

**TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
FORTY-FIRST SENATE REPORT No. 1**

Summary of Actions Taken by the Senate
October 16, 2008

1. By unanimous voice vote, the Senate approved the Media Policy, allowing up to five guests reserved for members of the outside press. Cameras are not permitted and only Senate members and special guests identified by the Chair may remain if the Senate goes into executive session. The Stanford Report and the Stanford Daily have regularly reserved seats as set out in the Senate Charter.
2. Advanced and Baccalaureate degree candidates was approved for conferral September 25, 2008, by the Administrative Session of the Steering Committee on behalf of the Senate, in an electronic vote. The Steering Committee action on behalf of the Senate was recorded in the first Senate report along with the minutes and will appear in the Stanford Report.

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

**MINUTES OF THE FORTY-FIRST SENATE
OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
October 16, 2008**

I. Call to Order

Professor Karen Cook, Chair, called the first meeting of the 41st Faculty Senate to order at 3:16 PM. In attendance were 43 voting members and 9 *ex officio* members.

II. Approval of Minutes – (SenD#6121)

The minutes of the June 12, 2008, meeting of Senate XL were approved.

III. Action Calendar: Recommended Media Policy for Senate – (SenD#6127)

Chair Cook briefly summarized the policy. It concerns outside media representatives at the Senate meetings and is the same as that adopted by the past 23 Senates. It allows up to five guest seats to be reserved for members of the outside press. Cameras are not permitted. When the Senate goes into executive session, only Senate members and special guests identified by the Chair may remain.

The Stanford Report and the Stanford Daily have regularly reserved seats, as set out in the Senate charter.

The motion came moved and seconded by the Steering Committee.

The motion was passed unanimously by voice vote.

IV. Report on Degree Conferral for Summer Quarter 2008

A. List of Candidates for Advanced and Baccalaureate Degrees conferred on 9/25/08

Chair Cook noted that the list of Summer Quarter 2007-008 Advanced and Baccalaureate degree candidates was approved for conferral, September 25, 2008, by the Steering Committee on behalf of the Senate, in an electronic vote. The full list of candidates was sent to the Senators in the previous week. The Steering Committee Action on Behalf of the Senate will be recorded in the first Senate Report along with the minutes and will appear in next week's Stanford Report.

B. Degrees Conferred Summary — 7/1/07-6/30/08 (SenD#6130)

The Registrar's office provided a document entitled Degrees Conferred 7/1/07-6/30/08. The report summarizes degrees awarded in the prior year, listed by school and by major, also listing minors. This report was for the Senate's information only; no vote was required.

Chair Cook thanked Registrar Tom Black and his staff for preparing the report.

V. Standing Reports

A. Memorial Resolutions:

Chair Cook invited Professor Richard Zare to present memorial statements in honor of two of his colleagues.

Douglas A. Skoog (1918-2008) SenD#6125

Douglas A. Skoog, emeritus professor of chemistry, died April 27, 2008, 7 days before his 90th birthday.

Skoog was best known for his three textbooks, which have dominated analytical chemistry for over 40 years. These books have been translated into German, French, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Croatian, Turkish, Chinese, and Korean and are used throughout the world. Skoog received three national awards for his contributions to teaching.

Skoog served two terms on the academic senate and was President of the board of directors of the newly constructed Stanford Faculty Club. From 1962 until 1976 he served as executive head of the chemistry department.

Madame Chair, I have the honor, on behalf of a committee consisting of Professor James (Jim) Collman, and myself, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a Resolution in memory of the late Douglas A Skoog, Professor of Chemistry, in the School of Humanities and Sciences.

All present stood in silent tribute.

William A. Bonner (1919-2007) SenD#6134

William Bonner died on October 1, 2007, at the age of 87 in Sunnyvale, California while recuperating from heart failure. He had a long and productive career as a teacher and scholar at Stanford. Bonner was born in Chicago in 1919. He received a B.S. from Harvard University in 1941 and a Ph.D. in Chemistry from Northwestern University in 1944. Bonner came to Stanford as an instructor in 1946, became an Assistant Professor in 1947, and rose rapidly to Professor of Chemistry. He became Emeritus in 1983.

From his earliest work he had an interest in chirality, the asymmetry of handedness of molecules, and the influence of molecular shape on reactivity. He was among the first to use radioactive labels to study the course and details of chemical reactions.

Bonner was a special colleague. One of the Stanford people who preceded the major changes that occurred here in the early 1960's, he helped facilitate the growth and changes in the Chemistry Department that ultimately made it one of the finest in the world.

Madam Chair, I have the honor, on behalf of a committee consisting of John Brauman, Edward Rubenstein, and Richard Zare, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a Resolution in memory of the late William A. Bonner, Professor of Chemistry.

All present stood in silent tribute.

Chair Cook thanked Professors Zare, Collman, Brauman and Rubenstein.

B. Steering Committee

Chair Cook began by reminding the Senate, "...of the distinguished group you elected last spring to the Senate Steering Committee: Harvey Cohen (Department of Pediatrics), Lanier Anderson (Philosophy), Jonathan Bendor (Business), Margaret Brandeau (Management Science & Engineering), Harry Elam (Drama, and Hank Greely (Law); Provost John Etchemendy and Academic Secretary Rex Jamison serve as *ex officio* members.

"Others assisting the Senate are Trish Del Pozzo, who actually runs the Senate, behind the scenes)along with Rex), Priscilla Johnson, and Charita Clay of the Academic Secretary's office, and our real-time reporter, Laura Brewer."

Senate Roster includes 55 elected Representatives, who are voting members, and 16 *ex officio* members who do not vote (these are President, Provost, school deans and other senior academic officers). Twenty of the 55 voting members are new to the Senate or have served one year.

The Senate has 7 reserved seats for standing guests. Chair Cook: "This year we welcome:

- Professor emeritus Saul Rosenberg, MD., who sits as the sixth emeritus representative to the Senate. The emeriti representative has the 'privilege of the floor', with no vote.
- Thomas Black, University Registrar, a long-time standing guest of the Senate, with privilege of the floor.
- Four seats are reserved for ASSU student government representatives.
- ASSU President – Jonny Dorsey.
- ASSU Undergraduate Student Senate designated representative – Stuart Baimel.
- ASSU Graduate Student Council representative—[seat to be filled pending an upcoming election].
- ASSU Student Representative at Large – Agnieszka Czechowicz

Chair Cook concluded this section with these comments:

"The Senate works best if you can come and represent your constituents. There are only 55 elected representatives. We represent a large number of faculty. I suggest that you try and keep absences to a minimum...We are all active academics and

need to be away, including me, occasionally. But do make every effort to come. If we don't have [important] business, we won't meet and I will cancel Senate meetings. And I will try to make the best use of your time.”

Fall Quarter meetings include the following reports:

The Senate meeting, October 30, includes a report from the Co-chairs, (Ramon Saldivar and Jim Canales), of the President’s Task Force on Undergraduate Expansion.

The Senate meeting, November 13, includes an update the NCAA Accreditation and a report from the Committee on Libraries’ Subcommittee on Digital Information Technologies in the Research Library Environment at Stanford. (This report is currently posted on the Faculty Senate website, <http://facultysenate.stanford.edu/>)

C. Committee on Committees

Penny Eckert, Linguistics, is Chair of the committee. The other members [all Senators] are Keith Baker, Steve Boxer, Stephen Boyd, Gilbert Chu, Michele Elam, and Paul Pfleiderer.

The Committee had no report.

D. President’s Report

Chair Cook invited President John Hennessy to comment.

President Hennessy began by commenting on university development.

“Last year was a very good year for the university... We had a wonderful year in terms of development returns. Our campaign made wonderful progress through the summer. And we ended up doing remarkably well, leading the country once again in terms of development results.

“We also had a good endowment report in terms of earnings, as of the June this year... [July through June] is the commonly used endowment year. We had not what we would consider a spectacular year, compared to recent results, but we had 6.2% earning on the endowment as of the end of June 30th. That compared quite favorably with [earnings on endowment] of many other schools, many of which were struggling to get 2% kinds of returns.

“That is the good news... As late as July and even August, it looked like things were not so terrible. Since then, of course, the economic tsunami has grown to incredible heights in some kind of self-reinforcing way, and... the impact on the endowment, while we don't know the exact numbers yet... we do know, on the public equities, that we have lost not only all of last year's earnings, but quite a bit of [the earnings] the year before.

[At the recent reunion weekend] "... as much as our alumni were delighted to be here, they were also a bit shell-shocked. We started off Friday morning with a panel that rarely fills all of Memorial Auditorium. This year, we programmed it to be on the financial crisis with a number of colleagues from across the university. We filled Memorial Auditorium, Bishop Auditorium, Cubberley Auditorium, and one other overflow room. There is obviously a lot of shell shock out there. I think this probably will inevitably affect our development results as we go forward. We can just all be very thankful that we started this campaign two years ago and are not trying to start one this year.

"We will also be hit by the general shortage of lending around the country. There is a lack of liquidity. People are reluctant to take on new debt. That will affect the timing of various new projects going forward, particularly anything involving facilities. So as we work this all through, I think we ask for everybody's patience and guidance...I know the provost will say something more about some details about the budget...

"Finally, to return to a high note and remind us of what we are really here for, I have the pleasure of announcing three new Bass University Fellows in Undergraduate Education. The first is Ravi Vakil in Mathematics, who will become the Robert K. Packard University Fellow in Undergraduate Education. The second is our fellow Senator and new department Chair of English, Jennifer Summit, who will become the Eleanor Loring Rich University Fellow in Undergraduate Education. And, finally, fellow Senator Philippe Buc, in History, who will become the Paul Davies Family University Fellow in Undergraduate Education. Please congratulate them."

[Applause]

President Hennessy said he would be happy to answer any questions except those about which way the economy is going to go.

Professor Pat Burchat asked, "Do you anticipate any upsides, for example, in terms of being able to get contractors for building, for example, who are maybe dying for work?"

President Hennessy replied, "We do anticipate relief on building inflation... We've been averaging somewhat north of 7% per year in building inflation... We anticipate seeing that fall off. That has been driven largely by a global building boom and the cost of materials."

There being no other questions, Chair Cook thanked President Hennessy and asked Provost John Etchemendy to comment.

Provost's Report

Provost Etchemendy first added to the President's reply to Professor Burchat:

"...We are actually even seeing some [decrease in costs for] things like steel. [We got] the steel for the Graduate School of Business (GSB) campus actually for a couple of million dollars below [the price] that a week and a half ago they absolutely refused to sell it to us for. So we are starting to see a break [in prices]. That's wonderful news, because [the cost of] materials have just been going through the roof.

"I have a couple of things on the GSB theme. As I think most of you know, Bob Joss announced his decision to step down as Dean of the Graduate School of Business next August. Bob has been—not to put too fine a point on it—a fantastic dean of the Graduate School of Business in so many ways. It is because of Bob's vision that the new Graduate School of Business is currently going up along Serra Street...[When finished] it will be a beautiful addition to the campus...Under Bob's oversight, the GSB has completely renovated, revamped—actually, reconceptualized—management education and is leading the nation in how we teach management education to MBA students.

"Finally, and I think in some ways most importantly to me, Bob has been an incredible university citizen. He has opened up the graduate school to the rest of the university...I'm sure many if not all of you have felt that the GSB had a tradition of being very insular and walled off from the rest of the university. That is completely gone, because of Bob. That's an incredible contribution to the university as a whole. And it has made us greater than the sum of our parts.

"...We will be forming a search committee this fall [for a new Dean of the GSB]. I have asked the Committee on Committees to make suggestions of names for membership on that committee. It's going to be extremely hard to fill Bob's shoes. But Bob is actually going to remain around as the Chair of the — what is it called, Bob?"

Dean Joss: "The campaign."

Provost Etchemendy: "The campaign."
[Laughter]

Provost Etchemendy: "And so we will have another dean. But we will also have the benefit of Bob's presence. I think we should all thank Bob for his contributions."

Dean Joss commented to the provost, "You didn't tell me about this."
[Sustained applause]

Provost Etchemendy then turned to the university's budget.

“John [Hennessy] has said a bit about the economic situation...It affects us in a number of different ways, most obviously...the endowment investment returns. Perhaps less obvious, we expect that there will be an effect on philanthropy—people, when they see their portfolio go down in value, tend to wait until it goes back up before they give gifts.

“Also perhaps not as obvious [will be] effects on financial aid. Because we have need-blind admissions, we provide however much money is needed by a student in order to come here. As the student’s family feels the effects of the economic downturn, that means we fill in more.

“Finally, this is all against a backdrop of declining support for sponsored research from the federal government... We’ve seen four, now five years of flat or declining support, in real terms, for sponsored research.

“All of that impacts the whole consolidated budget. It also impacts the general funds budget.

“We anticipate at this point—and this is a moving target, we don’t exactly know what the effect is going to be—that we will be cutting the budget by between \$25 and \$40 million. The general funds budget is a \$700 million budget, so you can calculate what that means.

“First of all...salary raises...will be less than...in recent years. But, then inflation is less than it has been in recent years. We’re coming off, actually, the second month in which the CPI (Consumer Price Index) did not increase. That’s quite unusual. So...the salary program will be less generous, I think, than it has been in the past.

“How will we achieve the cuts? By pulling back a bit on the salary program, and...asking all of the units and schools to come with potential cuts at the 3%, 5%, and 7% levels. They will present those potential cuts to the budget group and the budget group will make decisions about what cuts should be asked of the various different units and schools.

“The net cut will be anywhere from 2% to 6% for the university as a whole, unless the situation gets significantly worse.

“To end the negative news, I have to remind everybody, where would you rather be? Would you rather be working for General Motors? We are in really strong shape as an institution and there’s nothing significant to worry about. We will make it through this. We will not allow it to weaken us. We will not allow it to weaken our recruitment efforts and our retention efforts.”

Chair Cook added this coda,” So I think we should just ask Bob [Joss] to raise another 25 to 40 million before he steps down.”

[Laughter]

President Hennessy followed up with this comment: “I think those of you who were in the Senate last spring remembered the provost's budget report and remember that he said, ‘Don't panic.’ That was then. Now, I don't want you to panic, but I think it is a time when we need to begin to be extremely cost-conscious and a time when we need to realize that it is going to be almost impossible to start anything new when we have to rely on general funds to bootstrap those things. The reason to keep this in mind is that we will be doing our best to protect our ability to fund the financial aid program for our undergraduates, to protect our graduate students, to protect our faculty, and to protect our staff. This is not a time when I think we want to endanger our ability to keep everybody and keep the incredible strength we have built over the last many years. So try to pay attention to all the ways in which we don't need to add new pressure to the finances of the university at this time.”

Chair Cook asked if there were any questions for the provost.

Professor Gordon Chang asked the provost what's going to happen to the old business school campus?

Provost Etchemendy replied, “...The old business school campus consists of three buildings. The very large—what's called, the south building—the concrete structure that is most prominent—will ultimately come down. It is not clear exactly when it will come down. But it is not in good shape and it is not a very flexible building. We may use it in the interim as a surge building. [By the way], it won't come down in an earthquake; it's very strong, very solid. That's the problem”.

[Laughter]

“The other two buildings are really quite new. We have not determined how they will be used.”

Professor Al Camarillo had a question with respect to young faculty and recruitment. “Are we seeing a problem in terms of purchase of homes in the area having to do with the economic downturn?”

The Provost responded, “No. And our recruitment last year was a tremendously successful year. One thing, unfortunately—I guess unfortunately—the housing prices in the local area have really held up much more so than anywhere else in the country.”

Professor Camarillo — “So getting loans and so forth has...”

Provost Etchemendy — “So far, we have not had any problem.”

There being no further questions, Chair Cook thanked Provost Etchemendy.

VI. Other Reports

A. Report on Dual Career Academic Couples followed by a panel discussion (SenD#6137)

Chair Cook introduced the report: "...It's a report on dual-career academic couples. The report has been circulated, as well as an executive summary. It is for information only. Londa Schiebinger, Director of the Clayman Institute for Gender Research and Professor of History of Science, [will] present a summary. Then we have a panel who will talk about these issues as they relate to Stanford's ability to recruit and retain faculty: Robert Weisberg, Professor of Law and Special Assistant to the Provost for Faculty Recruitment and Retention; Dean Richard Saller of the Humanities and Sciences; and Pat Jones, Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity."

Professor Schiebinger began her presentation by saying, "It's a pleasure to be here. Sheri Sheppard [Chair of the 39th Senate] was a Fellow at the Institute last year and asked us to present our findings to the Senate, which we are happy to do. I would like to introduce one of my coauthors, Shannon Gilmartin [analyst and research consultant for the Clayman Institute], who is here." [Professor Schiebinger implied that Dr. Gilmartin would answer questions about the data.]

"I hope you have brought a copy of the report, *Dual-Career Academic Couples: What Universities Need to Know*...I wanted to have two projectors so you could compare the national data to Stanford's data [side by side]. But that wasn't possible. So I'll be asking you to look in the report for the national data, and I'm going to project Stanford's specific data."

"Three years ago the Clayman Institute set out to study dual-career academic couples at leading research universities across the country. Universities were selected to represent major geographic regions across the United States as well as metropolitan areas and college towns.

"We originally—rather naively—planned to gather data about academic couples from universities. We discovered that universities do not collect this information. Consequently we gathered data by surveying 30,000 full-time faculty. We received over 9,000 responses. All data are self reported. We have the best national data available on this issue.

"What did we find?"

A slide was projected, a pie chart showing the partner status of Stanford's faculty. Professor Schiebinger compared it to Figure 1 in the report which was a similar pie

chart of the partner status of U.S. academic workforce representing 9,043 full-time faculty from 13 leading research universities:

<u>Partner Status</u>	<u>Stanford University</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
Have academic partner	37%	36%
Have employed (non-academic) partner	38%	36%
Have stay-at-home partner	12%	13%
Are single	13%	14%

“...At Stanford, 37% of the faculty have academic partners, and 38% have employed partners. Many of those [latter] are professionals. It's very important to know that three-quarters of Stanford faculty have partners whose employment needs to be taken into consideration when the university is recruiting new faculty.”

Men and women have different partnering patterns.

A slide was projected, a pie chart showing the partner status of Stanford's faculty by gender. Professor Schiebinger compared it to Figure 2 in the report which was a similar pie chart of the partner status of U.S. academic workforce representing 3,716 women and 5,322 men from full-time faculty from 13 leading research Universities:

Women

<u>Partner Status</u>	<u>Stanford University</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
Have academic partner	39%	40%
Have employed (non-academic) partner	37%	34%
Have stay-at-home partner	4%	5%
Are single	21%	21%

Men

<u>Partner Status</u>	<u>Stanford University</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
Have academic partner	36%	34%
Have employed (non-academic) partner	39%	37%
Have stay-at-home partner	18%	20%
Are single	8%	10%

“We see that proportionally women have academic partners at a higher rate than men—but not remarkably so. We at the Clayman Institute launched this study because we had—three years ago—identified dual-careers as the next big issues for women. It is a women's issue, but, as you can see, it is also an issue for a large chunk male faculty.

“Even though the figures aren't very different for men and women, there are important gender differences that need to be taken into consideration when seeking to recruit top women.

“Number 1, women more often than men perceive a loss in professional mobility as a result of their academic partnerships (54% for women versus 41% for men).

“Number 2, women more often than men actively refuse job offers if their partner cannot find a satisfactory position. We saw that the number one reason for women refusing job offers was the partner issue. And the top issue for men were salary issues. We should talk to the women about that. These findings have significant implications. Dual-career status weighs more heavily on women in ways that go beyond the numbers. As we have also seen, dual-careers are an issue for the majority of Stanford’s faculty.

“I think also very important — not about dual careers—but you have to look at the proportion of women faculty who are single versus [the proportion of] male faculty, and you have to look at the proportion of faculty who have stay-at-home partners. Not all stay-at-home partners choose to stay home. Some are unemployed. But having the stay-at-home partner who can manage a household gives a faculty member a great advantage in their career trajectory.”

Partner Status of Underrepresented Minorities

A slide was projected, a bar chart showing the partner status of Stanford’s underrepresented minorities on the faculty. Professor Schiebinger compared it to Box 1 in the Report which was a similar bar chart of the partner status of underrepresented minorities on the faculty of U.S. universities.

All Respondents

<u>Partner Status</u>	<u>Stanford University</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
Have academic partner	37%	36%
Have employed (non-academic) partner	38%	36%
Have stay-at-home partner	12%	13%
Are single	13%	14%

Underrepresented Minority Respondents

<u>Partner Status</u>	<u>Stanford University</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
Have academic partner	42%	31%
Have employed (non-academic) partner	42%	34%
Have stay-at-home partner	8%	10%
Are single	8%	25%

“We see that Stanford enjoys a high proportion of dual-career couples from underrepresented minorities. I can't say why. I can only guess that we are using partner hiring here as a strategy.”

Professor Schiebinger then showed a slide that analyzed the hire types of couples in which both partners had academic positions for Stanford and compared it to analogous information for the U.S. in Figure 3 in the report. In the U.S. (totaling

36%), 10% were dual hires, i.e., hired as a couple at the current institution. 17% were independent hires, either responding to separate advertisements for positions or meeting each other after each partner was hired. In 9% only one partner is currently employed in academia.

“At Stanford of the 37% in which both partners had academic positions, 11% were “dual hires”, i.e., hired as a couple at the current institution. 18% were independent hires, either responding to separate advertisements for positions or meeting after each was hired. In 8% only one partner is currently employed in academia.

“...It is important to identify different ways that academic couples enter the university. And this [is] one of the things that we found [to be] important to set out and actually conceptualize. So of the 37% of faculty who have an academic partner, the first thing you can see is that 8% of those academic partners are unemployed. We call those solo hires. We're looking for a polite way to say that the academic partner is unemployed.

“The important thing to distinguish here is between ‘dual hires’ and ‘independent hires’. Dual hires is the category where the couple comes and there's a negotiation that takes place for the couple to be hired. Independent hires are where a couple comes, and each partner applies to a job at Stanford, or at any one of the universities we studied, and glorious day, they're hired quite independently of their being a couple. That's probably the happiest situation. It could also be that they met on campus, fell in love, and lived happily ever after. But, actually, the largest group is people who apply for the job. So that's 80% of this 18% bucket.

“Then, if you parse the dual hires...the largest group is sequential hires. So you have a recruit, we like to call him or her the ‘first hire’, who is recruited by the university. And the [person says], ‘I'm sorry, we can't take your job unless you can do something for our partner.’ They then negotiate for the ‘second hire.’

“There's also a new way that people are increasingly being hired, though it's still a very small group. We call them ‘joint hires’, because the couple is recruited as a couple. This is especially [the case] for senior faculty. It's a [prominent] couple, and it's a strategy of the university to go out and get them, especially if one of the partners is not well placed.”

Disciplinary Endogamy [academic couples in the same discipline]. “Academics tend to partner in the same field, because we all meet in graduate school, that sort of thing. What is striking and important about ‘disciplinary endogamy’ is where women and minorities cluster. As universities strive to boost diversity, it is helpful to understand where couple hiring may enhance that goal. This becomes important — again, we'll look at women— when we try to hire women in fields where they are underrepresented. If we take science, for instance, we see...that 83% of women scientists in academic couples are partnered with another scientist. That's shocking

and amazing. And this is compared to 54% of men. That's still a high number for the men.”

The percentage of academic couples in the same department is shown in Appendix B of the Report. “[It includes] all the fields that we surveyed; you can see that 58% of women physicists (another field where women are underrepresented), are partnered with another physicist.

“What does all of this mean?

“1. Our first and most important recommendation is that universities *develop a dual-career academic couple hiring protocol or written set of practices*. Universities have much to gain by developing agreed-upon, written protocols or guidelines for the processes whereby requests for partner hires flow efficiently through the institution. I am emphasizing process here. We aren't suggesting that universities hire more couples—they are already doing that. We are suggesting that when recruiting or retaining a faculty member involves a request for an academic position for a partner, that universities have an agreed upon process by which that request will flow efficiently through the university. Bob Weisberg and Pat Jones are currently working to write down Stanford's practices. This has many advantages—it builds greater uniformity and transparency across the university. One university in our study has had a written policy for a number of years that has also been well socialized among the faculty—people have discussed it. And this university finds that they have a very positive attitude about working toward partner hires when this makes sense. No one is advocating hiring a weak faculty member. It would be disastrous for us at Stanford to do that. But in many cases, you can hire a good person, and that is an advantage.

“2. Partner hiring can be used to create gender equality but only when done strategically. Historically, men more than women have used their market power to bargain for positions for their partners. Nationally women comprise 74% of second hires.

“I'm shocked. I'm amazed by that. And it's a pattern that should not really continue. We found that when women are the first hire they tend to bring partners of equal rank with them. And men first hires tend not to. One of our peer universities is using this observation strategically by seeking where possible to recruit women and underrepresented minorities as first (rather than second) hires. This may help universities address both diversity and equity issues.

“I was asked to speak only for ten minutes. There is much more in this report. I'd be happy to discuss it with you. The first part gives the data about dual careers. The second part talks about the values that couples have. I think it's important to understand the way that couples function in these hiring situations. And the third and longest [part] is about university policies and practices.”

Professor Schiebinger concluded her remarks by thanking the Senate.

[Applause]

While the panel was assembling, Chair Cook recognized Professor Andrew Fire:

Professor Fire asked, “Do you have a sense — in the numbers you showed...what fraction of the dual-career couples at Stanford, included one member at a different university nearby? Because it seemed like, from my experience, it's a fairly significant fraction...”

Professor Schiebinger replied, “...I think in our national study—we didn't break it out for Stanford—about 96% of faculty are at the same university, which means only a very small fraction are at another university.”

Shannon Gilmartin added, “That's among the couples that are dual hired. Among our independent hires, it's about 67% at the same university.”

[Note: Professor Schiebinger informed the Academic Secretary that the Report On Dual Academic Couples is available as a free download from the Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research's website at:

<<http://www.stanford.edu/group/gender/Publications/index.html>>

The Institute is also happy to provide copies upon request.]

The panel was ready. The moderator, Professor Weisberg, began the discussion, “We have very limited time, so I'm going to be a role model for everybody else; I'm from New York, so I can talk really fast.”

[Laughter]

Professor Weisberg continued, “As was just mentioned...my day job is teaching criminal law in the Law School...I have a separate position as Special Assistant to the Provost, and I share a lot of the relevant work with Pat Jones, who's going to talk in a few moments. As Londa [Schiebinger] said, one of the most important things to have at a university, in this world in which the couple hire is so important, is a process. We've taken very seriously the suggestion that we put down in some user friendly form, for everybody—all the faculty and chairs—[that process]. Pat and I and the Provost are developing such a document. We hope to have it available pretty soon.

“Meanwhile, there *are* processes. They may not be easily describable in any rigid, bureaucratic form. That probably is just fine. What there is, is a kind of resilient, flexible, cooperative network to deal with the common issue of dual careers.

“I want to emphasize that although the Clayman Institute's fabulous report focuses on dual career in the sense of two faculty members, the dual career situation confronts universities on a much wider scale. When it is an important thing—or

even a condition— in somebody...accepting a position at Stanford that the spouse or partner has a position, there's an unbelievable variety of positions that are feasible or aspired to... Many of them are faculty positions; many [are] academic or university positions that are not faculty positions; many [are] on campus or off campus professional positions and many of them [are] things we would simply call 'jobs'.

"I'm going to start with Dean Saller and ask him to talk briefly about how often [he encounters the situation of dual hires] in what form it comes to him, and what's the plan once it comes to him."

Dean Richard Saller replied, "I like to think of these [hires] in three categories. The first one is where both partners are clearly top-rate in their field and where there's a perceived priority need for both of them. That happens a little more often than lightning has struck me, but not a lot more often.

"The second category is, I think, the really tough one. That is where both [partners] are clearly academically qualified for a Stanford appointment, and where the first one meets a priority need, but the second one doesn't meet a defined priority.

"The third [category] is the one where the partner is probably not above the bar by the relevant department's reckoning, but may have a tenure-track job at another institution. That can often require delicate conversations. I think protocols are certainly worthwhile, and I will be glad to have them down on paper...In my experience, they're not likely to resolve the toughest issues here.

"Last year, H & S [the School of Humanities and Sciences] made 45 offers. Out of the 45, we had 32 acceptances. Of those 32, there was one couple. [The couple] happened to be in the same department (economics), which made the whole negotiation about priorities much easier, because it took place in one department. There were three more hires that included, as far as I know, nonacademic placements of the kind that Bob [Weisberg] often is very helpful with.

"Then there were 13 declines. Of those 13 declines, two were for spousal reasons, as far as we know (one man, one woman). In both cases, the second partner had a tenure-track offer from another university and our departments decided that they just couldn't make that kind of offer—that it fell into category three.

"Overall, when there are delays, I think the delays are probably not for protocol reasons. Bob is very responsive in helping us think about what the right match is. I think they're more often because the different parties may not have exactly the same clear view about which of these three categories the double hire falls into."

Professor Weisberg commented, "Let me just add that if there is one thing to emphasize in this broad categorical protocol [for dual hires], it...is speed. What does speed mean? It depends. Certain things have to wait for other things. These are often extremely complicated and sensitive matters. Nevertheless, when you see the

document we will produce, you will see emphasized...the theme that when someone is in a hiring...position, [such as] anybody on a senior faculty committee or [who is a] Chair, *legitimately* learns about a dual-career issue, whatever you can reasonably do, you have to do pretty quickly. [This is true] even though there will be delays down the road, simply because it's a complicated network, and you have to seize opportunities for moving things along as quickly as possible.

“Second, sometimes there is a kind of triage. That is to say, sometimes the problem can't be solved, and it's not good if the nonresolution of it becomes...very protracted. The failure of the dual-career hire is not fatal to all hires. If it does prevent us from getting somebody to accept a position, there are good and bad ways of that happening in terms of a possible future relationship.

“My colleague, Vice Provost Pat Jones, is crucial in this endeavor. By the way, she is one of the founding institutional representatives who started HERC [Higher Education Recruitment Consortium], the wonderful instrument for [regional] university communication about academic positions...Pat's going to talk about the university-wide picture, although H & S is a huge portion of it, a kind of ‘state of the union’ of the dual-career issue, and some of the stuff we do.

Vice Provost Jones began by thanking the Senate for being asked to participate.

“Last year, we collected two data sets that bear on our experiences with dual-career hiring as part of faculty recruitments and how big an issue this is for Stanford. ... We were asked by another institution that was preparing a report... to analyze the numbers of faculty offers made during the previous academic year where dual-career issues — where there were requests to the unit, the department or the school, for assistance with dual-career issues. In response to the question — [we analyzed]...recruitments during the '06/'07 academic year, because last year's recruitments were still in process. The data came from the school deans' offices. Overall, in the '06/'07 year [university-wide], there were 169 *offers* made; 28, (or 17%), involved requests...for assistance with dual-career issues. In terms of the faculty *hires*, there were 120 across the university; 22 (or 18%), involved request for assistance with dual-career issues.

“This set probably would not include situations Londa [Schiebinger] mentioned where the faculty member and...partner manage the issue by themselves, where they were applying independently for two positions, or where, by the time the negotiation got to the dean's office, a position had already been found by the spouse or partner.

“We also did our annual survey of factors affecting faculty recruitment and retention. Those of you who have been in the Senate know that we do a survey, usually fall/winter, [in which] we collect names from departments and schools of faculty who turned down our offers to come to Stanford the previous year. We contact those individuals and ask them why they did not come to Stanford...Summarizing those data over the three previous years ('04/'05, '05/'06, and '06/'07),

spouse/partner career issues...ranked number three, number one, and number four, respectively, among the reasons cited as the...number-one or number-two reason why people turned down offers to come to Stanford.

“Overall, in those three years, 26%...of people who declined our offers to come to Stanford cited spouse/partner career issues. In some of these cases, it may have been a situation where the spouse or partner wasn't movable, so we never really even had a chance to try to find him or her a position. We made an offer. They said, ‘I can't come; my spouse or partner is doing X, Y, or Z.’ But these data do give us a sense that this is a significant problem. And as I'm sure Dean Saller and the other deans know and the department chairs know, these are tremendously challenging issues to deal with. Very frequently, they're not issues that can be dealt with simply by throwing more money into the recruitment package...for lab space or research support or other things, by investment of resources... It is very complex. It frequently requires buy-in of another unit on campus.

“My office, as well as Bob [Weisberg], is available...and we do help faculty try to identify positions...either within the institution or outside. We do have resources. I provided for you a packet. The first page of this packet is the page in our newly revised brochure, ‘Family Matters @ Stanford for Faculty,’ which is now in the mail to you..., revised from the version originally sent out three years ago. This is just a general information page. The following pages are from our Web site, the Faculty Development and Diversity Web site...In the third and following pages in your packet, we, with help from student assistant Bobby Dockter from our office, have put together a fairly large collection of online resources of various sorts for partners of faculty to obtain assistance locally, generally in the Bay Area, for positions.

“Finally, Bob already mentioned this little postcard flier reminding all of us of our participation in the Northern California Higher Education Recruitment [HERC] consortium...a consortium of almost 50 Bay Area colleges and universities that lists current open faculty and staff and administrative positions. If somebody wants to look more broadly than Stanford, this is a great place to go.”

