’m wondering how the deans, in particular, think about this tension, because if we were thinking about replacement or weighted in the direction of hiring at the assistant level and promoting, we might have a steeper curve over time. Whereas for the process of replacing a retiring professor with more senior folks, the pool is much more limited and persists with the bias in the direction of men with an underrepresentation of underrepresented minorities over time. I see this, how limited and narrow our pool is, when we’re looking at the senior level. I wonder how you think about that at the dean’s level and you’re authorizing [recruitment at the] junior faculty level versus full professor appointments.”

Dean Saller responded, “We’re heavily biased toward hiring young people. I think, on average, H&S has been hiring two-thirds junior assistant professors/one-third senior. Our default is junior. Departments will sometimes make the argument that they need leadership, and we look at that critically, it’s one consideration among many. One thing that Stanford does that [the University of] Chicago didn’t do is hiring advanced assistant professors who come in; a book is finished in the humanities, some of the social science [research] is ready for publication, we hire them and after a few years, tenure them early, I think we do that pretty well, so we’re trying to continue it.”

Professor Cook commented, “Some of the [qualifications of the candidate] are internal to the department, the way the department thinks about how it should replace itself.”

Professor Valantine replied, addressing Professor Weinstein, “I think your point is well taken, and I’m talking about the Medical School now. We’ve had several busts
in the pipeline for women graduating from medical school and graduate schools for over ten years now. We cannot hide behind the lack of pipeline; it’s due to the leakiness of the pipeline. I realize it’s different in the physical sciences. For example, I saw data that showed the hiring of women faculty in the physical sciences across the country is higher proportionately than women in the available pool, which is a step forward.”

Chair Levitt invited Dean Pam Matson to comment about Earth Sciences.

Dean Mason, “We do have small numbers but in our last five to ten years fifty percent of our hires have been women and they’ve been at the assistant level. It’s not really, in a sense, up to the departments to decide. It’s a school-wide agreement that we’re going to be looking for young, up-and-coming great people and the pools are much better at that level, so it’s working for us, quickly.”

Professor Cyert observed, “I was surprised to see that the women are especially under represented at the department chair level [at Stanford]. I think that they’re much lower, overall, than the percentage of full professors at Stanford, right, which was 26% if I remember correctly, and there were 8 female department chairs, 58 male department chairs. I wondered if anyone has comments about that.”

Professor Cook replied, “Having been a department chair I’m going to say, IQ test that we pass.”

[Laughter]

Professor Cyert continued, “Are there barriers in that level?”

Professor Valantine, “Yes. There are 28 departments in the School of Medicine. We don’t have that many department chairs that are women [two]. So this is part of the previous discussion, what can we do to change that? Is it a pool issue? Some of the [candidates for chair] of these areas are very highly specialized that really don’t have a pipeline. For example, in the surgical specialties; the women are not well represented in the pools. There are many reasons and every one of them needs to be addressed.”

Professor Andrea Goldsmith commented that she was from “Electrical Engineering, which these data show is the department with the lowest percentage of women in a school with the lowest percentage of women in the university, so I’ve experienced being an underrepresented gender, certainly in my department. I have a couple of comments, one is on leadership. I believe that leadership matters because it pushes down the importance of looking for a broad pool, casting a wide net, and trying to avoid the subtle biases that we see all the time in search committees and in evaluating candidates. It’s not enough to have it come just from the very top; it really needs to trickle down to all the levels of leadership including the department chairs.”
“Of all the things that I have done to try and encourage more women and underrepresented minorities in engineering, the place where I think I’ve been most effective is not within the university but in my professional societies. That is where, first of all, there’s a much larger group of women, because societies span many universities. It’s also a place where women and minorities look for mentors, and for people to write their letters of recommendation, I think that we should look beyond just universities to professional societies, and start initiatives within societies, to have mentoring and peer groups. I found it was easy to do within my professional society and it’s had a tremendous impact.”

Professor Eric Roberts commented, “I want to say thank you to all the people who’ve worked on this over the years. The difference in this meeting and the meeting in which you forced this issue onto the floor almost twenty years ago now, is just amazing and it’s wonderful to see this kind of progress.

“I did want to ask a question about something that’s been troubling me in our department of Computer Science. We have, for example, lost three female candidates for our faculty. We made offers to three women to be assistant professors in the last decade, all of whom chose to remain at MIT, where they got their PhDs. We have this policy that we don’t hire our own PhDs; to make sure that there’s some change, we make them go away for a little while, and then maybe we’ll hire them back. But the effect is that MIT hires the MIT graduates and then MIT hires the Stanford graduates.”

[ Laughter ]

Professor Roberts continued, “This sounds like a reasonable position from first principles. But it has this inevitable discriminatory effect. And I’m wondering whether that’s a problem for other departments as well, or something that there could be university guidance on. This is probably not something to be so firm about. If your goal is to increase the diversity.”

Provost Etchemendy responded vehemently, “Let everybody know it is not a university call, that you can’t hire your own graduates. And it tends to be in some schools it’s discouraged [recruiting their own graduate students to the faculty]. There are certain departments that I know of that are absolutely convinced that [recruitment from within is not desirable] and this may be true of CS. I think, in particular, in the case of, for example, a spectacular woman PhD in computer science or whatever, that I think we should [recruit her]. We absolutely should. I remember one case, Jim Plummer came to me and said, ‘Look, we have this wonderful woman who’s graduating …’ in whatever department it was, and had an opportunity for a postdoc somewhere else and what Jim ended up doing was funding this person to go on the postdoc and then come back to Stanford. In other words, offering the job first, and then having them go out and do whatever they were going to do, and then come back. I can’t remember the details. But we can do that kind of creativity. We have the flexibility to do that. There are very few rigid policies at the university.”
Chair Levitt concluded the discussion. “Thanks again to this group for a wonderful presentation.”

[ Applause ]

VII. Unfinished Business
There was no unfinished business.

VIII. New Business
There was no new business.

IX. Adjournment
A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed unanimously. The Senate adjourned the meeting at 5:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Rex L. Jamison, MD
Academic Secretary to the University
Professor of Medicine, Emeritus
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<td>P  Magill, Elizabeth, <em>Dean of the Law School</em></td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Matson, Pamela, <em>Dean of the School Earth Sciences</em></td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Minor, Lloyd, <em>Dean of the School of Medicine</em></td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Mitchell, Jay, <em>Law</em></td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Moin, Parviz, <em>Mechanical Engineering</em></td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Moler, Kathryn, <em>Applied Physics</em></td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Mudgett, Mary Beth, <em>Biology</em></td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Osborne, Jonathan, <em>Education</em></td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Palumbo-Liu, David, <em>Comparative Literature</em></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Plummer, James, <em>Dean of the School of Engineering</em></td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E  Prinz, Friedrich, <em>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</em></td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Rabin, Robert, <em>Law</em></td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Raisian, John, <em>Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education</em></td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Reardon, Sean, <em>Education</em></td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Reich, Rob, <em>Political Sciences</em></td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Reijo Pera, Renee, <em>Obstetrics and Gynecology</em></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Roberts, Eric S., <em>Computer Science</em></td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Safran, Gabriella, <em>Slavic</em></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Saller, Richard, <em>Dean of the School of Humanities &amp; Sciences</em></td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Saloner, Garth, <em>Dean of the Graduate School of Business</em></td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Satz, Debra M., <em>Philosophy</em></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Schindler, Rafe, <em>SLAC</em></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E  Shapiro, Lucille, <em>Developmental Biology</em></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Solgaard, Olav, <em>Electrical Engineering</em></td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Spiegel, David, <em>Psychiatry &amp; Behavioral Sciences</em></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Stedman, Stephen, <em>FSI</em></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Steele, Claude, <em>Dean of the School of Education</em></td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Van Roy, Benjamin, <em>Electrical Engineering</em></td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Wasow, Thomas, <em>Linguistics</em></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Weinstein, Jeremy, <em>Political Science</em></td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Wolak, Frank, <em>Economics</em></td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Zoback, Mark, <em>Geophysics</em></td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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