parable positions elsewhere, the HUDS staff-
ners total earnings have been low because most
union members have had regular work only
when Harvard is in full session: typically, less
than eight months per year.

A $55,000 yearly income guarantee for full-
time workers figured prominently in the din-
ing workers’ negotiating position, along with
the demand that their healthcare costs not
increase. Harvard offered summer stipends
of about $150 per week for workers with be-
tween five and 20 years of service at the Uni-
versity, and $250 per week for workers with
more than 20 years; it also proposed the high-
er copayment schedule adopted by HUCTW
(details appear at harvardmag.com/huds-
strike-16). The union turned down those
proposals, and after four months of nego-
tiations, the workers went on strike Octo-
ber 5—the first strike at Harvard since 1983.

During the next three weeks, striking
workers paraded around campus, chant-
ing and beating out rhythms on five-gallon
buckets. They appeared to attract signifi-
cant support from students, many of whom
are friendly with the staff they see daily at
meals. Most dining halls closed, but HUDS
managers (and nonunion employees who
were asked by their supervisors to pitch in)
maintained operations at some facilities.

Following a 22-day strike, negotiators
reached agreement after a marathon bargain-
ing session (accompained by a large student
sit-in at the building where the talks were
conducted), and the workers voted 583-1
to approve a contract. It provides a $35,000
guaranteed income for those who work full
time during the academic year, achieved by
paying a stipend of $2,400 across 13 weeks,
or about $185 per week (rising to $3,000, or
about $231 per week, by 2020), with a pro-
rated stipend for part-time workers. Wag-
es will increase 2.5 percent annually for the
five-year term of the agreement. And health
coverage will remain unchanged for the next
two years, and then will move toward higher
copayments, but with part of workers’ added
costs covered by a flexible spending account
for each worker. Read a full report at har-
ardmag.com/hudscontract-16.

Next up were the 700 custodians, who also
appeared headed for a strike. But a middle-
of-the-night settlement on November 16
averted another walkout. It calls for a 12.5
percent increase in wages across four years;
because janitors earn slightly more per hour
than dining-hall workers, and most of them
work year-round rather than the seven and
a half months per year typical for the latter,
their financial situation is notably better.
The typical custodian earns $22.07 per hour
and $45,766 per year, according to the Univer-
sity; that hourly wage will increase to $24.67
by the end of the contract. About 30 percent
of custodians work part-time; the contract,
according to the union, “includes language
to promote full-time work.” Workers will
also have the option of joining a healthcare
plan offered by SEIU without any monthly
premiums, and with visits to certain doctors
without a copayment. Harvard’s plan, which
has monthly premiums and a broader net-
work of doctors, will introduce in 2018 a sub-
$55,000 premium tier, like the plans the
University has introduced for other
groups of employees. Read more at harvardmag.com/bjseiucontract-16.

With those negotiations resolved, atten-
tion turned to the November 16-17 ballo-
tering, overseen by the Nation-
al Labor Relations Board (NLRB), for
possible union recognition for grad-
uate-student teaching and research
assistants (as well as undergraduates
who perform paid teaching duties in
classes like Computer Science 50).
Harvard graduate students have been
organizing for more than a year to
form a labor union. They won the legal
right to do so last summer, after the
NLRB—unswayed by an amicus brief filed
by the University urging a decision against
student unionization—ruled that gradu-
ate students at private universities have the
to right form labor unions (as reported at
harvardmag.com/grad-unions-16).

Student organizers reported in the spring
that a majority of graduate students had
signed authorization cards indicating their
support for a union. But as the vote drew
loser in the fall, a number of students pub-
lie made the case against unionizing in op-
edals in The Harvard Crimson and posters scattered
throughout campus. Their arguments
first- and second-year graduate students—
were ineligible.) At press time, the results
were still unknown. Visit harvardmag.com/
grad-unionvote-16 for an update.

Much attention has been drawn to the
ways in which universities mirror society’s
broaden inequities and economic anxieties.
From the conditions of its lowest-paid blue-
collar workers, to those of students training
to become scholars and teachers, Harvard’s
financial responsibilities to its community
have become a subject for debate, too.

~MARINA BOLOTNIKOVA
AND JOHN S. ROSENBERG

Gender Agenda

Even as the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
(FAS) intensely debated the College’s pro-
posed rules sanctioning student participa-
tion in single-gender final clubs and similar
social organizations, which are not officially
recognized by Harvard, an outcry arose over
 overtly sexist behavior by two men’s sports
teams—decidedly official Harvard groups,
with the substantial institutional budget
and staff support that match athletics’ sta-
tus and assumed role in undergraduate life.
Herewith, a summary of the parallel devel-
opments during the fall semester.

In May 2016, dean of Harvard College
Rakesh Khurana recommended, and Presi-
dent Drew Faust endorsed, that beginning in
the class of 2021, members of unrecognized, single-gender social groups—final clubs, plus sororities and fraternities—be prohibited from holding leadership roles in recognized activities (for example, serving as an athletic team’s captain), or from receiving Harvard’s endorsement for fellowships such as the Rhodes Scholarship (see the details at harvardmag.com/finalclub-16).

In the announcement, Faust wrote, “Over time, Harvard has transformed its undergraduate student body as it has welcomed women, minorities, international students, and students of limited financial means as an increasing proportion of its population. But campus culture has not changed as rapidly as student demography.” Students should be able “to participate in the life of the campus free from exclusion on arbitrary grounds. Although the fraternities, sororities, and final clubs are not formally recognized by the College, they play an unmistakable and growing role in student life, in many cases enacting forms of privilege and exclusion at odds with our deepest values.” Khurana, countering objections that the rules in effect undermined students’ freedom of association, observed that they would still have the right to join discriminatory groups, but that doing so is contrary to Harvard’s values. “These new policies will not prevent undergraduates from choosing their own paths while at Harvard,” he argued. “The recommendations are instead focused exclusively on decisions belonging to the College about what it funds, sponsors, endorses, or otherwise operates under its name.”

But a former dean of the College, McKay professor of computer science Harry Lewis, did object to this perceived infringement on students’ freedom of association. Colleagues who concurred introduced a motion, debated in the November 1 faculty meeting, “that Harvard College shall not discriminate against students on the basis of organizations they join, nor political parties with which they affiliate, nor social, political, or other affinity groups they join, as long as those organizations, parties, or groups have not been judged to be illegal.” The debate—shaped by the terms and genesis of

---

**Getting Greener**

**Harvard has reduced** its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 30 percent during the past decade, the Office for Sustainability announced in early December. The goal, adopted in 2008 and measured from a 2006 baseline, was met despite 15 percent growth in square footage and an increase in energy intensity of existing space. (New laboratories, which use 46 percent of the energy on campus but represent just 22 percent of the space, account for a significant portion of this intensification.) The University achieved its goal by reducing demand (net energy use declined 10 percent during the decade); by shifting to renewable energy sources; and by “decarbonizing”—seizing the opportunity to make more use of low-priced natural gas, a less carbon-intensive fossil fuel than oil or coal (whether used to generate electricity or burned directly for heating and cooling).

Ninety-seven percent of the University’s emissions are attributable to energy use in buildings, the sustainability office reported (see page 21 for a portrait of its director). Thus, nearly a quarter of the reduction in GHG emissions came from reduced demand, achieved largely through more efficient lighting, heating, and cooling of buildings; a further 19 percent of the reductions reflects the purchase of renewable energy—principally wind power from Maine and shares of hydroelectric power from existing generators in Massachusetts. Another 8 percent was due to improved tracking and management of potent, short-lived pollutants called refrigerants.

But the largest gains are attributable to **switching fuels**, from oil and coal to natural gas, which fell in price during the decade as new domestic supplies became available. This was true both for the regional supply grid from which Harvard buys electricity (16 percent of the total emissions reduction reflects these suppliers’ less-carbon-intensive fuels) and for Harvard’s own district energy supply (representing 33 percent of the emissions reduction, a portion of which is attributable to the switch to natural gas). A major factor was converting a University steam plant to natural gas. Other upgrades to Harvard-run utilities, including an expanded, combined heat-and-power system, energy-efficient boilers, and improvements to the efficiency of chilled-water plants further reduced the emissions impact of Harvard’s utilities.

Even with cheap natural gas as a powerful tailwind, attaining Harvard’s initial GHG-reduction goal is notable, given the University’s simultaneous growth in physical plant and energy use. The second goal President Drew Faust articulated in 2008—cutting emissions 80 percent by 2050—will likely prove a far greater challenge. Renovations to the undergraduate Houses are leading to higher operational costs, because their systems have been brought up to modern codes, common spaces are air-conditioned, and previously unused basement storage areas have been repurposed into classrooms and studios (see “The Endowment Ebbs,” November–December 2016, page 18). Attaining the 2050 goal will thus require significant reductions in energy consumption as the campus grows further, as well as a substantially larger role for renewable supplies in place of fossil fuels. (For a more detailed report, based on data scheduled to appear after this magazine went to press, see harvardmag.com/sustainability-17.)

---

**How Harvard Reduced Emissions**

- **24%** Reduced demand
- **33%** Campus energy supply
- **16%** Shift in utilities’ fuel
- **19%** Purchase of renewable energy
- **8%** Better management of refrigerants
the College proposal—focused far more on rights of association, governance, and education in values than on gender exclusion per se. (Read a full report, with extensive excerpts from speakers’ remarks, at harvardmag.com/finalclub-fas-16.)

Lewis observed that “This motion stands on its own as a statement of principle that we, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, have long honored in practice....When this Faculty considered how to respond to the dilemma posed by ROTC’s discriminatory membership practices coupled with Harvard students’ desire to join as cadets, a faculty committee recommended that we cut off support to ROTC. But the same committee considered and explicitly rejected as ‘excessively paternalistic’ the option of punishing students who chose to join MIT ROTC.”

He maintained that “the signatories to the motion are not defending any or all of these organizations. Nor are we denying the problems they create. Nor are we against change! About all that the 12 of us probably agree on is that Harvard should avoid making rules restricting students’ civil liberties—of speech, of religion, or of association.” In%

his view, “the College is creating a blacklist, an index of prohibited organizations....join one of the heretical clubs, and you can remain a Harvard student, but there are certain blessings Harvard won't bestow.”

He introduced a second objection, on governance: “This policy is disappointing both for the dangerous precedent it sets, and for the irregular way it was enacted, by administrative fiat after the last faculty meeting of the year this past spring...Our concern is that having enacted a college policy of this importance without consulting this body or its elected representatives, the dean and the president would at a later date be empowered to enact other policies, about this matter or others, that properly lie within the jurisdiction of this body.”

Finally, he said, “My deepest concern is educational. The policy teaches our students, who watch everything we do, bad lessons. It is illiberal—it teaches students that it is OK to sacrifice basic individual freedoms in pursuit of large but only vaguely related social goals....Part of our commitment to diversity is our institutional confidence that students may think differently than we do, and may make private choices of which we disapprove. By all means, if we conclude that students should not visit or join these organizations, let's tell them they shouldn't go, and why. Let’s tell them loudly and clearly and persistently”—emphasizing education and suasion over rulemaking and sanctions.
Lerner professor of biological sciences Daniel Lieberman, a member of the Faculty Council, opposed the motion. First, he said, Harvard doesn’t need another anti-discrimination policy, because the one it now has is comprehensive. Second, he emphasized the narrow scope of the new rules, noting that it would leave students free to join all sorts of discriminatory and potentially objectionable organizations. “The only exception,” he said, “is that they cannot represent our University in leadership positions while being members of social organizations on campus that discriminate against other members of our community.” He termed the sanctions a revocation of privileges, rather than an imposition of penalties. Finally, he predicted that if the motion passed and the new policy were overturned, “we will face a deluge of unrecognized Greek organizations that will continue to erode our House system, and we will find our campus riven by more, not less, discrimination.”

Professor of government Eric Nelson said that “Harvard has never before conditioned fellowships, research support, or eligibility for leadership positions on anything other than academic merit and the confidence of one’s peers...This generational good sense is now to be set aside in favor of the view that students who have in no way violated the rules of the College should be sanctioned for associations that run afoul of (what are said to be) our values—and we can look forward to decades of acrimonious and dangerous debate about which associations are in and which are out.”

Undergraduate Council president Shai-Ba Rather and vice president Daniel Banks spoke in favor of the proposed College policy: “Organizations which discriminate on the basis of gender are antiquated...Women have been attending Harvard College for decades. To allow continued and active discrimination is the failure of the integration process: a promise to merge Radcliffe and Harvard and offer the full resources of this institution to all its students. Gender is a deciding factor...To claim that these institutions are not part of the Harvard community is to hide history and fact behind technicality, to allow the mistakes of our past to trump the opportunities—the equal opportunities—of our future.” Characterizing the issue as personal, Rather and Banks said they “view this policy as an opportunity for a new chapter in Harvard’s history and hope you embark in the writing process with us.” (In polling during council elections later in the month, The Harvard Crimson reported, a majority of students opposed the College policy) Debate resumed on December 6, but voting was deferred until early February; visit www.harvardmagazine.com for updates.

As these exchanges unfolded, enterprising Crimson reporters unveiled a document in which members of the 2012 men’s soccer team evaluated and characterized members of the women’s team in crude, explicitly sexual “scouting reports” (see www.thecrimson.com/article/2016/11/4/soccer-suspended-scouting-report-harvard). The fallout—a Crimson essay by former women soccer players confronting the implications of the men’s behavior and inviting them to confront the problem as well; an investigation by the office of general counsel at Faust’s instruction; and the finding that the behavior had continued through 2016, and that participants had not been forthcoming—ultimately resulted in forfeiture of the season for the men’s team, which had been on the verge of qualifying for the NCAA tournament. Director of athletics Robert L. Scalise, who had been scheduled to travel to Shanghai for an alumni event during the week of the men’s basketball game there against Stanford, canceled his trip to deal with the crisis. (The men’s cross-country team voluntarily reported similar, if somewhat less egregious, behavior to its coach, the Crimson reported; on December 2, after a University finding that that team’s behavior was not intended to “denigrate or objectify particular women,” it was put on “athletic probation”—training and supervision, but not a limit on competing this season, according to Crimson accounts.)

As it happened, the announcement of the soccer sanctions coincided with a long-planned, inaugural Harvard Alumni Association “Women’s Weekend.” A scheduled panel on women in sports suddenly had a new agenda item, concerning overtly sexist discrimination against female athletes. The forum, held in the former Radcliffe gymnasium, opened with Radcliffe Institute dean Lizabeth Cohen telling listeners, “Certainly much has changed. But damaging social attitudes persist, and not just among the men of
the Harvard soccer team.” Moderator Janet Rich-Edwards, associate professor of medicine, told the audience, “I want to take a second to talk about the elephant in the room.” She criticized the male players’ “witless cruelty” and offered as an opposing note these words from the women who wrote the Crimson essay: “We are hopeful that the release of this report will lead to productive conversation and action on Harvard’s campus, within collegiate athletic teams across the country, and into the locker room that is our world.” (A full account appears at harvardmag.com/womensportspanel-16.)

It was a beginning, but the airing out of attitudes in locker rooms, and elsewhere, still has a long way to go.

~ JONATHAN SHAW and JOHN S. ROSENBERG

Connecting Body and Soul

A DEVOUT 35-year-old Latina woman with two young children lies in the intensive-care unit (ICU) of a Boston-area hospital, dying from cancer. With no sign of improvement, the medical team advises withdrawing life support, but the woman’s husband refuses. The couple has been pushing for aggressive therapies, along with prayer support. Members of their Pentecostal church hold vigils at the woman’s bedside, praying that God will perform a miracle and cure her, but eventually she dies.

With most Americans placing a high value on faith, it’s no surprise that religious and spiritual beliefs can be a source of comfort, hope, and meaning during life’s most fraught moments, like those faced by this family.

“Illness is a spiritual experience for most patients with advanced disease,” says Tracy A. Balboni, associate professor of radiation oncology at Harvard Medical School (HMS) and a radiation oncologist and palliative-care physician at Dana-Farber/Brigham and Women’s Cancer Center. “Patients want to be seen as whole persons, not just as bodies affected by illness.” But doctors, she says, are often unprepared to connect body and soul. “As I went through medical training, I was often unprepared to connect body and soul. I was given tools to manage the physical realities of disease, but barely any to recognize or engage the spiritual and existential aspects of illness. They were clearly considered separate, even though there were so many natural connections, particularly in the setting of incurable disease.”

For the past decade, Balboni has been conducting research to illuminate how spirituality affects the patient experience, especially at the end of life. That work, published in leading medical journals, is now a centerpiece of Harvard’s interfaculty Initiative on Health, Religion, and Spirituality. The effort, launched in 2013, aims to promote rigorous research, provide training for students and medical residents, and spark collaborations across and beyond the University at the intersection of religion, medicine, and public health. Although centered at HMS and the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health (HSPH) and affiliated hospitals, it also involves chaplaincy leaders and faculty members from the Divinity School (HDS) and other Harvard schools.

“Many patients today are making decisions at least partly informed by their religious beliefs. We need to bring research to bear on understanding and describing what’s really going on,” says initiative co-leader Michael Balboni, a theologian, HMS instructor in psychiatry, and palliative-care researcher at Dana-Farber. (He is also Tracy’s husband and collaborator.)

Research led by initiative members, along with collaborators at Harvard and beyond, has already yielded insights on health outcomes, patient-clinician relations, and costs. For example, Tracy Balboni and her colleagues, drawing on the national Coping with Cancer Study, have found that terminally ill patients who receive spiritual support from their medical team are more likely to use hospice, seek less-aggressive treatments, and have better quality of life near its end.

On the other hand, outcomes are different when the spiritual support comes from patients’ own faith communities. In a 2013 study, Balboni and other investigators reported that patients with advanced cancer who are well supported by their religious communities choose hospice care less and aggressive medical measures more when they’re near death. Such patients “had six times higher odds of dying in the ICU,” says Michael Balboni. (As described by initiative leaders, “spirituality” is a connection to something larger than oneself that gives life meaning, while “religion” refers to beliefs and practices shared by a community.)

To delve more deeply into these issues, the Balbonis surveyed physicians, nurses, and terminally ill cancer patients at four Boston teaching hospitals from 2006 to 2009. The resulting study, Religion and Spirituality in Cancer Care, revealed that most patients want spirituality to be part of their cancer care and—somewhat surprisingly to the researchers—most oncologists and nurses think it’s appropriate for clinicians to provide spiritual care, at least occasionally. That might include asking about a patient’s spiritual outlook, requesting a chaplain’s bedside visit, or even praying with patients.

But these interactions are not common, according to the Balbonis. In a 2013 paper published in the Journal of Clinical Oncology,