

**TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
FORTY-FIRST SENATE REPORT No. 3**

Summary of Actions Taken by the Senate
November 13, 2008

By unanimous vote, the Senate accepted the report of C-Lib and charges it and its subcommittees to engage with the Stanford University Libraries (SUL) concerning the following recommendations, based on those of its Subcommittee on Digital Information Technologies in the Research Library Environment at Stanford.

The Senate requests a planning process to examine the costs and feasibility of potentially implementing the various recommendations of C-Lib. During this process, SUL should consult with the Budget Office, the Capital Planning and Management Group, and other relevant offices of the university. Special attention should go to the needs of the East Asian Library. Wide consultation with deans, development personnel, university officers and student leaders may lead to the addition of co-opted members. No fundamental decisions should be taken in absence of the following report to the Senate.

Specific topics the planning process ought to address include at least the following. What methods may guide decisions about the location of books on or off campus and how does the disposition of books interact with and balance against the development of digital book holdings? Given the cost factor of on-campus book storage and the limits imposed by the GUP on central campus building, what should be the role of browsable library stacks? What should be the relative priority among digitizing books, improved cataloging, virtual browsing, and other steps toward the electronic library? What would be the relative importance in any future on-campus library project among book storage, including books in non-Roman characters, and other uses of space such a research modules, faculty studies, open study areas, reference, or special collection areas?

The Senate charges C-Lib to monitor the progress of this process and to advise the Provost and the University Librarian on the implementation of options. C-Lib will report no later than the end of the academic year 2009-10 on the status of the planning process with regard to its original recommendations and may delineate new recommendations.

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

**MINUTES OF THE FORTY-FIRST SENATE
OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
November 13, 2008**

I. Call to Order

Professor Karen Cook, Chair, called the meeting of the 41st Faculty Senate to order at 3:10 PM. In attendance were 28 voting members and 5 *ex officio* members.

II. Approval of Minutes – (SenD#6154)

The minutes of the October 30, 2008, meeting of Senate XLI, with two minor revisions, were approved.

III. Action Calendar

There were no items on the Action Calendar.

IV. Standing Reports

A. Memorial Resolution:

Chair Cook welcomed James Sheehan, Dickason Professor in the Humanities, Emeritus, to come forward and present a brief memorial statement in honor of his colleague, Gordon Craig, J. E. Wallace Sterling Professor of Humanities, emeritus. The full length resolution will appear in the Stanford Report.

Gordon Alexander Craig (1913-2005) SenD#6156

Gordon Alexander Craig, J.E Wallace Sterling Professor of Humanities, died on October 30, 2005, a few weeks before his ninety-second birthday.

Craig was one of the most distinguished historians of his generation. His scholarship ranged across all of modern European history with a particular emphasis on Germany. In addition to his scholarly eminence, he was widely admired as a teacher, mentor, and reviewer. He received many honors and awards, was a member of honorary societies in the United States, Great Britain, and Germany, and served as president of the American Historical Association. At Stanford, he was chair of the History Department, a co-founder of the Program on International Relations, and chair of the Faculty Senate. In 1973, he received the Dinkelspiel Award for Outstanding Service to Undergraduate Education.

Craig's wife of 66 years, Phyllis Halcomb Craig, died in May 2006. They are survived by their daughters, The Reverend Susan Craig, Dr. Deborah Preston, Professor Martha Craig, a son, Charles Craig, eight grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren.

Madame Chair, I have the honor, on behalf of a committee consisting of Paul Robinson, Peter Stansky, and myself, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a Resolution in memory of the late Gordon Craig, Professor of History in the School of Humanities and Sciences.

All present stood in silent tribute.

Chair Cook thanked Professors Sheehan, Robinson and Stansky.

Chair Cook welcomed Ewart Thomas, Professor of Psychology, to come forward and present a brief memorial statement in honor of his colleague, Kennell Jackson. The full length resolution will appear in the Stanford Report.

Kennell A. Jackson (1941-2005) SenD#6157

*Kennell Jackson, Professor of History, died on November 21, 2005, at Stanford Hospital at the age of 64. Kennell joined the Stanford faculty as an assistant professor of History in 1969. He was a perceptive chronicler of African and African American cultures, past and present, as evidenced in his pioneering dissertation research on changes in popular culture in Kenya, and in his more recent books, *America Is Me*, and *Black Cultural Traffic: Crossroads in Global Performance and Popular Culture*, which he co-edited with a member of this ad hoc committee, Harry Elam.*

Kennell's impact on undergraduate life at Stanford was unparalleled. In the classroom, by making rich connections between Africa and America, he exposed students to what is now called "transnational history" well before students at other comparable universities. Outside of the classroom, he directed the program in African and African American Studies from 1980 to 1989. He started the Faculty Night dinners, which some of us enjoy, and he also started the Undergraduate Scholars Program, a mentoring program for minority and other students that is now a central part of undergraduate life. Finally, during his 25 years as Resident Fellow at Branner Hall, he created "Branner Presents". In recognition of his university service, Kennell received the Lloyd W. Dinkelspiel Award for Distinctive Contributions to Undergraduate Education in 1972. Then, in 1990, he was awarded the Allan V. Cox Medal for excellence in fostering research among undergraduates.

Kennell's presence continues to be felt in many ways. It is easy to imagine how fluently he would be expatiating in our present season about that prominent descendant of Kenya's Luo group, Barack Obama Jr., and his historic campaign! And it is tempting to speculate about which of the four aspirants to highest office would have been the featured speaker this year in "Branner Presents"!

Many of us will retain fond memories of Kennell, and some of us were bequeathed pieces from his impressive collection of art and 1st edition rare books. Other posthumous gifts from him endowed undergraduate research opportunities in the African and African American Studies program, and helped in the construction of

the new home for the Black Community Services Center. Therefore, long after memory becomes unreliable and artifacts lose their luster, Stanford undergraduates will continue to feel the tug of Kennell's durable legacy.

Madame Chair, I have the honor, on behalf of a committee consisting of Harry Elam, Richard Roberts and myself, to lay before the Senate of the Academic Council a Resolution in memory of the late Kennell Jackson, Professor of History in the School of Humanities and Sciences.

All present stood in silent tribute.

Chair Cook thanked Professors Thomas, Elam, and Roberts.

B. Steering Committee (StC)

Chair Cook reminded the Senate that the next meeting is January 22, 2009. There will be an Administrative Session at 2:15 PM before the meeting.

On January 22nd there will be a report on Information Security Policies and Initiatives.

Among the items on the Senate agenda for Winter and Spring Quarter are reports from the Vice Provost on Undergraduate Education and the Vice Provost on Graduate Education February 19th.

C. Committee on Committees (CoC)

There was no report.

D. President's Report

The president was away.

Provost's Report

Provost John Etchemendy announced that the committee to search for the new Dean of the Graduate School of Business (GSB) had been constituted. The committee will be co-chaired by John Roberts from the GSB, and the provost.

The GSB faculty representatives are Jennifer Aaker, Deborah Gruenfeld, Erica Plambeck, Peter DeMarzo and Madhav Rajan.

The non-GSB faculty representative is Joseph Bankman from the Law School; Alumni from the GSB alumni council are Gene Sykes, who chairs that body, and Tom Freihl, who is a member of the GSB advisory council; student members are Brad Hively, MBA student, and Gabe Adams, a Ph.D. student, and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Stephanie Kalfayan.

Chair Cook thanked the provost and opened the floor for questions.

Professor Philippe Buc described a recent wave of spam on his email that consumed much time in discussion with Stanford's information technology (IT) group. His complaint was that although the problem was systemic, i.e., not limited to his email address but campus wide, the IT did not send out a message to everyone alerting them to this problem.

The Provost offered to look into it—providing it was truly a systemic issue and not just a little more spam than usual.

University Librarian Mike Keller pointed out that recently, two ISPs [internet service providers]...in San Jose ceased providing support of many spam filtering operations, but in the last few days there had been a dramatic drop in the amount of spam.

Professors Laura Lazzeroni and Andrew Fire spoke in support of Professor Buc's complaint.

Provost Etchemendy was convinced and said he would pass Professor Buc's request along.

Professor Harry Elam observed that the administrator of the English department sent out a warning to its faculty, one of whom is Professor Michele Elam, who forwarded it to him.

Chair Cook thanked the provost.

V. Other Reports

A. NCAA Accreditation: Analysis of Student Graduation Rates (SenD#6144)

Chair Cook welcomed the Honorable LaDoris Cordell, Special Counselor to the President, and Professor Lee Ross to present a report on the graduation rate of student athletes as part of the requirement reported for NCAA [National Collegiate Athletic Association] re-certification. Director of Athletics Bob Bowlsby was in attendance.

A spreadsheet was distributed which showed the graduation rates of Stanford athletes compared to those of Stanford undergraduates for the years 2005-2007, for the major sports, by gender and ethnic group. Overall graduation rates for athletes and undergraduates from Notre Dame, Duke and the University of California at Berkeley were provided for comparison.

Judge Cordell explained that to be certified by the NCAA, Division 1 schools are required by the NCAA to conduct a self-study, which has now been completed. Included in the self-study is the NCAA's requirement to report on graduation rates.

Judge Cordell introduced Professor Lee Ross who had prepared the report.

Professor Ross thanked Judge Cordell and then turned to the report.

The *graduation rate* (GR) is based on a comparison of the number of students entering the university and the number of those graduating within six years. The units are expressed in percent. Factors affecting the GR include the need to take more than six years to graduate for economic or travel reasons, transfer to another college, or for academic deficiencies.

The *graduation success rate* (GSR) adds to first-time freshmen those students who entered mid-year and student-athletes who transferred into a college. The GSR subtracts “allowable exclusions”, including those who leave school to join the armed forces, foreign services, or a church mission, and those who died or become disabled. Finally it excludes students who would have been academically eligible to compete had they returned to the same college.

Excerpt from the spreadsheet.

Stanford 2007	Athl 07	Gen 07	Def 07	Athl GSR 07	Notes
All S-A's	95%	95%	0%	94%	
Male S-A's	93%	95%	-2%	94%	
Female S-A's	96%	95%	0%	95%	
Baseball	100%	95%	5%	96%	
M Bball	100%	95%	5%	67%	5 coh - 2 grad
M Track	100%	95%	5%	83%	
Football	80%	95%	-15%	93%	
M Other	100%	95%	5%	99%	
W Bball	80%	95%	-15%	92%	
W Track	75%	95%	-20%	92%	
W Other	100%	95%	5%	95%	

Athl, Athletics; Gen, Freshman undergraduates; Def, Difference between Athl and Gen; Athl GSR, Athletic GSR; coh, number of athletes in cohort; grad, graduated.

“The report is relatively self-explanatory...you’ll see that the report is given mainly in terms of percentages, which are a little misleading. If you look at the figures, which are sufficiently highly aggregated, that is to say, have a good-sized data

sample...Stanford looks quite terrific, certainly by NCAA standards, and even by our own standards.

“We were asked to highlight and discuss cases where graduation rates for athletes in a particular category, a particular sport, a particular gender or race, fall below the rates for the student body as a whole. Given that Stanford has a very high overall graduation rate, that sets a pretty high [standard] for the comparison to meet.

“...There are certain years in which there are seeming anomalies among rates. But those typically are reflecting things like a year in which two students out of six on the basketball team...went pro, or where we have...a small, number, in absolute terms, of students who, in a given year, in a given sport, didn't graduate. If you aggregate across the years for any sport or across the sports for any year, I don't think you'll see any problem.

“For our purposes, the question isn't--do we satisfy the NCAA? I'm sure we do that very nicely. The relevant questions are precisely the ones the NCAA rarely asks. And they are: What was the life experience of the student athletes at Stanford? Were the ones who didn't graduate making good progress towards their degree? Were they taking classes and doing satisfactorily? Did the overall Stanford experience...serve them well? Put differently, can we be comfortable...that we were not simply exploiting a class of spear-carriers in professional zealous forums? I don't think any of you would have serious concerns in that regard. Certainly in the surveys we have done of student attitudes and their perceptions, [there was] very little evidence of dissatisfaction or having felt ill-used by the university.

“What would perhaps be in order is a study that looked at...data separating the revenue-producing sports [from the] the non-revenue-producing sports, over a longer time frame [to see] what was the course, not just at Stanford, but after...Stanford, how well were [the student athletes] served by their experience. What did they do at Stanford? What have they done subsequently? What reflections do they have on that experience?”

Some of the data were highlighted in yellow red colors. Professor Ross explained that the NCAA asked for comments on cases where there was a discrepancy between undergraduate and athlete graduation rates. “...Given our overall graduation rate of 95%, [we defined a discrepancy as instances] where the [graduation rate] was 90% or less. And we've highlighted all of those. Most of them are trivial. We highlighted in red the exceptional cases where the numbers in absolute terms looked suspect.

“You'll see in almost every case--I believe in every case--the ones that we highlight reflect one-year anomalies. They don't reflect any consistent pattern across years within sport or across sports within a single year. The NCAA, in its infinite wisdom, asked us to report percentages, which in this case are much less revealing than the

absolute numbers. ...But this group is certainly sophisticated enough to understand that that's not the way we would want to make sense of these data."

Chair Cook opened the floor for questions.

Professor Sheri Sheppard commented, "I notice, in general, that the women athletes graduate at a higher rate than male athletes. Is that consistent with the general population of college students, men and women, completing college?"

Professor Ross replied, "It may reflect...the fact that men and women are somewhat differently distributed among different sports--there are more men than women in the high-revenue-producing sports that lead to pro careers. Inevitably, we're going to find more males dropping out for that reason. I think if you exclude those cases, the rates become reasonably consistent across gender."

Professor Buc found it interesting that the results calculated by Stanford statisticians look different from those the NCAA would produce, using its own methods. He thought that other institutions would find discrepancies with figures produced by the NCAA or according to NCAA norms.

"The second thing--it would be interesting to know whether the student athletes actually [travel] the same intellectual path through majors and have the same possibilities of choosing majors they want [as do the non-athlete] students. There must be some kind of trade-off. But it would be nice to know what kind of trade-off."

Professor Ross nodded and said, "We do have some information about that from our survey of student athletes, and lots of anecdotal evidence. Obviously, participating in a highly competitive sport during the season when you're in training limits...your options in important ways. The main opportunities the students are denied are to study abroad, for example...Stanford in Europe. It also becomes somewhat harder for them to aim for a double major.

"I don't think athletic participation gets in the way of having...a normal student experience at Stanford. It may get in the way of having an exceptional experience in some dimensions--although, of course, it's giving them an exceptional experience in terms of travel and meeting people and other aspects. So...there clearly are tradeoffs in being a serious athlete at Stanford. But there are also tradeoffs, frankly, in being a serious and dedicated undergraduate taking a psychology major, [for example], in that you feel reluctant to spend year away from campus [to study abroad] because you'd miss out on research opportunities."

Professor Buc asked whether there were patterns in the distribution of athletes across majors.

Professor Ross replied, “I don’t have those data at my fingertips. I can tell you...that Stanford does not have a ‘jock major’...You can’t major in phys. ed. [physical education]. There’s not an enormous concentration of athletes in any single field. And there are a surprising number in...the most demanding of majors.”

Chair Cook invited the Director of the Athletic Department, Bob Bowlsby to comment. He stood and said, “If I could perhaps just add a little bit to the earlier question about the distribution of majors. Our distribution of majors closely mirrors that of the undergraduate student population. There are a couple of places where we vary a little bit. Some of our athletes tend to stay away from the sciences, simply because they have difficulty getting lab classes, because many are later in the year. We have lots of kids in Human Biology and lots of kids that pursue engineering, despite the fact that they have some real scheduling challenges...We work with some of the departments to try to find ways to have a Thursday night lab. As surprising as it may seem, there are a few of our students that really like a Saturday morning lab, despite the fact that it’s a heavy participation day for athletics...And we are significantly below the student population in study abroad. It’s very difficult for student athletes to go abroad.”

Professor David Burke asked, “Can you comment on the average number of years that it takes a student athlete to graduate, particularly how often students have to stay on an extra year even though they’re not eligible to participate in athletic support?”

The discussion that ensued was somewhat tangential to his question, so he rephrased it: “How often does a student athlete not get the work done in four years, and therefore have to spend an extra year, even though they’re no longer eligible to finish the degree?”

Director Bowlsby answered, “I don’t have a number for you; we provide fifth-year aid to those who require it to graduate. But the circumstance is much more frequent where they’re still competing in the fifth year and also receiving aid. And many are doing co-term and master’s programs.”

Judge Cordell concluded the session by noting, “Next week, we will host a visit by the NCAA peer review team selected by the NCAA to come here for two days. It is headed by Reverend John I. Jenkins, President of Notre Dame. The team will be here next week, during which time they will interview student athletes, coaches, the athletic director, the faculty representative of CAPER [Committee on Athletics, Physical Education, and Recreation] Professor Ellen Markman, and President Hennessy.

“Any relevant feedback we get from them will be added to our final report, which was submitted in May of this year. Then we await the certification decision, which will be rendered in spring of 2009.

“Finally, since the third certification cycle will not commence for ten years, 2019, the NCAA requires that President Hennessy appoint an athletics certification liaison to monitor all the plans for improvement that are contained in our certification report.

“We do have some improvement plans in areas we focused on in the self-study, [namely] student athletes’ well-being, minority issues, gender issues, and academic integrity. . . . We’ve involved almost 60 people in putting together the certification report. We have much to do over the next ten years. It never ends.”

Judge Cordell thanked the Senate and Chair Cook thanked Judge Cordell and Professor Ross.

[Applause]

B. Committee on Libraries (C-Lib): Digital Information Technologies in the Research Library Environment at Stanford (SenD#6152, SenD#6153 and SenD#6160)

Chair Cook welcomed Professors John Bender, Chair, C-Lib, and Michael Marrinan, Chair of C-Lib’s Subcommittee on Digital Information Technologies in the Research Library Environment at Stanford, to present the report.

Chair Cook pointed out that Senate document # 6160, the proposal for Senate action comes from the Steering Committee because it is a slightly revised version of the original C-Lib proposal.

Professor Bender began the presentation. “The main business of the Committee on Libraries this year was to receive this substantial report from the subcommittee. . . . [Professor] Michael Marrinan will present the ‘skeleton’ . . . of the report. [University Librarian] Mike Keller has [provided you] a handout. . . about the Google settlement.

“We are asking you today to approve the motion [Senate document # 6160] which puts yet another committee in place. The reasoning is this: The subcommittee had six months to work on what is largely. . . a policy statement. It did not have the opportunity to do detailed studies of cost, square footage, linear footage, and many other issues that come into play if we were to go full speed ahead, not only with something like a building, but even something like a massive improvement of the library catalogue that is a crown jewel in the committee's recommendations.

“As C-Lib worked on this report, it became clear that it was a. . . comprehensive scheme for what libraries of the near future might look like. . . . We used to go to a building that had people in it and books in it--that was the library. If it was a history library, it looked almost exactly like a biology library--people, books, study space.

“Libraries now are very different from one another. Some are more digital, some less digital. They're dispersed in time and space. So we have a completely new

situation in which the core recommendation of the subcommittee is that we move towards... a hybrid library... that's self-consciously hybrid and [allows us to] actually take advantage of that hybridity to advance faculty research.

“It became clear that [rather than] putting this long list of recommendations... for you to vote on, which probably would have occupied you the rest of the year, the better course of action is to put the motion before you, which asks for a study process that would stretch almost two years to look into all these things.

“The key players will be the faculty and students on the committee, the library leaders and staff, who have [much] data that were not tapped into fully for the subcommittee report, and many officials in the university, most of whom work with the provost and who know things about planning and about buildings.

“[Approval of this motion] would mobilize that planning process, [a progress report about] which would [be presented to] the Senate by the end of the next academic year... We hope you will agree that this is a good strategy for dealing with what is a big issue. One hundred sixty-five people came to the [town hall] meeting about this issue last week. Every speaker endorsed the subcommittee report.”

With the aid of slides, Professor Marrinan presented the subcommittee's report.

Context of the genesis of the subcommittee

Global library challenge, i.e., the transition from print to electronic record (“digitization”). “Libraries at Stanford are part of a global network and research libraries throughout the world are asking the same questions that we're asking here today, which is to say, how do we figure out what to do in the next 15 years to 20 years as more and more information becomes digitalized?”

Constraints of the GUP (General Use Permit) (the limitation of use of land imposed by Santa Clara County). “The second factor in why this happened is the general-use constraints on Stanford, constraints with which we are all familiar.”

The decision to demolish Meyer Library. “The catalyst for what we're doing was, of course, the announced destruction of Meyer Library and its replacement not by a library, but by a smaller academic computing building, which set off a worry of a ‘domino effect’, because the collections that are in Meyer, some 700,000 volumes--the East Asian librarian almost in toto and a fair number of green books--would have to be moved somewhere else. The answer to that was to move it into Green Library itself, which meant moving other things out of Green into storage in Livermore. Everybody was up in arms, all of which was predicated on not having much of a discussion amongst the faculty.”

The recent economic meltdown. “This report, which was written in June, after consultations with the faculty last spring, could not predict the economic meltdown... which means, as you know, that building on campus has been

temporarily frozen, except for those that already have money in hand. It also means that the destruction of Meyer, which, at the time that we started, was proposed [to happen in] about seven years, is now in the process of being looked at again, perhaps to be put off for longer than seven years. A lot of it depends on what the county tells us we have to do for seismic [reasons].”

Storage of books in the Livermore facility. “...All of what we thought about over the previous months was predicated on the idea there would be [more] storage in Livermore. However...the second module at Livermore has been moved back in the capital plan...If you look at the fill rates, we're looking at a situation where there's not going to be any room in Livermore.”

Goals of the subcommittee

Ensure faculty input. “The first and most important goal was simply that the faculty get a voice in what's going on here. We came out of the town hall meeting [a year ago] with a feeling...decisions were being made about the nature of the libraries at Stanford without faculty consultation.”

Protect and preserve the East Asian Library. “The second goal was to worry very much about the East Asian Library, what's going to happen to it, what does it mean for the program, and what does it mean for the status of Stanford.”

Assess the impact of the ongoing digitization of all books in the Stanford libraries. “The third goal was to worry about the impact of Google...which has become a big player in libraries around the world. Not all of us are absolutely convinced that Google is the only game in town...”

Review the decisions about which books to transfer off campus and which books to remain. “The fourth issue that we wanted to study was...books on and off campus. We have been told that we don't have to worry; that everything is going to be online and books are going to become redundant. We were not all convinced that that was the case, and we wanted to look at that problem.”

Monitor the digital/integration of books. “Finally, we wanted to ask---how do we integrate this world? If there are going to be digital books, digital materials, and print materials, how do we keep it together? How do we work across the divide? How do we keep our research running? The underlying premise of the committee was that not everybody is moving at the same speed; that they ought not to move at the same speed; and that they ought not to be forced to move at the same speed. Disciplines are different. We were greatly heartened to find a large study by the Ithaca Group that in fact, said the same thing--that one size does not fit all when it comes to libraries.”

Modus operandi

Consult departments. “The first thing we did was to consult departments... Members of the committee--usually me--meeting with faculty in their faculty

meetings. I went to a fair number of faculty meetings. [We asked] about how they do their research, and how they use the libraries. And that was very useful -- those were very useful meetings.”

Solicit letters from department chairs. “We contacted department chairs to ask them to hold meetings within the department and to prepare a written report for the committee. We got a fair number of [reports]—although...we didn't get 100%.”

Discussion of findings. “The first thing the committee did was to discuss the findings that we assembled [after the deadline of the receiving reports, April 1.]

Findings

Browsing—walking among book stacks. “...That long-dead practice called ‘browsing’ is in fact not so dead at all. We heard again and again from faculty that browsing is an important part of the way one does research in a research university.”

Storage criteria may need to be revised. “People are not necessarily happy with the way [storage criteria have]...evolved...something like this: Look at the circulation records and if the books are not being circulated, move them off campus. [There were a lot of complaints about this process.]”

Digitization of non-roman characters (e.g. Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Cyrillic, old German, etc.). “These are characters that can be photographed, but can't be read by machines, which means that you can get pages and images, of characters, but you can't search those characters. Which means that the so-called digital scans of this material are largely useless unless you know what you're looking for.”

State of the online catalog. “...Libraries are going to have a lot of digital materials in them. They're going to be spread all over. We're going to have books in Livermore. We can't avoid that. But the only thing that we can count on, we hope, is to bring all of those parts together when we're doing a research project, is the catalog. ...We [received many] complaints about the [quality of the] catalog--in its user interface, the depth of cataloguing, and its usability, how you can browse with it. One of our priorities was to look at the catalog and think about how it can be made better.”

Hybrid research spaces. “These are little areas that could be set aside for medium-term projects, not lifetime sinecures for tenured faculty, but projects where, for six months or a year, you could have a space to bring together print materials along with your computer and its electronic materials, to work on a project. In other words, to have kind of a little library inside the library. Those are the kinds of things that we found were of some interest.”

Major recommendations of the subcommittee

Catalog renewal. “The first recommendation, one of the most important, is a project for catalog renewal. That means to look at Socrates [Stanford University's library

catalog], think about how it can be redesigned [to avoid] spending a lot of time and money going back particularly into the collections that were originally on cards and now are in some kind of digital form but for which the cataloging was never very good. This is particularly the case for multi-volume sets, where you might have 100 volumes, and Socrates will tell you [only] that there are 100 volumes. For example, I use the correspondence of Napoleon, and there are about 100 volumes. And it will tell me that we have 100 volumes, but it won't tell me in what volume I can find Napoleon's decree of 1814 on such and such a topic. In order to do that, I have to either go to the SAL [Stanford Auxiliary Library] I...or SAL II, which I don't mind going to, or bring them over *en masse* and look through them one by one. The catalog should do better than that. [Also it is important] that the catalog include a scanned and searchable title page, table of contents, and index.”

Research modules. “We believe that a library of the next 50, 75 years would be very smart if it would allow its researchers to temporarily set up shop for a project, and when the project is over, dismantle it...If you're going to have books in a special place, they have to be accessible to the rest of the users and to the staff [if they have] to be recalled. So[the idea is to have] little libraries inside the library for which a graduate student, or faculty member would submit a proposal for short term lease, for example, six months, to run a project, and after that time, it would be dismantled and somebody else would move into it.”

Research portals should be created electronically in libraries for storage of data, references and other material necessary for ongoing research projects. “...How many of you download something from JSTOR [journal storage, an online system for archiving academic journals], put the PDF in the folder and forget where you put it six months later? Part of the problem is the material that comes in digital form has to be accessible. That means it's got to be cataloged [and] stored somewhere. We're suggesting something like what you might call cloud [computing]. We all have a lot of space on the Stanford servers, most of which is just filled up with e-mail. And the AFS [Andrew File System] system works terribly, frankly, because I've tried to use it.”

Browsing model project. It has been asserted that digital browsing is as convenient as physical browsing. Models should be developed that show this to be the case.

The ATS [Academic Technology Specialist] program should be expanded to provide more assistance to faculty and students.

The subcommittee also made some secondary recommendations.

Secondary recommendations linked to the major recommendations

Hybrid library goal. Until the cataloging has become adequate, the libraries must continue to offer simultaneous print and digitized books and journals. “...Rather than saying that our long-term goal is a bookless library, we should say that our

long-term goal is a hybrid library, because we think it's going to be hybrid for along time.”

Serials transfer. Storage criteria should be reviewed and possibly revised. “Serials can be accessed much more easily with a search engine. Specific articles can be brought back with a PDF form. We can make a big space on campus by moving serials first.”

Repurpose SAL I and II. “...SAL I and II [are part of] the GUP. That's valuable space...Let's incorporate them into the on-campus collection, [by turning them into branch libraries rather than simple despositories].”

Create new more modern campus storage. “...We need a modern, efficient, high-density storage unit on campus, and we suggest that it be built close to Green Library.”

GUP. “Finally, the next time the GUP is negotiated...Stanford should...try to find some way to get at least a discount on storage space for books.”

Professor Bender thanked Professor Marrinan and then asked University Librarian Michael Keller to comment on the report.

Librarian Keller: “First, [I will make] a disclaimer and a footnote and then give some comments.

“The disclaimer is that the... subcommittee of C-Lib worked independently of the library leadership. The footnote is that they derived and received data from library analysts. There was no filter in between the folks who could supply data to them and the subcommittee.

“My comment is-- this report, in effect, validates and verifies things that we are doing, things that we are trying to do, and things that we would like to do. So it has, despite some of the criticisms, my full support and the support of those who are responsible for the libraries.

“The library continues to be a major acquisitions enterprise relative to all the research libraries in the U.S. We continue to get somewhere between 110,000 and 150,000 new books every year in physical forms, tens of thousands of e-books, and tens of thousands of e-journals. We also have big special collections. I'm happy to tell you that in these matters, both the provost and the president have been really very supportive.

“Secondly, we have also been working hard on the digital library front in various ways, including beyond getting the content. As Michael [Marrinan] committee's recommendations point out, work on the browsing model should be underway. It *is* underway, with special money, one-time money over three years from the president.

I believe that we will have a prototype to bring to you sometime in year two and year three of that effort.

“With regard to the Google [handout]...let me give you some highlights that are not on the paper.

“The Google settlement, [when] it occurs--this year...or ten years from now--will bring [to our libraries] the present number of volumes in the Google collection--about seven million, of which half are public-domain works and half are in copyright but out of print. We have contributed 1.2 million volumes to that effort. When we get access to that collection, there will be a dramatic increase in the number of books that are accessible, albeit books in digital form through the Google book search service.

“When will the settlement be complete? It could be complete as early as September 2009. But if there are challenges to it, it might take another decade....”

“Because of our enthusiastic participation, the fact that we are sending [Google] 2500 books a day and have already sent 1.2 million books, we will get a license from Google with a dramatic discount. That license will allow every person with a Stanford ID to read those books. There's some talk about downloading and printing as well--whether we cover those costs or individuals do it remains to be known. In addition...we will get the use of the front matter, as...the subcommittee recommended, table of contents, title page, and index. We can append those to the bibliographic records, and they will be searched, and can be seen very easily.

“We will also have a link in Socrates from the Socrates bibliographic record to the Google books. We've already started doing that. You will also find in Socrates links to e-books that we've purchased from other sources.”

Professor Bender thanked Librarian Keller and commented that the motion before the Senate is for approval of C-Lib and its subcommittee to continue to work on the issues outlined by Professor Marrinan.

Chair Cook began the discussion by calling upon Jonny Dorsey, ASSU undergraduate senator who commented that the ASSU “...passed a resolution endorsing C-Lib's recommendations and asking to you do the same...for three reasons...”

“First of all, undergraduates actually use a lot of the same research methods [as faculty]...and in many ways rely more upon physical access to books than faculty...When we're doing research for a topic we don't know very much about, we rely upon the library and the physical proximity of those materials to be our first introduction to a field...”

Second, "...advanced undergraduates, the students doing thesis research [have] needs relatively similar to those of grad students. To the extent that these recommendations apply to grad students in addition to faculty, they also end up percolating down to the undergraduates doing novel research.

"The third point is that while...not every undergraduate considering coming to Stanford looks at the libraries as an 18-year-old high school senior, the ones you care about, the ones who are actually going to seek you out to do research and who are probably the same people who are going to end up writing senior theses when they're 21 or 22, are going to be looking at the libraries [and the] support the university gives to undergraduate research.

"These are conclusions that we came to after consulting broadly with undergraduate members of the ASSU, as well as with other interested undergraduates. So I think they have a fair bit of traction within the undergraduate body. This isn't just a faculty concern. Over half of the undergraduates are humanities or social sciences students, and there are many more in related fields, bio, engineering, et cetera, who benefit from the materials in the library."

Professor Matthew Sommer began by saying, "I teach Chinese history. I'm also on C-Lib and was on the sub committee that generated the report."

Professor Sommer noted that the Asian languages department faculty endorsed enthusiastically the recommendations of the subcommittee, especially that the East Asian Library be preserved on the core campus, a physical collection for access for research. He confirmed the special challenges of the non-Roman character set of languages. The Chinese Unicode [a tool to convert Chinese characters into decimal form] requires recognition of more than 70,000 separate items, far beyond the number for Roman characters.

"Optical character recognition technology for Chinese is not very good yet. We assume the technology will continue to improve...but right now, it's higher for contemporary texts, much lower for classical texts...there is a 20% error rate [in digital conversion which] requires extensive proofreading for pre-modern materials. The proofreader must have the level of education comparable to the people doing the research.

"...Essentially, all books in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean published prior to the 20th century were printed with hand-carved wood blocks. So... [there is] a lot of noise in the images; most newer versions of these are simply photographic reprints of the wood block prints. .

"As a result, the kinds of databases that we do have...are simply photographs of each page that are not searchable for content or key word...but for title only because that is a separate input. Chinese is apparently ahead of Japanese and Korean...

“For these reasons, the East Asian faculty is very concerned about anything that might take away our access to physical books...and our ability to do research. We're not Luddites, we have benefited...from these new technologies. [But] we want to make sure that any changes that take place, [will not interrupt] our teaching and research mission.

“We have sets of materials [in Chinese, Japanese or Korean] each of which [contains] more than 1,000 volumes. The catalog for contents [of those volumes] has not been done. There's one set of Korean volumes with more than 3,000 volumes. If you go into Socrates, it says ‘volumes 1 through 3,000 plus’. If that set is in Livermore, it might as well be in Korea, unless you're going to recall all 3,000 volumes on campus. And then where are you going to put them?”

“The East Asian studies faculty and graduate students are very enthusiastic about these recommendations, mainly because they preserve...intact the East Asian Library on the core campus so we can do our research.”

Professor Bender added, “Everyone may not realize that the books stored at Livermore are not in shelf order. They are not browsable. They're in big containers. So it's not like SAL I and II at all. The 3,000 volumes, if they were there, would just be boxed.”

Professor Buc commented, “...Last year I asked the Center for Teaching and Learning to compile studies about the difference between reading online and reading print as a technology...the long and the short of that [compilation] is that students prefer to print things and read them over browsing them [on the computer screen]...One reads that PDFs are not made to be read online, they're made to be printed.

“I also, belatedly, want to ask...the committee's consideration that we may want to rebuild an undergraduate library [like] Meyer but with a really good shelf list where the students can browse and not be distracted by e-mail...we should have a nice undergraduate library [like] the library that I used at Yale...where I found immediately what was key in the disciplines that I was exploring...”

Professor Gordon Chang thanked the members of C-Lib and the subcommittee and said, “Matt's [Sommer] comments reminded me that in a university which does research in a Roman language but is moving aggressively to internationalization, we are going to have great demands on the library as we move into Islam, Islamic studies and the South Asian studies, among others. These are huge areas of acquisition.

“That said, one thing that struck me...is the suggestion of how Stanford stands in contrast to our peer institutions...What our peer institutions are doing is highly relevant. It raises issues of how they're thinking about the new global, digital age---the [same] issues that we're facing here. Clearly, they've come to different

conclusions. That's...of concern...it appears to me every one of our peer institutions...are moving in a different direction than we seem to be....They [must have]...a different logic, a different reasoning...If they're moving in that direction and we're going in this direction, what is that going to mean for us as a competitive institution in the future?...Were you able to consult with other folks at other institutions?"

The replies from Professors Bender and Marrinan mentioned Princeton, Yale, Toronto, Chicago and Harvard.

Professor Bender, cautioning that systematically surveying other institutions wasn't part of the mission of the subcommittee, said it was clear that major investments in core libraries were happening at our peer institutions. He noted, "Princeton is building its old library completely new from the inside out. They have a new science library which has 325,000 books in it. So the question, just of basic investment is very significant."

Professor Bender requested that Professors Buc and Gordon and any other faculty members or students who have suggestions about the libraries should correspond with Mimi Calter, C-Lib secretary.

Professor Yakov Eliashberg was next to speak: "One serious concern which the Mathematics department has in connection with the continuing digitalization of libraries is archiving. For instance, currently Math and Computer Science library is considering canceling paper subscriptions for all Springer journals in exchange for getting the online access to all Springer journals. While this may sound attractive, because indeed, most of us use online journals when it is possible, we also often need to access 40-50 years old journals. So what is the guarantee that 30-40 years from now Stanford faculty and students would have an access to today's journals? We cannot trust Springer, or any commercial publisher, with the task of keeping old archives, because they can go out of business, change their policies, etc. Hence, Stanford itself needs to find a solution for this problem, and arrange for archiving of the current digital media, either alone or in cooperation with other universities and research institutions."

Librarian Keller replied. "This is a very good point. Most of the active science, technology, and medical journals, including engineering, have digitized their back sets. Most of those journals also recognize that their online version is the most complete version, therefore the version of record. Therefore, the question of the digital archive is very important. There are several attempts underway, at...The Hague...the British Library...and Harvard, to build a digital archive, and we are building a digital archive. [We have invented] software called LOCKS...that allows institutions at very low cost to cache and save over long periods of time e-journals and articles and other options. It is not yet proven which one of these [efforts] is the best way. In fact, it is my belief we have to be involved in several different efforts

and have to monitor all the other efforts to know which, in the long run of time, will be efficacious.”

Professor Lazzeroni asked whether the committee had given any consideration to possible impacts [of these proposed changes] on individuals with disabilities.

Librarian Keller responded, “...Presently we have a service that supports those that have visual issues or physical issues manipulating books and digital material. We have the right under the law to convert text to Braille, and to convert them to larger size. Under the terms of the county code, state code, and the ADA [Americans with Disabilities Act], when we build a building or modify a building significantly, we make the spaces physically responsive to those with issues of mobility. We also, under the terms of the contracts we write, and under the terms of the Google settlement, can provide, without fear, versions of works that can be more easily read and also converted to Braille.

“...In the course of the Google negotiations, we did have a session with the National Association for the Blind. And partly as a result of the intervention of the libraries in the Google settlement, there is a big section about providing accommodations for those with various kinds of disabilities that need extra special versions.”

Professor Lazzeroni asked about provisions for learning disabilities like dyslexia.

Professor Keller replied that it was unclear to him...whether [a learning disability] is regarded as a disability of the same sort as visual difficulties, difficulties with speech and hearing, or difficulties manipulating text and whether it was included in the ADA.

Professor Lanier Anderson was skeptical that the actual cognitive value of physically browsing the objects will be reproducible by some electronic tool and he asked the librarian if he could say something that would mitigate his skepticism.

Librarian Keller tried. “Our specifications are not to try to do a kind of virtual cave [that would simulate] the experience of walking down library stacks...We're looking at the intellectual aspects of browsing. People browse by call numbers. You walk among the stacks to the location of a book or a classification of a subject you know about, and you look at that shelf and you look around. And you start picking books off the shelf. So, clearly, one of the browsing attributes has to be browsing in classification. [But] the limitation of browsing physically is that not all of the books in that classification are located on that shelf. Big books, small books, rare books, and so forth are spread [elsewhere in] the library.

“We're going to allow you to browse by author...by title, by subjects and by their various attributes, printing and publication date, location of the publisher and the publisher themselves.

“I think that you should be skeptical and that we should hear from you. As we bring out these models, we'll ask you to be part of the focus group to give us strong feedback about what we have. And I've got your name and your address...”

Professor Anderson smiled, “You know where I am.”

The librarian said yes he did.

Professor Marrinan endorsed Professor Lanier's skepticism.

Professor Keith Baker congratulated Professor Marrinan and his committee on an exceptional report, adding, “There was enormous concern a year ago when the issue of taking down Meyer and moving huge quantities of books off campus was taken up. I think the real fear was that a miscalculation in that process, not fully thinking through the process, and miscalculation of the rate at which we might reasonably move into a digital universe... could cost a generation of scholars at Stanford a great deal of work. ... This report is very thoughtful, very practical, and begins to lay out some serious consideration of what the libraries at Stanford could be, and should be for the next generation... This is an excellent start in thinking about an absolutely fundamental aspect of scholarly life at Stanford. I hope that the Senate will adopt this action, and let's move ahead as quickly as we can to thinking through this very important issue.”

Provost Etchemendy commented, “The president and I also support this motion, as John [Bender] and Michael [Marrinan] know.

“I think that it is something that requires a lot of thought. As Keith [Baker] points out... we want not to move in the wrong direction too early and then be sorry about that later. I think that that can happen either way we go, that is, whether we build an additional on-campus book storage facility, library, or not. We could be sorry ten or fifteen years down the road.

“I think the recommendations are very thoughtful. They [contain] some very interesting ideas about how to configure space, how to make it more accessible. Some of these [recommendations] are ongoing already. As Mike [Keller] has pointed out, he's trying to work on the online browsing model and the catalog upgrading, which are absolutely essential. There's no question that in a hybrid library, as Michael [Marrinan] has called it, it is absolutely essential that you have the catalog to bring it all together.

“The hard questions are going to come -- and I don't know that this committee can answer the hard questions. The hard questions are about tradeoffs... There are tradeoffs for any limited resource, whether it be space on campus, which is one dimension, or money, another dimension... The committee can certainly look at numbers and say, ‘Well, here's how much it will cost.’ But will the committee then

be able to say, ‘And furthermore, that investment is the investment that the institution wants to make’? Without knowing what the [tradeoff] is--what are we not doing because we're doing that-- we can't make a sensible decision. That's not a problem with this recommendation...it will eventually happen that we will have to make those kind of decisions.”

Chair Cook read one sentence of the recommendation, which she noted is the heart of the major action the Senate was being asked to take.

“The Senate requests a planning process to examine the costs and feasibility of potentially implementing the various recommendations of C-Lib.”

Chair Cook then said, “That's the core of the action. With that in mind, I just want to get a sense of the Senate of whether we can move to action today or whether we need to have another meeting on this issue.”

There was general nodding and vocal consent to have a vote.

She continued, “Is there any burning question that hasn't been answered?”

Professor Bender made a brief comment. “I agree with what John [Etchemendy] said. The motion before you specifically asks this study group to set priorities among things internal to library concerns. ...I think it's very clear that the university has to set priorities amongst many things.”

Chair Cook called for a vote on the recommendations that came moved and seconded by the Steering Committee:

“The Senate accepts the report of C-Lib and charges it and its subcommittees to engage with the Stanford University Libraries (SUL) concerning the following recommendations, based on those of its Subcommittee on Digital Information Technologies in the Research Library Environment at Stanford.

“The Senate requests a planning process to examine the costs and feasibility of potentially implementing the various recommendations of C-Lib. During this process, SUL should consult with the Budget Office, the Capital Planning and Management Group, and other relevant offices of the university. Special attention should go to the needs of the East Asian Library. Wide consultation with deans, development personnel, university officers and student leaders may lead to the addition of co-opted members. No fundamental decisions should be taken in absence of the following report to the Senate.”

“Specific topics the planning process ought to address include at least the following. What methods may guide decisions about the location of books on or off campus and how does the disposition of books interact with and balance against the development of digital book holdings? Given the cost factor of on-campus book storage and the

limits imposed by the GUP on central campus building, what should be the role of browsable library stacks? What should be the relative priority among digitizing books, improved cataloging, virtual browsing, and other steps toward the electronic library? What would be the relative importance in any future on-campus library project among book storage, including books in non-Roman characters, and other uses of space such a research modules, faculty studies, open study areas, reference, or special collection areas?

“The Senate charges C-Lib to monitor the progress of this process and to advise the Provost and the University Librarian on the implementation of options. C-Lib will report no later than the end of the academic year 2009-10 on the status of the planning process with regard to its original recommendations and may delineate new recommendations.”

The motion was passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Chair Cook thanked Professors Bender and Marrinan and University Librarian Keller, the Committee on Libraries, and especially the subcommittee for its hard work. She also expressed appreciation to the Senate for the thoughtful discussion.

VI. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

VII. New Business

There was no new business.

VIII. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was moved by Professor Sheri Sheppard, seconded and passed unanimously.

The Senate adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Rex L. Jamison, MD
Academic Secretary to the University

November 13, 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
A Applebaum, Mark, <i>Music</i>	08
A 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
P 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
A Bent, Stacey, <i>Chemical Engineering</i>	04
A Berek, Jonathan, <i>Obstetrics & Gynecology</i>	13
A Berger, Jonathan, <i>Music</i>	08
P Blau, Helen, <i>Microbiology and Immunology</i>	12
A Boardman, Gregory, <i>Vice Provost for Student Affairs</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
A Boxer, Steven, <i>Chemistry</i>	06
A Boyd, Stephen, <i>Electrical Engineering</i>	04
A Brandeau, Margaret L., <i>Management Science and Engrg</i>	04
A Bravman, John, <i>Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P Buc, Philippe C., <i>History</i>	07
A Burchat, Patricia, <i>Physics</i>	06
P Burke, David, <i>SLAC</i>	10
P Cabrera, Blas, <i>Physics</i>	06
A 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
P Chu, Gilbert, <i>Medicine - Oncology</i>	13
A 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>
A 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
P 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
A Greely, Hank, <i>Law</i>	09
P Gumpert, Patricia, <i>Vice Provost for Graduate Education</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
A Harris, Jerry, <i>Geophysics</i>	02
A Hennessy, John, <i>President of the University</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
A 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
A Joss, Robert, <i>Dean of the Graduate School of Business</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
P 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
A Lipsick, Joseph, <i>Pathology/Genetics</i>	12
A Marshall, Larry, <i>Law</i>	09
A Matson, Pamela, <i>Dean of the School Earth Sciences</i>	<i>ex officio</i>
A Osgood, Brad, <i>Electrical Engineering</i>	04
P Pflleiderer, 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>
A 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
P Shaqfeh, Eric, <i>Chem Engrg and Mech Engrg</i>	04
P Sheppard, Sheri, <i>Mechanical Engineering</i>	04
A Simoni, Robert D., <i>Biology</i>	06
P Sommer, Matthew, <i>History</i>	07
A Stearns, Tim, <i>Biological Sciences</i>	06
A 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
P Willinsky, John, <i>Education</i>	03

Present on Invitation or by Request:

Dan DeYoung, James Sheehan, Paul Robinson, Ewart Thomas, Jamila Rufaro, Jody Nyberg, Richard Roberts, LaDoris Cordell, Lee Ross, Bob Bowsby, Ann Enthoven, John Bender Michael Marrinan, Serge Plotkin, Mimi Calter, Mike Cherry, Andrew Herkovic, Catalina Rodriguez, Assunta Pisani, Doug Brutlag, Gavin Wright, Stephen Hinton, DongFang Shao, Laura Schoenthaler

Present on Standing Invitation:

Kathleen Sullivan, Agnieszka Czechowicz, Adam Beberg, Jonny Dorsey, Amir Handen, Lindi Press, Stephanie Kalfayan, Ginny McCormick, Mike Antonucci

Outside Press: