TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
FORTY-FIFTH SENATE REPORT No. 6

Summary of Actions Taken by the Senate
February 7, 2013

At its meeting on Thursday, February 7, 2013, the Senate took the following action:

By divided voice vote, the Senate approved the recommendation of the Steering Committee to revise the Committee on Review of Undergraduate Majors (C-RUM) charge.

The Senate also heard a report from Athletics Director Bernard Muir, the Jaquish & Kenninger Director of Athletics.

Rex L. Jamison, MD
Academic Secretary to the University
Professor of Medicine, Emeritus
MINUTES OF THE FORTY-FIFTH SENATE
OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
February 7, 2013

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

In attendance were 37 members, 7 ex officio members and many guests.

II. Approval of Minutes – (SenD#6707)
The minutes of the January 24, 2013, meeting of Senate XLV were approved.

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

IV. Standing Reports
A. Memorial Resolutions:
Chair Levitt invited Professor Willard E. Fee Jr., M.D., the Edward & Amy Sewall Professor II, in the School of Medicine, Emeritus, to present a brief memorial statement in honor of Jon Eisenson, Professor Emeritus, from the Department of Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery in the School of Medicine. The full-length memorial resolution was included in the Senators’ packets (SenD#6717) and will be linked to in the Stanford Report.

Jon Eisenson (1907-2001) SenD#6717
Dr. Jon Eisenson, Professor Emeritus, Department of Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery, School of Medicine, died of prostate cancer, at his home on the Stanford campus on July 27, 2001 at the age of 93.

Jon Eisenson was born Dec. 17, 1907. After graduating from City College of New York in 1928, and receiving both a MA in 1930, and a PhD in 1935 from Columbia University, Dr. Eisenson taught at Brooklyn College, Queens College, Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons and New York University. Serving in World War II, he established and supervised the language rehabilitation program for the Surgeon General's Office and achieved the rank of Major. As fellow and past president of the American Speech and Hearing Association and the American Speech and Hearing Foundation, Professor Eisenson helped develop the diagnostic category of childhood aphasia – brain damage that leads to difficulty speaking or understanding language.

Dr. Eisenson joined Stanford as a professor of hearing and speech science and established the Institute for Childhood Aphasia at Stanford in 1962. He was Distinguished Professor of Special Education at San Francisco State and visiting
professor at other universities including Northwestern and the universities of Wisconsin, Colorado, Utah, Tel Aviv (Israel) and Queensland (Australia).


Mr. Chair, I have the honor to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a Resolution in memory of the late Jon Eisenson, Professor Emeritus, Department of Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery in the School of Medicine.

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

Chair Levitt thanked Professor Fee.

Chair Levitt invited Don Kennedy, President Emeritus, and Bing Professor of Environmental Science, Emeritus, to present the memorial statement for Lawrence G. Crowley, M.D., Professor of Surgery, Emeritus.

**Lawrence G. Crowley (1919-2011) SenD#6718**

Lawrence G. Crowley was an important person in the life of Stanford University, Stanford Medical Center and the Children’s Hospital at Stanford for over 30 years. One of his roles was in working with the Packard family and Lucile and David Packard in bringing the Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital at Stanford to reality in 1989. Larry and the family would surely be proud of the growth in the size and stature of their creation 22 years later.

Larry was born on July 2, 1919, in Newark, New Jersey, and died at his home at The Forum in Cupertino on March 30, 2011, at the age of 91. Larry had a challenging childhood. His mother’s death shortly after his birth left him to assume many family responsibilities during his childhood. He found solace at a YMCA Summer Camp in Vermont at nine, eventually becoming the Camp Director – a template for a life in which he would start early, persevere and contribute.

He graduated from Yale University, as a track athlete with Majors in History and Political Science, and then at Yale Medical School. His Surgical Residency, also at Yale, was interrupted by Army service during World War II in Germany.

While still an intern, he met a Yale student nurse, Madeline Robb, who subsequently became his wife of 66 years. As a young mother, she contracted poliomyelitis – a disease that at the time was treated with what could charitably be called benign neglect. Larry wouldn’t hear of that for Madeline, and he arranged for her to go to Warm Springs, Georgia, for a year of rehabilitation while he took on a Fellowship at Emory.
A move to Southern California followed residency in 1953, and Larry began a distinguished career in practice, administration and scholarship. He became a Director of Casa Colina, a polio rehabilitation center, and over the years became its Chair of the Board – after which he enlarged its scope and mission until it became and remains one of the nation’s most innovative rehabilitation centers.

In 1964, a year after Bob Chase became Chairman of the Department of Surgery at Stanford, he prevailed upon Larry to join him here as Associate Professor of Surgery and Chief of Surgery at the Veterans Administration Hospital. His gifts as a teacher, administrator and consensus builder were recognized by promotion to Professor of Surgery in 1970 and he joined the administrative ranks as an Associate Dean where he co-authored the medical school’s long-range plan.

He was soon recruited to become Dean of the Medical School at the University of Wisconsin, but after five years Larry returned to Stanford as Deputy Dean and was set to work solving the Medical School’s financial and political problems, among them some town-gown problems at Stanford Hospital. Because of success in his many endeavors and his wide acceptance as a faculty leader, Stanford’s President appointed him Vice-President for Medical Affairs and Dean in 1980.