Professor Weisberg thanked Professor Jones and invited questions from the floor.

Professor Anat Admati began the questions: “...In your classification of academic faculty, how did you treat lecturers and adjunct faculty—[were they considered ‘full time academics’]?”

Professor Schiebinger answered that the positions were self reported. “But then we asked a series of questions about their partners. So we found out the rank of their partner. We studied both same-sex and heterosexual couples, and we found out just all sorts of things—what discipline they're in, that sort of thing.

Professor Matthew Sommer directed his question at Dean Saller, “...You mentioned three categories. The second sounds like one of the most difficult or

challenging...because departments are often very concerned about sort of 'freebie hire' skewing the department's own plans or trajectory for intellectual shape. What kind of incentives can you offer departments in that situation, the second, 'trailing spouse'?"

Dean Saller replied, "There are different levels of discussion. In some cases where we think the first hire is so important to the school that we'll engage in the grossest sort of bribery, then the question is whether they believe us. That gets into really interesting questions, because they say, 'Oh, well, five years down the road, you won't remember.' When I keep track, I do try to keep sort of a separate column to break these out. But can I guarantee that my successor is going to keep the same account? That's a hard [one] to make a credible commitment on. We certainly try. But I understand the worry."

Professor Schiebinger commented, "We're trying to get rid of this term, 'trailing spouse'. It doesn't do anybody any good. We're really trying to set forward the term, 'second hire' or 'partner hire', which makes it more attractive. If they're really a 'trailing spouse', you shouldn't be hiring them."

Dean Saller noted, "I've been a trailing spouse."

Professor Schiebinger sympathetically suggested, "Well, let's call you a second hire."

Chair Cook commented, "It's not unusual for me to have graduate students in my office saying, 'I have a partner, a husband, who is also going to be an academic.' Based on your experiences, when should they put that on the table when they're applying for an academic position?"

Professor Schiebinger replied, "...We asked that question. People tend to do it...sometime in the interview process... [As far as what your advice to your graduate students should be], you can decide what you think your best advice to them would be..."

"From the point of view of the couple, I believe the best advice is not to talk about this until you have an offer. From the point of view of universities...people need to find out as soon as possible to set in motion these...processes that Bob and Pat are talking about. And especially for junior hires, because your window of opportunity when you're making that offer is very small."

Professor Weisberg commented, "Just an empirical point. I would say it is true, whether this is a good thing or a bad thing, that what Londa describes with entry-level hires is the most common thing. They don't mention [their partner's need for an academic position] until they get an offer...Because we can't ask certain questions in the interview process, it becomes a key moment when we legitimately learn [of the partner's need]. We can ask more specific questions when somebody

becomes a recruit, that is to say, an offer has been made. Even then the question has to be somewhat ‘euphemized’. We are somewhat dependent on the state of the world and we have to react quickly.

Vice Provost Jones commented, “One of the things that institutions are moving towards and we're going to try is to have [available] when somebody is interviewed, if not earlier, information about what they have to do if they have a dual-career. If they anticipate that being an issue, give them information about whom to contact at the institution and the [assurance] that the institution does care. [Then] it doesn't depend on having the person interviewing the candidate to ask him or her about a possible partner need, which is not supposed to be done.”

Professor Admati had another observation, “I just want to make a quick comment about the notion that spouses [are not movable]. A lot of time, especially with senior offers, we don't get [as far as an offer], so your statistics won't include the situation where [some feelers were put out and the recruitment was stopped right away]. There are many cases like that.”

Professor Schiebinger responded, “This is one of the questions we asked on the survey—has your department not considered someone because the spouse was not movable?”

Professor Jennifer Summit said, “I'm very interested in HERC, which you mention here, and it seems like a really positive resource for us to encourage faculty, potential hires, with spouses' situations to look for jobs at neighboring institutions...I have my doubts about how effective these partnerships with neighboring institutions are. And one of the possibilities might be if cash were exchanged and you give a couple of scenarios about possibilities here. Do you really see that possibility developing? Is there a chance of putting some teeth into HERC?”

Vice Provost Jones replied, “There has been one example where Stanford paid a local institution to hire the spouse as a lecturer in their department. I don't know how that has worked out in the long term...The provost and I had a visit a couple of years ago from I think the provost and dean [from a local university]. During the conversation, he said], ‘By the way, we'd love to hire the spouses of partners of your faculty,’ the main reason being [Stanford had] a housing assistant program, and [that university didn't]. So it was a way to get their faculty.”

Professor Robert Simoni expressed concern: “I want to come back to the question about when do you tell your prospective hirer what your situation is. I disagree [with your answer]. Having dealt with couples coming in [one instance] where it was kept a secret until the offer was made, as you suggest, and the other instance, when they came for their first interview, it just came out in the course of conversation, initiated on their part, I think the latter is much preferable to the former. Getting it at the end, means you have less time to work on it. The couples that keep it a secret seem to think that it may jeopardize their opportunity to even be considered. That's certainly

not been the case in my experience. I think it's a case where honesty up-front will hold you in good stead.”

Professor Schiebinger observed, “In the third section of this report [contains] what we learned from our survey and what we learned from interviews. But we haven't included our opinion.”

Professor Cecilia Ridgeway noted, “...The national data and the data you [showed on the slides] were very similar, suggesting Stanford is very much like its peers. I was curious whether, [given] the fact that more and more women are represented at increasingly egalitarian rates in academe, and therefore this [dual hire] business [reflects this change], the universities that do the best on this are the cutting-edge ones, and are the ones who are going to get the best overall quality. So how do we compare? In other words, this gets to be a competition issue...So how do we compare with our peers in terms of our success with this, with this dual career issue?”

Professor Schiebinger answered, “We compare very well, because some universities are really low.”

Professor Ridgeway interjected, “Are awful.”

Professor Schiebinger concluded, “I guess I was surprised and pleased that I think Stanford is doing a good job at this.”

Professor Weisberg smiled, “And on that positive note –“
[Laughter]

Chair Cook thanked Professors Schiebinger, Weisberg, and Jones, and Dean Saller.
[Applause]

VII. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

VIII. New Business

There was no new business.

VIII. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rex L. Jamison, MD
Academic Secretary to the University

October 16, 2008
Meeting of Senate XLI
RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Name	Unit
P Admati, Anat, <i>Graduate School of Business</i>	01
A Aiken, Alex, <i>Computer Science</i>	04
P Anderson, Lanier, <i>Philosophy</i>	08
P Applebaum, Mark, <i>Music</i>	08
P Arvin, Ann, <i>Vice Provost & Dean of Research</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Baker, Keith, <i>History</i>	07
P Bambos, Nicholas, <i>Management Science and Engrg</i>	04
A Beach, David, <i>Mechanical Engineering</i>	04
A Beasley, Malcolm, <i>Applied Physics</i>	06
P Bendor, Jonathan, <i>Graduate School of Business</i>	01
P Bent, Stacey, <i>Chemical Engineering</i>	04
P Berek, Jonathan, <i>Obstetrics & Gynecology</i>	13
P Berger, Jonathan, <i>Music</i>	08
P Blau, Helen, <i>Microbiology and Immunology</i>	12
P Boardman, Gregory, <i>Vice Provost for Student Affairs</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Boxer, Steven, <i>Chemistry</i>	06
A Boyd, Stephen, <i>Electrical Engineering</i>	04
P Brandeau, Margaret L., <i>Management Science and Engrg</i>	04
P Bravman, John, <i>Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Buc, Philippe C., <i>History</i>	07
P Burchat, Patricia, <i>Physics</i>	06
P Burke, David, <i>SLAC</i>	10
P Cabrera, Blas, <i>Physics</i>	06
P Callan, Eamonn, <i>Education</i>	03
P Camarillo, Albert M., <i>History</i>	07
P Carstensen, Laura, <i>Psychology</i>	07
P Chang, Gordon, <i>History</i>	07
A Chu, Gilbert, <i>Medicine - Oncology</i>	13
P Cohen, Harvey, <i>Pediatrics</i>	13
P Cook, Karen, <i>Sociology</i>	07
A Drell, Persis, <i>Director of SLAC</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Dutton, Robert W., <i>Electrical Engineering</i>	04
A Eckert, Penelope, <i>Linguistics</i>	08
P Elam, Harry, <i>Drama</i>	08
P Elam, Michele, <i>English</i>	08
A Eliashberg, Yakov, <i>Mathematics</i>	06

Name	Unit
P Etchemendy, John, <i>Provost</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Fire, Andrew, <i>Pathology</i>	12
A Goldsmith, Andrea, <i>Electrical Engineering</i>	04
A Gordon, Deborah, <i>Biology</i>	06
P Greely, Hank, <i>Law</i>	09
P Gumpert, Patricia, <i>Vice Provost for Graduate Education</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Harris, Jerry, <i>Geophysics</i>	02
P Hennessy, John, <i>President of the University</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Horwitz, Ralph, <i>Medicine</i>	13
P Jamison, Rex, <i>Academic Secretary to the University</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Jones, Pat P., <i>Biological Sciences</i>	06
P Joss, Robert, <i>Dean of the Graduate School of Business</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
A Keller, Michael, <i>University Librarian & Dir. of Acad. Info.</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
A Kramer, Larry, <i>Dean of the Law School</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Lavori, Philip W., <i>HRP – Biostatistics</i>	13
P Lazzeroni, Laura C., <i>Psychiatry and Behavioral Sci</i>	13
P Lipsick, Joseph, <i>Pathology/Genetics</i>	12
P Marshall, Larry, <i>Law</i>	09
A Matson, Pamela, <i>Dean of the School Earth Sciences</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Osgood, Brad, <i>Electrical Engineering</i>	04
P Pfliederer, Paul, <i>Graduate School of Business</i>	01
A Pizzo, Philip, <i>Dean of the School of Medicine</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
A Plummer, James, <i>Dean of the School of Engineering</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Ridgeway, Cecilia L., <i>Sociology</i>	07
P Saller, Richard, <i>Dean of the School of Humanities & Sciences</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
A Satz, Debra M., <i>Philosophy</i>	08
A Shaqfeh, Eric, <i>Chem Engrg and Mech Engrg</i>	04
P Sheppard, Sheri, <i>Mechanical Engineering</i>	04
P Simoni, Robert D., <i>Biology</i>	06
P Sommer, Matthew, <i>History</i>	07
P Stearns, Tim, <i>Biological Sciences</i>	06
P Stedman, Stephen, <i>FSI-CISAC</i>	11
A Stipek, Deborah, <i>Dean of the School of Education</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Summit, Jennifer, <i>English</i>	08
A Willinsky, John, <i>Education</i>	03

Present on Invitation or by Request:

Richard Zare, James Collman, Edward Rubenstein, Londa Schiebinger, Shannon Gilmartin, Michele Cale, Bob Weisberg, Megan Pierson, PJ Wallace

Present on Standing Invitation:

Philip Spitz, Kathleen Sullivan, Stuart Baimel, Agnieszka Czechowicz, Lindi Press, Stephanie Kalfayan, Kathleen Sullivan, Ginny McCormick, Mike Antonucci

Outside Press: