begun. The above-grade part of the complex, on columnar stilts to allow pedestrian passage, will enclose a quadrangle in the courtyard north of the Science Center (the roof over the current hole), which will become a performance space.

Even with much bigger equipment than Mike’s steam shovel (and help from many sidewalk superintendents), it took many days longer, and millions of dollars that may have significant effects on the future composition of the University’s faculty. Meanwhile, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) designated its own senior diversity adviser—one of a set of counterparts in each school who will work internally and, with Hammonds, on University-wide concerns. Separately, new research by a Harvard Graduate School of Education (GSE) scholar indicates some of the effects of teachers’ gender on students’ courses of study.

Hammonds, professor of the history of science and of African and African American studies, said in an interview that she had “learned a great deal about Harvard” through the task force’s investigations, and now wanted “to be a part of the implementation,” even at the cost of forgone teaching and research. Although dozens of steps are involved—from faculty and staff training programs to new recruiting procedures, changes in family benefits, and innovative ways of funding research—Hammonds described as her overarching priorities tenured appointments and the environment in which Harvard junior faculty members work.

As adviser to the president and provost, Hammonds will vet the files submitted when candidates for tenure are reviewed during the appointment procedure. Her aim, she said, will be to assess whether “the process of building the case has been as broad as possible.” She will also “review junior-faculty and other term appointments across the University,” according to the July 20 news release accompanying her appointment. Paying systematic attention to junior
Hammonds intends to form a council of expert faculty members—such as sociologists who have studied the influence of affirmative action guidelines and practices on institutional behavior—who can help the University create a more diverse faculty. They will also assist in allocating the funds set aside to facilitate appointments that contribute to faculty diversity. The second group will be the diversity advisors designated by each dean.

Two groups will advise her. Hammonds intends to form a council of expert faculty members—such as sociologists who have studied the influence of affirmative action guidelines and practices on institutional behavior—who can help the University create a more diverse faculty.

University’s spokesman, characterizing the letter as a “Corporation communication,” said it would remain confidential.

But the following Monday, August 1, Harvard released Harper’s letter with a response from Summers and a statement by Houghton (see www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/daily/2005/07/28-harper.html).

Citing incidents dating from Summers’s early, acrimonious meeting with then-Fletcher University Professor Cornel West through his January remarks on the role of women in science, Harper wrote, “I saw a pattern. Your statements demeaned those who are underrepresented at the top levels of major research universities.” Harper noted that on March 17, following the FAS vote, he had urged Summers to resign. Of recent Corporation discussion of the president’s salary for 2005-2006, he wrote, “In my judgment, your 2004-2005 conduct, implicating, as it does, profound issues of temperament and judgment, merits no increase whatever.” Absent benchmarks for Summers’s future performance, and given a decision he attributed to Houghton to increase Summers’s salary before full discussion at the retreat, Harper added, “I cannot in good conscience remain a member of the Corporation when the procedures that should guide our deliberations are not followed.” He concluded by reiterating, “I believe that Harvard’s best interests require your resignation.”

In his response, dated August 1, Summers expressed deep regret at Harper’s resignation and underscored “my commitment to the important issues you and I have discussed,” including “[e]xpanding opportunities for outstanding individuals from groups that are traditionally underrepresented” within the University. Summers also noted his hope that “in time and with attention to the concerns raised this past semester,” relations between FAS and the administration would improve, in furtherance of academic goals.

Houghton’s statement defended the board’s adherence to its procedures. He noted that “my Corporation colleagues and I” recognize and support “Summers’s strong commitment to working with the faculty and others in the Harvard community.” The remaining Corporation members have “recognized and respected” Harper’s perspective, “while taking different views” and are “very much saddened by his departure.” Looking ahead, “[W]e will do our utmost to serve the best interests of the University to whose welfare we are fully devoted.”

To that end, the Corporation’s next—and confidential—business will be electing Harper’s successor. Houghton is now the board’s only pre-Summers member. The election, as always, is subject to the “counsel and consent” of the Board of Overseers, whose new president, U.S. District Court Judge Patti B. Saris ’73, J.D. ’76, was one of the alumni panelists introduced by Summers to brief University alumni affairs and development staff at their annual workshop on July 27.
run, that will have a greater impact.

Given the emphasis on recruiting and retaining scientists, and the past problem of achieving diversity in those departments (see “Harvard by the Numbers,” page 73), it may be useful that both Hammonds and Martin have pertinent backgrounds. Hammonds acquired bachelor’s and master’s degrees in physics, and another degree in electrical engineering, before completing her doctorate in the history of science at Harvard. She founded MIT’s Center for Diversity in Science, Technology, and Medicine.

Martin, who studied biology as an undergraduate at Cal Tech, said she now perceives that “one reason I didn’t stick with biology was that I found the lab environment so unpleasant,” with a subtext of “men doing the glamorous stuff and women killing the mice.” That experience plus her years as a junior professor at Harvard (1992-1996) and more recently as a single mother “have made me much more sensitive to the way Harvard’s practices make it hard” to balance scholarly and family needs and to progress up the faculty ranks. Scheduling academic work well into the evening, for example, is a particular difficulty for “colleagues in certain fields where women have been underrepresented, such as engineering and computer science—at least in part, apparently, because there are so few female faculty members in such fields now. Results were mixed in various humanities and social sciences courses. In all, the authors found, “The results suggest that female faculty members do have the potential to increase student interest in a subject as measured by course election and major choice.”

A Sensitive Census

The revelation last autumn that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) had made offers of tenured professorships to only four women during academic year 2003-2004—fewer than in any year save one during the preceding decade—set off the debate about the composition of the faculty that rocked Harvard for much of the past winter and spring (see “Tenure and Gender,” January-February, page 64, and coverage in subsequent issues). How has FAS fared since? It is too early to calculate the yield—the percentage of acceptances—for offers extended during the academic year ended June 30, but the number of offers extended to women at both the tenured and junior-faculty levels did increase, as shown in these data from FAS’s faculty-development office.

Martin cited as “the hardest problem” the issue of improving diversity for members of underrepresented racial and ethnic groups. There is not even a framework for understanding the problems of hiring and retention in relation to race, and the “pool problem”—the number of academically qualified candidates for searches—is “much different” and more constrained than for women. “I think the issues of gender and diversity are linked,” said Hammonds. In absolute numbers, she said, the population of underrepresented minority scholars at Harvard is small, but not substantially smaller than at peer institutions. She hopes to maintain data on the “pool of outstanding scholars of color that we choose from”—data not now readily available—and also emphasized the importance of making a concerted effort to enlarge those pools by enrolling more qualified minority applicants in graduate school.

As Hammonds reaches out for her colleagues’ expertise, she may make use of a new paper by GSE associate professor of education and economics Bridget Terry Long (with Eric P. Bettinger at Case Western Reserve University), “Do Faculty Serve as Role Models? The Impact of Instructor Gender on Female Students,” published this spring in the American Economic Review, examines 54,000 students’ choice of subjects for further study, and of field of concentration, based on their initial exposure to same-gender faculty members. Women teachers, they found, positively affected female students’ interest in pursuing work in geology, mathematics, and statistics, among quantitative subjects. The opposite effect occurred in biology and physics. No statistically significant effects appeared in certain fields where women have been underrepresented, such as engineering and computer science—at least in part, apparently, because there are so few female faculty members in such fields now. Results were mixed in various humanities and social sciences courses. In all, the authors found, “The results suggest that female faculty members do have the potential to increase student interest in a subject as measured by course election and major choice.”

Allston Options—and Actions

With a near-term goal of establishing an expanded campus footprint across the Charles River during the next decade, Harvard released on June 2 a report outlining options for long-term development in Allston. New York planning firm Cooper, Robertson & Partners prepared the “interim” report, which proposes possible sites for new undergraduate Houses, for laboratories to house novel interdisciplinary science initiatives, and for academic buildings to meet the needs of the graduate schools of education and of public health—all priorities outlined by President Lawrence H. Summers in 2003. The report, which stresses the need for improved transportation among Cambridge, Allston, and the Longwood Medical Area, was intended to serve as a jumping-off point for public discussions that will continue into the fall. In a conference call on the day it was released, Summers, Graduate School of Design dean Alan Altshuler (a member of the University’s Master Planning Advisory Committee), chief University planner Kathy Spiegelman, and David McGregor, managing director for Cooper, Robertson & Partners, answered questions about the report and Harvard’s plans for Allston.