Larry had served on the Board of Directors of the original Children’s Hospital for Convalescent Children, known then fondly as the “Con. Home”, since 1982. It was the vision of Lucile and David Packard and Larry that brought the Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital to reality in 1989. Larry resigned as Vice President and Dean in 1986 so that he could devote his full attention to the Children’s Hospital project. He served as Chair of its Board following Lucile Packard’s death in 1986. Among a long list of awards, there is the Lawrence Crowley Endowed Professorship in Child Health, established by a gift from the Lucile Packard Foundation for Children’s Health and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

Larry Crowley was a consensus builder who engendered trust and respect from those with whom he worked. He was calm under pressure—and he always made certain that he weighed all sides of a controversy. He was a valued friend, colleague and leader.

Larry is survived by his wife, 3 children, Larry, Jr., Steve and Suzanne, and by 5 granddaughters and 3 great-granddaughters.

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor on behalf of a committee consisting of Professor Robert A. Chase, Professor James B. D. Mark and myself, Professor Donald Kennedy, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a Resolution in memory of Lawrence G. Crowley, Professor of Surgery in the School of Medicine.

At Chair Levitt’s invitation, everyone stood for a moment of silence in tribute.
Chair Levitt thanked Professors Kennedy, Chase and Mark.

A. Steering Committee
Chair Levitt turned to the Steering Committee announcements.

February 21st: Dean of Research Ann Arvin and Professor Peter Michelson, Chair of the Committee on Research, will lead 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.

April: There is no April meeting—the annual Academic Council meeting, convened by President Hennessy, will take place on April 18th in place of the regular Senate meeting.

The Senate will return May 2nd when the Board of Judicial Affairs will present revisions to the Alternative Review Process.

Chair Levitt called attention to an important date: Online elections for the Senate and the first round of Advisory Board elections will begin February 11th and continue through March 1st. “Be sure to remember to vote—faculty participation is the foundation of Stanford’s faculty governance system. You’ll be sent a link to the online ballot on February 11th.”

B. Committee on Committees (CoC)
“We will hear from the CoC later today.”

C. President
Chair Levitt invited the President to comment. President Hennessy had one announcement.

“The Engineering School had a record number of new members elected to the National Academy of Engineering—eight, which we believe to be not only a Stanford record, but an all-time record for one institution. We send our congratulations to:

Craig T. Bowman, Professor of Mechanical Engineering

Gregory G. Deierlein Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, and John A. Blume Professor in the School of Engineering

David L. Dill, Professor, Department of Computer Science

Abbas El Gamal, Hitachi America Professor in the School of Engineering, and Professor and Chair, Department of Electrical Engineering
President Hennessy commented, “That represents seven of the nine departments in Engineering that had a new member of the Academy, and a tribute to all of them.”

[Applause]

There were no questions for the President.

**Provost**

Chair Levitt asked the Provost if he had any comments.

Provost John Etchemendy reminded the Senate of a previous session on online learning, in which John Mitchell, Vice Provost for Online Learning, and Peter DeMarzo, Bernd Girod and Charles Prober, Associate Deans for Online Learning, discussed clarifications in the policies governing teaching at other institutions, and ownership of courses [October 25, 2012]. The Provost said he will be sending a memo describing the clarifications to the deans and department chairs, and asking them to convey the information to their faculty. Along with the memo will be a list of FAQs [Frequently Asked Questions] the faculty might have.

Chair Levitt suggested to the Provost that clarification about using copyrighted material on MOOCs [massive open online courses] should be included in the FAQs.

Provost Etchemendy agreed and added, “All copyrighted material has to be cleared. Things that you could use in a live classroom you cannot use in the MOOCs—you can’t put a New Yorker cartoon, for example, in a MOOC.”

Professor Robert Reich noted, “One of the recommendations [discussed at that Senate meeting] involved Stanford’s expectations about faculty who wish to partner with outside entities and offer courses, and whether or not permission needed to be obtained and how the [revenue] sharing might be involved. Does that also apply even to the three months of time in which faculty are not employed by Stanford?”

The Provost replied, “Yes, it’s been a long-standing policy that faculty employed at Stanford are not allowed to teach for another institution, even during the summer.”
That’s what we hire you for and is consistent with the expectations of our students. The clarification recommended by the faculty committee was that [this policy] also applies to online institutions like Coursera and Udacity. It applies even if you create the course in the summer or while you’re on sabbatical.

“If there is ever any revenue [from online courses], our intention is to share it with the faculty member and the faculty member’s departments. We don’t have a central interest in having this as a new revenue source.

“The policy [is intended] to protect the institution and the faculty member and that member’s intellectual property. Our students pay tuition on the expectation that they’re getting an education from first-rate faculty that cannot be gotten elsewhere.”

There were several follow-up questions. The Provost made it clear that he was referring to faculty having a regular teaching position at another institution. Faculty can teach at another academic institution as a visiting faculty member; that is a longstanding tradition. Similarly, faculty can teach a short course for their professional societies.

“But you cannot teach for another institution that is offering a course for credit while you are an employee of the university. That is what we are hiring you for.”

With regard to online courses, the Provost emphasized the distinction between teaching as part of an online course through a Stanford program, which is consistent with Stanford’s policy, and participating in an online course produced by another institution, which is not.

“You can’t create competitive material for an institution that may end up competing with the university’s current or potential programs.”

There were no other questions for the Provost.

V. Other Reports
A. Director of Athletics Report
Chair Levitt introduced the next speaker.

“Please help me welcome Athletics Director Bernard Muir, the Jaquish & Kenninger Director of Athletics, to give us a presentation about athletics at Stanford, and scholar athletes, and all the issues that come up time and time again.”

Athletic Director (AD) Muir, an imposing figure, stood and faced the Senate. “Thank you very much for having me. I’ve been on the job about six months and I feel like some of our student athletes, I’m not sure exactly where to turn, but I am excited about working here and hopefully getting to that sophomore year as quickly as possible.”
AD Muir began by a brief review of his career. “I have wanted to be an athletic director from the time I was in high school. I grew up in Gainesville, Florida. I never had aspirations of playing professionally. I played basketball as a high school student athlete. My mom always said, ‘Bernard, if you have the opportunity to use basketball to get to wherever you want to go, by all means do so.’ I was recruited by Brown University and played basketball for them. I knew I wanted to stay in the game in some way and I thought, it’d be great if I could work behind the scenes. As a youngster I sold orange juice at the Florida football games. I learned that you could use orange juice for more than just breakfast in the mornings, selling oranges in the student section.

“The first day [at Brown] I stopped in at the office of the athletic director and said, ‘You know, at some point I’d like to be in your shoes. I’m not trying to take your job, but at some point in time I’d love to do that.’ He said, ‘Bernard, I’ve had seniors talk to me about a job in athletics, but I’ve never had a freshman talk to me about my job. Let’s see how things unfold and then eventually we’ll see where that goes.’

A slide of the US depicted AD Muir’s career path.

“I worked at the NCAA on the NCAA basketball championship. As a basketball student athlete, to be able to work on the Final Four was a tremendous opportunity. It provided me a platform to meet presidents, athletic directors, and conference commissioners, and [helped me] grow in my profession. Eventually, I got a call from the athletic director at Notre Dame. And as you can see from the map, I’ve had the opportunity to work at Notre Dame, Georgetown, Butler, Auburn and most recently at the University of Delaware before I came to Stanford.

“When I got the call from President Hennessy and the wonderful news, I turned to my wife and said, ‘Can you believe we’re going to be in Palo Alto, working at Stanford?’ And she said, ‘That’s wonderful! That’s tremendous! But don’t screw this up.’

AD Muir continued, “Knowing that I have that type of support at home—”

“When I get emails and phone calls from people asking, ‘Hey, how come we didn’t win?’ I just go home and I know the worst is yet to come.”
AD Muir continued, “At Stanford the expectations are high and part of my job as an athletic director is to manage those expectations, especially when we’re dealing with alumni and friends. Being able to walk in here and watch our football program head to the Rose Bowl, I thought that’s pretty special. Over the course of the season I visited with donors. At the USC weekend I remember people saying, ‘Bernard, if we can just keep this game close. We lost Andrew [Luck], this is going to be a tough competition, just keep it somewhat close’—and sure enough our team wins. At Oregon I remember people saying, ‘Bernard, they are really, really fast.’—And sure enough, we pull off the upset. And then I remember getting to the UCLA game—the second one [for the Pac 12 championship], and donors said to me, ‘Bernard, we better win.’”

[ Laughter ]

“The term the NCAA uses is ‘the student athlete’ but here at Stanford, it’s really about the ‘scholar athlete.’ We’re going to go through some slides about our student athletes and show how remarkable they are, as scholars, how they’re balancing competing at the highest level and competing in the classroom amongst a very highly competitive environment. They are a highly energetic group of students, getting the best out of the experience.

“Our recruiting never stops. Yesterday David Shaw [Stanford’s football coach] had a reception whereby we celebrated 12 scholar athletes that are joining the Stanford community. Ten coaches went out and sought these kids nationwide and said, ‘These twelve represent our class.’ [It’s a] small class—normally the numbers are in the twenties—but we didn’t need as many so we sought twelve. We had about 400 people in the Alumni Center that came to see the twelve that will be joining us. When Jim Harbaugh started here [as head football coach], that group of friends was maybe ten or twenty and now it’s grown to about 400.

“People are interested, yet these kids understand that this is a remarkable experience. When they are here, we make sure that they have the best experience possible. When they graduate we’ll recruit them again because we want them to stay connected to the program.

“So when you listen to the story about these student athletes and their incredible experience, think about the term, ‘scholar athlete,’ because that is truly unique. And that is our charge—to make sure that we brand that message because the story here is vastly different than the story anywhere around the country. It’s different from the story at South Bend, Indiana or Knoxville, Tennessee, or Baton Rouge, Louisiana.”

AD Muir introduced and then showed a video about Stanford’s athletes. He said that, “two former student athletes in soccer, as well as a club student athlete in tennis produced the video that captures the scholar athlete experience at Stanford.”
“This [slide] is a snapshot of our profile.

“We offer over 500 scholarships. Many scholarships in some sports provide the full ride to come to Stanford. In other programs, such as women’s lacrosse, we divide the scholarships among a number of student athletes. That’s part of the plan in allowing students to have the opportunity to come to Stanford.

“We’ve won the Director’s Cup, which measures how well you do across a broad range of sports in the post season. When we get to the NCAA championships it’s a measure of how far you go and how well you do. And we’ve won these cups eighteen years in a row. At that first staff meeting with our coaches and staff, I said, ‘Look, I know it’s not a big deal [since] you’ve won these cups eighteen years in a row, but let me tell you, number nineteen is a big deal.’

[ Laughter ]

“I’m happy to say, coming out of the fall standings, we are ranked number one. But it is something, as our staff knows, I sweat about every day.”
“We’re a very diverse population. The university is very diverse, and our student athletes follow suit.”

The next slide was another set of pie charts showing the distribution of revenue for the Athletic Department, which totaled $91,455,000, and the distribution of expenses, which totaled $92,477,000.

“The majority of our expenses are for compensation of our coaches and staff and scholarships for our student athletes. Other costs include upgrading and maintaining our facilities, travel and other expenses.”

A bar graph compared graduation rates at Stanford with the nation. For the year 2005-2006, national rates were 63% for all students and 65% for all student athletes; for Stanford the rates were 96% for all students and 97% for all student athletes. For the 4-year class averages, 2002-2005 the national rates were 63% for all students and 64% for all student athletes; for Stanford the rates were 95% for all students and 92% for all student athletes.
“This graph provides you a comparison with our peers in the PAC12. You can see our graduation rates clearly exceed [those of our peers]. We make sure that we graduate our student athletes; we’re true to our mission in making sure that they get their degree.”

The next slide was a photograph of the presentation of the Rose Bowl trophy to Coach David Shaw and the Most Valuable Player Award to Usua Amanam, New Year’s Day, 2013.

“Every time we have a competition, it is a chance for us to bring the community together. And this [slide] is a reminder of the remarkable year we had in the sport of football. When I think about the Rose Bowl, to have 40,000 people show up and celebrate the best that Stanford has to offer is truly remarkable.”

The next slide summarized some facts about Stanford’s scholar-athletes.

**Top 5 Scholar-Athlete Majors**
1. Human Biology
2. Science, Technology & Society
3. Engineering
4. Management Science & Engineering
5. Psychology
Fall 2012:
- Average cumulative scholar-athlete GPA: 3.286
- 25 scholar-athletes in co-term programs
- 11 scholar-athletes pursuing double majors
- 18% of freshmen scholar-athletes participated in at least one IntroSem

A graph showed that between 30 and 45 scholar-athletes were in Overseas Studies between 2009 and 2012.

AD Muir commented, “The NCAA is concerned that athletes are fully integrated into the broader community. At Stanford we can say that is indeed the case. We would love to have our student athletes get more involved in taking advantage of the opportunities here, whether it be Sophomore College, or overseas programs, but that sometimes can be difficult. Based on the scheduling and the year-round practice and competition, it becomes a challenge and something that we’ve got to continue to look at.”

The next slide was a photograph of a Stanford cross country runner competing in a race.

“This is Miles Unterreiner, a member of our cross-country team. A unique opportunity came his way this fall; he applied to be a Rhodes scholar and was interviewed in Seattle. At the same time he participated in NCAA national championships in Louisville, Kentucky. He was in a difficult pinch because the first interview in Seattle and the championships were in Louisville the same weekend. He was invited to return for the last round of the interviews in Seattle the same afternoon as the race. Fortunately one of the members of our [Stanford] family stepped up and provided him private transportation—only at Stanford!—to get from Seattle to Louisville for the competition, and back to Seattle.

“Unfortunately he did not win the Rhodes scholarship—and unfortunately—it was also a tough day from a competitive standpoint [at Louisville].”

[ Laughter ]

“But Miles said he had a wonderful experience. Now he did say, ‘I really could get used to doing that private charter thing.’”

[ Laughter ]

“Miles is a Phi Beta Kappa student and one of the top 25 students graduating in the School of Humanities and Sciences. He received the Kennedy Thesis Prize for Best Senior Thesis in Humanities.”
“We interview our student athletes, and conduct a survey asking: ‘How was your experience? Would you do it all over again if you were to choose Stanford?’ Our recruiting is ongoing and we have to make sure, as coaches and administrators, that the kids can differentiate between the Stanford experience, the Duke experience, the Notre Dame experience, and other places once they get on this campus. As coaches and as administrators, we’re thrilled when kids bring their parents with them. They can get caught up in glitz and glamour [of recruiting] and the investments that schools are putting into facilities and the dollars that they’re spending in other areas, but when you get on this campus we want to make sure the student athletes [and their parents] have a wonderful experience. Our surveys show that over 90% [of our scholar athletes] do have a wonderful experience and that they would do the Stanford experience again.

“We provide Academic Support Services to make sure that they can balance studies and athletics. We want to make sure they are taking the courses necessary to graduate in the majors they choose.”

The next slide was a photograph of a student along with her typical daily schedule that began at 6 AM and had an event almost every hour until 11 PM, which was marked for study.

“Daphne Martschenko is a rower on our women’s rowing team. As you can see she’s a pretty busy student. She’s up at 6 AM lifting weights, then getting to class, having
afternoon practice, having a little social time, and then getting up the next day and participating. Daphne is truly a remarkable student athlete. She’s a double major in Anthropology and Slavic Studies with a minor in Arabic. She’s also the kitchen manager of the Slav dorm and secretary of the Cardinal Council, which is [composed of representatives from each of the sport teams]. She’s also competing nationally in the sport of rowing. She was on the US Under-23 team, a rowing team that competed in the world rowing championships in Lithuania.”

AD Muir turned to the practice schedules.

“As you can see, practice hours range from 1–7 PM. I know there is push to have more morning classes [for all Stanford students]. That certainly pleases us, selfishly, because our kids, by the time they finish their classes and head to the practice times, the ‘sweet spot’ is between 3 and 5 PM. Some have asked why we can’t start practices earlier in the morning. We could, in some instances, but sometimes it’s hard to get a full group of kids to be in practice early morning, and then getting underway.”

A slide summarized the Medical & Support Services provided by DAPER, the Department of Athletics, Physical Education and Recreation:

—10-year contract with Stanford Hospital and Clinics to provide comprehensive health care.
—DAPER partners with Stanford Hospital and the School of Medicine for multidisciplinary research projects, e.g. knee injuries prevention and concussion studies.

—The DAPER medical team consists of 10 team physicians, 5 physical therapists, 18 certified trainers, a biomechanist and a sports nutritionist.

“We like to provide our student athletes balance and appropriate support. Certainly from a medical standpoint, we have the best doctors, trainers and sports performance people to help the student athlete balance those needs. Basically, in a given sport, an athlete devotes over 20 hours a week. When you consider practice and competition, the training room, watching film, and traveling, it’s well over 20 hours. That’s the reality. But the NCAA rule is that you are restricted to 20 hours of true participation for athletic endeavors.”

Ongoing challenges

Early recruiting. “The recruiting is getting earlier and earlier in the process. My daughter is a ninth grader who really wants to play lacrosse, and she’s starting to get what I call ‘love notes’ from places. The other day she said, ‘Oh Dad, I got this email from the assistant coach from USC.’ And I said, ‘Delete it.’”

[ Laughter ]

“We have to make sure that [high school students] understand the process of admission [at Stanford]. We are going to give them an application to fill out. But it’s not a done deal when they say yes and we say yes, that they’re coming to Stanford. So recruiting becomes even more of a challenge for us.

Growth rate of costs that is faster than the growth rate of revenue. “I mentioned the $90 million budget, which would cause some people to say, ‘That’s a lot!’ But when we look at what some schools are spending, they’re not offering as many programs as we are. They’re also putting a lot of dollars into a limited number of programs. Schools in some of conferences like the SEC [Southeastern Conference] and the Big Ten Conference [are spending] well over $100 million dollars for athletics.”

Impact of media contracts. “We just struck a deal with the PAC 12 that ensures we get plenty of exposure for our programs on TV, but at the same token we’re mindful of the [influence of TV on the times games begin]. Many of our games are starting later than they used to. That is something we have to be aware of, moving forward. [The corollary of the] travel commitments [required of] our kids is something that we have to keep an eye on.
Professionalization of our business operations within the university environment. “I refer here to making sure we are as efficient as possible and are using our technology appropriately. These are things that we need to make sure and leverage when appropriate. Getting people to our games is another challenge for us.

“With that I will be glad to answer any questions people might ask.”

[ Applause ]

Chair Levitt said, “Thank you, Director Muir. I’ll now open the floor for questions.”

Professor Tom Wasow had the first comment and question. “I’m a big fan of Stanford athletics and go to a lot of athletic events. I tell my friends at other institutions that we do it right, or more nearly right, than their institutions. But I’m concerned about the professionalization of college sports, especially football and basketball. That’s led to an arms race of facilities and coaches’ salaries. The Knight Commission recently issued a report that showed athletic budgets rising much more rapidly than academic budgets. It compared the amounts spent by athletics departments on a per-athlete basis versus the overall complete academic expenditures per student. At FBS [Football Bowl Subdivision of the NCAA] schools overall, six times as much was spent on the athletes as on students in general. In our conference it’s more than seven times as much, which is still less than that at the SEC, which is twelve. I noticed the [DAPER] revenue was $1 million less than the expenditures, which suggests that general university funds are subsidizing the athletic department.

“The Knight Commission made a number of recommendations, one of which struck me as particularly appealing. It suggested that the financial reports athletic departments make to the NCAA should be made public. And I was wondering, to turn this into a question rather than a speech—

[ Laughter ]

AD Muir replied, “We think there should be greater transparency within the academy. That’s why we put the numbers out there. This is something other institutions are facing across the country—there needs to be a dialog about where we’re investing, and why we’re investing in young people in the way other departments do so. I think that we are modest in our approach. I just don’t get that sense that it’s right for the Stanford experience [to do otherwise]. Not to say that we’re not going to invest in the future, because I think we need to, but it has to be somewhat modest for Stanford.

“NCAA is making a concerted effort for all departments to say, ‘Here is what we’re investing in the academy.’ It’s no different than what you would do in other departments in the university.”

Looking at Professor Wasow, AD Muir said, “Yours is a great question, because it’s one that needs to be asked. We’re not trying to hide [our financial costs], where this is
an investment. It’s a sliver of the overall university budget. But it is an important investment, one in which kids get a wonderful experience.”

Provost Etchemendy commented, “As to the question about whether or not the general fund is subsidizing DAPER, the answer is no. DAPER includes collegiate athletics, recreation programs and physical education. Most athletics programs [at other universities] don’t include PE and recreation. We have general funds that go to pay for PE and for recreation and the BeWell program, which you all participate in. Intercollegiate Athletics is an auxiliary, so it has to keep its spending within the revenue it brings in. In some years it’s difficult and expenses exceed revenue a little bit, which is fine—that’s true of lots of units and schools and we cover that and then when Intercollegiate Athletics’ revenues exceed expenses, it pays it back.”

Professor Reich commented, “I’m proud to be affiliated with a university that has such an extraordinary sports program. We’ve had student athletes who I know are extraordinary just the way you described them.

“I also think that Stanford’s sports program is unlike the vast majority of programs at other universities. The NCAA in general and the PAC12 in particular have come in for a beating over the course of the past decade. The Taylor Branch exposé in the Atlantic Monthly [September 2011] revealed the cartel that NCAA is—and the PAC12, too, and the general corruption in college sports, generally. I’m curious—what role do you think you have in the bully pulpit, with a gleaming program? What’s your take on the rest of the NCAA and what, if anything, were you planning to do with your position here, to say something about it?”

AD Muir paused. “Before I answer your question, we have a phrase, ‘Every day is game day.’ As I was walking over here a number of coaches said ‘good luck today.’ I didn’t know that this was going get such widespread coverage. I saw it in Stanford Report, yesterday morning, and I thought, ‘Why do they say ‘good luck’? It’s not like I’m going to play Oregon.”

[ Laughter ]

“But based on the last couple of questions, maybe it is like we’re going on to play Oregon!”

AD Muir addressed the question. “I think this is a perfect platform to say, ‘This [Stanford] is the model we’re all aspiring to.’ Some of my former NCAA colleagues, say, ‘We’re looking to Stanford to lead in that regard.’ We like the process we have to go through [here, in which] students are vetted before they are admitted. When they are here, we have high expectations of them to do athletics and academics. We are probably going to be at least a top-5 program [in football] in the polls next year. These kids are coming to Stanford and are now competing at the highest level.”
Professor Reich followed up. “The Stanford story is an amazing one, and one we should tell, but I’m curious—what’s your view about the NCAA in general? What do you say in public? Do you have reforms that you’re putting forward in public? Is the NCAA something that we should be proud about as a general association? Are you proud of it?”

AD Muir answered, “I am because I am part of it. Stanford is a part of the NCAA, the PAC12 is part of the NCAA. There’s work to be done; we still are going through a major reform effort. We’re making sure that our student athletes continue to graduate. The NCAA is not seeing 90% graduation rates but we’re inching toward higher graduation rates because we’re asking for tougher requirements. We’re making sure the kids are retained and moving toward a meaningful degree.

“Many people have said there shouldn’t be an NCAA but I think you need a governing body to make sure that we continue to march forward and understand what our overall mission is.”

Professor Caroline Hoxby had a comment and a question. “Recently, with a colleague, I have been doing a survey of 40,000 very high achieving students in the United States who could go to Stanford, but a logical [alternative] place for them to go would be their state’s flagship university, for example, the University of Washington, or Berkeley, or a university like that. When they didn’t apply to those places we asked them why. The answer we got more than anything else was, ‘I don’t want to go to my state flagship university because that place is only about sports.’ Now that’s not true of most state flagship universities in the United States; most of them have great academic programs. These students would naturally be honor students at those programs. But the perception is that these places are just about sports; that’s what these kids are picking up on from the television and elsewhere.

“I’m a sports fan and I got basically hysterical when we were in the Rose Bowl. Towards the end of the game my husband said, ‘Stop jumping up and down! It’s not helping things.’”

[ Laughter ]

She continued, “What’s extraordinary about Stanford is not our making it to the Rose Bowl, or to the other national championships, but the combination of our doing it with scholars and athletes. If we can tell that story, that’s the story that other universities clearly are not telling.

“I had a student who was a pitcher for the baseball team a few years ago. The team had a championship game and he asked me if he could take the final exam at 5 AM so he that could go pitch the game afterwards. I said, ‘Yes, if you want to take it at 5 AM it’s fine with me.’ That’s the sort of story we need to get out there—that our students are serious [about their studies]. It was the final for him, first, and then pitching in the championship game afterwards.”
AD Muir nodded. “We have to do a better job as a leader, to say, this is a model showing you can do both, [one] that others can follow. [The response to your survey] is unfortunate because we know that the university is much more than just the athletic platform. Yes, it provides [athletes] that opportunity, but it’s so much more. If we can get people together and expose them to other aspects of the university life, that would be wonderful thing.

“That brings up a comment I’d like to make with respect to compliance. The NCAA rulebook is about 400 pages thick. That means we have to educate a broad constituency—not only our athletes, not only our coaches, but also the faculty, who play an important role in [seeing that our scholar athletes obey the rules]. If you have questions or if you’re not sure of something, either email us or call us. [Professor] Al Camarillo is our Faculty Athletic Representative, so if you want to speak, faculty member to faculty member, Al the your person to contact.”

Professor Eric Roberts commented, “The spiraling increase in attention to sports and with budgets going up mean that a lot of the focus shifts to the high-visibility sports and the superstar athletes. Of course there are people who profit from having that scholar/athlete combination, at all levels of sports. When I was an undergraduate, one of my good friends was the captain of the Radcliffe basketball team. She later became a journalist and one year was offered both the Knight Fellowship here, and the Neiman Fellowship at Harvard, and I tried to convince her to come here. That happened one of the years that the Stanford women’s basketball team won the national championship. I sent her a picture of the team from the Mercury News. She wrote back, ‘That was a good try, but in the years since Title IX it’s not that I wouldn’t have been Captain of the Radcliffe basketball team, I wouldn’t have even made the team. And I would have missed out on everything that that meant to me.’

“What do we have for the students who need that team connection, that sense of leadership that comes from [participating in sports], that sense of solidarity with a group of women that was underrepresented, but are not star athletes? Are we putting too much focus on the superstars?”

AD Muir replied, “I don’t think so. If you come to Stanford and want to experience being a part of an athletic team, there’s a lot of opportunities to join a club sport, participate in intramural athletics, or, if you just want to work out, use the recreation facilities. It’s important to make sure our club sport program is robust because it provides a student an opportunity to travel and compete, just not at the highest level.”

Professor Landy, after commending Stanford’s athletic program, said, “We can send an even stronger message that ‘scholar’ comes before ‘athlete’ by having practice earlier in the day. We were told at the last Senate meeting there was a congestion of courses, and that part of the reason is that athletes often practice starting at 3 PM. As far as I know, there’s nothing in the laws of the universe that says that has to be true.
“Another comment is about the issue of chronic traumatic encephalopathy. It raises some morally problematic, morally fraught questions about whether it makes sense for us to continue programs that put people at risk, to at least some degree, of brain injury. What your thoughts are about that?”

AD Muir addressed the latter comment. “It is an issue across several sports, like soccer and lacrosse, not just football. And it is getting much more attention at every level, [from] Pop Warner to the NFL. Our Stanford doctors, led by Dan Garza, are carrying on research on the subject. You might invite him to talk here. We are talking with him regularly; he and his colleagues are studying football players during spring and fall practices, to determine exactly what the ramifications are for this physical [activity].

‘We’re having a dialog with the NCAA and with its football rules committee. Everyone is concerned about this issue because we don’t want kids walking away from the game with lingering effects from competition. The experts will probably be able to provide more information in that regard, but in the meantime we must continue to have our sports medicine aware of what’s going to happen here, and where we need to go to make this game that many love, even safer.”

Professor Michele Elam seconded the idea of inviting a medical expert to speak to the Senate on this topic.

Professor Gabriella Safran asked why so few freshmen scholar athletes take freshman seminars and Overseas Studies. “[6.5 percent] of athletes in freshman seminars seems like a very low percentage. I was wondering what made them not participate in this experience that I think students overall enjoy and get a lot out of.”

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Harry Elam commented. “We’ve got to think about teaching at alternative times. Scheduling was the number one reason why students aren’t interested in freshman seminars. We’re hoping with this change in schedule, reducing four requirements down to two, that there’d be more room and we’ll see how that plays out.”

In response to Professor Safran’s question, he turned to Professor Russell Berman and said, “Next year with the change in schedule, hopefully, we’ll have people teaching at different times and that will have an impact. In terms of overseas studies, we’re doing a couple of things. There are overseas seminars, as well as having a summer program in Chile and we’re hoping that athletes can take advantage of that.”

Professor Berman replied, “There’s some increase in participation because of the decrease in the IHUM requirement. I haven’t parsed that specifically for student athletes, but I can say that seminars that are scheduled at 8:30 or 9:00 in the morning do fill.”
Chair Levitt commented to AD Muir, “On your slide that showed the schedules, the two peak times for practices were between 3 to 4 and 4 to 5 PM and so we were given guidance by the IntroSem office to avoid those two hours, where there were the biggest conflicts. If people choose not to avoid those hours, they won’t have athletes in their seminars.”

Professor Ralph Cohen asked, “What besides continuing success on the playing field, do you see as your biggest challenges? In your six months here, have you seen things that the athletic program doesn’t do well and needs significant improvement?”

AD Muir responded, “One question is about overall student/athlete welfare, whether our scholar-athletes have an outlet to understand the resources that are available to them. We have to do a better job of education across the board and provide even greater support. I think sometimes we get caught up; our coaches are just obviously focused on—let’s get to that next game, or that next competition. Sometimes we have to take a step back and ask about the academic side, ‘Are we providing to the full extent, everything that we’re talking about here?’ [Are our athletes aware] about these great opportunities to maybe study abroad, or to do community service?

“Another issue, as I mentioned before, is the branding of our program; we need to extend to a broader community to make sure people understand there’s something here for them, that this is not just limited to those at Stanford, or to alums, but that this is an opportunity for people to come and see our programs and our students; these are wonderful stories and kids should be exposed to them. My daughters are a perfect example; their first day on campus they had a chance to meet Emily Oliver, one of our women soccer goalies. She is a tremendous person. They got a chance to meet her, so engaging and so with it, and now my kids have instant role models, 850 of them.”

Chair Levitt said, “Director Muir, I’d like to just ask you to comment on an issue we discussed at the Steering Committee meeting. Occasionally, amidst the enthusiasm of athletes and their coaches, faculty may learn of a student being pressured to take a less-demanding course, or even choose a different major, by their coach. There have been allegations from time to time that this is the case. How should we handle this, if the issue comes up?”

AD Muir replied, “If those issues come up I would say, ‘Please, pick up the phone and call us, directly.’ I just had a discussion with Rob Urstein, Dean of Freshmen, and one of our coaches, to talk about that exact issue. We realized that the issue was not steering kids toward particular courses, but trying to make sure our kids were on track to graduate as quickly as possible because they had the opportunity to do other things earlier in their career. But if you get that sense of [pressure by coaches on taking certain courses], please let us know and we will follow up with our coaching staff. Or, you can bring it to Al Camarillo.”
Chair Levitt asked Professor Camarillo, “Al, would it be best to go through you as the Faculty Athletic Representative, or to go straight to the Athletics Department?”

Professor Camarillo responded, “As the Faculty Athletic Representative and the representative of the Provost to the Athletic Department, I’m in direct contact with colleagues, I’m one of those conduits for information. I’m glad to field emails or phone calls.”

Chair Levitt, concluding the discussion, said, “Please join me in thanking Director Muir and wishing him success.”

[ Applause ]

**B. Revisions to the charge of the Committee on Review of Undergraduate Majors (C-RUM) (SenD#6715)**

Chair Levitt turned to the second report. “Earlier in the year we had a discussion about how majors are or are not reviewed, and who should review them? We identified an issue in the Charge to C-RUM, which might need revising. So we asked the Committee on Committees (CoC) to review the charge to C-RUM and make a recommendation. The CoC has proposed some amendments to the charge, which you should have all received. I asked Tom Wasow, Chair of the Committee on Committees to present the recommendations of the CoC.

“This comes as an Action Item requiring a vote.”

Professor Wasow spoke from his Senate seat. “There are three interconnected problems with the way C-RUM has been operating. One is excessive workload; C-RUM members spend an enormous amount of time reviewing a large number of majors.

“The second is that departmental [majors] reviews typically are done by the school and then go back to the school; they don’t come to the Senate because the Senate doesn’t have to reauthorize department majors.

“The third problem is closely connected to second; it is the redundancy. The school is reviewing the major and C-RUM is reviewing the major. With the faculty chronically overworked, this seems like a waste of time.”

Professor Wasow stated the three changes to the charge to C-RUM (Original SenD#5340).
The first was to correct the misnamed Committee in A. General Charge:

*The Committee on Review of Undergraduate Majors...*

The second was to replace Item 4 under B. Specific Duties, with the following:

*Monitor the review processes of departmental majors through annual reports provided by the relevant deans, with particular attention to advising and curricular issues, including the effects of prerequisites and the requirements of the major itself on the overall educational experience.*

The third was to state in D. Membership, the correct titles of the *ex officio* members of C-RUM:

*The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Dean of Humanities and Sciences, the Dean of Engineering, the Dean of Earth Sciences, and the Registrar, or their representatives, shall be *ex officio* members of the Committee without vote.*

Professor Wasow explained, “We added wording to indicate that C-RUM should make sure the schools are attending to the reviews. In particular, we talk about advising and curricular issues, including the effect of prerequisites and the requirements in the major itself on the overall educational experience. This relates to discussions we’ve had over the last year and a half and connected with the SUES Report, about the problem of some majors having very large numbers of requirements, thereby not giving students sufficient time for intellectual exploration.

“That’s the main change that we made. We corrected some mistakes; the first sentence of the charge had the wrong name for the committee, we fixed that. We also mentioned people who would be *ex officio* members, and leave it to them to pick who the representative should be if the *ex officio* member can’t attend.

“That’s basically it. It’s a fairly straightforward change that we think will make this a more functional committee.”

Chair Levitt opened the floor for discussion.

Professor Kathryn Moler commented, “The concern raised at the last Faculty Senate was that the committee was toothless. Do you agree that was the concern? If so, I don’t quite understand how these changes make it less toothless. They ‘will monitor the review processes...’ We also monitor carbon dioxide levels. What is C-RUM supposed to do with the results of that monitoring? The next section [of the Charge to C-RUM] of reporting responsibilities says to keep the Academic Secretary apprised, and I was just wondering, what would be an outcome of this process?”

Professor Wasow replied, “The ‘toothless’ charge was about departmental majors. There were two ways to go. One was to say, ‘Ok, let’s make departmental majors
require review by C-RUM or the Senate, on a periodic basis.’ We thought that was not realistic and would add to the workload, not only of the committee, but also of everybody on the Senate and everybody in the respective department. The other was to say, ‘Ok, the primary concern of this committee is the review of IDPs [Interdepartmental Programs]’, but it also should have some cognizance of what the schools are doing in terms of reviewing department majors, and provide feedback.

“So it remains apparently relatively toothless with regard to department majors. But we’ve added some specific language of things that we think departments might not be attending to as closely as they should be, and this committee can perhaps remind the schools to pay attention to it.”

Chair Levitt added, “There is also a requirement in the charge for an annual written report to the Senate and an oral report would accompany it. So if C-RUM felt that certain departments were not being reviewed, that would be an occasion to bring it to the Senate, right?”

Professor Wasow replied, “That is correct.”

Professor Mark Zoback weighed in. “I was going to make Tom’s last point for him. In effect, the revised [item 4] puts teeth into the charge by actually not doing inadequate reviews, but instead, reporting to the Senate on how well the schools are doing in the review process of their departmental majors. If some unnamed school were not following up and doing regular reviews, the Senate would know that. I think de facto, that puts pressure on the school to improve the departmental review process. So I think it actually does put teeth in it without giving an unworkable load to the committee members to do the reviews themselves.”

Provost Etchemendy agreed. “It’s exactly what Mark just said, with the addition that, in an unusual act of this university, it was a decision not to redo work, not to have several committees doing the same work. I’ve always wanted to have, as the government supposedly has its paperwork reduction act, a ‘committee-reduction act’ at this university so we wouldn’t have committees of faculty redoing at many stages, what the previous stage did. I think it is a great step in the right direction.”

Professor Zoback stated, “In the spirit of this opportunity, I move that the Senate adopt the revised charter for C-RUM.”

The motion was seconded [by many.]
Chair Levitt called for a voice vote.

All in favor of revising the C-RUM charge as recommended by the CoC, please say Aye. Nay? Abstentions?

The motion was approved by divided voice vote.

VI. Unfinished Business
There was no unfinished business.

VII. New Business
There was no new business.

VIII. Adjournment
A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed unanimously. The Senate adjourned the meeting at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

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