

**TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
FORTY-FIRST SENATE REPORT No. 10**

**Summary of Actions Taken by the Senate  
June 11, 2009**

1. By unanimous voice vote, the Senate conferred baccalaureate degrees on the Spring Quarter candidates listed in SenD#6233, as recommended by the Committee on Undergraduate Standards and Policies.
2. By unanimous voice vote, the Senate also conferred the various advanced degrees on the Spring Quarter candidates listed in SenD#6234, as recommended by the Committee on Graduate Studies.

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

**MINUTES OF THE FORTY-FIRST SENATE  
OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
June 11, 2009**

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Karen Cook called the final meeting of the 41<sup>st</sup> Senate to order at 3:20 PM. There were 36 members and 11 *ex officio* members present.

**II. Approval of Minutes – (SenD#6231)**

The Minutes of the Senate Meeting, May 28, 2009, were approved.

**III. Action Calendar**

**A. Committee on Undergraduate Standards and Policies (C-USP): List of Candidates for Baccalaureate Degrees (SenD#6233)**

The list of candidates came moved and seconded by C-USP.

Chair Cook asked Registrar Tom Black if there were any changes to the list. Registrar Black said the list was correct.

The list of candidates for baccalaureate degrees was approved by unanimous voice vote.

**B. Committee on Graduate Studies (C-GS): List of Candidates for Advanced Degrees (SenD#6234)**

The list of candidates came moved and seconded by C-GS.

Chair Cook asked Registrar Black if there were any changes to the list. The Registrar replied that the list was correct.

The list of candidates for baccalaureate degrees was approved by unanimous voice vote.

**IV. Standing Reports**

**A. Memorial Resolutions**

Chair Cook welcomed Professor Ken Waldron, to present a brief memorial statement in honor of Kosuke Ishii, Professor of Mechanical Engineering in the School of Engineering.

**Kosuke Ishii (1957-2009) SenD#6235**

*Kosuke (Kos) Ishii, Professor in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Stanford University, passed away on March 2nd, 2009 at age 51. He is survived by*

*his wife, Naomi (MS 1987), of Los Altos, California, his sister Akemi Iida, and his father, Tsuneharu, and mother Masue, who reside in Japan.*

*After completing his Stanford Ph.D. in 1987 under Professor Phil Barkan, Kos launched his academic career at the Ohio State University. He quickly became a popular teacher and productive researcher. In 1995 he joined the Stanford faculty. He established the Manufacturing Modeling Laboratory and made the ME 317 Design for Manufacturability course sequence his own. In 2006 he was appointed to the Science Council of Japan. He became a Fellow of ASME [American Society of Mechanical Engineers] in 2007, and received the ASME Spira Outstanding Design Educator Award in 2008.*

*There has been a remarkable response to his passing from Kos' former students and from people in the professional community throughout the world. This is very gratifying to his family, and to those of us who were his colleagues.*

*Madame Chair, I have the honor, on behalf of a committee consisting of Sheri D. Sheppard, Mark R. Cutkosky and myself, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a resolution in memory of the late Kosuke Ishii, Professor of Mechanical Engineering in the School of Engineering.*

All present stood in silent tribute.

Chair Cook thanked Professors Waldron, Sheppard and Cutkosky.

The full text of the memorial resolution will be published in the *Stanford Report*, June 17th.

Chair Cook welcomed Professor Jonathan Dorfan, to present a brief memorial statement in honor of his colleague, Herbert Conrad DeStaebler, emeritus professor at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.

**Herbert Conrad (Hobey) DeStaebler (1911-2008) (SenD#6236)**

*Herbert Conrad (Hobey) DeStaebler died of cancer in his home on June 13th, 2008 at the age of 79. Hobey began his Stanford research career in 1956 at HEPL [Hansen Experimental Physics Laboratory] and was a key member of the team that designed SLAC, to which he devoted his entire professional life. He became a Professor (Research) in 1974 and retired as Emeritus Professor in 2003.*

*Hobey worked in W.K.H. "Pief" Panofsky's legendary electron-scattering group, whose experiments helped develop the Standard Model of particle physics. He also played a key role in SLAC's scattering experiments, which were later honored with a Nobel Prize.*

*Following the scattering experiments, Hobey made seminal contributions to all the accelerators and experiments that characterized SLAC's evolution. He was very active in the safety programs at SLAC: his ability to analyze and calculate the risks associated with complex situations kept SLAC employees safe.*

*For half a century, Hobey was an important figure at SLAC—his quiet manner and his dedication to getting it right served the laboratory well.*

*Madame Chair, I have the honor, on behalf of a committee consisting of Professor Richard Taylor, Jean Deken and myself, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a Resolution in memory of the late Herbert (Hobey) DeStaebler, Professor (Research) at SLAC.*

All present stood in silent tribute.

Chair Cook thanked Professors Dorfman, Taylor and Deken.

The full text of the memorial resolution will be published in the *Stanford Report*, June 17th.

