



Deliberative Polling to Inform the Design of the New School on Climate and Sustainability

Report

Stanford | Center for Deliberative Democracy

FEBRUARY 2021

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW 2

WHAT IS DELIBERATIVE POLLING®? 2

WHO DELIBERATED? 2

WHAT HAPPENED? 2

EVALUATIONS 3

TABLE 1 PARTICIPANTS VS NON-PARTICIPANTS AT T1 5

TABLE 2 FACULTY PARTICIPANTS VS. ALL OTHER ACADEMIC COUNCIL FACULTY 9

TABLE 3 T1 VS T2 POLICY ATTITUDES AND KNOWLEDGE 10

TABLE 4 POLICY PRIORITIES POST-DELIBERATION 15

TABLE 5 EVALUATION QUESTIONS 16

APPENDIX A: ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPTS FROM THE TRANSCRIPTS OF THE SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS 17

PROPOSAL 1: THE NEW SCHOOL SHOULD COLLABORATE WITH OTHER SCHOOLS TO MAKE SHARED RESOURCES FOR SUSTAINABILITY-RELATED ENGAGEMENT AND RESEARCH BROADLY AVAILABLE TO ALL SCHOLARS AT STANFORD. 17

PROPOSAL 2: HERE WE HAVE A SET OF PROPOSALS REGARDING VARIOUS RESEARCH TOPICS FOR WHICH THE NEW SCHOOL MIGHT INCORPORATE A CRITICAL MASS OF FACULTY MEMBERS ON CITIES, CLIMATE SCIENCE, EARTH AND PLANETARY SCIENCES, ENERGY, HUMAN HEALTH, HUMAN SUSTENANCE, THE NATURAL WORLD, PUBLIC POLICY, AND SOCIAL SCIENCE AND ETHICS. 18

PROPOSAL 3: FACULTY MEMBERS IN THE NEW SCHOOL SHOULD BE FREE TO SEEK AND ACCEPT FUNDING TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ON TOPICS THAT MIGHT AID THE ENERGY INDUSTRY TO TRANSITION TO A CARBON-FREE WORLD 19

PROPOSAL 4: THE NEW SCHOOL SHOULD OFFER PROGRAMS IN EXECUTIVE AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION 20

PROPOSAL 5: THE NEW SCHOOL’S FORMAL CRITERIA FOR FACULTY HIRING AND PROMOTION SHOULD VALUE ACTIVITIES TO ACCELERATE IMPACT ALONG WITH RESEARCH AND TEACHING AND HAVE THE FACULTY SENATE AND THE PROVOST APPOINT A COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THESE IMPLICATIONS. 22

PROPOSAL 6: IF INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBERS WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE NEW SCHOOL, THE STANFORD ADMINISTRATION SHOULD STRIVE TO ACCOMMODATE THEM. 23

PROPOSAL 7: THE FACULTY MEMBERS OF THE NEW SCHOOL SHOULD COLLECTIVELY UNDERTAKE A PROCESS TO FINALIZE THE DESIGN THE ACADEMIC STRUCTURE. 26

PROPOSAL 8: STANFORD SHOULD EMERGE FROM THE TRANSITION WITH SEVEN SCHOOLS: H&S, LAW, GSB, ENGINEERING, MEDICINE, EDUCATION, AND THE NEW SCHOOL. 28

PROPOSAL 9: THE NEW SCHOOL SHOULD INCLUDE IN ITS ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE THE WOODS INSTITUTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT. 30

PROPOSAL 10: THE NEW SCHOOL SHOULD INCLUDE IN ITS ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE THE PRECOURT INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY. 31

Overview¹

The Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford (CDD) assisted the university administration in conducting a Deliberative Poll of Stanford faculty on proposals affecting the design of the university's new school on climate and sustainability. The project engaged a participant sample of 203 faculty recruited from all parts of the university. They deliberated intensively on both Saturday and Sunday mornings on January 30-31, 2021.

What is Deliberative Polling²?

Deliberative Polling attempts to answer the question: what would a population think about an issue if it were to consider that issue under good conditions? Those conditions include balanced briefing materials, moderated small group discussions and plenary sessions where questions agreed on in the small groups are directed at experts who can answer the questions from different points of view. At the end of the process, the participants answer the same questionnaire as when first contacted. The process is designed to facilitate the participants arriving at their own considered judgments on the issue. No group consensus is necessary, only responses in confidential questionnaires.

The process was first developed in 1988 by Stanford University Professor James Fishkin (Director of the [Center for Deliberative Democracy](#)) and Janet M. Peck (Chair of International Communication). With various collaborators, including Dr. Alice Siu, Associate Director of the CDD, it has been applied 110 times in 30 countries, usually to stratified random samples of the mass public. It has been applied to bring wind power to Texas, to desegregate the Roma-only schools in Bulgaria, to consider reforming the pension system in Japan, to change the constitutions in Mongolia and Iceland, to make decisions about nuclear power in Japan and South Korea and many other topics and places. In collaboration with Larry Diamond (Hoover and FSI) and [Helena](#), it was recently applied nationally in the US in the project [America in One Room](#).

The process has been implemented both face to face and online. Many of the online projects have been conducted with the automated moderator platform developed in collaboration with Ashish Goel (Professor of Management Science and Engineering) and the [Stanford Crowdsourced Democracy Team](#). This project used the platform which is designed to permit a small group to moderate its own discussions without a human moderator. Lodewijk Gelauff and Sukolsak Sakshuwong, graduate students in Management Science and Engineering, were instrumental to this process.

Who deliberated?

Deliberative Polls are usually conducted with stratified random samples of the mass public, often as controlled experiments, on contested issues of public policy. In this case, the questions were about university policy and the population was distinctive: academic council faculty at Stanford plus the fellows of selected research institutes (Woods and Precourt). The 203 who deliberated Saturday and Sunday (the participants) can be compared in their policy attitudes with 446 other faculty who completed the initial questionnaire but did not deliberate (the non-participants). These comparisons can be found in Table 1. The participants can also be compared with the rest of the academic council faculty on demographics, such as gender, rank and school within the university (Table 2).

Data was collected on 27 proposals and empirical premises that relate to the proposals. In the initial surveys, 9 of the 27 show statistically significant differences between participants and non-participants. But these differences are in the range of about half a point on the 11 point scale³ in 6 of those 9 cases. These are statistically significant differences, but they are substantively not very large. On the other hand, in three cases there are larger differences. The participants came into the process more supportive of the school (on Q1, 83.9% of the participants, mean of 8.052 favored formation of the school compared to 73% of the non-participants, mean 7.297) who favored formation of the school). On Q3.8 participants came in more strongly supporting a critical mass of faculty doing research in the natural world (80.9% vs 67.6%, means of 8.016 vs 7.190). On Q6.6, participants agreed less with the empirical premise that making engagement activities part of the criteria for hiring and promotion would diminish the academic status of those faculty (39% among participants and 45% among non-participants, means of 4.789 vs 5.545).

Overall, the participants appear to be broadly representative of faculty attitudes on these issues at time 1 (the initial questionnaire), if one judges by the number of attitudes offering no statistically significant differences between participants and non-participants and the magnitude of the substantive differences in the attitudes where there were differences. However, there are the three particular issues already noted where the differences are larger but for those issues the two groups were on the same side of the scale with up to about a dozen percentage points of difference in support.

In terms of initial knowledge, the participants were slightly more knowledgeable about the new school than were the non-participants (by about 11 or 12 points as can be seen in Table 1, Q12 and 13). But both participants and non-participants scored low at the outset and one would expect those interested in participating to be somewhat more knowledgeable.

Separately we can evaluate demographic characteristics of the participants compared to the rest of the academic council faculty. Some basic comparisons can be found in Table 2. The gender distribution among participants is about the same as the rest of the academic council faculty (69% vs 70% male and 31% vs 30% female). There were fewer Assistant Professors participating (10% vs 20% among the rest of the faculty) and more Professors (68% vs 60%). As could only be expected there was a higher rate of participation from schools directly affected (the School of Earth Sciences had 22% of the participants but only 1% of the rest of the academic council faculty in the University) and Engineering had 21% of the participants and 15% of the rest of the academic council faculty. However, other parts of the University, had more substantial participation, even if not fully in proportion to their numbers: Humanities and Science had 24% of the participants compared to 35% of the rest of the academic council faculty, Medicine had 21% of the participants compared to 31% of the rest of the academic council faculty. In general, the 203 participants included significant representation from across the University and were broadly similar in their policy attitudes going into the process.

What happened?

When first contacted, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire on 27 policy attitudes, including 20 policy proposals for the new school as well as factual assumptions and knowledge questions. On Saturday and Sunday mornings, they deliberated for 90 minutes in small groups about the proposals, identifying key questions they wanted answered in plenary sessions with experts, also for 90 minutes. The small group discussions took place on the Stanford Online Deliberation Platform. The plenary sessions took place on Zoom and the participants asked their questions, often receiving multiple answers from different perspectives. The plenary sessions were moderated by Jon Levin, Dean of the Graduate School of Business. The panelists were: Nicole Ardoin (Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education; Senior Fellow, Woods Institute), Sally Benson (Professor in Energy Resources Engineering; Co-Director of Precourt Institute), Noah Diffenbaugh (Professor in Earth System Science; Senior Fellow Woods Institute), Stephan Graham (Dean of the School of Earth), Kam Moler (Vice Provost and Dean of Research), Anjana Richards (Associate Director of Program Strategy for the Emmett Program; Project Manager for Sustainability Initiative).

After completing the initial questionnaires, the participants received a briefing document detailing the 20 proposals and arguments for and against each one. This document was vetted for balance and accuracy by the Blueprint Advisory Committee and the Coordinating Committee.

¹ This report was drafted by James Fishkin and Alice Siu of the CDD. The Stanford Online Deliberation Platform was created in collaboration with the Crowdsourced Democracy Team, in particular Ashish Goel, Lodewijk Gelauff, and Sukolsak Sakshuwong. This Deliberative Polling project was conducted with the invaluable collaboration of Kam Moler, Steve Graham, Anjana Richards and the members of the Blueprint Advisory Committee.

² Deliberative Polling is a trademark of James S. Fishkin. Any revenues from the trademark are used to support research at the Center for Deliberative Democracy.

³ The scale is 0 to 10 where 0 is strongly oppose and 10 is strongly favor with 5 in the middle.

After the deliberations, the participants completed the same questionnaire again with the addition of some evaluation questions. Table 3 shows the before and after results for the 27 policy attitudes (policy proposals and empirical premises about them) and the knowledge questions. At both T1 and T2, the participants are divided into two groups—“affected” and “non-affected” faculty. This is a rough division between faculty from units who are most directly involved in climate change and sustainability issues and those from other parts of the university where they are likely to be less directly involved.⁴

There are a number of statistically significant changes for the sample overall as well as some other changes that are statistically significant just for the affected or the non-affected faculty. In addition, the items that did not change can be viewed as expressing relative priorities that have been tested against adverse argument. Many participants, particularly among the non-affected faculty, had not thought about these issues before. But after the weekend’s discussions they would have considered the issues in depth weighing arguments for and against. Even if their initial impressions matched their final responses, their views at the end of the weekend can be thought of as their considered judgments.

Because all the proposals were rated on the same 0 to 10 scale, the resulting mean scores yield a ranking of relative priorities. For the 20 policy proposals these are pictured in Table 4. These range from the new school incorporating a critical mass of faculty in climate science (mean of 9.485 out of 10) to incorporating the Precourt Institute into the organizational structure of the school (mean of 6.770 out of 10). The proposition that Stanford should emerge from the transition with seven schools rose from rank 15 to rank 10 on the list, mean of 8.107). It is noteworthy that all of the proposals ended the deliberations with strong majority support, ranging from 97% for inclusion of a critical mass in climate science (no. 1 in the rankings in Table 4) to 62% for inclusion of the Precourt Institute (no. 20 in the relative ranking in Table 4). The only propositions that the faculty opposed were empirical premises weighing against the new school or some of its proposed practices. After deliberation, only 16.8% agreed with Q6.2 that “faculty would be more productive studying climate and sustainability from within their current departments” (mean of 4.419 on the 0 to 10 scale). Only 35.6% agreed with Q6.6 that “making engagement activities (such as transferring technology, co-producing knowledge with stakeholders and writing policy briefs) formal criteria for hiring and promotion would diminish the status of certain faculty in the academic community” (mean of 4.71 on the 0 to 10 scale). There was also only minority support, before and after, for the idea that Woods and Precourt would be more effective if independent (see discussion below).

In terms of the changes in Table 3 it is first notable that support for the New School rose significantly from a mean of 8.052 to 8.365 on the 0 to 10 scale. In percentage terms it had 86.3% support by the end of the deliberations. Furthermore, support was strong and increased substantially for the proposal that “Stanford should emerge from the transition with seven schools: H & S, Law, GSB, Engineering, Medicine, Education and the New School.” Support increased significantly from 70.5% (mean of 7.355) to 80.6% (mean of 8.107 on the 0 to 10 scale). The increase was significant for the faculty overall and for the non-affected faculty. One item that might have been thought controversial was not. “Faculty members in the New School should be free to seek and accept funding to conduct research on topics that might aid the energy industry to transition to a carbon-free world” started at 86.2% support and dropped only slightly (and non-significantly) to 83.5% (mean of 8.324). See Appendix A with the transcript excerpts for the faculty’s nuanced defense of academic freedom in this case, provided that the normal conflict of interest protections were respected.

There was overall support, both before and after for the proposition “the New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in ethics.” This idea had about 73% support both before and after. However, support rose significantly among the non-affected faculty (from 76.6% to 82.1%) and it fell significantly among the affected faculty (from 69% to 62.7%).

Should the New School incorporate the Woods Institute and the Precourt Institute into its organizational structure? In both cases, there were drops in support but the drops were not statistically significant. Support for incorporating Woods dropped from 76.5% to 66.3% (mean of 7.554 to 7.299). The drop was larger among the non-affected faculty, 82.6% to 68.5%. Support for incorporating the Precourt Institute dropped from 70% to 62% but this drop was also not statistically significant. In both cases, there were questions about whether the Institutes would be more effective at serving the needs of researchers if unattached to any single school. Q6.4 asked this for Precourt and it hardly changed—38% were in favor before deliberation and 34.5% afterwards. In the case of Woods, essentially the same result--30.3% were in favor before deliberation and 30.4% afterwards. It is noteworthy that virtually all of those participants who were neutral or negative on including Woods (60 out of 62) were neutral or positive about the proposition that Woods would be more effective if unattached. In the case of the Precourt Institute virtually all of the respondents who were neutral or negative about including it in the school were neutral or positive about the proposition that it would be more effective in serving the needs of researchers if independent (66 of 69 respondents). Clearly the hesitation about including Woods and Precourt is about whether, if incorporated into the school, they would continue to be as effective in serving the needs of researchers throughout the university. The transcript excerpts in Appendix A under proposals 9 and 10 provide further detail. However, inclusion of both Institutes had strong majority support (approaching or exceeding two thirds) at the end of the process and the concern about serving the rest of the academic community remained a minority concern of about a third of the participants.

There was also controversy about whether “the New School’s formal criteria for faculty hiring and promotion should value activities to accelerate impact along with research and teaching” (Q5.1). Support dropped from 72.1% to 66.2% but this drop (from a mean of 7.13 to 6.9) was not statistically significant. Appendix A details a lively debate under this proposal. There was also a statistically significant rise in support for the proposal for a procedural solution to help resolve the issue. “The Faculty Senate and the Provost should appoint a committee to consider the implications of considering engagement activities in tenure decisions” (Q5.2). Support rose from 69.9% to 74.8% (mean of 7.0 to 7.453).

Table 3 also includes two knowledge questions that were in the briefing materials. Only 17.6% knew the timetable for decisions about the New School before deliberation, while 65.3 % did afterwards. And before deliberation, only 46.3% knew the percentage of Academic Council faculty who would be highly affected, while 55.4% did afterwards. These two questions provide suggestive evidence that the faculty read the briefings and become more informed in the process.

Evaluations

Table 5 presents the results of evaluation questions in the post-event questionnaire. Every element of the process got high ratings. The small group discussions were thought to be valuable by 86% of the participants (and about the same for affected and non-affected faculty). The briefing materials were valuable according to 64% of the participants but more so by the non-affected faculty 70.5% than by the affected faculty 54.9%. Since the affected faculty have been actively discussing these issues they probably had less need for the briefing materials. The plenary sessions were thought valuable by 60.1% of the participants, again more by the non-affected faculty (67.9%) than by the affected faculty (49.4%). Overall “the event as a whole was valuable in helping clarify my positions on the issues” was agreed by 80.2% of the participants (with no differences between affected and non-affected faculty).

There were also some more particular questions about the small group discussions. The discussion platform was well received. 94% agreed (with no differences among affected and non-affected faculty) that “the discussion platform provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussions.” 66.3% also agreed that “opposing arguments were considered.” And 77.4% agreed that “the members of my group participated relatively equally in the discussions.” 82.4% agreed that “the important aspects of the issues were covered in the group discussions.”

A Note on the Blueprint Advisory Committee

⁴ The “affected faculty” were those in the School of Earth, Energy, and Environmental Sciences departments: Earth System Science, Energy Resources Engineering, Geological Sciences, Geophysics; faculty in Biology that specialize in Ecology, Evolution, as well as the Hopkins Marine Station affiliated faculty and faculty in Civil and Environmental Engineering and Fellows at the Precourt Institute Fellows and the Woods Institute Senior Fellows.

The Blueprint Advisory Committee (BAC) is comprised of thirty faculty members that is helping to create more specific plans (blueprints) for the new school. The BAC comprises members from all seven schools, four interdisciplinary institutes, and Land Buildings and Real Estate (LBRE). They serve as citizens of the university rather than as representatives of their home departments or organizations. The Blueprint Advisory Committee met (virtually) as a group for the first time on September 30, 2020. A mid-October email from co-chairs Moler and Graham to BAC members captures the nature of the committee's work:

“The members of the BAC are acting as facilitators to realize the priorities, opportunities, and visions for sustainability scholarship and education that many of you articulated during the long-range planning. Importantly, it is not our job to make decisions; it is our job to facilitate the development of concrete options that will be presented to decision-makers throughout this academic year and beyond. We envision that a new school will accelerate scholarship in existing and emerging areas, integrate collaborators with different skills and perspectives, create a synergistic braid of capabilities and traditions, and help to create a sustainable planet and a sustainable society for future generations.

“The new school will make its unique contributions to research, education, and translation by building on the expertise that resides throughout Stanford. Our formidable task is to understand the perspectives and the key insights of each group and to integrate them in a whole that represents more than the sum of its parts – while cherishing and preserving what makes each of our academic departments, centers, institutes and schools an effective, welcoming home that enables faculty, students, and staff to do their best work.”

Moler and Graham organized the BAC members into working groups to develop blueprints for four areas: *Academic Structure*, chaired by Noah Diffenbaugh; *Cross-cutting Themes*, chaired by Sarah Billington; *Educational Programs and Residential Neighborhoods*, chaired by Nicole Ardoin; and *Engagement*, chaired by Deborah Sivas.

The four Working Groups met weekly through October and November 2020 to discuss and debate their themes. They drew upon the work of previous committees, interactions with stakeholder groups and individuals, and cross-talk with the other Working Groups. The Working Groups delivered their respective blueprint documents to co-chairs Moler and Graham by early December. Moler and Graham spent the last three weeks of December 2020 integrating the efforts to the BAC into this report.

After conversations with leadership of the Faculty Senate in August 2020, Moler and Graham created a Coordinating Committee to guide the Blueprint Advisory Committee and to interface with the Senate. The Coordinating Committee consists of Moler, Graham, Bill Barnett (GSB/Woods), Mark Horowitz (EE), Sarah Billington (CEE/Woods), Arun Majumdar (SoE/Precourt), Debbie Sivas (Law), Nicole Ardoin (GSE/Woods), and Noah Diffenbaugh (SE3/Woods).

Table 1 Participants vs Non-Participants at T1



		Participants at T1	Non-Participants at T1	Difference
		n = 203	n = 446	
ID	Prompt and Responses			
Q1	How strongly do you oppose or favor the formation of the New School focused on climate and sustainability?	8.052	7.297	-0.755 (0.000)
	Favor	83.9%	73.0%	-10.9%
	In the middle	10.9%	15.7%	4.7%
	Oppose	5.2%	11.4%	6.1%
	No opinion	6.3%	17.0%	10.7%
Q2_1	The New School should collaborate with other schools to make shared resources for sustainability-related engagement and research broadly available to all scholars at Stanford.	9.084	8.961	-0.123 (0.359)
	Favor	95.0%	93.5%	-1.6%
	In the middle	4.0%	4.5%	0.5%
	Oppose	1.0%	2.1%	1.1%
	No opinion	1.5%	14.3%	12.9%
Q2_2	If individual faculty members wish to participate in the New School, the Stanford administration should strive to accommodate them.	8.528	8.399	-0.128 (0.445)
	Favor	87.4%	89.9%	2.5%
	In the middle	9.5%	7.7%	-1.9%
	Oppose	3.0%	2.4%	-0.6%
	No opinion	2.9%	15.2%	12.3%
Q2_3	Faculty members in the New School should be free to seek and accept funding to conduct research on topics that might aid the energy industry to transition to a carbon-free world.	8.309	8.060	-0.248 (0.229)
	Favor	86.2%	81.7%	-4.5%
	In the middle	7.4%	10.1%	2.7%
	Oppose	6.4%	8.2%	1.8%
	No opinion	8.3%	17.9%	9.6%
Q2_4	The faculty members of the New School should collectively undertake a process to finalize the design of the academic structure.	8.295	8.006	-0.289 (0.162)
	Favor	85.8%	84.0%	-1.8%
	In the middle	8.7%	8.6%	-0.2%
	Oppose	5.5%	7.4%	1.9%
	No opinion	10.7%	24.2%	13.5%
Q3_1	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research related to cities.	7.762	7.750	-0.012 (0.951)
	Favor	79.0%	82.2%	3.2%
	In the middle	15.5%	11.4%	-4.0%
	Oppose	5.5%	6.3%	0.8%
	No opinion	11.7%	25.6%	13.9%
Q3_2	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in climate science.	9.513	9.079	-0.433 (0.000)
	Favor	99.0%	95.0%	-4.0%
	In the middle	0.5%	3.7%	3.2%
	Oppose	0.5%	1.3%	0.8%
	No opinion	2.9%	15.2%	12.3%

T1 is before deliberation. T2 is after deliberation. Numbers not in parentheses are mean responses or percentages. Numbers in parentheses are p-values resulting from a t-test. Percentages reported for 'No opinion' and 'Not applicable' are raw percentages. Percentages reported for all other categories are valid percentages.

Q3_3	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in earth and planetary sciences.	7.974	7.509	-0.465 (0.037)
	Favor	81.0%	74.4%	-6.5%
	In the middle	9.5%	16.3%	6.8%
	Oppose	9.5%	9.3%	-0.2%
	No opinion	7.8%	22.9%	15.1%
Q3_4	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in energy.	8.899	8.665	-0.235 (0.115)
	Favor	94.5%	89.7%	-4.7%
	In the middle	5.0%	7.8%	2.8%
	Oppose	0.5%	2.4%	1.9%
	No opinion	2.9%	17.0%	14.1%
Q3_5	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in human health.	7.098	6.924	-0.175 (0.478)
	Favor	65.8%	67.4%	1.6%
	In the middle	18.7%	13.6%	-5.1%
	Oppose	15.5%	19.0%	3.4%
	No opinion	5.9%	20.9%	15.0%
Q3_6	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in social science.	7.352	7.119	-0.233 (0.316)
	Favor	67.4%	71.0%	3.7%
	In the middle	22.8%	15.1%	-7.7%
	Oppose	9.8%	13.9%	4.1%
	No opinion	5.9%	21.1%	15.2%
Q3_7	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in human sustenance.	7.747	7.602	-0.145 (0.498)
	Favor	84.7%	79.3%	-5.4%
	In the middle	9.4%	12.9%	3.5%
	Oppose	5.9%	7.8%	1.9%
	No opinion	17.1%	30.7%	13.6%
Q3_8	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in the natural world.	8.016	7.190	-0.826 (0.000)
	Favor	80.9%	67.6%	-13.3%
	In the middle	11.5%	18.7%	7.3%
	Oppose	7.7%	13.7%	6.0%
	No opinion	10.7%	29.4%	18.6%
Q3_9	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in public policy.	8.162	8.153	-0.008 (0.967)
	Favor	83.3%	86.0%	2.7%
	In the middle	11.6%	7.4%	-4.2%
	Oppose	5.1%	6.6%	1.5%
	No opinion	3.4%	18.2%	14.7%
Q3_10	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in ethics.	7.345	7.077	-0.268 (0.254)
	Favor	72.7%	69.7%	-3.0%
	In the middle	16.5%	15.7%	-0.8%
	Oppose	10.8%	14.6%	3.7%
	No opinion	5.4%	21.5%	16.2%
Q4_1	Stanford should emerge from the transition with seven schools: H&S, Law, GSB, Engineering, Medicine, Education, and the New School.	7.410	6.837	-0.573 (0.028)
	Favor	70.5%	63.6%	-6.9%
	In the middle	19.1%	22.6%	3.5%
	Oppose	10.4%	13.8%	3.4%
	No opinion	15.6%	36.5%	20.9%

Q4_2	The New School should include in its organizational structure the Woods Institute for the Environment.	7.554	7.636	0.082 (0.755)
	Favor	76.5%	80.8%	4.3%
	In the middle	12.7%	11.1%	-1.5%
	Oppose	10.8%	8.0%	-2.8%
	No opinion	19.0%	41.5%	22.5%
Q4_3	The New School should include in its organizational structure the Precourt Institute for Energy.	7.094	7.490	0.396 (0.174)
	Favor	70.0%	78.4%	8.4%
	In the middle	15.0%	10.4%	-4.6%
	Oppose	15.0%	11.2%	-3.8%
	No opinion	22.0%	46.0%	24.0%
Q4_4	The New School should offer programs in executive and professional education.	7.157	6.698	-0.459 (0.082)
	Favor	69.8%	63.7%	-6.1%
	In the middle	20.8%	19.4%	-1.3%
	Oppose	9.4%	16.9%	7.5%
	No opinion	22.4%	37.7%	15.2%
Q5_1	The New School's formal criteria for faculty hiring and promotion should value activities to accelerate impact along with research and teaching.	7.067	6.493	-0.574 (0.032)
	Favor	72.2%	64.1%	-8.1%
	In the middle	9.8%	13.1%	3.3%
	Oppose	18.0%	22.8%	4.8%
	No opinion	5.4%	21.3%	15.9%
Q5_2	The Faculty Senate and the Provost should appoint a committee to consider the implications of considering engagement activities in tenure decisions.	6.942	6.534	-0.408 (0.166)
	Favor	69.9%	64.5%	-5.5%
	In the middle	11.6%	14.3%	2.8%
	Oppose	18.5%	21.2%	2.7%
	No opinion	15.6%	24.9%	9.3%
Q6_1	Allowing faculty members to opt-in to the New School enables them to choose the environment they consider most conducive to their success.	8.053	7.644	-0.410 (0.043)
	Agree	86.6%	81.2%	-5.4%
	In the middle	8.6%	13.1%	4.6%
	Disagree	4.8%	5.6%	0.8%
	No opinion	8.8%	28.3%	19.5%
Q6_2	Faculty would be more productive studying climate and sustainability from within their current departments.	4.612	5.027	0.415 (0.064)
	Agree	20.8%	26.0%	5.2%
	In the middle	38.8%	42.9%	4.1%
	Disagree	40.4%	31.1%	-9.4%
	No opinion	10.7%	33.6%	22.9%
Q6_3	Combining the School of Earth, Energy, and Environmental Sciences (SE3) with the New School would diminish the SE3's current reputation.	3.715	3.400	-0.315 (0.326)
	Agree	21.9%	18.5%	-3.4%
	In the middle	19.0%	17.6%	-1.4%
	Disagree	59.1%	63.9%	4.8%
	No opinion	33.2%	54.0%	20.9%
Q6_4	The Precourt Institute would more effectively serve the needs of researchers unattached to any single school.	5.132	4.908	-0.224 (0.543)
	Agree	38.0%	31.9%	-6.1%
	In the middle	21.5%	27.0%	5.5%
	Disagree	40.5%	41.1%	0.6%
	No opinion	41.0%	63.5%	22.5%

Q6_5	The Woods Institute would more effectively serve the needs of researchers unattached to any single school.	4.667	4.514	-0.153 (0.661)
	Agree	30.3%	26.8%	-3.5%
	In the middle	21.2%	25.7%	4.5%
	Disagree	48.5%	47.5%	-0.9%
	No opinion	35.6%	59.0%	23.4%
Q6_6	Making engagement activities (such as transferring technology, co-producing knowledge with stakeholders, and writing policy briefs) formal criteria for hiring and promotion would diminish the status of certain faculty in their academic community.	4.789	5.545	0.755 (0.016)
	Agree	39.2%	45.8%	6.7%
	In the middle	16.4%	18.6%	2.2%
	Disagree	44.4%	35.5%	-8.9%
	No opinion	16.6%	32.5%	15.9%
Q12	When will the Stanford administration intend to finalize decisions for the New School?	0.176	0.057	-0.118 (0.000)
	Correct	17.6%	5.7%	-11.8%
	Incorrect	82.4%	94.3%	11.8%
	Not applicable	0.0%	13.9%	13.9%
Q13	About what percentage of faculty on the Academic Council would be highly affected?	0.463	0.359	-0.104 (0.015)
	Correct	46.3%	35.9%	-10.4%
	Incorrect	53.7%	64.1%	10.4%
	Not applicable	0.0%	13.9%	13.9%

Table 2 Faculty Participants vs. All Other Academic Council Faculty



Demographic (Sig.)	Category	Faculty Participants	All Other Academic Council Faculty
Sex (0.718)	Male	69%, 140	70%, 1060
	Female	31%, 63	30%, 444
Rank (0.000)	Assistant Professor	10%, 21	20%, 297
	Associate Professor	17%, 34	20%, 294
	Professor	68%, 139	60%, 903
	Fellow	4%, 9	1%, 10
School (0.000)	Graduate School of Business	3%, 7	7%, 109
	Law School	2%, 4	4%, 58
	School of Earth Sciences	22%, 44	1%, 21
	School of Education	0%, 0	4%, 56
	School Of Engineering	21%, 43	15%, 223
	School of Humanities & Science	24%, 49	35%, 533
	School of Medicine	21%, 42	31%, 464
	SLAC National Accelerator Lab	2%, 5	2%, 30
	Vice Provost & Dean of Research	4%, 9	1%, 10

T1 is before deliberation. T2 is after deliberation. Numbers not in parentheses are counts. Numbers in parentheses are percentages or p-values resulting from a chi-squared test

Table 3 T1 vs T2 Policy Attitudes and Knowledge



		Participants at T1			Participants at T2			Difference		
ID	Prompt and Responses	Overall	Not Aff	Affected	Overall	Not Aff	Affected	Overall	Not Aff	Affected
Q1	How strongly do you oppose or favor the formation of the New School focused on climate and sustainability?	8.052	8.212	7.859	8.365	8.625	8.129	0.312 (0.024)	0.413 (0.032)	0.271 (0.178)
	Favor (6-10)	83.9%	86.5%	81.2%	86.3%	87.1%	86.0%	2.5%	0.5%	4.9%
	In the middle (5)	10.9%	12.5%	9.4%	8.3%	9.5%	7.0%	-2.6%	-3.0%	-2.4%
	Oppose (0-4)	5.2%	1.0%	9.4%	5.4%	3.4%	7.0%	0.2%	2.5%	-2.4%
	No opinion	6.3%	10.3%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-6.3%	-10.3%	-1.2%
Q2_1	The New School should collaborate with other schools to make shared resources for sustainability-related engagement and research broadly available to all scholars at Stanford.	9.101	9.277	8.893	9.075	9.232	8.869	-0.025 (0.827)	-0.045 (0.761)	-0.024 (0.899)
	Favor (6-10)	95.0%	96.5%	93.0%	94.6%	97.4%	90.5%	-0.5%	0.9%	-2.5%
	In the middle (5)	4.0%	2.7%	5.8%	5.0%	2.6%	8.3%	1.0%	0.0%	2.5%
	Oppose (0-4)	1.0%	0.9%	1.2%	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%	-0.5%	-0.9%	0.0%
	No opinion	1.5%	2.6%	0.0%	1.5%	0.9%	2.3%	0.0%	-1.7%	2.3%
Q2_2	If individual faculty members wish to participate in the New School, the Stanford administration should strive to accommodate them.	8.543	8.439	8.700	8.472	8.544	8.350	-0.071 (0.628)	0.105 (0.598)	-0.350 (0.112)
	Favor (6-10)	87.4%	86.0%	89.0%	91.1%	92.2%	89.3%	3.7%	6.3%	0.3%
	In the middle (5)	9.5%	10.5%	8.5%	4.9%	4.3%	6.0%	-4.6%	-6.2%	-2.6%
	Oppose (0-4)	3.0%	3.5%	2.4%	3.9%	3.4%	4.8%	0.9%	-0.1%	2.3%
	No opinion	2.9%	1.7%	4.7%	1.0%	0.0%	2.3%	-2.0%	-1.7%	-2.3%
Q2_3	Faculty members in the New School should be free to seek and accept funding to conduct research on topics that might aid the energy industry to transition to a carbon-free world.	8.324	8.202	8.440	8.378	8.172	8.655	0.054 (0.735)	-0.030 (0.903)	0.214 (0.252)
	Favor (6-10)	86.2%	83.0%	89.5%	83.5%	81.6%	86.9%	-2.7%	-1.4%	-2.6%
	In the middle (5)	7.4%	9.0%	5.8%	11.0%	12.3%	8.3%	3.6%	3.3%	2.5%
	Oppose (0-4)	6.4%	8.0%	4.7%	5.5%	6.1%	4.8%	-0.9%	-1.9%	0.1%
	No opinion	8.3%	13.8%	0.0%	2.4%	1.7%	2.3%	-5.9%	-12.1%	2.3%
Q2_4	The faculty members of the New School should collectively undertake a process to finalize the design of the academic structure.	8.282	8.250	8.291	8.387	8.590	8.114	0.105 (0.533)	0.340 (0.104)	-0.177 (0.528)
	Favor (6-10)	85.8%	86.0%	85.2%	89.7%	91.4%	88.1%	3.9%	5.4%	2.9%
	In the middle (5)	8.7%	9.0%	8.6%	7.4%	6.9%	8.3%	-1.4%	-2.1%	-0.3%
	Oppose (0-4)	5.5%	5.0%	6.2%	3.0%	1.7%	3.6%	-2.5%	-3.3%	-2.6%
	No opinion	10.7%	13.8%	5.8%	1.0%	0.0%	2.3%	-9.8%	-13.8%	-3.5%
Q3_1	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research related to cities.	7.756	7.918	7.533	7.648	7.929	7.333	-0.108 (0.476)	0.010 (0.960)	-0.200 (0.394)
	Favor (6-10)	79.0%	83.2%	72.7%	73.6%	77.5%	68.7%	-5.4%	-5.7%	-4.1%
	In the middle (5)	15.5%	13.9%	18.2%	18.8%	18.9%	18.1%	3.3%	5.1%	-0.1%
	Oppose (0-4)	5.5%	3.0%	9.1%	7.6%	3.6%	13.3%	2.1%	0.6%	4.2%
	No opinion	11.7%	12.9%	10.5%	3.9%	4.3%	3.5%	-7.8%	-8.6%	-7.0%

ID	Prompt and Responses	Overall	Not Aff	Affected		Overall	Not Aff	Affected		Overall	Not Aff	Affected
Q3_2	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in climate science.	9.505	9.440	9.595		9.485	9.569	9.452		-0.020 (0.832)	0.128 (0.279)	-0.143 (0.333)
	Favor (6-10)	99.0%	99.1%	98.8%		97.0%	98.2%	96.4%		-2.0%	-0.8%	-2.4%
	In the middle (5)	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%		1.5%	0.9%	2.4%		1.0%	0.9%	1.2%
	Oppose (0-4)	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%		1.5%	0.9%	1.2%		1.0%	0.0%	1.2%
	No opinion	2.9%	5.2%	0.0%		2.0%	1.7%	2.3%		-1.0%	-3.4%	2.3%
Q3_3	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in earth and planetary sciences.	7.957	7.724	8.226		8.297	8.582	7.940		0.341 (0.049)	0.857 (0.001)	-0.286 (0.219)
	Favor (6-10)	81.0%	78.0%	84.9%		83.0%	87.6%	76.2%		2.0%	9.6%	-8.7%
	In the middle (5)	9.5%	13.0%	4.7%		10.5%	8.8%	13.1%		1.0%	-4.2%	8.4%
	Oppose (0-4)	9.5%	9.0%	10.5%		6.5%	3.5%	10.7%		-3.0%	-5.5%	0.2%
	No opinion	7.8%	13.8%	0.0%		2.4%	2.6%	2.3%		-5.4%	-11.2%	2.3%
Q3_4	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in energy.	8.898	8.964	8.821		9.157	9.282	8.964		0.259 (0.020)	0.318 (0.048)	0.143 (0.349)
	Favor (6-10)	94.5%	95.5%	93.0%		96.0%	97.4%	94.0%		1.6%	1.9%	1.0%
	In the middle (5)	5.0%	4.5%	5.8%		3.5%	2.6%	4.8%		-1.6%	-1.9%	-1.1%
	Oppose (0-4)	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%		0.5%	0.0%	1.2%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No opinion	2.9%	5.2%	0.0%		1.5%	0.9%	2.3%		-1.5%	-4.3%	2.3%
Q3_5	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in human health.	7.132	7.202	7.098		7.079	7.433	6.634		-0.053 (0.763)	0.231 (0.320)	-0.463 (0.089)
	Favor (6-10)	65.8%	66.7%	64.7%		70.0%	72.8%	66.3%		4.2%	6.1%	1.6%
	In the middle (5)	18.7%	21.0%	16.5%		13.5%	14.9%	12.0%		-5.2%	-6.0%	-4.4%
	Oppose (0-4)	15.5%	12.4%	18.8%		16.5%	12.3%	21.7%		1.0%	-0.1%	2.9%
	No opinion	5.9%	9.5%	1.2%		2.4%	1.7%	3.5%		-3.4%	-7.8%	2.3%
Q3_6	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in social science.	7.388	7.382	7.398		7.713	7.951	7.458		0.324 (0.022)	0.569 (0.005)	0.060 (0.752)
	Favor (6-10)	67.4%	66.3%	67.4%		76.4%	78.8%	73.5%		9.0%	12.4%	6.1%
	In the middle (5)	22.8%	26.0%	19.8%		15.6%	15.0%	16.9%		-7.2%	-10.9%	-2.9%
	Oppose (0-4)	9.8%	7.7%	12.8%		8.0%	6.2%	9.6%		-1.8%	-1.5%	-3.2%
	No opinion	5.9%	10.3%	0.0%		2.9%	2.6%	3.5%		-2.9%	-7.8%	3.5%
Q3_7	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in human sustenance.	7.775	7.941	7.589		8.075	8.600	7.548		0.300 (0.084)	0.659 (0.001)	-0.041 (0.893)
	Favor (6-10)	84.7%	88.8%	79.7%		83.9%	88.3%	78.8%		-0.8%	-0.5%	-1.0%
	In the middle (5)	9.4%	9.0%	10.1%		9.8%	7.2%	13.8%		0.4%	-1.8%	3.6%
	Oppose (0-4)	5.9%	2.2%	10.1%		6.2%	4.5%	7.5%		0.3%	2.3%	-2.6%
	No opinion	17.1%	23.3%	8.1%		5.9%	4.3%	7.0%		-11.2%	-19.0%	-1.2%
Q3_8	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in the natural world.	8.017	7.489	8.593		8.376	8.181	8.543		0.360 (0.033)	0.691 (0.009)	-0.049 (0.806)
	Favor (6-10)	80.9%	72.9%	89.3%		84.2%	82.9%	85.4%		3.3%	10.0%	-3.9%
	In the middle (5)	11.5%	14.6%	8.3%		9.2%	8.1%	11.0%		-2.3%	-6.5%	2.6%
	Oppose (0-4)	7.7%	12.5%	2.4%		6.6%	9.0%	3.7%		-1.0%	-3.5%	1.3%
	No opinion	10.7%	17.2%	2.3%		4.4%	4.3%	4.7%		-6.3%	-12.9%	2.3%

ID	Prompt and Responses	Overall	Not Aff	Affected		Overall	Not Aff	Affected		Overall	Not Aff	Affected
Q3_9	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in public policy.	8.204	8.457	7.904		8.340	8.752	7.831		0.136 (0.331)	0.295 (0.109)	-0.072 (0.745)
	Favor (6-10)	83.3%	87.2%	79.1%		89.8%	93.7%	84.3%		6.5%	6.5%	5.3%
	In the middle (5)	11.6%	10.1%	14.0%		7.1%	5.4%	9.6%		-4.5%	-4.7%	-4.3%
	Oppose (0-4)	5.1%	2.8%	7.0%		3.0%	0.9%	6.0%		-2.0%	-1.9%	-1.0%
	No opinion	3.4%	6.0%	0.0%		3.9%	4.3%	3.5%		0.5%	-1.7%	3.5%
Q3_10	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in ethics.	7.404	7.519	7.370		7.452	7.962	6.827		0.048 (0.746)	0.442 (0.030)	-0.543 (0.006)
	Favor (6-10)	72.7%	76.6%	69.0%		73.7%	82.1%	62.7%		1.1%	5.5%	-6.4%
	In the middle (5)	16.5%	15.9%	17.9%		15.2%	13.4%	18.1%		-1.3%	-2.5%	0.2%
	Oppose (0-4)	10.8%	7.5%	13.1%		11.1%	4.5%	19.3%		0.3%	-3.0%	6.2%
	No opinion	5.4%	7.8%	2.3%		3.4%	3.4%	3.5%		-2.0%	-4.3%	1.2%
Q4_1	Stanford should emerge from the transition with seven schools: H&S, Law, GSB, Engineering, Medicine, Education, and the New School.	7.355	7.506	7.188		8.107	8.494	7.700		0.751 (0.001)	0.989 (0.001)	0.513 (0.136)
	Favor (6-10)	70.5%	75.3%	65.9%		80.6%	85.1%	76.2%		10.1%	9.8%	10.3%
	In the middle (5)	19.1%	16.9%	20.7%		16.9%	14.9%	17.9%		-2.2%	-1.9%	-2.9%
	Oppose (0-4)	10.4%	7.9%	13.4%		2.5%	0.0%	6.0%		-7.9%	-7.9%	-7.5%
	No opinion	15.6%	23.3%	4.7%		2.0%	1.7%	2.3%		-13.7%	-21.6%	-2.3%
Q4_2	The New School should include in its organizational structure the Woods Institute for the Environment.	7.554	7.938	7.149		7.299	7.650	6.892		-0.255 (0.335)	-0.287 (0.359)	-0.257 (0.567)
	Favor (6-10)	76.5%	82.6%	68.8%		66.3%	68.5%	63.4%		-10.2%	-14.0%	-5.4%
	In the middle (5)	12.7%	10.5%	15.6%		16.1%	17.6%	13.4%		3.4%	7.1%	-2.2%
	Oppose (0-4)	10.8%	7.0%	15.6%		17.6%	13.9%	23.2%		6.8%	6.9%	7.6%
	No opinion	19.0%	25.9%	10.5%		5.9%	6.9%	4.7%		-13.2%	-19.0%	-5.8%
Q4_3	The New School should include in its organizational structure the Precourt Institute for Energy.	7.072	7.333	6.775		6.770	7.141	6.282		-0.303 (0.285)	-0.192 (0.558)	-0.493 (0.313)
	Favor (6-10)	70.0%	73.5%	64.9%		62.0%	63.6%	58.5%		-8.0%	-9.9%	-6.3%
	In the middle (5)	15.0%	15.7%	14.9%		16.1%	17.8%	14.6%		1.1%	2.1%	-0.2%
	Oppose (0-4)	15.0%	10.8%	20.3%		21.9%	18.7%	26.8%		6.9%	7.8%	6.6%
	No opinion	22.0%	28.4%	14.0%		6.3%	7.8%	4.7%		-15.6%	-20.7%	-9.3%
Q4_4	The New School should offer programs in executive and professional education.	7.195	7.060	7.478		7.351	7.250	7.552		0.156 (0.416)	0.190 (0.482)	0.075 (0.791)
	Favor (6-10)	69.8%	67.1%	73.2%		71.7%	72.6%	70.7%		1.9%	5.5%	-2.5%
	In the middle (5)	20.8%	25.9%	15.5%		16.2%	15.0%	18.3%		-4.6%	-10.8%	2.8%
	Oppose (0-4)	9.4%	7.1%	11.3%		12.1%	12.4%	11.0%		2.7%	5.3%	-0.3%
	No opinion	22.4%	26.7%	17.4%		3.4%	2.6%	4.7%		-19.0%	-24.1%	-12.8%
Q5_1	The New School's formal criteria for faculty hiring and promotion should value activities to accelerate impact along with research and teaching.	7.132	7.594	6.580		6.911	7.396	6.296		-0.221 (0.276)	-0.198 (0.458)	-0.284 (0.384)
	Favor (6-10)	72.2%	77.4%	65.9%		66.2%	70.7%	59.8%		-6.0%	-6.7%	-6.1%
	In the middle (5)	9.8%	11.3%	8.2%		14.9%	17.2%	12.2%		5.1%	5.9%	4.0%
	Oppose (0-4)	18.0%	11.3%	25.9%		18.9%	12.1%	28.0%		0.9%	0.7%	2.2%
	No opinion	5.4%	8.6%	1.2%		2.0%	0.0%	4.7%		-3.4%	-8.6%	3.5%

ID	Prompt and Responses	Overall	Not Aff	Affected		Overall	Not Aff	Affected		Overall	Not Aff	Affected
Q5_2	The Faculty Senate and the Provost should appoint a committee to consider the implications of considering engagement activities in tenure decisions.	7.000	7.374	6.618		7.453	7.703	7.211		0.453 (0.049)	0.330 (0.225)	0.592 (0.141)
	Favor (6-10)	69.9%	75.8%	63.3%		74.8%	77.6%	71.1%		4.8%	1.8%	7.8%
	In the middle (5)	11.6%	11.0%	12.7%		10.4%	10.3%	10.8%		-1.2%	-0.6%	-1.8%
	Oppose (0-4)	18.5%	13.2%	24.1%		14.9%	12.1%	18.1%		-3.6%	-1.1%	-6.0%
	No opinion	15.6%	21.6%	8.1%		1.5%	0.0%	3.5%		-14.1%	-21.6%	-4.7%
Q6_1	Allowing faculty members to opt-in to the New School enables them to choose the environment they consider most conducive to their success.	8.038	7.714	8.395		8.253	8.408	8.111		0.214 (0.173)	0.694 (0.002)	-0.284 (0.195)
	Agree (6-10)	86.6%	84.0%	89.3%		87.5%	90.4%	84.3%		0.9%	6.4%	-4.9%
	In the middle (5)	8.6%	10.0%	7.1%		8.5%	6.1%	10.8%		-0.1%	-3.9%	3.7%
	Disagree (0-4)	4.8%	6.0%	3.6%		4.0%	3.5%	4.8%		-0.8%	-2.5%	1.2%
	No opinion	8.8%	13.8%	2.3%		2.4%	1.7%	3.5%		-6.3%	-12.1%	1.2%
Q6_2	Faculty would be more productive studying climate and sustainability from within their current departments.	4.587	4.337	4.844		4.419	4.261	4.545		-0.169 (0.291)	-0.076 (0.678)	-0.299 (0.292)
	Agree (6-10)	20.8%	15.5%	26.5%		16.8%	11.1%	23.8%		-4.0%	-4.4%	-2.8%
	In the middle (5)	38.8%	42.3%	34.9%		44.5%	52.8%	33.8%		5.7%	10.5%	-1.2%
	Disagree (0-4)	40.4%	42.3%	38.6%		38.7%	36.1%	42.5%		-1.7%	-6.2%	3.9%
	No opinion	10.7%	16.4%	3.5%		6.8%	6.9%	7.0%		-3.9%	-9.5%	3.5%
Q6_3	Combining the School of Earth, Energy, and Environmental Sciences (SE3) with the New School would diminish the SE3's current reputation.	3.719	3.583	3.742		3.320	3.067	3.470		-0.398 (0.171)	-0.517 (0.256)	-0.273 (0.482)
	Agree (6-10)	21.9%	15.6%	25.4%		13.7%	12.6%	14.3%		-8.2%	-3.0%	-11.1%
	In the middle (5)	19.0%	23.4%	15.5%		25.1%	23.3%	26.0%		6.2%	-0.1%	10.5%
	Disagree (0-4)	59.1%	60.9%	59.2%		61.2%	64.1%	59.7%		2.1%	3.1%	0.6%
	No opinion	33.2%	44.8%	17.4%		10.7%	11.2%	10.5%		-22.4%	-33.6%	-7.0%
Q6_4	The Precourt Institute would more effectively serve the needs of researchers unattached to any single school.	5.133	4.907	5.446		5.186	4.889	5.625		0.053 (0.854)	-0.019 (0.964)	0.179 (0.675)
	Agree (6-10)	38.0%	30.9%	46.0%		34.5%	32.0%	39.2%		-3.6%	1.1%	-6.8%
	In the middle (5)	21.5%	29.1%	14.3%		27.1%	27.0%	27.0%		5.6%	-2.1%	12.7%
	Disagree (0-4)	40.5%	40.0%	39.7%		38.4%	41.0%	33.8%		-2.1%	1.0%	-5.9%
	No opinion	41.0%	52.6%	26.7%		13.7%	13.8%	14.0%		-27.3%	-38.8%	-12.8%
Q6_5	The Woods Institute would more effectively serve the needs of researchers unattached to any single school.	4.696	4.381	5.102		4.744	4.556	5.068		0.048 (0.870)	0.175 (0.661)	-0.034 (0.941)
	Agree (6-10)	30.3%	21.9%	40.0%		30.4%	27.7%	35.1%		0.1%	5.8%	-4.9%
	In the middle (5)	21.2%	28.1%	13.8%		26.0%	29.7%	20.8%		4.8%	1.6%	6.9%
	Disagree (0-4)	48.5%	50.0%	46.2%		43.6%	42.6%	44.2%		-4.8%	-7.4%	-2.0%
	No opinion	35.6%	44.8%	24.4%		11.7%	12.9%	10.5%		-23.9%	-31.9%	-14.0%
Q6_6	Making engagement activities (such as transferring technology, co-producing knowledge with stakeholders, and writing policy briefs) formal criteria for hiring and promotion would diminish the status of certain faculty in their academic community.	4.778	4.678	4.855		4.710	4.422	5.072		-0.068 (0.762)	-0.256 (0.438)	0.217 (0.474)

ID	Prompt and Responses	Overall	Not Aff	Affected		Overall	Not Aff	Affected		Overall	Not Aff	Affected
Q12	Agree (6-10)	39.2%	34.4%	44.0%		35.6%	28.8%	45.5%		-3.6%	-5.6%	1.5%
	In the middle (5)	16.4%	20.4%	12.0%		16.8%	21.6%	10.4%		0.4%	1.2%	-1.6%
	Disagree (0-4)	44.4%	45.2%	44.0%		47.6%	49.5%	44.2%		3.2%	4.4%	0.2%
	No opinion	16.6%	19.8%	12.8%		6.8%	4.3%	10.5%		-9.8%	-15.5%	-2.3%
	When will the Stanford administration intend to finalize decisions for the New School?	0.173	0.052	0.333		0.653	0.591	0.750		0.480 (0.000)	0.539 (0.000)	0.417 (0.000)
	Correct	17.6%	5.2%	33.7%		65.3%	59.1%	75.0%		47.8%	54.0%	41.3%
	Incorrect	82.4%	94.8%	66.3%		34.7%	40.9%	25.0%		-47.8%	-54.0%	-41.3%
	Not applicable	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		1.5%	0.9%	2.3%		1.5%	0.9%	2.3%
	About what percentage of faculty on the Academic Council would be highly affected?	0.460	0.296	0.667		0.554	0.487	0.643		0.094 (0.011)	0.191 (0.000)	-0.024 (0.686)
	Correct	46.3%	29.3%	67.4%		55.4%	48.7%	64.3%		9.1%	19.4%	-3.2%
Q13	Incorrect	53.7%	70.7%	32.6%		44.6%	51.3%	35.7%		-9.1%	-19.4%	3.2%
	Not applicable	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		1.5%	0.9%	2.3%		1.5%	0.9%	2.3%

T1 is before deliberation. T2 is after deliberation. Numbers not in parentheses are mean responses or percentages. Numbers in parentheses are p-values resulting from a t-test. Percentages reported for 'No opinion' and 'Not applicable' are raw percentages. Percentages reported for all other categories are valid percentages.

Table 4 Policy Priorities Post-Deliberation



RANKING T2 OVERALL

ID	Questions	T1 RANK	T2 RANK	OVERALL	Non-AFF	AFF
Q3_2	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in climate science.	[1]	1	9.485	9.569	9.452
Q3_4	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in energy.	[3]	2	9.157	9.282	8.964
Q2_1	The New School should collaborate with other schools to make shared resources for sustainability-related engagement and research broadly available to all scholars at Stanford.	[2]	3	9.075	9.232	8.869
Q2_2	If individual faculty members wish to participate in the New School, the Stanford administration should strive to accommodate them.	[4]	4	8.472	8.544	8.350
Q2_4	The faculty members of the New School should collectively undertake a process to finalize the design of the academic structure.	[6]	5	8.387	8.590	8.114
Q2_3	Faculty members in the New School should be free to seek and accept funding to conduct research on topics that might aid the energy industry to transition to a carbon-free world.	[5]	6	8.378	8.172	8.655
Q3_8	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in the natural world.	[8]	7	8.376	8.181	8.543
Q3_9	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in public policy.	[7]	8	8.340	8.752	7.831
Q3_3	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in earth and planetary sciences.	[9]	9	8.297	8.582	7.940
Q4_1	Stanford should emerge from the transition with seven schools: H&S, Law, GSB, Engineering, Medicine, Education, and the New School.	[15]	10	8.107	8.494	7.700
Q3_7	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in human sustenance.	[10]	11	8.075	8.600	7.548
Q3_6	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in social science.	[14]	12	7.713	7.951	7.458
Q3_1	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research related to cities.	[11]	13	7.648	7.929	7.333
Q5_2	The Faculty Senate and the Provost should appoint a committee to consider the implications of considering engagement activities in tenure decisions.	[20]	14	7.453	7.703	7.211
Q3_10	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in ethics.	[13]	15	7.452	7.962	6.827
Q4_4	The New School should offer programs in executive and professional education.	[16]	16	7.351	7.250	7.552
Q4_2	The New School should include in its organizational structure the Woods Institute for the Environment.	[12]	17	7.299	7.650	6.892
Q3_5	The New School should incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on research in human health.	[17]	18	7.079	7.433	6.634
Q5_1	The New School's formal criteria for faculty hiring and promotion should value activities to accelerate impact along with research and teaching.	[18]	19	6.911	7.396	6.296
Q4_3	The New School should include in its organizational structure the Precourt Institute for Energy.	[19]	20	6.770	7.141	6.282

Table 5 Evaluation Questions



Participants at T2				
ID	Prompt and Responses	Overall	Not Aff	Affected
Q14_1	The small group discussion was valuable in helping clarify my positions on the issues.	8.100	8.327	7.798
	Agree (6-10)	86.0%	85.8%	85.7%
	In the middle (5)	8.5%	10.6%	6.0%
	Disagree (0-4)	5.5%	3.5%	8.3%
	Not applicable	2.4%	2.6%	2.3%
Q14_2	The briefing materials were valuable in helping clarify my positions on the issues.	6.183	6.580	5.622
	Agree (6-10)	64.0%	70.5%	54.9%
	In the middle (5)	14.2%	14.3%	14.6%
	Disagree (0-4)	21.8%	15.2%	30.5%
	Not applicable	3.9%	3.4%	4.7%
Q14_3	The plenary session was valuable in helping clarify my positions on the issues.	5.894	6.304	5.325
	Agree (6-10)	60.1%	67.9%	49.4%
	In the middle (5)	10.6%	11.6%	9.6%
	Disagree (0-4)	29.3%	20.5%	41.0%
	No opinion	3.4%	3.4%	3.5%
Q14_4	The event as a whole was valuable in helping clarify my positions on the issues.	7.315	7.568	6.964
	Agree (6-10)	80.2%	80.2%	79.5%
	In the middle (5)	9.1%	9.9%	8.4%
	Disagree (0-4)	10.7%	9.9%	12.0%
	No opinion	3.9%	4.3%	3.5%
Q15_1	The discussion platform provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussion.	4.645	4.575	4.738
	Agree (6-10)	94.0%	92.0%	96.4%
	In the middle (5)	2.5%	2.7%	2.4%
	Disagree (0-4)	3.5%	5.3%	1.2%
	No opinion	2.4%	2.6%	2.3%
Q15_2	The members of my group participated relatively equally in the discussions.	3.980	3.964	4.048
	Agree (6-10)	77.4%	77.7%	78.6%
	In the middle (5)	5.5%	5.4%	6.0%
	Disagree (0-4)	17.1%	17.0%	15.5%
	No opinion	2.9%	3.4%	2.3%
Q15_3	The discussion platform tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered.	3.874	3.956	3.744
	Agree (6-10)	66.3%	66.7%	64.6%
	In the middle (5)	22.6%	25.4%	19.5%
	Disagree (0-4)	11.1%	7.9%	15.9%
	No opinion	2.9%	1.7%	4.7%
Q15_4	The important aspects of the issues were covered in the group discussions.	4.131	4.205	4.024
	Agree (6-10)	82.4%	85.7%	77.4%
	In the middle (5)	8.5%	6.2%	11.9%
	Disagree (0-4)	9.0%	8.0%	10.7%
	No opinion	2.9%	3.4%	2.3%

T1 is before deliberation. T2 is after deliberation. Numbers not in parentheses are mean responses or percentages. Numbers in parentheses are p-values resulting from a t-test. Percentages reported for 'No opinion' and 'Not applicable' are raw percentages. Percentages reported for all other categories are valid percentages.

Appendix A: Illustrative Excerpts from the Transcripts of the Small Group Discussions⁵

Proposal 1: The New School should collaborate with other schools to make shared resources for sustainability-related engagement and research broadly available to all scholars at Stanford.

1. “If someone in their home department wants to collaborate with someone in a different School those barriers should be gone...[However] I'm a very disciplinary based person. I'm all for the strength of Home Department.”
2. “I do think the critical thing is to have a source of funding that is aimed at multidisciplinary research of this nature-- new sources of funding as opposed to relying on traditional governmental sources.”
3. “Fellowships that I have available to me right now in the school of Earth and TA ships I cannot use to support graduate students in other departments. This pay scale is different. This pay scale is different. So then there's this lack of consistency between what I'm paying my students in Earth and what students would be paid elsewhere. So I think the inability to move grants and fellowships easily across to other schools is one of the current impediments.”
4. “I just want to kind of be the devil's advocate a little bit here and one of the problems when sharing resources is when it's owned by everybody that nobody is really owning it. If different people have different kinds of grant audiences and have different incentives and it might be very difficult to create an environment where what kind of the incentives will be aligned for everybody? And then the resources won't be used in an effective way. They won't be owned and nobody would lead them.”
5. “I agree that the statement is reasonable. I think the details are ill-defined. So it's really hard to make a clear Yes/ No call on this one in my opinion.”
6. “One of the details which would help us to think about these issues --is whether it's a kind of zero sum context or whether there would be a lot of new resources that the school would seek and make available to share in. In fact, if there were a lot of new resources that would come to Stanford through the new school that would make this kind of collaboration and the incentives for collaborations...”
7. “Got to say I really like everyone's enthusiasm for shared facilities. I think one thing I'm a little disappointed in this proposal is there's really no discussion of how these things might be funded. And I think that's when push comes to shove....How do they become self-sustaining and maybe even generate income ... then leverage the next thing that needs to be done.”
8. “There's some concerns that the big project is great. However, is it going to be subtractive? Is it going to take resources from one Department to another? Are people going to jump ship and disrupt programs in existing departments?”
9. “So let me suggest since we all agree that sharing is a good thing. I think the real question with sharing is who decides? Right. In SLAC, lots of people contribute, but somebody within that organization makes the decisions on who gets the resources. So maybe it would be more interesting to talk about who should decide who gets resources rather than whether we should share them.”
10. “There is also the question of allocation, right? I mean is it sharing all resources? No resources? Obviously, it's not either one of those. I'm thinking of models like what the Woods Institute has a call for applications every year for certain kinds of projects. One could imagine some kind of model like that. But again the question is which resources are we talking? Faculty? Are we talking equipment or we talking space?”
11. “If you have a shared facility that can be used for sustainability work but becomes all of a sudden interesting also for other types of research, I think it can start creating conflict. ..Do you only get access if you do sustainability research...When you have money at stake everyone wants to participate. How are you going to decide the details of that?”
12. “That Catalyst program that ran for a couple years. I don't know if that's still ongoing. It really actively tried to reach out outside of the School of Engineering...those types of things would be great.”
13. “I guess I was wondering what the alternative to this proposal was. What does it look like to not do those things and does any current School in our system not to do those things. So I guess I would need more information as to what's really at stake with this question.”
14. “I think the general agreement that where we have here is that this is a going to be a highly interdisciplinary Enterprise and it's inconceivable that it could operate on its own without very strong collaboration with other schools.”
15. “I would suggest that a lot of what we're doing depends upon the answer to the question. How do Woods and the Precourt Institute fit in? Are they separate institutes that cut across the University or they put entirely within the school?...Most everything else depends upon on that question and that is very absolutely central. In particular because I believe that not everybody interested in climate will be forced or put into the school.”
16. “I think shared billets and joint appointments are clearly desirable in this for this school because one of the big big risks is setting up something as sort of a second class operation for the disciplinary Scholars involved in the school and having the ability and in fact, encouraging sharing billets with regular departments, disciplinary departments. I think it's a good way of ...guaranteeing quality in the new school.”
17. “I do think the critical thing is to have a source of funding that is aimed at multidisciplinary research of this nature new sources of funding as opposed to relying on traditional governmental sources.”
18. “Fellowships that I have available to me right now in the school of Earth and TA ships I cannot use to support graduate students in other departments. This pay scale is different. So then there's this lack of consistency between what I'm paying my students in Earth and what students would be paid elsewhere. So I think the inability to move grants and fellowships easily across to other schools is one of the current impediments.”
19. “If you read the cons, nobody in the medical school would want to share their resources with geologists for example, so, I don't understand what sharing resources means. We have some groups in your sciences, engineering better funded than others and the way it's envisioned it would have a conglomeration of multiple disciplines. Some of them are not well funded some are and what so how're we supposed to share our resources?”
20. “Maybe it could be set up in a way that there are specific resources...specifically earmarks for collaborative projects which would require a layer of bureaucracy where new school members and non new school members put forth joint proposals for the use of these resources.. It would require some sort of formal process to apply for these resources...”

⁵ These transcripts are edited for readability, to avoid redundancy and to preserve anonymity. They are organized by discussion topic and are drawn from all the small groups.

Proposal 2: Here we have a set of proposals regarding various research topics for which the New School might incorporate a critical mass of faculty members on cities, climate science, earth and planetary sciences, energy, human health, human sustenance, the natural world, public policy, and social science and ethics.

1. “Physical distance actually was a bit of a barrier I collaborate with people in a circle of buildings all around the building where I’m located in electrical engineering and you know medicine and physics and applied physics and so on. So anyway having some Central area where this sustainability is focused will be very good.”
2. “I’m actually wondering how people feel about the prospect of joint appointments... You might be a joint department or you might be a department where you have jointly appointed faculty and right now in Woods, we have jointly appointed faculty... but I think it would be a real statement to have a school where everybody was jointly appointed and I’m not sure what that would mean for cohesiveness. So I guess I would just like to get people’s thoughts on whether a joint appointment should be a core aspect of a new school or whether we should have solo appointments.”
3. “Some of these seem quite broad and some of these are little bit more focused. For example, the natural world. I think that’s Broad and many of the other categories can be included in that also. Social science and ethics is quite broad. It seems to me that social science and ethics is similar to saying we should include Natural Sciences and Engineering so wondering what people think about whether or not social sciences should be more specific.”
4. “These broad topics are rather amorphous like the natural world and just social sciences and policies and ethics... I think is going to be hard to attract faculty to come to the new school and develop a new department. The administration really needs to pay attention that we need that enthusiasm to develop that critical mass and so having topics that are exciting and that people are passionate for...”
5. “I think the more specific the better and I also think we might focus on how to attract students ...because I mean ultimately in the end, that’s what we do and that’s the large part of our impact. Thinking into the future we need to have alumni ...making impacts in all areas of science and industry and government.”
6. “I just like to give a forward-looking perspective: sustainability is extremely important to the business school and we need to have more faculty in the business school that are working on sustainability in addition to whatever is happening in this new school. And so I just think it’s very important that we make sure going forward that this is not delegated, that the business school doesn’t say, “oh this is the school of sustainability. They’re doing the hiring. We don’t need to bring in people working on this.” So going forward to ensure the faculty or replenish that are working on this and that it’s the work is integrated into all the schools of Stanford.”
7. “The one thing that’s challenging for me and evaluating all of these topics...they haven’t given us criteria to really understand how will these units be integrated. How will it be different from just changing where we’re sitting? How will they think about the rearrangement of academic units and ensuring that there’s integration and we’re not just creating new silos that are just slightly different a name from what we already have.”
8. “It’s a challenge to reassemble people from a whole variety of schools where they might already have a home. I’m particularly concerned about not the people who with 10-year or later in their careers. That might make such a change but I am worried about younger people who may have disciplinary issues that relate to their appointments and promotions. They’ll have to be considered. So I think that this reassembly is important to think about in terms of those kinds of faculty issues in addition to the fact that creating departments create suspense and I think that that’s something else would have to be considered carefully.”
9. “I’m seeing a lot of notions of pulling different resources, merging different departments and what I hope it doesn’t come out as that. This is just another reorganization of Stanford with some different editions.”
10. “I really like what you make said earlier, thinking 50 years ahead. What kind of school is going to be and what kind of identity is going to form? And I think this is a great opportunity indeed to foster a new kind of interdisciplinarity and I don’t see that here. It’s rather eclectic like an assemblage of all kinds of things and let’s see how they’re going to fit.”
11. “I’m from a department that you probably don’t know much about it’s called Earth System Science, and we have a combination of scientists and disciplines in water and soils and oceans. But we also have environmental psychologists and anthropologists to economists, a food security group. And that is one of these things that developed organically and there is an advantage to having people in one place.”
12. “Stanford needs to do is have a strategy to define actually that shared resources need to be supported. They need to have maintenance to need to have quality a lot of times. It’s missing. We spend money on installing facilities, but then I think some of the follow-on there’s missing.”
13. “What possible way to think about this? I mean, they’re all areas where obviously they’re important...are any of these fields where you would actually be at a disadvantage to be in that location rather than someplace else... I can think that’s seems apropos is human health if that was your field. Would you really want to be in this school rather than in a public health department in the medical school or something like that? Are there areas where you’d actually be at a disadvantage to be put in this school rather than someplace else perhaps public policy is something like that as well.”
14. “How should the school be organized? So if we think that departments may not be the right thing, I’m curious should the new school have departments or should we just have themes that kind of change over time?”
15. “I could see slices of all of these different disciplines being effective contributors to the mission of the new school. The particular array of disciplines that would comprise that would kind of depend on what the overall objectives of the school are...I’m having a little bit of trouble because I’m not a hundred percent sure what the overall mission of the school will be and that will help to determine which slices of these different disciplines might be relevant for achieving them.”
16. “I’ll be interested in hearing from some folks in terms of what structure the school could have other than the traditional school department faculty within departments who are hired and promoted within that department. I know that we all understand the restrictions imposed by that structure, but at the same time there’s not a lot of alternatives except for the sort of system where you have joint appointments and things to facilitate interactions and also that people can have appointments and institutes.”
17. “It sounds like this is going to involve a lot of rearranging of departments. So I’m curious of people who are going to be affected by this. I’ve not affected by this myself...Is there pushback? Are people concerned about that rearrangement or the people who don’t want to be rearranged?”
18. “I guess when you talk about like this tension already, then you should add engineers to the mix right because they’re talking about moving our departments to that school as well or making a joint apartment. And I think that is something that a lot of the faculty in my department are worried about as well.”

19. “One sort of obvious challenge is in hiring, tenure decisions and promotion decisions--if you've got people that are very diverse in terms of what they study and what they work on within the same department. For example, if we had a social scientist and I was working on the tenure case I wouldn't (have) any idea who to contact. I have no context so that is a bit of a challenge sometimes when the department or the school gets too diverse.”
20. “How should we be organizing ourselves and working ourselves. Also how can we recruit students and indicate to them where they should be following within the university given their interests....All of these topics are important for the University (to be) working on. The question in my mind is will they be advanced by living in the school of sustainability or can they exist and be productive in other (places)?”
21. “It's unclear to me what the alternative is: is the alternative to not have these topics (in the school) or is the alternative (to) have them but people are isolated. And of course, I think it doesn't make any sense to have people isolated in the school. They have to have a community to speak to but I think a lot of it depends on the ways in which appointments to the school are done. Is it going to cannibalize the existing departments or is it going to be done in a way that that does not primarily through joint appointments?”
22. “I want to know more about the history of the Earth School because there's some similarities between this initiative and what I imagine people hoped the Earth School would do...what people feel the Earth School is doing really well and in what ways we feel it's falling short.”
23. “Earth is a small school and maybe it doesn't have enough resources to do what it really needs to do... Are we trying to build up Earth? Make it more self-sufficient or are we trying to solve some big societal problem?”
24. “I guess I'm going to shift gears just a little bit. I have to say that I'm bothered by the fact that social science and ethics always get lumped together. They're quite distinct...Ethicists tend to be more humanist/ philosophers bioethicists, that sort of thing. I can tell you that the students are desperate for climate Justice and environmental justice is a thing that the Earth System students ...are desperate for and I think there are a lot of the professional schools as well and I so I think that's really a distinct thing.”
25. “Just getting back to the research themes maybe energy food and water might be the cross-cutting ones. But I think they're just trying to build up areas where we need higher emphases. But ideally these are not turning into departments. I don't see a department of cities or a department of climate maybe climate science might be one for certain social science and ethics or something of that nature. It's just areas that we need to build out. I think the one danger with joint appointments...where will they put their emphasis?”
26. “There may be a need to consolidate some things into departments. For instance. There was on the question of cities. It was clear that there was no strong program. There was some undergraduate program, which I don't know much about but so in some cases maybe there is a need to have a department or a structure versus other things would fit much better and that Matrix structure for instance things like Big policy or Social Science and Tech they tend to be too broad and those things that are extremely broad. Perhaps they don't even belong in this kind of question because it would be very hard to structure them.”
27. “Since I see this as my opportunity to vote on some of these topics I want to express my opinion on the department of climate. I wish the entire school was seen as climate and sustainability and that was a cross-cutting theme between them as my personal opinion. I also wish that ocean sciences was specifically on this list integrating not only ocean chemistry physical biology, but also policy and how that's affecting climate on a big scale and the human resources that we take from the ocean. There's aspects of Earth sciences that belong in the school and I think there's aspects that don't and that's going to be hard.”
28. “I think the question that's coming up for me now is can one Dean appropriately pay attention to all these areas or are the chairs equally enabled?”
29. “Yeah, I'd love to hear more from people that are involved in any of these areas about what already exists at Stanford and whether a new school would be advantageous or would take away because from the biology perspective, it's hard for me to know. I think it would be nice to have 1 two major critical focuses of the school rather than seven eight or nine.”
30. “I think it makes sense to look at the places where Stanford is really lacking in certain expertise. ...I just look at this list and I wouldn't know what to cut out of this list. It seems to me having a more holistic approach to this isn't necessarily a bad thing.”

Proposal 3: Faculty members in the New School should be free to seek and accept funding to conduct research on topics that might aid the energy industry to transition to a carbon-free world

1. “I don't have a problem with people taking funding in this area...(but) this industry pulled us out of the Paris Accord. This industry is unraveling Obama era environmental legislation, so I think we have to be aware of the fact that there is this huge industry that's having a huge impact and be realistic about what impact we are having.”
2. “I'm a little confused by this question. Certainly any oversight should be equally applied to the new school, but I don't see anything specific here right beyond what is already impacting many departments or schools.”
3. “I think that as long as people are working within the framework of what's acceptable in terms of conflicts of interests the Faculty ought to have the freedom to decide what they want to research and from whom they wanted take money, but it needs to be monitored.”
4. “I agree with the comments by most people that we should have freedom for applying for funds but I'm curious in this field whether there's a distinction between investigator-initiated research versus industry initiated research and whether we see that in medicine a lot that distinction and I'm wondering if that would make a difference.”
5. “It's kind of a funny question because the technology that's needed for massive large-scale carbon sequestration...much of that lies within that industry. We have to engage with the people who know how to implement the Technical Solutions that are going to be required. So we shouldn't be shutting people out.”
6. “My understanding is that it's not about engaging with people or with actors within those industries. It's about receiving money from them and the potential for conflict of interest and distortion and suppression of unattractive...results that the funders don't like I think is real. So I'll just be the token dissenting.”
7. “Yeah, I think this question is crazy. I mean there is a question about whether faculty in the school should be doing research to search for and produce more oil and gas or coal. And that's a very different question than you know, if you're doing research that's funded by the energy industry and they do some work on oil and gas should we not receive their funds? Stanford's received funds from the energy industry for a long time to do things like increased solar and geothermal?”

8. "I am in favor of a freedom and that's what one of the main reasons. I am at Stanford. I'm sensitive to one con and it's about the potential bias introduced by an overwhelming of funding coming from fossil fuel companies. And so I was wondering if the idea of an honor code related to the mission of a school and new school on climate susceptibility would be something reasonable."
9. "I think that as long as people are working within the framework of what's acceptable in terms of conflicts of interests the Faculty ought to have the freedom to decide what they want to research and from whom they wanted take money, but it needs to be monitored but I don't think you can eliminate it and you know, ask people not to use sources of funds That could be very helpful for all for their research and for the society."
10. "I have mixed feelings because I want to trust all my colleagues, but I don't think they're always trustworthy. I do want to be sure of conflict of interest issues and have a structure for that because we think academics can't be corrupted, but they can."
11. "I really strongly believe that we should maintain an open ability to gain funding. I think one of the tricky things is that it's not always so clear in terms of where the funding is coming from. So for example Department of Energy under the Trump Administration started investing huge amounts of money in hydraulic fracturing and we can all agree that you know, most of us think that's probably not a good thing for the climate system. And so it's not always that it's money coming directly for energy companies. It's very topical. Feels to me like this needs an ethical statement that's agreed by The Faculty, but that we should be very cautious and actually shutting down areas of funding because they could be could be very productive missions could be hidden."
12. "I would just offer two caveats number one, the literature on disclosure altering behavior is not encouraging and so thinking that disclosure is a solution I think is unrealistic. The other concern I have is watching the failure of the university to back up people during the covid crisis when they spoke out against Atlas. So I do think there is concern about whether controversial positions and whether our faculty positions will be supported by the university."
13. "I think the principle of freedom to seek funding as academic freedom. I just don't think is arguable. So that's to me the strongest card on this case."
14. "One of the things that we have seen over and over and over in industries being involved in research is that sometimes that industry begins over and over to co-opt the research and drive it.. (there) would have to be something put in place to prevent that from happening and to make the goals of sustainability the main thing being researched."
15. "I see a really big problem with language here. I think if you want to place incentives for faculty not to accept funding from those companies, that's fine. But sort of telling them that they're not free to do it I see as really problematic. What if you work with a defense contractor? There is a lot of people that get funding from defense contractors and they might then find themselves in a similar situation...(this is) Why I think this is pretty problematic to say that they should not be free to seek and accept funding."
16. "I get a good chunk of my funding from the oil industry and related companies and you know historically a lot of the funding in the school and a lot of the students in the school are funded in that way...it seems to me that the efficient and clean extraction and the transition away from oil needs to involve oil companies and if we completely exclude them from the picture, I really think we're being naive and doing a disservice.."
17. "I actually think that one should work with a fossil fuel company. In other words taking the money from the fossil fuel company to aid the transition...is a major part of the energy landscape and the major part of the economy. Many of these companies in fact do recognize that it is important for them to transition out for this purpose. It is important...to work with them to facilitate this kind of transition."
18. "Why impose barriers as long as there are mechanisms in place and faculty are sheltered and can express their views freely and there are no agreements that would prevent publication of results that might upset the industry partners.... So as long as the typical checks and balances are in place, I see more pros than cons for something like this."
19. "I wanted to comment on the funding I think faculty should be allowed to seek funding. I've been serving on the committee for research which kind of follows the research policy handbook in there are two key policies one of which is openness in research another which is academic freedom and currently those both allow faculty to seek sponsored research funds from any resource. So if we were to limit this it would be something that would require careful rewording of the research policy handbook that governs all faculty on campus."
20. "I feel like we're missing a voice on the opposite side and I have heard arguments on the opposite side. Not so much along the lines of preventing faculty from seeking and accepting funding but along the lines that the appearance of receiving a lot of money from oil companies creates the appearance that they may be steering or dancing the directions."
21. "Energy resource engineering is traditionally really core strength of Stanford in a way that it's not a many other top schools and just cutting that off completely and would be quite difficult...what if tobacco was a primary vehicle for drug delivery all throughout our medical system. You know fossil fuels are all around us. It doesn't mean that it's not a huge concern what emissions come from them, but it's a complicated subject. And so I guess I have a question for the Dean to see the specific recommendations that could be followed."
22. "I have to tell you as a physician doing cancer research, I've collaborated with many Pharma companies and biotech companies. I founded companies like many faculty, but it's always disclosed."
23. "What I'm about to say will not be popular but maybe a new school for a new world should find alternative ways to fund research than oil and gas companies. I mean you can imagine that maybe having a new shiny object and getting funding and saying look we're not going to take any funding from oil and gas. ...this could be a way to sort of embark on a New Journey now, I totally believe that working with people and getting them to be more sustainable is probably something that needs to happen."

Proposal 4: The New School should offer programs in executive and professional education

1. "I totally agree for me. This is a no-brainer. Of course, we want to try to reach out from those who are actually having the levers in the steering column making the decision. So sure, you know, executive and professional education. I don't see why we shouldn't do that if we want to do that."
2. "I'm not against this idea. But I do see a point in some of the common arguments in terms of trying to replicate the GSB inside of the school. It would seem better to me to collaborate with the GSB offering some programs within their executive professional education that capability."

3. "There's already an existing collaboration between the department called EI / the Emmett Interdisciplinary program and environment and resources and they have a strong partnership with both GSB and law and I think that works. I think it's a little weird for us to create as well kind of a mini business school. I wonder if we could collaborate with the business school and have and have this Executive Education Program co-administered."
4. "I think it would be good to have a new school but I agree that it would make sense to have other programs up and running first and not to not have this be a major focus of the school at the beginning."
5. "I would just add the first con that it's diversion of attention from education of undergraduate and graduate students. That's a big one. That's really important. We've seen that in the business school that that needs to be managed and it's very important that we're working together."
6. "Well, like I guess underlying what happens in business is they want to make money. Right business is all about making money and climate and sustainability are not necessarily about making money. Right? And so there's an inherent potential conflict there."
7. "I think eventually it should do this. But I think at the beginning it needs to get its act together as a school, but I think we have a an obligation to teach Executives and professionals about sustainability."
8. "I guess my only comments were that that this is apple pie. It's great, but it wouldn't be my first priority and you have to form the school first and get it started and moving and figure out how to do the undergraduate and graduate education. And then you can see how Executive Education would fit into that."
9. "Well, this may be a little bit off the topic but I think that really the one we talked about education and actually promoting certain ideas. I think in the entire really in the materials that we received there is really not enough emphasis on educating. The public climate change is about change of lifestyle in the really really near future. So I'd rather work on that than on this other side."
10. "I'm sort of surprised it's come up. It seems like a smaller issue relative to the bigger Mission issues, Vision issues that we've been grappling with. But I guess I don't see any problems with it, but it seems like a less higher priority issue than some of these other things."
11. "I have admit that I am a little confused by this particular question. I'm not quite sure what type of professional education we're talking about. But that said, I'm also a little bit worried about it because it is the schools that do offer professional education tend to be dominated by those programs."
12. "My first response is just I don't even know what exactly what Executive Education is and it sounds like most Executive Education that I've encountered seems kind of like a boondoggle. So to me this seems like a digression from the school's research purpose and I tend to agree with the idea of more pushing it over into a partnership with the GSB."
13. "When I think about how to deal with these like trillion-dollar problems, the only way this is going to be resolved if I could be media and government and current industry all working together and exchange information. There's no way that trillion-dollar energy business is going to be changed by researchers at Stanford, so having a way in which the industry is going to buy into it and politics... So to me, it seems like this new school should try provide a different environment in which these different parties come together and try to find out how not only on the basis of Technology, but other ways we can collaborate."
14. "I was just looking at one of the arguments against this which is that the GSB is were leading Executive Education Program might suffer. But in fact, I would turn that around and say it would be fabulous if the school of sustainability could could develop say a master's degree in Business sustainability to go along with MBAs in order to just bring new people into the business community that had this approach and that have these abilities along with them, but not just training.... train people to be those Executives in the future."
15. "Just to speak against the other con on that list that that it may divert attention from other other undergrad and grad programs. We do have programs like this in the current School of Earth Energy and environment and it doesn't feel like it diverts from anything. There are professors that are very interested in doing that and they do it and no one seems to suffer from it."
16. "I mean one thing I'm curious about is what kind of degree are they talking about here? Like they don't specify is this like an MBA and like sustainability oriented businesses or like a master's in public administration. Like I don't I don't understand what degree they're talking about."
17. "If I look at the two cons, whether this would divert attention from undergrads and grad students. First of all in the School of Engineering... we do that and hasn't taken away attention either. It's other people who do it or faculty do it on top of their teaching. We will have it very clear in our mind that our priority is undergrad and grad education. So I don't think the first con really has a lot of merit and the second one maybe is more interesting, but we have plenty of examples of two schools doing something similar. Think of statistics and biostatistics and both programs can be world-class and not other each other. So I don't really see a problem there either."
18. "The actual big problem here is going to be the challenge...(of) developing the curriculum for the undergrad and grad students. That's really going to be quite challenging. I think the professional education could be a little bit more bite-sized pieces and if there's individual areas of inquiry or teaching where there's professional relevance, we can kind of shift those out as supplementary things, but maybe hidden over here is a really tough problem with the curriculum for thw undergraduates and graduate students."
19. "I work a lot in Executive Education within the School of Engineering through the center for Stanford center for professional development. I think the con arguments here are our kind of poppycock. "professional education, May divert attention of education undergrads and graduate students." I think we can walk and chew gum at the same time. And saying that competition within the GSB's world leading executive education program. Yes GSB has a worldleading Executive Education Program since when did we start to say at Stanford: you get to do this you get to do this you get to do this. I thought our mantra was always in a field of flowers let the best ones bloom."
20. "So I'm going to talk about maybe one of the less pleasant parts but necessary parts of executive and professional education. As a mid-career faculty member I use it to supplement my salary it's expensive to live in Silicon Valley. It's expensive to buy a house. I would not have been able to buy my house on campus without engaging into that and as we think about the development of faculty and retention without this we are going to continue to lose young faculty members to peer schools that are in cheaper areas to live."
21. "The reality of the situation is that at least most of us are on nine months salaries and we're allowed for three months to either carry out our funded research or be involved in consulting work that that adds to our salary. So that we have that opportunity that's not going to be taken away."
22. "I'm assuming that this new school is full-service undergraduates, masters students and graduate students and PhD students... there's nothing incompatible between executive programs and masters programs...In addition to Executive programs. I would like to see the school put out. Gather a policy and training

education program for state local and federal governmental leaders, people coming into Congress to be able to understand the issue as part of executive education.”

23. “My question is how would this why do we need this when we have a school of education doesn't the school of education have a program like that and couldn't they lead that and interface with the new school?”
24. “There is currently a degree program in the school of Earth called sustainability science and practice which does exactly that...It's not heavily supported. It's sort of a model of what could be so I think we're sort of thinking about that. I agree that these programs should be joined with what the law and business (do). I think absolutely in fact business sort of proposed. This is a way of being involved more in the new school. The final point if we do this, we should think about what the impact is and what that implies for faculty rewards, tenure process and things like that. If we expect people to do this, we better take it into account.”
25. “Just as a point of dissension there. ...it's research that counts the most when it comes to tenure decisions....But I think I do agree that if this becomes central it would have to be embedded in the evaluation criteria...one of the things that I'm excited about with the new school is just this really strong desire to address the urgency of the problems and get solutions going and out there. And so I think bringing in Executives... (so) that our ideas can get out at higher management levels fast.”

Proposal 5: The New School's formal criteria for faculty hiring and promotion should value activities to accelerate impact along with research and teaching and have the Faculty Senate and the Provost appoint a committee to consider these implications.

1. “I just want to point out that I think we're once again having a discussion about whether we want this to be about fundamental research or whether this is about applications and it relates ultimately to the mission of the school, which honestly I don't fully understand. But if the mission is the school is to to have impact outside research then obviously we should reward that impact because that would incentivize people to invest in having that impact but if the mission of the school is to do fundamental research then we shouldn't.”
2. “I do a ton of collaboration with environmental nonprofits. I get funding from the environmental defense fund and others. They already exist. They do a good job. My role with them is helping them with the science. So they get the science, right and that's my role and I don't get involved in the advocacy side. Is it beneficial to the University's long-term goals to get involved in change-making per se?”
3. “I just want to point out that it seems to me that a lot of people in the University are currently advocating ...without being rewarded for it. So I'm just wondering if the rewarding part will create the wrong incentives. That's I think the question that that needs to be a fully fleshed-out.”
4. “Way too many opinions out there in the world...We need to be really skeptical about what we think about the world and really question ourselves. And the whole twitterverse communication people jabbering at each other. It's insane and the sustainability world doesn't need it. We need good science.”
5. “As long as it's not essential to get tenure and do these sorts of activities, then I'd be okay with it as long as if you do it in addition to your normal research then...But as long as it's not essential for getting tenure then I agree.”
6. “Somebody needs to think hard about what kind of impact is being proposed here and it would include those kinds of activities which are really not research activities necessarily at all.”
7. “I think making this an additional imposition on younger faculty is going to be very difficult. I also think we get into the very dangerous area of trying to decide as with research what is acceptable and unacceptable engagement. And again, the Atlas example comes to mind. I'm sure we would all want to say that Atlas was engaged in not very useful and not very productive outreach and engagement but should he not be promoted for instance if he worked for Bush and because of that because it's the wrong type of Engagement. I think we're getting into very dangerous territory here.”
8. “I guess I totally agree that younger faculty need to concentrate on the research, but I was trying to say that I think that the Administration has been trying to eliminate professors of the practice that do advocate and I don't see any reason why this school couldn't incorporate them. And then I have to tell you about Atlas. I think he's responsible... for deaths and I think universities need to take stands against that.”
9. “This is always tricky even in a research area. The metrics are heavily debated. So I do think it's always nice if people add novelty to the approaches or to what they're doing in terms of getting impact.... I find it a little bit tricky though figure out how to quantify even if you put a committee together.”
10. “Speaking as a junior person. I can tell you that my Dean told me a couple of years ago when the humanities division was rolling out its public intellectual programs that the reason they had no program specifically oriented for junior faculty because they wanted us focused on our research and producing peer-reviewed scholarship. So maybe this is just a Humanities problem, but it does seem to me that this sort of divide between kind of the slow but real impact of peer-reviewed scholarship and the kind of idea of advocacy or say writing an op-ed is real and does affect tenure.”
11. “I think this is an extremely slippery slope. Couldn't I have more impact if I jump on the AI bandwagon? Oh, I do some fundamental research that might have application in 30 years. I think this is something that needs extremely careful thought and I'm not sure that impact is the right way to determine if a faculty member should cut tenure.”
12. “You need some reasonable mechanism to evaluate that and I just want to emphasize that I don't think it's either or like Publications or Twitter followers. It's that you have a set of ways that people can impact the field and that should include scholarly impact, but it should also include impact on policy impact on you know education of young people those kinds of things.”
13. “I would agree that this is a really important part of a sustainability school and that this kind of impact would have to be really part of how we would make progress, but we know what we mean by impact scholarly impact, international impact that really moves the field. Suppose we took this phrase and put another word in it should value activities to accelerate Global impact along with research and teaching. Would you think about it differently if our standards were just as high for that kind of impact as scholarly impact? That's one of the things we need to discuss. What are the standards? What are we trying to achieve?”
14. “One thing I would like to add as a fundamental resource researcher whose work basically has no practical application to the real world: I'm concerned about how different people would be weighed against each other fairly in the evaluation process. I think if you're doing sustainability research, it's important for your work to have an impact on the real world like that seems like a no-brainer but in terms of evaluating tenure, I don't know how different faculty will be compared to each other.”

15. “Yeah, I think I'm not negative as well. As in my sense is that you know impact in the sense of our researchers is translating into you know, technological developments or influencing policy that that's appreciated already, but it's very much driven by our research and this seems to kind of place impact as like counter to research or competing with research and if it's simply like a service type impact. I don't dismiss the value of those things. I just worry that our institution is not really set up to facilitate that door.”
16. “I think if we broaden the word impacts of something like impact and outreach that might be more palatable and incorporate more of the fundamental research crowd because a lot of us do participate in those things like space policy or giving public lectures and things like that. So I think if they made the language a little bit more inclusive and would be less scary to some of us.”
17. “It just could be a metric that could help, be used as a relative positive in an overall package.”
18. “Every University I've taught at has said that service counts along with teaching and research in a tenure and advancement decisions and at every University. I've taught at it hasn't mattered nearly as much as the other two categories and public service has mattered less than University Service. So I read this proposal as saying that the university should take this opportunity to think about whether we want to change the formal criteria. Before advancement for the new school to give more emphasis to Public Service maybe with an eye to later extending that to other parts of the University. I think it's a good idea.”
19. “Let me start with the following statement. I believe that the way the tenure system works and modern universities are organized is not very conducive to either doing interdisciplinary research or research that leads to big changes any time in our lifetime any time in this century. I do think the conceptual way is to have a multicolored criteria thing as many people have mentioned. An alternative would be to have different categories of Faculty. I don't know the Michigan case, but I've seen this done successfully at Harvard and Princeton and help them evaluate people who are professor of practice jobs...”
20. “I don't want to see science get penalized because it doesn't have immediate benefits because we still need to do fundamental research. There's a lot we don't know.”
21. “I really like the idea of the tenure and promotion process reflecting the science goals of our departments and institute's so in this case, I think that involves incorporating impact into those decisions, but one thing that does concern me about that is the idea and actually I initially misread it the idea that it would be a requirement. I see all of these entities in the new school being a combination of potentially more fundamental science and impact and so I don't like the idea of it being a requirement for those things. If your work is more on the traditional research side than you should be evaluated for those types of projects products. And if you're on the more applied impact side, then you should be valued for (that).”
22. “I just wanted to add that if we're going to include engagement activities in the tenure process and we should probably do so across all schools. There's no reason for it to be just in the new school or in one specific school. It should be I mean if we're going to change anything about the tenure process it should be uniform.”
23. “So I think one way to think about this that it's not mandatory that you have impact research and teaching. The Departments and schools should decide what they want to value in terms of when you're evaluating someone that should be among the criteria that you can use to evaluate someone. So not everybody is going to have to do outreach or engagement or things like that. And if they don't they're not going to be penalized for it one way. Expecting that it would be excellent in research and teaching, that's what would continue. But if impact is a big part of what they do and they're being asked to do, then that should be considered.”
24. “Sometimes these engagements of making impact take a long time. So it might decrease the quantity of maybe papers by some people but I don't think that's the point I didn't and I see it actually as really important scholarship figuring out what works in one place what can actually be transferred to another to make it work there. I think it will be tricky to get the metrics but I think this is really really important.”
25. “I wanted to resonate with what everyone had said and add that. I think these sorts of activities that accelerate impact should certainly be valued like time is not on our side when it comes to addressing problems of sustainability and getting solutions out there quickly is absolutely what's needed. But I also want to make sure that the new school and the University at large doesn't devalue those longer term, you know fundamental research topics-- He won't have an immediate impact but could make a huge difference, you know, 50 years from now or a century from now. So I value it as long as we don't devalue the other more fundamental activities.”
26. “I have mixed feelings on whether Stanford's primary role should be about impact..I just want to re-echo how important it would be for that to be a different track and not something that is associated with tenure considerations unless we're going to require all philosophy professors. To also as part of their tenure packages say how their philosophical scholarship has impacted the world dramatically. I don't think it's reasonable to have that be different across schools.”
27. “I like to jump in and point out that if we consider Yale and Duke to be peer institutions for Stanford, they both have schools of environment that hire and tenure people who do interdisciplinary work and do work that's impactful in the real world. And so I think they're models for how to do that. And again, I would not sacrifice scholarship or excellent teaching at all.”
28. “It's not about everybody should be striving to have an impact and be measured for doing that. What we should be is encouraging people who want to do that rather than discourage them and saying if you're coming up for tenure you shouldn't do anything that looks like it has an impact in the real world even if it's interdisciplinary. So it's really a matter of emphasis. I agree with everyone who said we have to maintain the high research and teaching standards This is if you're just doing fundamental science, but if your work also has an impact and you care to do that, it shouldn't be actively discouraged. That's my position.”

Proposal 6: If individual faculty members wish to participate in the New School, the Stanford administration should strive to accommodate them.

1. “The idea of having a grounding in the home department is is a very powerful to me. However, I've also spent some time going to some major international meetings on energy climate change and for example, the importance of cities in dealing with climate change and things like that, and I've got a got an interest for sure. And energy and climate on a more global scale. So it depends. I don't think I would move to this, but I would maybe have an interaction with the new school”
2. “The most compelling argument I've heard for the school is that allows us to hire the next generation of leaders in the area of climate and sustainability science that it's been very difficult in our current structures of departments to find homes for people that work at the intersection. It's very difficult to mentor and tenure people who are working in that interdisciplinary gap. I'm not sure how I feel about that. I haven't personally been involved in a situation where I felt that we couldn't hire who we wanted to because of this structure. I feel very strongly that whoever wants to be in should be in but I feel most strongly about asking the administration how they're going to ensure that those who elect to stay in their own school.”

3. "I'm basically in favor of this. I think you know it's a vague statement. So some people are going to want to participate to the full extent others to varying and smaller extents. But I like the concept that everyone that says hey, I think this is important. I want to be part of the new school that some kind of interaction with the school is made possible."
4. "I think you know, I guess it's one thing that hasn't been mentioned so far as the faculty are likely to you know, do the best work when they feel like they're in the right institutional home. And so I think facilitating that and letting people join (if) they're excited makes a lot of sense and I think you may need another issue to solve as mitigating any of the negative effects on funding streams, etc. For departments where people will be leaving and that remains to be, you know, worked out how that would work."
5. "I'm not sure but my my sense is that there should be an open process where people learn about it later and and see that they want to join but the first people who join will have more to say about how it's structured what its culture as and so forth. So, yeah, it's important to get as many voices heard as possible, but I don't think it makes sense to go out and try to twist people's arms to join. It's to be driven by interest and fit."
6. "This is as close to a no-brainer as I think we have here. If I can't trust the goodwill of my colleagues to make the right decisions themselves and the university then all hope is lost. I say yes."
7. "I'm supportive of sort of allowing folks to participate but also thinking about what the impact is on the programs for which they leave. So we see quite a bit of interdisciplinary programs at least from a curriculum perspective. It's very hard to support the core foundation of the Departments that they leave and so I think that having a model where you make sure that the health of those departments for which the person they have shifted their responsibilities are in line with the new appointment. That would be fine. But it's more of an organizational (issue) in the funding for that."
8. "What is our core educational mission in terms of Majors? Let's just use undergrads as an example. But then when you have interdisciplinary programs that have joint partnership, we then see a lot of times they're sort of just the responsibility of the faculty member is blurred where they have a commitment to you know, the interdisciplinary program versus the department and so what I'm thinking about is really how to welcome something new but don't lose that core educational foundation."
9. "I'm definitely in favor of that and it's very important to me that there is collaboration. I'm just not sure that it's just a wide-open door saying okay, if you want to be administratively belonging to the school you just have to say so and we strive to accommodate it. What expectations do you do you get when you when you say that way. I'm just thinking the process should be a little bit more nuanced, but I definitely agree with you that we want engagement with all set with those with all schools with everybody?"
10. "My experience is it's been very difficult to work across units especially with the business school being a separate unit in the University. It's really a huge pain. I teach outside the business school as well. And I have all kinds of issues with that when we tried joint appointments... So I think that a lot of thought has to be given to what's a primary affiliation."
11. "I could also see that there might be an entire migration in that entire faculty move over to the school because they might be better supported. So that's more like a reorganization than building a new school. That's one argument against this that I could see, but I hope that's not the case."
12. "I was just going to add on a general note that I think Stanford has a lot of institutes and various forms of institution that are located in departments and are less strongly associated with particular schools. And I think in general as an institution we could do with more kind of intellectual energy flowing back into departments and schools. So I don't think we need necessarily more institutes for things especially because as you've already pointed out, we already have an Institute for the environment."
13. "Yeah, I guess I'm wondering about the unasked question, which is what about those who are in units that may be absorbed into the new school, but don't feel that they fit. How is this going to work out? I know this is a concern in in several of the departments in S III that you know, people may work somewhat on these problems, but they work on other things as well. And I know colleagues are concerned about this. I'm surprised it's not something we're discussing."
14. "My experience with Stanford is this is one of the few places where students and faculty can go across departments and I would say we should try to expand that to go across different schools as well. And I think it will work out. I'm not too worried about the fact that maybe some people might want to go there and can't leave the department. So I would think it's a very good thing."
15. "I remember there was discussion yesterday. It came up about a little bit about this question and some of it some of the things I heard were that existing people in this new school would help we have an input on who else joins the school. But again, it's still a chicken and egg. It's not clear at all to me who decides who that initial membership of that school is going to be and whether everyone who hops in or almost everyone who hops in is going to be allowed to opt in and who's going to actually make that decision but seems like the one of the most critical steps it has to happen, and it's not at all clear."
16. "I just want to say that I don't think that you're going to have a problem with too many people sort of flocking to this school because if you are going to one of the things that's going to limit it is teaching. I mean if you're going to be 50% let's say I said, I was going to be 50% in electrical engineering and 50% in this new school. Then I would want to teach half of my classes in this new school and if there isn't a curriculum that fits that then that shouldn't be there as I think that you have to add to think about what you're going to teach in this world and it's that's going to also help help us. Find out how to populate the faculty."
17. "It's one of the things that strikes me about this that I totally agree with is that we're spending a lot of time thinking how to bring diversity into our institutions and into our deliberations. And this would be a very good time. It seems to me to include that diversity from the very beginning and figure out the governance structure that not only allows that but encourages it."
18. "A related issue to this or maybe it's tangential but it's something that came up. I actually brought it up on the chat yesterday, which is you know, this is looking to be a very interdisciplinary school collaborating with other schools and so on and with this collaborative work comes a challenge in giving people credit for their scholarship. So, you know, this is kind of a big issue with this school."
19. "I also just want to say that the proposal is not necessarily for anybody who would join right? I mean, I was initially thinking of that proposal as one that might apply to folks for whom the fit might not be immediately obvious or people like me. I would love to participate in these discussions, but do you guys want to play with me? Do I want to play with you? Right? I mean, we don't really know each other very well or at all, so just kind of feel like there needs to be some way, some mechanism for that to happen before we decide to stick together."

20. "Looks like this question is kind of aimed at the issue of whether within departments, there may be differences of interest and so individuals might be moving suffer from their departments. I think this makes a lot of sense. The civil and environmental engineering and biology seem like a couple departments where this might happen and it's going to be very difficult to get a consent that everybody remains either out of the school or in the school and so some sort of way to accommodate individuals seems important. I thought the comment that people might join who don't have work to do with sustainability and it seems like laughable to me. I don't know how anybody's kind of jumping into new initiatives just because they are twiddling their thumbs with nothing to do."
21. "So unlike yesterday when I found it difficult to understand why people would be opposed to some of the things that were being proposed suggested. This one seems to me a really bad idea. It seems to me that if you want the school to be excellent, the school needs to be able to hire the best people. We don't tell any of the other schools on in the University that they should strive to accommodate anybody in the University that wants to be part of them and if I want this school to be as excellent as the other schools, it should operate under the same rules."
22. "I'm cautious about this too. I think there should be lots of opportunities for people to affiliate in some way with the new school, but that does not have to mean wholesale moving of billets over at will because I do wonder about what happens to departments that are left behind and I say that as somebody from a social science department, political science, where I can imagine that maybe some people would want to have some connection with this but there's no way would we want the whole department to move that way. And so we would have to figure out ways for a couple of people from certain particular social science departments to work their way into the school."
23. "My view is somewhat consistent with previous commenters is the way to get new, particularly interdisciplinary collaboration going is create a safe space, a level playing field for people to join together in the middle and not have it look like a acquisition and merger but rather a joint effort. So everybody has equal rights and opportunities on the inbound. I think there should be a process that tries to help people who want to join but doesn't guarantee them the right to join. It's literally a two-way street."
24. "I think it's a chicken in the egg type question in the sense that you need a critical mass. If it's just one person moving into a new school then what are they teaching? What kind of Department would they be in? There needs to be a chunk from each of the subgroups in there. But I also agree that there needs to be a limit to accommodation as the new school would have to presumably pay somebody's salary. So if they're not really doing anything related to sustainability, hw does that fit? So maybe there's an application process or something of that nature."
25. "I think this is where the question of what the research areas are going to be in the new school becomes really important. I know we have that list of items a2j, but I think depending on what ends up being a priority if it even emerges from that list. What Becomes of the Earth Sciences School sort of it is part of that consideration because you don't want to be duplicating but there are implications in keeping those two sort of sub-areas, multiples of areas, quite separate."
26. "It seems to me that the people who are really the core of the department should have the biggest voice in how the department gets constructed. So I agree that people should be able to participate but I think their voices shouldn't outweigh people (for whom) that's really their roots."
27. "So I'm in civil and environmental engineering and our department is basically up for grabs for the new school. So we have had a lot of discussions with the dean of the School of Earth as well. And it's difficult for our department. Some of us feel really strongly to join that new school. Some of us want to stay in the School of Engineering. So for many of us kind of joint split Department between the two schools is the ideal. Not sure if that's going to happen and not sure what's going to happen. If afterwards individual members want to join I think they should accommodate individual members as well."
28. "I think at the end of the day it's not going to be the administration. It's going to be for individual faculty members. It's going to be a negotiation between them and their department and it's going to be a human side of what do you want to break eggs or not break eggs and how you kept whether you can move in a partial way and still be functioning well, or whether you have to make a yes or no decision and that probably is going to be made more at the departmental level in the school level, not at the top level."
29. "I can start I reflected on this question as a department chair and people asking or faculty seeking courtesy appointments. I haven't seen any evidence during my five years as department chair of anyone wanting to join our department who wasn't a wonderful fit. So I struggled a bit to imagine circumstances under which someone would want to to join yet would not be a good fit."
30. "In principle, this could be great right that everybody can (join)... (but) this type of participation means there are no chosen members at the beginning and then everybody just comes rushing in so I would think it would be better to choose members in the beginning in a different process not by self-selection and then other people can come and participate through other means."
31. "I'm a member of two departments...but lots of people are constantly wanting to come in and without some sort of process for selection and review a qualifications. It seems to me it would be much more chaotic than it is already. So I think that some sort of wedding structure needs to be in place and it's not entirely voluntary to join a department or school for that matter."
32. "You could end up with some very unexpected people signing up to participate and and they just may not be a good fit at all based at least on what they've done to date. They may have an intention to do stuff in the future in let's say the sustainability space, but I think at least early on targeting people whose overlap as most obvious and then gradually building up."
33. "I think that by letting people join just because they want to would make it very difficult for the new Department chairs and the Deans who really put their Vision forward and decide how they're going to emphasize what they're going to do. Obviously that everybody will be able to join the new department and much of what they do may not be what the Department wants to be their emphasis."
34. "I guess there could be different levels of Engagement. Some people might be engaged in the sense that they get the list of seminars that people are going to, other people may get a third of their salary or some summer salary or funding for research assistants, or what have you so you could have different levels of Engagement for people and someone has to decide that obviously who gets involved and how much each person is getting involved. But I think that'll work out once the sort of leadership of the new school is assembled and there's no committee leading things. I think there will be people who can make those decisions and they don't have to be locked in forever at some level. It's harder to have someone nudge someone out than bring someone inside."
35. "I think this comes back to the thing that we thought we were going to discuss yesterday...what critical mass do we need in each of these different areas? And that's the starting point. ...we only have resources to spread so far. And now how do we begin to expand from here? The initial conditions will determine the filters that we use to decide."
36. "Well, I mean, I think from the point of view of the department, you know of Earth's systems that makes a lot of sense, but I don't think just anybody from any Department that may not have done any studies or any work in sustainability should have the right to get into it. I think they have the right to apply but I think there's got to be some screening about levels of involvement. Who do you put into your core faculty? And who do you maybe have as an affiliate?"

37. “Part of this is going to be shaped by whether we're talking about joint appointments and what percentage time or courtesy appointments. I'll also say that, you know, the university is obviously at some point going to have to worry if you have a potential flow out of from other departments into this new school and that gets back to the question of how many new billets are going to be added.”
38. “What departments will be part of this school. And how many of those would be there. I got a little confused about even the point about Arts and Sciences. I would think that those departments will decide you know who from Arts and Sciences would like to go to that new school rather than here's a free check that anybody who wants from art science has to go to the new school. Maybe there are other things that are going in the background that I am not familiar with but I think the Departments would be kind of the foundation for this new school and we should let this departments decide who comes in.”
39. “I think I'll there won't be a huge rush. I think it'll come from Woods and Precourt and people who are already involved with those institutes who are not part of Earth already and there has to be some way of deciding who is in the school and who is not and it's also got to be clear about what happens whether you're there or joint appointments whether it's courtesy. I'm in political science. I'm not going to leave political science to join the new school, but I would certainly want to be an affiliated...”
40. “I think it's a little bit strange that this question comes before the one that's a few ahead about transitioning with seven schools versus eight schools. I think that's a central question that comes before maybe this question.”
41. “I think the school has to retain some power or somebody the administration of the school has to retain some power to turn people down.”
42. “I think another question to think about is whether the existing Department should have any say in it any veto in it. Let's say ...your departure from your current Department would cause serious problems with that current Department. Even if your research fits well with the new school do we think the current Department should have any say or have a veto over a move? I think this is an interesting question.”
43. “We heard that environmental science is number one ranked in the country. So is environmental engineering number one ranked in the country and when we jeopardize our standings if we move to a new school, that's a very serious question. On the other hand, it looks like the university is going to put a lot of resources in this and if this is a new direction with a support of the president should we be on that train or are we going to get left in the station? I think we want to be aligned with the goals of the administration.”

Proposal 7: The faculty members of the New School should collectively undertake a process to finalize the design the academic structure.

1. “I also appreciate the opportunity of the new school.... how do you get people who sit in departments across the university to collaborate on certain issues and how do you promote that transdisciplinary? Really requires an investment of time and energy and particularly for young people to come in whom we need in those endeavors the most, how do we incentivize them to come in? I think these are university-wide issues.”
2. “I think we're going to need to define a school that's very different from other schools that allow other faculty from outside to engage in the teaching... more research collaboration.”
3. “Sounds like a bit of a chicken and egg problem, which is how do we decide who the faculty of the new school are before we define a structure
4. “It seems to me that it's not a tenable thing to just throw out a call for faculty and say who wants to be in the new school and then let's figure out how it's going to work. I think initially there has to be some sort of overall structure set up from the top and then within that structure faculty come in...but I just can't see it working to have fifty, a hundred faculty, saying “Oh let's build it from scratch.”
5. Imagine you're trying to recruit someone. You say would you like to join our school? And I said, well what department would I be part of? Well, you could be part of that process that you know that decides and they go no, no. No, I need to I need to get better guarantees. I need to understand more about it than that.”
6. “I think it would be incredibly interesting to have an iterative engagement process with all 200 of us, you know over time to think through those options some of which the structures committee have already laid out...”
7. “Again, I think this is a no-brainer in a sense that those who participate in the school design the school just as at present if I want to change the structure of my school or my department I mobilize my colleagues and make a proposal to do so.”
8. “My biggest worry is that Junior faculty members that don't see themselves represented are not left behind. So several of my colleagues already expressed to meet the that they have concerns in that regard.”
9. “It would be wonderful if the school could remain adaptive and you know, we're basically doing a pretty big experiment. And so I feel like there's a need to recognize that there's an iteration where yes, maybe the core group of really dedicated faculty starts with a structure that then kind of iterates as we grow and finalize it... I think there has to be a prototyping phase and I realize that's hard administratively, but I think that would be useful for them to consider.”
10. “I do think it pays to have some outside folks looking at this too and making suggestions again. So it doesn't just become a group of people just feathering their own nest. So I think some big vision people would be very useful to help guide this process.”
11. “I was just gonna say that the I can imagine a sort of natural process. Whereby people who are most invested in this new school jump in early and therefore have a disproportionate sort of role in shaping it and then other people can choose whether or not to join later that would seem to be how this sort of process ought to work...that has both advantages and disadvantages.”
12. “Well, I think there's there's two parts to this one. How much of Earth Sciences wouldn't fit in this new school? And the second one that comes in is constructing the seventh School in a way that it's really a new school and it's not as number of us have heard from colleagues and Earth Sciences us joining them somehow coming to their their Club. So I think this also has been a problem of messaging perhaps that also needs results kind of those two issues are both have to do with seven or eight.”
13. “I think the people in the group should start talking about what the structure is, but that has this chicken and egg problem that we keep on talking about: who's going to join our organization that has no internal structure? What do people think about the ideas that there's some temporary structures... there's an expectation that those structures will change over the first years or first decade in the school is do you think that's workable or do you think that's not workable?”

14. “I think the question of the proper size is an important one, but I also think that this question is asking us to weigh in on how the structure of the school should be determined whether the people who initially are starting...should engage in a collective decision to figure out the structure that seems to me a good idea. It seems to me that that should affect how many people you want initially and what kind of people you want. Initially, but I do think that if we want this school to thrive, we need to get the right group of people and then we need to let them engage in a collective discernment process to figure out the right structure for their work.”
15. “Wanted to also bring up the point that the question about academic structure in a lot of physical science departments really surrounds training and if you're if you're training chemists, then you're in a chemistry department and if you're not training chemist, then you're not. And that will be a very strong guideposts in how the academics is organized.”
16. “I guess on the positive side, a lot of times you run up against some bizarre rule and you ask why it's there and people say oh, I've just always done it that way and so this is an opportunity to really reimagine, from scratch and then you can be the ones, you know, 20 years from now saying because that's how we did it when we built this new school.”
17. “Well, I think this question relates to the design of the academic structure. So in that regard, I feel that yes, of course the faculty of the new school should do that. But again, I really voice the opinion that the core faculty you'd be a hundred percent and these other people are joint appointments and they come from another department. So their roots are really in another place. It seems to me that the core faculty should really be the ones to design the academic structure with input.”
18. “Let's say those people who are in school of Earth right now, which has a majority who probably will move to the new school. Will they have more say in how the new school should look like compared to those people who then join? I think many people in the school of Earth still think that this is a school of Earth plus. That's the mindset of some of the people in the school of Earth and how can we change that?”
19. “I think potentially a good way to approach this problem and maybe one that's already been pursued is to get a critical mass of faculty, students and postdocs together who identify what are the most, critical kind of short term and also long-term problems in sustainability and they probably reflect some of the department structure that we spoke about yesterday, like, Urban cities and oceans, human health environmental justice, but maybe if there were Workshop like this kind of focus on what are the core problems with, you know breakout sessions. I think kind of naturally people would gravitate to discussing what the solutions to those problems might be and that might help form.”
20. “If there's going to be at least some faculty members that are involuntarily switching to this new school because we're not starting completely from scratch with new hires then if you're completely recreating the Department's for these people, they should have some say but I also agree it shouldn't be complete saying there needs to be more leadership.”
21. “Yeah, I think the real challenge here is trying to develop something new in the new school in the context of existing departments without weakening those departments. But serving those people within various departments who would like to do more solutions oriented research and I don't read anything into the new plan about advocating or we were forcing to be Advocates...”
22. “This chicken egg things keeps coming up. I just I do worry a little bit with this new school... Let's design the academic structure once all the faculty have been assembled that that's going to be a deterrent to people especially to potential hires to come because they have no idea what they're joining.”
23. “Although so I agree but this feels like another one of those chicken and egg kinds of questions. You know, of course the faculty who make up the school should have a say in the design of the structure of the school and yet how do you know how to move on, you know how to choose to be a part of that school without knowing a little bit enough about what it looks like?”
24. “I don't know why this hasn't been done yet. But I think that among the things people most care about when fretting about this new school, myself included, is what is the name of the school? And what is the name of the department? I'll be in and I think if they just asked everyone to name their ideal expected Department, we would see clusters immediately and then they could they could do some self-organizing maps analysis or something and then just say, okay. Well here are the five departments. We agree that the missions all belong to school like that simple survey of the name, which is everything to a lot of people just hasn't been done. And that's why we continue to be stuck in my opinion.”
25. “So for me sustainability, it's not such a useful term in that it can cover so much material. And in fact sustainability should pervade all of the unit's administrative academic throughout the university. So it's not a useful word in my opinion for Designing academic units unless it's defined and that was one of the first questions. I asked nearly two years ago And in one very revealing meetings got Finn dorf simply told me he wasn't sure he didn't know what exactly what we meant and without defining some boundaries.”
26. “Okay, so we have a school which is fairly actually named and has a lot of resources related to planetary science and so on and so forth. Does anyone have a sense of the creation of the new school? So is this or we getting a fresh start because we have to expand the Ambit of what? We are already doing in the school of Earth. I mean, is that the idea and if so, where is the aunt? Where's the important part of that expansion? And how do we reflect it in this new?”
27. “Well, I'm not sure I know enough about how we vet new courses and departments inside the administrative structure but it seems to me that one way or another it has to be kind of a process where the school thinks of its structure and plans but given that it's got a very broad reach. It should come back to either committees or the academic Senate and the administration and an iterative fashion in the first couple years. So that because so much of the resources to being devoted to this. It seems to me that there is an institutional interest as well as a kind of specific focus of the faculty that needs to get expressed over this development period.”
28. “I think maybe we've covered all this enough, but just to confirm at least for my own understanding. I think what we're saying now is that the school needs to be well enough to find that people can make an intelligent choice about whether they want to be part of it and that probably means that you if we're going to have departments that departments need to have been sort of set out and something about the sort of mandate of the school and made the philosophy of the school. But then the faculty who are assembled then take that forward the challenge of bringing it to life and figure going out how those departments work together how they engage faculty outside the school and so forth. Is that anyway, that's what I'm here.”
29. “I think also knowing whether the departments will be organized disciplinarily or around topics would be a huge decision maker whether to join or not for me. So I would want to know whether one or both are going to exist.”
30. “I do think that it is an important distinction between the structure that's already created and that's formed by the members and I guess I would say one way of kind of helping this move along is kind of like what we did with presentation of school vs. College or a hybrid between the two is to maybe come up with

three structures that are or two structures that are helpful to kind of wrap our minds around and I totally think that the people that are part of that school should be making the decision about what they want to participate in but maybe giving us some structure to go forward with would be.”

31. “Although so I agree but this feels like another one of those chicken and egg kinds of questions. You know, of course the faculty who make up the school should have a say in the design of the structure of the school and yet how do you know how to move on, you know how to choose to be a part of that school without knowing a little bit enough about what it looks like...”
32. “I think the comparison to computer science is a good one because 50 60 years ago computer science as a discipline didn't really exist and it has emerged largely out of electrical engineering logic, mathematics and it has happened in an incremental evolutionary fashion with a lot of people initially had joint appointments and then kind of it became a life of its own I can imagine a similar Evolution here where maybe a few people start incrementally so joint appointments and once we have got this sufficient momentum intellectually.”

Proposal 8: Stanford should emerge from the transition with seven schools: H&S, Law, GSB, Engineering, Medicine, Education, and the New School.

1. “They want to change the name to be more all-encompassing because then they can sell it to some very big donors. So if you want to have all these great new things happen to solve the problems of the world and the climate and Earth and energy because energy is very strongly connected with all of these things. Then you've got to get a very big donor who will you know endow the centers, the new school”
2. “At first I was thinking it makes a lot of sense, a lot of the structure’s in place in in school of Earth. Let's just make that modification basically, but now I'm thinking that it does make more sense to have eight schools rather than seven on because not all faculty members in school of Earth want to be in this and it just seems to me that we've got a strong school over it already and it if we really want to make a statement. This should be a new school. Not just modifying one that's already there.”
3. “You know the idea of having school of Earth and this new school. I think you know speaking from sort of the inside... I don't think that would be tenable at all because frankly 80% of what's called Earth does fits easily into the school of sustainability or whatever we're going to call it and maybe more than that. So I don't think it would be terrible to have a school of Earth and this new school is the emphasis of the new school is sustainability have some of us have to move to engineering but I think seven schools is the best approach.”
4. “Well, as a member of the GSB I can tell you that I know from firsthand experience of basically having grown replications of department. So we have an econ Department. We have the OB the organizational behavior is basically a sociology and psychology departments and there's some competition between them. It's not particularly healthy in my view so it can be under certain circumstances. But this discussion it occurred to me that that two schools would make sense if the focus of the sustainability school will not be disciplinary if it would really be phenomenon oriented. But if the purpose would be to just replicate departments that already exists, then we would create unhealthy competition.”
5. “I think part of the problem is this little false dichotomy as well about the argument about what the minimum size of the school should be because if you look at the facts, you know, there's at least three schools that are you know, less than a hundred. And so this whole concept like if we don't have a school that's bigger than a hundred a hundred and fifty then.... So if the school of Earth went, was 50 or 60 people is it still could be you know with the traditional Earth departments and maintaining that excellence in world leadership in that and the school of climate and sustainability starts out at about that number and then grows. I don't see a problem with that to be honest with you.”
6. “I think the con that it would make faculty less welcome to join is not true. I think that we've heard that there's quite a few folks that would like to participate in sustainability and I guess my own perspective is again, I went back to look at the mission statements in the activities that our schools were currently doing and it made sense that really the sustainability is a piece of Earth and Earth could strengthen in different ways again the question is which ways. But I think many folks would partner. I don't feel like outsiders.”
7. “We usually think about ten year Horizons and that schools and colleges seem to have much longer lifetimes. So what is the life cycle of a school? Should every school or college be reinvented on a 50-year timeline for instance? And then this just happens to be the time which is next.”
8. “I think one thing that would help is if everyone, every school were to imagine a department that was where people did truly interdisciplinary work down to sustainability who would want to be in such a school if there were resources available and it was very attractive to do so? Then we'd have a kind of a subset of people whom we could be talking with who could help formulate the next step.”
9. “I'll just say again as an outsider to go back to the question is that my instinct would be that the seven School model looks more plausible to me. But I also recognize that those of you who are closer to the issue see that raises issues. And so I guess I'm curious whether those of you who would be affected by this... do you think a 7 School model is better than an 8 school model?”
10. “I want to make sure that the voice is clear coming from at least my perspective. I would very much favor a new school being developed from the ground up for the simple reason that if we're looking now at the cons, for example, they're really centered on one specific con S III and what's happening with structures that we already know today. We're not even considering how people from the humanities and social sciences are going to be integrated very quickly.”
11. “We're concerned about things that work well being broken just to be shoehorned into the new school. Sometimes they fit sometimes they don't and so me it seems to me that the question is whether it's seven schools or eight schools. What's the what's the cost of having an 8th school at least in a transition period?”
12. “What is the smallest viable size for a school given if we formed an eight school, as I said before most of us S III would move into it and the small minority would not and then what happens to those people? ...It's great to build this great new school. But if it's disadvantaging a significant fraction of faculty, that's not that's not the outcome we want either.”
13. “I've been thinking about this a bit since yesterday and one of the problems with having the seven schools, is that the current School of Earth transforms into this other thing and so it's almost natural that it will grow from there or transform from there. And then we're almost left with the momentum of that school. It's a great school. I totally agree, but it doesn't have a huge amount in it that we desperately need like the biology of the planet and the ecosystems that control it in the sociology and the racial Justice. Those will be hard to add if we're just taking this thing.”
14. “The real question is what to do with the school of Earth... I think some of the participants here are saying don't really fit in a new school. So could we spend some time talking about how to do the transition because I actually think the school of Earth is a problem for the University because it's too small compared to the other schools.”

15. “That kind of goes back to the chicken and egg problem. Because we're asking people now if they want to join and it's not really clear what the what the culture is going to be, I agree that the 8 school option is probably not the right way to go. But I think it's going to be very important to not say this is the new school, but this is really a new school that is Broad and includes these people from the social sciences and we're going to need all these people to actually get to sustainability.”
16. “Well to me, I think this is kind of a no-brainer because the School of Earth is so good. And so important that we need what they have or at least most of it. I think the risk here is the by using the school of Earth as a base we end up with that the existing culture of that school really controlling everything that happens. Not that there's something wrong with their culture just that incoming people are then in an environment that's already existed for a long time. And it's harder to break out in the established new ways of doing things.”
17. “If the alternative is having both the school of Earth and this new school, neither of them will be large enough to be able to survive in the academic environment and they're both going to be competing for the same space. I don't see any real option other than it is going to be a school that's involving people from the school of Earth... I just don't see how you can mechanically do it otherwise and still stay viable.”
18. “Let me just do a big bombshell in this whole thing. What I am concerned about this school is it will become ideologically pure...unless you have a certain set of beliefs that is that you want to move away really from fossil fuels that they don't have a place, that the biggest issue is going to be in the environment not trade-offs with the economy. You're not welcome in this school if that's the case and it turns out to be an ideologically pure school. We may have a real problem.”
19. “I just wanted to say I do support and like the idea of having seven schools. I know there's been an enormous amount of work put into designing things so far...I think defining the problems and the mission of the school... I can I can definitely see a home for some of the fundamental topics within the new school and I think if you look to places like Woods Hole or Scripps Institute of Oceanography, you'll find those fundamental topics like geophysics or geochemistry within their Institute of oceanography..”
20. “Not rushing to join the new school there. In fact resisting go quite strongly like precourt and woods institutes that they have want to join a market. That's my understanding.”
21. “I would add to that. I we've had a lot of discussions in Woods and there's a lot of enthusiasm for the new school and not just waiting for what its shape is going to be but trying to influence its shape. There are 50 or 60 ocean Sciences people who have already written a plan for how they would like to see the structure of the new school to maximize the benefits of work. They're already doing protecting those in the current structures, but also building to the new school Hopkins Marine station is probably 80% of the way of jumping into the new school. So I think it'd be unfair to say there's not a lot of support.”
22. “It's just that human fear of building something new and worried that you're going to lose out on everything good that you had before right I think and not having any details.”
23. I think it doesn't seem on the surface to make a lot of sense to have a school of Earth and the school of Climate or Sustainability. ...most of us are worried about the sort of fundamental research being put up front as a priority or mission for the school.... it doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to have eight schools with a lot of overlap between Sustainability and Earth.”
24. “We spent a lot of time talking about the name. There's a lot of people who would like Earth or some kind of Earth Sciences to be in there. But then of course you want the name to be pretty short and Punchy. It's going to be kind of reduced to one word anyway.”
25. “Okay, since no one spoke a very important part of this is focused on policy effects of the new school and yet Stanford has no school of public policy. And so if one really wanted to have the one two punch it might be most appropriate to think of adding a school of public policy.”
26. “My understanding is that we want to get a bunch of money from donors and donors don't like to support t things that exist but they like to be founding partners of new things. And so part of this theater is a way to allow people to be at the root of something new even though we do have a really successful School of Earth that just you know has grown too big for its buildings.”
27. “If this were an Ideal World and we just think about it in terms of the intellectual arguments I could see why you could have something completely distinct than go to 8 but as I read the paper every morning, I think we're stuck in a crisis that's going to last a few years. So you're trying to launch something at a time of Economic and health uncertainty and it just seems to me it may be a safer path to keep it to seven and to absorb even if there are intellectual problems with absorbing the existing School of Earth Systems, and then if you need to break away later, you could think about doing that.”
28. “Lets just say that the school is school is for sustainability and there are some faculty in the school of Earth say geology in the geology Department who don't want see themselves in that school. Is that an argument for creating it as an eight school or could that faculty move into H and S Department of geology in H and S as a viable alternative?”
29. “It seems to me the core intellectual problem is combining a professional school with a traditional academic school...where a professional school has an orientation to training people that go out there and get certain kinds of jobs...a much more applied focus in terms of its research now. That tension exists in the law school, exist in the business school where you have both elements. ... the law schools law schools were moving in the direction of bringing in more sort of scholarship that wasn't necessarily about occupational training. But then in response to what the market was doing, they've switched back more to being a training and vocational orientation. Now the problem is that that that ambivalence between whether you're training for vocational versus purely academic plays out in terms of what you're doing. the students, what your tenure decisions are going to be, to what degree it's about actually getting out in the world...”
30. “I'd still like to hear from the people in or around the School of Earth. Whether the model that's being contemplated..you favor. If it's not just a complete merger of the existing School of Earth into the new school whether the model you favor is an 8th school or just some remaining departments merged into engineering or H&S.”
31. “I will put my cards on the table. I think a new school is the way to go because I really think that we do need a culture change in a variety of dimensions at Stanford and the and climate change sustainability food security a whole series of issues that are related to sustainability as well as protection of the earth as Earth's the school of Earth does are absolutely central, but we need a new way to think about that and not be totally stuck in the old ways. So I'm an advocate of a new school...”

Proposal 9: The New School should include in its organizational structure the Woods Institute for the Environment.

1. “Woods is more of the sort of conduit to applied practice... how do we value that applied work or that impact work? I think that Woods is really well set up to do that given their endowment and their connections with donors that are looking for more applied work... not only as an interface to the university, but it is an interface to the external world.”
2. “How do we build that new school? Maybe instead of sort of looking at the existing School of Earth as a template to build from maybe what we should be doing is looking at these cross-cutting interdisciplinary research institutes and trying to figure out how to start building this new school more by using them as a template. What are the problems that people are getting funded for who are the people that are most involved? Where are the Partnerships coming from? I'd love to see analyses of all of that.”
3. “My personal opinion is: this is absolutely clear that Woods Institute should be part of this school. It's a much stronger position for The Institute. It can still play the role of reaching across the university and reaching outside of the university and in fact may be better, but it becomes a really strong and well-supported part of the story. It's good for the University to because it's easier in a sense to explain that we have a school that includes these incredibly important institutes than to say we have a school.”
4. “We had questions previously about Earth sciences. And where those faculty would go with a new school. Can you speak you to whether there are perhaps any groups within the Precourt who might find a better home say in engineering?”
5. “As someone who hasn't been at Stanford for that long...so this sort of an outsider perspective. It seems like part of the reason why the proposals are coming for a new school is because the nimbleness and the emergence of things like Woods Institute and Precourt were pushing in a direction which then says okay. Now we need to codify that. My concern would be that once that gets codified into a new school that the nimbleness kind of disappears.”
6. “There is some concern that schools tend to be more inward-looking...and so the threat about being within the school is that it could make it that the Woods could then become more insular and not do this big outreach across the university. On the other hand, if you say that the Woods Institute is going to be outside the new school while you finally made a major commitment. To say we're going to go for climate and sustainability and then Woods is not a part of it, that seems to be a problematic message.”
7. “Not leveraging these institutes I think would be a big mistake. And if you could align if the fixing is the alignment of the fundraising and the development side, let's fix that but let's not lose the forest just because we're looking at the tree of leveraging the opportunity of integrating these institutes in somewhere.”
8. “It I think one one thing I will note about Woods is that gets it goes back to our discussion yesterday about inter-school collaboration versus intra School collaboration. And I think to the extent that Woods gets absorbed into the new school, which I agree, it should, it could actually fill that function as being the part of the school that looks to build connections with H and S and other schools that are not necessarily part of the school, but are relevant to questions of climate and sustainability.”
9. “Woods Institute and Precourt also have this history of success and learning and how to promote interdisciplinarity sustainability. And so it seems like a key foundations for the school definitely something to in some way Incorporated in the school. That's 20 years of success in this area.”
10. “What I would say is that it, you know while thinking about Woods as a model. I think it's also good to think about expanding the model. So Woods has been quite difficult for those of us in the qualitative social sciences and Humanities to get any kind of grip on. I mean not that I need to grip it but, you know to find an entry point is a better way of saying it.”
11. “In general I'm in favor of preserving all the independent Labs outside the school these independent labs are setup to as a bridge between different departments and different schools and it should not be should not be just taken in by the school and I see that I'm actually Senior fellow in Precourt so that potential next question and also director of gives them which is independent lab. And so these and you see how these things can operate very effectively under the dinner.”
12. “I mean what I worry about is if Woods get subsumed in entirely into a new school, then what's the point of having Woods would seems to me like the outward facing and to take for the rest of the university and the way I mean, it's almost like the starter Drive Great. It gets you gets you sucked into sustainability if you're coming from one of the other schools.”
13. “I think it's really important as with all of these questions that we define what the mission of the school and what the mission of the Woods Institute is going to be. I'm of two minds On the one hand it seems like if you have a school of sustainability then Woods becomes completely redundant but on the other hand you could imagine constructing a mission that made it more outward facing to the university may be more outward facing to Industry.”
14. “I don't think it's within our purview to worry about how the donors feel. This is really about what we think might work best in the new school. I personally would love to see Woods have very close ties of some kind with the school of sustainability. I'm not sure exactly what organizational structure that means. And I feel that woods and precourt as well. Bring Dimensions to the school that you don't get from academic departments from typical faculty members focused on their research.”
15. “So Woods maybe a less attractive second home for existing faculty and less successful advocate for funding and filling joint positions. So we talked a little bit about maybe it's just kind of seeming that most of the joint appointments would be with with existing departments or however, whatever the new organization of the new school looks like and woods again. I just am wondering given how challenging it has been to get these joint appointments with other faculty members across the university. Is this a real con or is this? I mean just because I just has been so challenging.”
16. “I think the danger is if Woods stays separate then it really becomes quite confusing as to what the difference between these two entities are and I hope maybe within the new structure they will still be disciplinary departments and cross disciplinary programs within the school.”
17. “It seems like a lot of people are worried about like this new school closing off and not allowing any collaborations, which I've never felt is a problem here at Stanford. I have collaborations with the med school.. with people at School of Engineering. I just walk over and talk to them and we write a grant together and it gets done. So I don't understand why if there is a new school there's this worry that like, oh, you're going to steal our social scientist.”
18. “I think the institutes have brought a couple of signature strengths at least in the case of Woods....the strength of working across all the seven schools. A second is an orientation towards external engagement and doing work that that connects to policymakers and others. I think the concern that in our conversations with Woods has been if there's a new school, does that become the bright shiny object at the heart of the sustainability and Should have in and

does that in the end divert attention and resources from what the school, what the institute could do. Or is there a way to bring all these pieces together in a sustainability package?"

19. "Can I just pick up on that point for a second because I think that's really important that school will have core faculty. We've talked about the various kinds of affiliations that you would seek with faculty who remain in other schools and that gets them very quickly to the competition for time with the institute's that you've just described."
20. "So one of the questions around Woods is whether it should exist outside the school and bridge all the schools together around issues of environment sustainability or whether it should sit inside the school and I think the idea of it sitting inside the school but really being kind of transmembrane boundary that pulls the other schools in is a really great vehicle."
21. "I'm actually struggling with this a bit. I do think it should be integrated but I don't want it to lose what it does, which is really to reach out to people in so many other parts of the university and I'm having trouble getting my head around the right organizational structure here right now like FSI or CASBS."
22. "Seems like you could use the insights of what's been successful so far within the school. There are some things you need disciplines for - how do you produce knowledge? How do you vet whether people are vanguards or charlatans. How do you evaluate knowledge production? And then how do you synthesize people across problems? And it seems like Woods is this more horizontal piece of this sort of Matrix structure at present and I think the new school would need to do things like that."
23. "Yeah, I think I am aware at least of maybe one of those situations and it I from what I've absorbed in my little time here. It's frustrating for our department to so infrequently be in charge of our own destiny because money Source has come that we may be only have half a say in and so we can't strategically grow like if we could strategically grow we would have a search for environmental justice yesterday, but instead money comes from lots of different sources and then either we are opportunist and we take it because it could be a great candidate or it's a bad fit, but we wouldn't look for them anyways."
24. "I think we're all thinking that of course. these institutes should be under the umbrella of the new school. Of course, people should be able to opt into the new school if that's the purpose and it's all then about the structure of the organization of that."

Proposal 10: The New School should include in its organizational structure the Precourt Institute for Energy.

1. "They do find a lot of research on Clean Energy Technologies, you know, they're really interested in Grid modernization questions. There's a slew of about 50 researchers that work on electricity systems across campus and I engaged in their seminar series and really appreciate that bringing together of people across campus. So and I think they'd actually do a very nice job in seminar series of also engaging the business community. Maybe a little bit more so than Woods has in the past event. I think Woods does but Precourt has really done very effectively."
2. "I think in Broad terms (Precourt) to be much like Woods except it's focused on energy instead of the environment. A lot of the activities are associated with sustainable energy because that's where the excitement in research actually is. I think what this question comes down to and maybe causes us to think differently about previous one: which is the content of Woods and the content of Precourt? What will get absorbed into this new school?"
3. "We're not getting a sustainable world by complaining or pointing fingers at the bad guys. We're getting one by building a better world with better technology and better ideas. And so to me, it includes a heavy engineering component. It became very clear to me yesterday that there's a significant faction that you know doesn't want to sully their hands with such dirty work and so I think the Precourt question is intimately tied into these questions of industrial Affiliates. Are they verboten?"
4. "I agree that the arguments here are pretty much similar to the arguments for the Woods. I don't see the advantage of making it part of the school. You know, one of the arguments against was that it's already involved as a resource for all seven schools. And so, you know, I don't know how bringing into this school is going to change or improve on that."
5. "I think it's unsettling that when we talk about the energy Institute. We immediately go and talk about fossil fuels that's an industry that makes a huge amount of money and is just one one thing going on. The energy Institute itself has lots of other opportunities and they do a lot of other work outside the fossil fuel type of structure the ability of huge corporations to co-op research and co-op messages is pretty clear. And so I think that's a danger that we have to folk. The have to face Precourt itself can certainly function really well without being tied to the fossil fuel industry. It would be it would be vastly better if they were not tied."
6. "Yeah, I think that if you look at funding from fossil fuel history, of course energy is a way broader than fossil fuel in the industry. This is already been declining significantly over the last few years. And I think it's going to decline very, very fast. It's a dying industry and if you heard about for example General Motors commitment to making electrical Vehicles by 2035, I will just let this process play out. I don't have a problem surly with that. I think it's just going to happen naturally and the focus of Energy Research is definitely going into very different directions."
7. "If anything the argument is stronger for Precourt to be not be in the school of sustainability because it funds a lot of things that are pretty fundamental physics and chemistry that are funded to faculty that are in H&S or an engineering."
8. "I think everything that we've said about Woods applies to Precourt unless somebody has some twist that we need to consider."
9. "It seems to me that there's huge advantages for them to stay as an interdisciplinary Cross School entity. But have people that want to be core faculty of the new school joint."
10. "One thing that isn't mentioned here because I guess Precourt and Woods don't have an educational component. But it's I think it would be interesting to think about what, if they are part of the new school do they then take on an educational component and because if one of the issues at least with words has been it's been difficult to hire certain faculties. So if they're under the school, then it might be easier to attract them. Don't know if that's necessarily true. Maybe we just need the sustainability school to attract them, but it does feel like they should possibly have an educational component, but that would be broadening their mission."
11. "I think it's set up somewhat similar to Woods, although I think that a lot more of their funding derives from what corporate sponsorships like, for example with this or that Energy company rather than unrestricted donors. I could be wrong about that. But the overlap of the Precourt with the new school seems a little less clear than Woods."

12. "Yeah, I think from my perspective of someone who has not been involved with either they are rather similar, but the details are different. But it certainly feels like we're not going to solve the climate sustainability problem without addressing energy. So it does seem very central to this historically."
13. "I was just suggesting that it seems like it makes more sense to have it be a cross school organization as opposed to fully within the new school of sustainability. I don't know. But everything Precourt does really is about transitions of energy. And if so, then maybe that's a better place for it. I was just suggesting the justification for including it fully in the new school isn't as clear to me."
14. "For the reasons you just gave this actually would argue the reverse. I like it in the school so that it pulls all of that weight from engineering and so on into climate sustainability and that those two then really work in concert and for me that it integrates better being like would sitting on the boundary of the new school, but actually within the new school."