Chair Cook welcomed Professor emeritus Charles Prescott, to present a brief memorial statement in honor of his colleague, Edward Lee Garwin, emeritus professor of Applied Research at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.

**Edward Lee Garwin (1933-2008) (SenD#6237)**

*Edward Lee Garwin, Professor Emeritus at SLAC, passed away in Stanford, California on November 11, 2008 at the age of 75.*

*Ed was born on March 22, 1933 in Cleveland Ohio. He received his bachelor's degree in physics at the Case Institute of Technology, and his PhD degree at the University of Chicago in 1958. He worked briefly at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana and in industry in Southern California before joining the SLAC Research Division in the fall of 1962. There he first worked on the designs for beam lines and experimental facilities for the two-mile-long electron accelerator (known as the linac). He was heavily involved in the design of the Linac Beam Dump and on various accelerator vacuum issues. Following completion of the Linac construction, Ed formed the Physical Electronics group (PEL) and provided a variety of services and personnel toward the SPEAR storage ring project, including Ed's suggestion that SPEAR would make a fine light source for surface science investigations. Under Ed's leadership, PEL evolved into a surface science and materials analysis facility for SLAC's major projects SPEAR, PEP, and SLC. Numerous critical projects passed through Ed's group over the decades, always to be met with interest and ingenuity. Ed made major contributions to SLAC as a group leader, an advisor on technical matters, and a mentor, to the younger staff. He will be sorely missed.*

*Madame Chair, I have the honor, on behalf of a committee consisting of Helen Quinn, Greg Loew, Jean Deken, and myself, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council this Resolution in memory of the late Edward L. Garwin, Professor Emeritus of the School of SLAC.*

All present stood in silent tribute.

Chair Cook thanked Professors Prescott, Quinn, Loew and Deken.

The full text of the memorial resolution will be published in the *Stanford Report*, June 17th.

**B. Steering Committee**

Before Chair Cook could comment, she was interrupted by a Senator, who turned out to be none other than the Vice Chair of the Senate, Professor Harvey Cohen, who rose and said, “Madam Chair, I rise to a point of personal privilege, whatever that means.”

[Laughter]

He walked down to stand beside Chair Cook, turned and faced the Senate, and said, “I know that medical record privacy is covered by certain regulations; however, since we are not in the medical center, I have nullified all HIPAA [Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act] regulations to present to this august body important medical information about our fearless leader.”

[Laughter]

“Here is Karen Cook’s latest medical center visit.

“Chief Complaint: This is the first Stanford University Academic Faculty Senate Chairmanship for this incredibly accomplished and delightful Stanford superstar, who comes to the clinic with the chief complaints of ‘which budget crisis are we dealing with now’ and ‘why there are no faculty senate members going to graduation in bathing suits’.”

[Laughter]

“History of Present Illness: The patient was in her usual state of academic health, and directing the very successful sociology program with a specialization in, ‘Whom do you trust?’, until last spring when a retired nephrologist implored her to run for the Chair of the Academic Senate. She agreed to do this — although no mental status examination was done at the time’.”

[Laughter]

“Despite a difficult and ugly campaign against a highly disreputable opponent...

[Laughter]

“...she was victorious, much to the benefit of Stanford University. She brought her formidable intellect, dynamic drive, and most importantly, her sense of the absurd, to this role. Her major skill, developed in her prior life as a cognizant dean (and I thought deans were never cognizant – silly me) and chair, was being able to herd cats, and end all meetings by 5:00. She was cruising in this role, leading a discussion on whether we should increase the number of undergraduates, in response to a Washington pathogen, named Grassley, and his attempt to infect University endowments. Then, suddenly, without warning, there was a report by the provost, of a ‘slight’ problem with our endowment. It began with a ‘slight’ bleed in September, followed by an autumn hemorrhage leading to a winter state of shock.

“What had Karen done to cause this?”

[Laughter]

“As a sociologist, she felt she should have been less ‘trusting’, and anticipated the evils of society. To complicate matters, there was a nasty battle on Academic Senate Faculty disappearance from graduation ceremonies, and the appropriate use of bathing suits at graduation. The combination of these events resulted in Karen’s decision to seek medical intervention.

“After a thorough mental status examination, it was decided that Karen Cook is incredibly healthy, not so wealthy, and very wise...”

[Laughter]

“...but that Stanford University was suffering from two grave illnesses - poverty and apathy. To cure the University, we as Senators, must help Karen by soliciting all our friends and families to support our poverty stricken University, and by donning our bathing suits and academic regalia—do you hear that, Philippe [Professor Buc]?—by joining Karen and me at the Stanford graduation.”

“My prognosis is that Stanford will survive and thrive, but that most of us will look terrible in our bathing suits.”

[Laughter]

“My recommendation for Dr. Cook is that she keep smiling, never change, and have lunch with me often!”

[Laughter]

“Karen, to remind you of all of us, I would like to present you this engraved gavel, so that you can always get us to behave. Thanks so much.”

[Laughter and sustained applause]

Chair Cook, beamed and said, “Thank you, Harvey. And Harvey, as you know, was part Chair this year. So thank you for filling in for me.”

Chair Cook then resumed the agenda. She welcomed the newly elected members of next year’s (42<sup>nd</sup>) Senate, the Chairs of the Academic Council Committees and the Emeriti Council and the Chair of the Board of Trustees [Leslie Hume], who were in attendance and were also invited to the President’s reception at the Faculty Club following adjournment.

Chair Cook continued, “I now have the pleasure of thanking all of the other people in the Senate who have served in special roles this year.”

Chair Cook thanked, “...the energetic members of this year’s *Steering Committee*: Harvey Cohen—‘who was my very active vice chair’, Lanier Andersen, Margaret Brandeau, Jonathan Bendor, Harry Elam, Hank Greely, Provost Etchemendy, who attended every meeting of the Steering Committee but one, and the Academic Secretary, Rex Jamison.”

Chair Cook expressed her appreciation, on behalf of the Senate, to the *Chairs of the Academic Council Committees*, “...upon whom the Senate relies so heavily for accomplishing its responsibilities in academic policy formulation, and in oversight of the academic offices that implement academic policies.”

John Bender, Committee on Libraries, who will continue as Chair next year.

Philippe Buc, Committee for Undergraduate Standards and Policy, also a Senator, who will continue as Chair next year.

Ian Hodder, Committee for Review of Undergraduate Majors.

Phil Lavori, finishing his third year as Chair of the Committee on Graduate Studies, also a Senator.

Steve Monismith, Committee on Research, who will continue as Chair next year.

Serge Plotkin, Committee on Academic Computing & Information Systems, who will continue as Chair next year.

Paul Switzer, Committee on Undergraduate Admissions & Financial Aid, completing his second year as Chair.

Chair Cook added her thanks to the *committee staff*, "...who work hard to support the important work of the committees."

Chair Cook thanked the members of *Committee on Committees (CoC)* "...for facilitating University governance by identifying the right faculty colleagues to participate in the many different standing and ad hoc committees at Stanford."

Gilbert Chu and Penny Eckert served as Chairs of CoC. Members were Keith Baker, Steve Boxer, Stephen Boyd, Eamonn Callan, Michele Elam, Paul Pfleiderer and Jennifer Summit.

Chair Cook thanked Gordon Brown, Chair of the *ad hoc Senate Committee to Examine Non-academic Council Appointments and Procedures*. "His report will be coming to the Senate at the beginning of the fall."

She concluded, "I'd like to thank Rex Jamison, our nephrologist, who's been a great leader, actually, behind the scenes, to Trish Del Pozzo, finishing her *25th year in service as* Assistant Academic Secretary to the University, and Charita Clay, Priscilla Johnson, and Laura Brewer, who is our court reporter.

"And if we could just take a moment to thank all of these people, and, in particular, Trish, by applauding."

[Applause]

**C. Committee on Committees (CoC)**

There was no report from the CoC.

**D. President and Provost Report**

President Hennessy had no report but made a brief statement.

"I think in what will probably go down as one of the most difficult years for universities in recent times, the provost and I would like to say thank you to all the members of the Senate. I think your collegiality, your support, and your wise counsel as we wrestled with the budget and financial issues was deeply appreciated. I think Stanford will emerge a stronger and better institution in the future because of the involvement of so many of you in our faculty as we grappled with the difficult issues facing us. And I think we all look forward to a restful summer and a better fall."

"Thank you, all."

Chair Cook thanked the president. There were no questions for him.

Provost Etchemendy was invited to speak. "I don't have any reports or announcements, either. However, I do want to say that this is Bob Joss's last Senate

meeting as an *ex officio* member. Bob has led the Graduate School of Business [as Dean] for ten years, has done a spectacular job, and leaves the school both academically, physically, and every possible way, a strong place with an exciting future. There is the financial blip, but that's Karen's fault."

[Laughter]

Provost Etchemendy continued, "Thank you very much, Bob."

[Sustained applause]

## V. Other Reports

### A. Report from the Chair of the Emeriti Council (SenD#6238)

Chair Cook asked Professor Emeritus David Abernethy, Chair of the Emeriti Council, to present the 2008–2009 Report of the Emeriti Council. He distributed a handout to the Senators. It included this table:

Faculty members taking retirement:

1998-99	34	2003-04	33
1999-2000	41	2004-05	40
2000-01	34	2005-06	27
2001-02	34	2006-07	42
2002-03	31	2007-08	35
		2008-09	25 (estimate)

Professor Abernethy began by reporting, "About 600 faculty emeriti, about 130 spouses of deceased emeriti, and about 180 staff with emeritus status live locally—on campus or in the near Bay Area. So what you would call the local emeritus constituency is rather large—about 900 people. Death thins our ranks, as just heard already. But our ranks also continue to grow. And the data on that summary [above] indicate the number of faculty retiring and retiring into emeritus status—an average of about 34 individuals each year over the past 11 years.

"A list of faculty emeriti arranged both alphabetically and by department has been prepared and will be made available to members of the next Senate in the fall, ideally for you to distribute to department chairs. We hope that that list will be helpful to chairs and to deans who may wish to recruit emeriti either for teaching or for short-term to long-term administrative assignments.

"We want to thank very much the provost for financial support and Vice Provost for Faculty Development, Pat Jones, and Pamm Moore, Administrative Associate in Pat's [Jones] office for administrative assistance."

Speakers, 2008-2009

Professor Abernethy referring to the handout, said, “The printed report lists the speakers at this year’s quarterly lecture series, which we sponsor in order to allow distinguished emeriti to reflect on their careers and, to the extent they wish to do so, their personal lives. We had great talks from Eleanor Maccoby (Psychology) in the fall, Herant Katchadourian (Psychiatry and Human Biology) in the winter, and Al Macovski (Electrical Engineering and Radiology) in the spring, to an audience that averaged about 150.

“From my perspective, three themes recurred in the talks by these speakers and by speakers in previous years.

*Mentoring.* First of all, many referred to the highly influential role of an individual—a parent, a third-grade teacher, a tenth-grade teacher, an academic mentor—in setting a person on a particular course, and in modeling qualities of curiosity, persistence, and articulate enthusiasm for a subject that made for academic success.”

*Serendipity.* “Secondly, people stressed the huge role of serendipity, accident, randomness in life. Many of those in their 80’s got hit sideways by World War II. Or another person, in effect said, ‘I wanted to major in psychology, but the class was full, so I took a biology course, and off I went into this unexpected field.’”

Professor Abernethy drew the analogy as if in India, one saw a sign on golf course that said, “Play the ball where the monkey drops it...”

[Laughter]

“...Hey, you stupid monkey, why are you taking my ball and landing it over there in the sand trap?

“So that’s the rules of the game—you go to the sand trap and try to blast out of it. And, in a sense, those are the rules of life as well.

“Our speakers illustrate not only the role of serendipity and accident, but also the role of skill, the role of ingenuity, and the role, again, of sheer good luck in figuring out how to blast their way out of the sand trap after that stupid monkey dropped the ball there unexpectedly.”

*Institutional Environment.* “And, thirdly, institutional culture and structure matter a great deal in how scholars chart their course and in the degree [to which they are able to exercise] their intellectual mobility and creativity. Stanford is probably a pioneer—and is certainly a leader today—in drawing school and disciplinary boundaries, just as others do, but then saying, ‘Hey, let’s just jump across them. Let’s experiment with transcending the lines we just drew.’”

“So Herant Katchadourian has a foot firmly in the Medical School Psychiatry Department and another foot in the Humanities & Sciences innovative Human Biology program. And Al Macovski, the first joint appointment between the Engineering School and the Medical School, talked about the very stimulating interactions with people across disciplines—and, indeed, schools—that may have helped to account for his roughly 160 patented inventions in medical imaging.”

Recent Requests for Assistance to the Emeriti Council

Professor Abernethy reported, “The council continues to take initiatives to figure out ways in which we might be useful... This year, a couple of requests actually came our way. In particular, a very interesting session was held at the initiative of Martha Cantor, Chancellor of the Foothill De Anza Community College District, and others with her. She invited Stan Schrier (Professor of Medicine) and me to a meeting to tell us about the horrible financial and administrative problems faced by California’s community colleges. If Stanford thinks it’s in trouble, try being the chancellor of a community college. Then you are in deep trouble.

“... We talked about ways in which the emeriti faculty, voluntarily, might be able to assist, for example, as a guest lecturer in a community college course talking about one’s own area of specialty, or arranging an open lecture series in which people say, ‘What’s new in the field of X or Y or Z?’

“Chancellor Cantor spoke eloquently of what she called an ‘ongoing crisis’, financial, organizational, psychological, morale, at these community colleges. What they were interested in was perhaps discussing these crises with specialists at Stanford in organizational behavior, psychology, economics, and with staff members at Stanford who have had long-term administrative experience, to deal with how organizations handle crises that never seem to let up.

“We’re delighted to be asked, as emeriti, to respond to the questions and problems and requests of another institution. As the Emeriti Council, we have no authority whatsoever. We have very little money. All we can do is to publicize these opportunities for service and hope that our colleagues will respond in sufficient numbers and with sufficient spirit to requests that do come our way.

“Thank you very much.”

[Applause]

Chair Cook expressed the Senate’s appreciation, “Thank you, David. And thank you for your leadership.”

**B. Survey on Faculty Quality of Life (SenD#6239)**

Chair Cook invited Deborah Rhode, Ernest W. McFarland Professor of Law, to present a report by the Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life. She welcomed several members of the panel who were guests in attendance.

With the aid of slides, Professor Rhode began her presentation.

“Let me just begin by way of a brief introduction. Once upon a time in the not-so-good-old days—at least from the standpoint of women’s issues—Stanford, like its peer institutions, faced some—how to put it delicately—‘challenges’. In the year 2000 these came to a head after a very public report that some of you may recall involving MIT. [In 1999 the Massachusetts Institute of Technology published a study, which found unintentional but institutionalized gender discrimination against female faculty. Later the study was criticized as being unscientific.] The less said about that, the better. But what happened in the aftermath is that nine enlightened university presidents, including our own John Hennessy, got together and pledged to do something about it. As is traditional in academic circles, what that meant was, ‘let’s throw a committee at it,’ and I was somehow induced to chair [the committee].

“One thing led to another, and, ultimately, to a survey on faculty quality of life as well as on non-salary forms of compensation, which at that point we had not been tracking. That included summer stipends, lab space, and all the related add-ons to faculty life. We reviewed those [resources], along with other data, and produced a major report. One of its recommendations was that, although Stanford was certainly moving in the right direction, significant challenges did remain, and the university should have an ongoing panel to address concerns of equity and diversity.

“And because no good deed goes unpunished, I found myself as the Chair of that panel. And the next several years were involved in doing follow-ups concerning the recommendations of the first faculty committee. We met with all the deans. We held focus groups. We created a Faculty Women’s Caucus and prodded the university into additional construction of campus childcare facilities and a number of other things.

“After a series of efforts in this direction, it seemed time [for] another follow-up to the original survey to evaluate how well we were doing. So this past November we [conducted] a second quality-of-life survey. We began once again to collect data on nonsalary forms of compensation. We’re still crunching those numbers and will produce a report in the summer. But we now have a fairly complete picture from the quality-of-life survey that we can present to you today.

“A full set of the data and slides, was sent to you electronically prior to the meeting. You have the summary slides that I’m now going to present at your seat. I will just hit a few of the high points.

“First let me just thank the panel members. This is an add-on to life that took a lot of time.

#### Panel Members

- Deborah Rhode (Law), Chair
- Anthony Antonio (Education)
- Shelley Correll (Sociology)
- Pat Jones (Biology; Vice Provost for Faculty Development & Diversity)
- Bob Weisberg (Law; Special Assistant to the Provost)
- Hannah Valentine (Cardiology; Senior Associate Dean, School of Medicine) Staff
- Jacyn Lewis (Associate Vice Provost, Faculty Development & Diversity)
- Jill Crowley (Research Analyst)
- Corrie Potter (Research Assistant)

“So, for Anthony, Shelley, Bob, Hannah, and especially Pat, we are deeply grateful. We also had terrific research assistance from Corrie and Jill. And Jacyn gave us a variety of insights and technical support. So our thanks to all. .

“Note that this survey was done in November, before the economy really turned south. So we might have had a somewhat different view [had we done the survey later]. This is obviously a challenging time in which to implement these recommendations. But not everything we’re recommending is extremely resource-intensive. We’re hopeful that we can continue to make progress in the right direction.”

The next slide showed a 64% overall faculty response rate; 56% of faculty completed all of the survey. The responders were representative by gender, race/ethnicity, rank and school.

“This tells you that [the survey] was pretty successful as these things go, with about a two-thirds response rate and a fairly representative sample. And here’s the bottom line on the findings.”

The next slide showed that 79.1% of faculty members are “somewhat” or “very” satisfied being a faculty member at Stanford, an increase in “very satisfied” from 24% in 2003 to 43% in 2008. 72% would choose to be a faculty member at Stanford again, up from 63% in 2003.

“On the whole, we’re a pretty happy group— about four fifths ‘somewhat’ or ‘very satisfied’. And the percentage of ‘very satisfied’ has increased substantially from 2003 to 2008. There aren’t significant differences across gender, rank, race, and ethnicity, in terms of overall satisfaction. And most schools show some increases. And most faculty, almost three-quarters, would again choose to be a faculty member at Stanford.

“So, on the whole, I think that’s a sign of substantial progress.”

The next slides described the Core Measure Indices used and the 12 items chosen as indicative of a supportive unit (e.g. school or department) and supportive colleagues.

“In designing the survey, we came up with a number of indices and then used them for purposes of presenting these data in the way that this slide illustrates. We tried to...come up with measures that seem to be the best predictors of overall satisfaction. As you see, a supportive unit turns out to be that factor, along with a reasonable workload and supportive colleagues. And these are the ways that we chose to measure the supportive unit. [A slide described the factors relevant to a supportive unit such as a sense of inclusion and respect from colleagues.] It’s pretty straightforward and replicates what most other universities have done in this area.”

#### Summary of Findings: Supportive Unit

- ❑ Male and Female faculty differ in their perceptions of unit support. This difference is consistent across ranks
- ❑ Women generally report lower unit support across schools, with significant differences in:
  - H&S Natural Sciences
  - H&S Social Sciences
  - Medicine Clinical Sciences
- ❑ Underrepresented Minority and White faculty differ in their perceptions of unit support, with URM faculty reporting lower unit support than White faculty.
- ❑ Underrepresented Minority Assistant Professors report lower unit support than both Asian and White Assistant Professors.

“What we have found is that there are some significant gender differences in the perception of support in the units, although, as I’ve said, not in overall satisfaction. Perceptions of unit support are lower for women than men in some schools, and lower for underrepresented minorities [compared to] white faculty throughout most of the university.”

### Summary of Findings: Supportive Colleagues

- ❑ Male and female faculty differ in the degree to which they report that their colleagues are supportive. This difference is consistent across ranks.
- ❑ With the exception of the female faculty in the Law school, female faculty generally report lower colleague support across schools, with significant gender differences in:
  - GSB
  - H&S Social Sciences
  - Med. Clinical Sciences
- ❑ Underrepresented Minority Assistant Professors report lower colleague support than both Asian and White Assistant Professors.
- ❑ Some schools score high on unit support, but not colleague support, and vice versa

“We also find with that with respect to supportive colleagues, there are differences between male and female faculty in the degree to which they feel that they’re well supported. With the notable exception of us women in the law school, female faculty generally report lower colleague support across the university, with significant gender differences in some of the schools. And underrepresented minority assistant professors also report lower collegial support. So there’s work to be done in specific units of the university.

“I want to pause...simply to note that of all the units in the university, the law school turns out to be the happiest. And women law faculty rate their satisfaction about five on a scale of five...Now, I personally would like to take credit for this fact.”

[Laughter]

“And I think my colleague, Bob Weisberg, who is here, would like to [take credit] also...In fact, the explanation is more complicated, but it does show the role of leadership on these issues. The law school has been blessed with three deans—Paul Brest, Kathleen Sullivan, and now Larry Kramer—who have been terrifically supportive. I guess this suggests that, since lawyers are not known to be a happy profession, if we in the law faculty can do it, so can all of you! We have now set a gold standard for satisfaction, so, yes, you can”.

[Laughter]

### Summary of Findings: Sources of Stress

- ❑ For faculty overall, cost of living is cited most frequently as an “extensive” source of stress.
- ❑ There are no gender differences in the degree to which cost of living is cited as a source of stress for male and female faculty.
- ❑ Gender differences in items cited as “extensive” sources of stress:
  - Household responsibilities: 30.3% of women vs. 16.6% of men (p<.001)
  - Childcare: 31.3% of women vs. 16.4% of men (p<.001)

“For faculty overall, what seemed to be the major stressors? Well, not surprisingly, it’s cost of living. No gender differences here. But there are gender differences in the items that are cited as *extensive* sources of stress. Not surprisingly, household responsibility and childcare burdens are disproportionately experienced by women.

“Most faculty comments, in response to the question, ‘What university-sponsored remedies or strategies would you like to see?’ focused on childcare. That was true in our earlier survey. The problems [center around] availability, affordability, accessibility, hours, and backup emergency care. It’s a measure of progress that remains to be made that 90 percent of faculty with young children cited childcare as a significant source of stress. This is one area where we need to continue to work...the university is not alone among major employers in trying to figure out what’s a cost-effective way to address it.”

### Summary of Major Findings for this Survey

- ❑ Overall, satisfaction is high among Stanford faculty.
- ❑ Measures of satisfaction and climate show improvement from 2003.
- ❑ Perceptions of aspects of work climate, especially unit/colleague support and workload, contribute most to overall satisfaction.
- ❑ On these measures, significant differences remain among faculty members by gender and race/ethnicity across and within schools.
- ❑ Primary sources of stress are:
  - 1) cost of living for all faculty
  - 2) childcare for faculty parents
- ❑ On most questions Stanford faculty responded similarly to those of peer private research universities, except that a higher proportion of Stanford faculty reported cost of living as a source of stress.

“Here are the major takeaways: Satisfaction is high and moving in the right direction but there are still areas where we need to address differences that relate to gender in some areas of the university, and race and ethnicity in pretty much all areas of the university. We need to address the principal sources of stress surrounding childcare and cost of living. We’re probably not atypical if we look at the data from our peer institutions...”

The final three slides summarized the Panel's recommendations in terms of

- Work Climate Issues
- Work/Family and Cost of Living Issues
- Evaluation and Accountability

“The panel spent a fair amount of time on recommendations and what can we realistically hope to do to make progress in a time of financial challenge.”

Work Climate Issues. “We...have to continue with the efforts to increase faculty diversity in general and to increase diversity in leadership positions in particular. We need to do more to assess and address work climate issues, especially those faced by women and faculty of color. And we need to look more carefully at some of the programs we have in place involving mentoring.”

Work/Family and Cost of Living Issues. “We need to try as best we can, given the current budget constraints, to address the work-family and cost-of-living issues, and, in particular, childcare. [This includes] more facilities, more emergency backup care, more attention [concerning] work-family conflict issues that don't require significant financial expenditures but do require responsiveness on the part of deans. To the extent possible, [the university should enhance its efforts] to assist employment for spouses and partners. In this employment market, things are only going to get tighter” [and the challenges for dual career couples will be greater].

Evaluation and Accountability. “...We've learned over the past decade how important it is to do continuing monitoring and evaluation, and to develop more effective ways of assessing the programs we have in place. Like many institutions, we spend large amounts on diversity and equity initiatives. It's very difficult to isolate the effectiveness of any particular strategy. Working with peer institutions, we can probably do better in identifying metrics of evaluation that would enable us to compare our progress with [that of] other schools and with ourselves over time. We still should have a panel and senior administrative positions, like [the one held by] Pat Jones, to address these issues. But the panel probably shouldn't be chaired by me.

“Since this is, God willing, my last report to the Senate on this subject, I will close with a final thank you. Eight years ago, when Provost Etchemendy asked me to chair the committee on these issues, we had, as they say in the trade, a full and frank conversation about the task. He assured me that this was not a window dressing assignment and that he and President Hennessy were truly committed to progress on equity and diversity. That has turned out to be true, and their strong support is not to be taken lightly. Since research on gender is part of my day job, I am well aware of the difficulties for large institutions, even with the best intentions, to make significant progress on these issues. And progress there has been at Stanford, reflected not just in the increased satisfaction measures that you saw, but also in the qualitative comments that faculty wrote in on their survey forms.

“One other person who deserves enormous credit for the improvements is Pat Jones, the Vice Provost for Faculty Development. Her dedication, good judgment and good humor have been invaluable. All of us working on these issues have had extraordinary support from the president and provost’s office, and I am glad to have one public opportunity to express our deepest appreciation.

“And on that I hope not too saccharine note, let me invite questions.”

Chair Cook asked, “Can we just thank you, first?”

[Applause]

Chair Cook opened the floor for questions.

Professor Andrew Fire began the questions. “Looking through these very useful recommendations, there was one...which is very concrete—childcare...Another one that stands out...is the mentorship of junior faculty. That strikes a lot of us as a very important and critical factor...Were there specific recommendations regarding procedures or standardization...on that?”

Professor Rhode: replied, “One of the themes that came out on the questionnaire was that a lot of junior faculty felt isolated in their departments and didn’t think there were enough occasions to get together with senior faculty in their fields.”

Professor Fire commented, “...No mentorship.”

Professor Rhode nodded, “We have a formal mentoring program. And we have a specific program that the Faculty Women’s Forum offers for women if they want a mentor outside of their department. We haven’t done enough, I think, in evaluating how well those programs are doing, and, if they aren’t doing well, why not. That’s why [we recommended]... to start looking more carefully at how satisfied faculty are with the programs we have and, where they fall short, what seems to be the cause.”

Vice Provost Pat Jones commented, “The university has guidelines [stating that] each faculty member is to have a mentor in the department. That’s supposed to be set up soon after the new faculty member arrives. How well that pairing works varies. We don’t know that that is actually happening in every department. But we also encourage junior faculty to find additional mentors...I think there is more that can be done [to find]...out across the university how it’s working. I know that the medical school, under Hannah Valentine’s leadership, is developing a pilot program to set up mentoring teams for individual faculty. I’ll be interested to see how that pans out over the next year or so.”

Professor David Burke noted that on the slide which showed sources of stress, “Clearly, childcare was one of the recommendations. But not far behind that is the care of the aged or another family member. Have you noticed any trend [which indicates] over the last five or six or eight years that is changing? I would guess that that’s something that will become more of a problem...”

Professor Rhode agreed. “I think it’s quite clear...that this is a more significant problem for faculty than it was when we did the survey four years ago. If you look at the demographics...you don’t have to be a rocket scientist to figure out why that is...It’s likely to get more substantial over time, which is one of the reasons we want to try to set up some programs. We have suggested one that the provost’s office consider...backup assistance in the care of elderly as well as minor dependents. But there needs to be a more systematic look at what we can do and what other universities are doing to address the issue.”

Professor Cecilia Ridgeway noted that although overall satisfaction rates did not vary by gender, there were differences in how male and female faculty rated factors that contributed to overall satisfaction rates, such as unit support. She asked if we had ways to account for that anomaly. Professor Rhode noted that such disparities were common in satisfaction surveys, and were probably a function of the importance of frames of reference. Where gender is relevant, women compare their situation to other women, and tend to report similar levels of satisfaction as men even though they experience more inequities. “That’s why the fact that there aren’t gender differences in overall satisfaction rates doesn’t suggest there isn’t any problem to be addressed.”

A similar exchange occurred between Professors Laura Lazzeroni and Rhode.

Professor Anat Admati, “First of all, I want to say that I’ve been here 25 years, and the progress in this area is amazing, especially in the last decade. One question I have regards remedies. In the medical profession it’s extremely common now for women to work part time. [The profession] is filled with happy practitioners—internists, especially—working part time and keeping just about the right balance. It’s usually a great deal for the employer when people are part time, as everybody knows.”

Professor Admati continued, “The University has pretty strict rules about these things. They’re meant to discourage consulting and other things...[Did] you check into the possibility of having more flexible part-time arrangements that might violate the two-years-in-seven [rule]...so that people can, for a period of time, have a better balance? There are studies about what happens when you drop out for a year and a half.”

Professor Rhode replied, “I think there has been an increase in flexibility in those policies. When we met with individual deans after the first survey, it was quite clear that, especially in the medical school, there was a lot of unhappiness about the full-

time, hourly commitments that were expected. People recognized a need to tailor policies to meet individual circumstances. I think you see a lot more faculty now taking reduced teaching loads to accommodate family responsibilities. Phil [Pizzo, Dean of the Medical School] isn't here and Hannah [Valantine of the Medical School, also on the Panel] isn't either, but my understanding is that they have made efforts to loosen things up, especially for the clinical faculty, who often get hit hard with all of the patient care, grant related fund-raising and the other commitments that attend to that line."

Professor Admati pointed out, "It's across the university. It's not just [the medical school]".

Professor Rhode agreed. "That's why we flagged the general issue—are we doing enough with work-family conflict policies? I think [organizing] additional focus groups with people who have expressed concerns along those dimensions may get us better information about how well our current structures are working."

Provost Etchemendy commented, "There are two different [issues here]. We don't have a policy against part-time appointments. Many departments or schools are not interested in having part-time appointments because they don't work for the position. The two-in-seven rule, for example, is a rule that governs when you have a full-time appointment, how much leave you can take over the course of seven years.

"But the real problem about part-time appointments—and I don't have a solution—is when it comes to untenured faculty. Sometimes this is a time of life where it might be good to have a part-time appointment, but the culture of academia makes it very difficult for somebody to take an extended period off and then come up for tenure, after – well, [we] have a limit of ten years. As we all know, [this is] because the expectation [of the performance] does not necessarily get adjusted appropriately."

Professor Admati clarified, "I'm talking about all kinds of fractions [of employment]."

Professor Rhode concluded, "In terms of the things that were flagged as intense concerns that was not one of them. I think many more people wanted a way to make their family responsibilities doable within a full-time schedule...For most faculty, let's face it, we have some flexibility. And certainly—at least outside the med school—we have control over our hours to an extent that other professions deeply envy...I think that building in more childcare assistance and cost-of-living adjustments that would enable people to purchase assistance, would make the biggest difference for people in terms of juggling family commitments. It's not that most faculty want to reduce their hours. They want more help in dealing with the conflicting responsibilities."

Professor Gordon Chu asked about the response rate in the 2003 survey and learned that it was about 49%, compared to 64% this time.

Professor Jonathan Bendor asked, “On the childcare question, do we know if some of our peer institutions manage this better?”

Vice Provost Jones replied, “In terms of numbers of on-campus slots, we are among the leaders, especially for an institution of this size. With the provost’s support, Stanford developed a pioneering program a few years ago [called] the junior faculty childcare assistance program. I think we’re at the top of our peer group but we’ll know more next week. Stanford is hosting this year’s meeting of the ‘MIT9 University Group’ that Deborah mentioned. The first item on the program is a report of a study conducted under the auspices of the American Association of Universities this past year by researchers at U.C. Berkeley on childcare policies—what kinds of resources are provided to faculty, research associates, postdocs, and graduate students?”

“...I think the institution has been very supportive. In addition to the new childcare center that opened this past September behind Escondido along El Camino, a sister center is scheduled to be constructed, once we can get that project off the hold list, given the budget shortfall.”

Professor Bendor commented, “We’ve heard that the hours [that the childcare center is open] are a concern.”

Vice Provost Jones acknowledged that was a concern.

Chair Cook thanked Professor Rhode and the Panel.

[Applause]

Chair Cook announced, “There’s one piece of unfinished business and one piece of new business. The unfinished business is—on behalf of the Steering Committee and the Senate, I would like to thank both the president and the provost for their engagement with the Senate in what must be the most fun year you’ve had in your careers.”

[Laughter]

“But we thank you for listening to faculty and for keeping us informed in the way that you have done and for being transparent in your decision-making.”

[Applause]

Turning to the new business, Chair Cook smiled, “And Harvey and I have the great pleasure of passing on the gavel to Andrea and Andrew. Please come forward.”

Professors Andrea Goldsmith and Andrew Fire, the Chair and Vice Chair of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Senate, respectively, came down to center stage to join 41st Senate Chair and Vice Chair, Karen Cook and Harvey Cohen.

[Applause]

Chair Cook told the Senate, “You will clearly be in good hands.”

Professor Goldsmith, looking directly at Vice Chair Cohen said, “I told Andrew if he has a speech like yours for me next year, that he’s going to get it!” She accompanied this comment, by shaking the gavel just handed her at Professor Fire, who appeared unfazed.

**VI. Unfinished Business**

There was no unfinished business.

**VII. New Business**

There was no new business.

**VIII. Adjournment**

Chair Cook Cohen declared the final meeting of the 41<sup>st</sup> Senate, and the last Senate meeting whose minutes will appear in print in the Stanford Report, adjourned at 4:40 PM *sine die*.

Respectfully submitted,

Rex L. Jamison, MD  
Academic Secretary to the University