

December 14, 2005

## Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 12/14/2005

Stuart S. Peterfreund  
*Northeastern University*

---

### Recommended Citation

Peterfreund, Stuart S., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 12/14/2005" (2005). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 75.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10004336>

This work is available open access, hosted by Northeastern University.

TO: FACULTY SENATE  
FROM: STUART A. PETERFREUND, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE  
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2005-06 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 14 DECEMBER

---

Present: (Professors) Alper, Bannister, Bobcean, Bruns, Cokely, De Ritis, Futrelle, Glod, Hall, Hansberry, Herman, Janikian, Kane, Melachrinoudis, Morrison, Peterfreund, Powers-Lee, Reucroft, Reynolds, Robinson, Sanchez, Sherwood, Willey  
(Administrators) Abdelal, Finkelstein, Greene, Onan, Sridhar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Flym, Krishnamoorthy, Marshall, McKnight, Ryan, Schaffer, Strauss, Wiseman  
(Administrators) Falcon, Moore, Soyster, Stellar

Provost Abdelal convened the meeting at 11:57am and asked members of the Presidential Search Committee to introduce themselves. They were: George Chamillard, Trustee & Chair of the Presidential Search Committee, Prof. Barry Bluestone, Trustee Harry Daniels, Prof. Carol Glod, Peter Kunzel (student representative), Senior Vice President Vincent Lembo, Prof. Robert Lowndes, Trustee Katherine McHugh, Director Mark Putnam, and Trustee Jean Tempel.

After thanking committee members for joining the Senate meeting, the Provost opened the floor to questions and input.

Trustee Chamillard expressed appreciation for the opportunity to meet with the Senate. He said that the Trustees recognize they have a critical decision to make in selecting the new President. The Committee has been active and takes the challenge seriously. One of the challenges is what should the next leader of NU look like. To answer that we must ask what should NU look like going forward. What challenges are facing NU? Knowing that, the question becomes what set of skills or experience should the next President bring? In order for the Committee to answer what the broader NU community sees as the challenges facing us, sessions such as these have been arranged. However, Trustee Chamillard suggests that unless a Renaissance person is found, tradeoffs will have to be made as well.

Professor De Ritis said that increasingly, over the 8 years he's been at NU, there has been less funding of academics. He suggests focus on how the allocation of resources can be more on the academic side so that faculty can provide the best education. Trustee Chamillard requested clarification: More faculty? More classrooms?

Professor De Ritis clarified that space is important but university faculty as a whole need support to attend business conferences and other venues that would allow them to get the word out about NU without constraints.

Professor Futrelle expressed that in many ways faculty can take care of themselves by raising support from the outside but cannot raise large scale funding from Washington or large foundations. He suggests that talk about more equipment, etc., is meaningless without a President that can speak with vision. How do university presidents sell their institutions? In addition, NU has weak alumni giving from a tradition of graduates who are not heading corporations today.

Professor Cokely indicated that raising funding on a large scale takes too long. While faculty is pushed to smaller classrooms, those classrooms do not have the technology that allows students to receive the education they deserve given the tuition that they pay. While long term resources are important, NU needs a President that can make difficult decisions on the academic side in the near term.

Professor Peterfreund would rather look at larger issues such as style. Noting that it took a long time for NU's current President to buy into shared governance, he would like the next person to come in having bought into NU's strong tradition of shared governance and with enough confidence to leave academics to the chief academic officers. He would like to see a President who extends shared governance to matters of space and resource allocation and who buys into the principle of responsibility-centered management. While NU will never be Harvard where each tub floats on its own bottom, Prof. Peterfreund would like to see it move in that direction—to have accountability be a unit responsibility rather than a University responsibility. Other attributes are visionary capabilities, the charisma to be a presence in the world of public affairs and fundraising, and the intelligence to know how to delegate.

Trustee Chamillard said that these were all good points and asked several clarifying questions. The issue of centralized or decentralized organization requires very different skills. How much change is desirable and in what area? Mr. Chamillard asked Prof. Peterfreund to consider that he was a candidate asking that question.

Professor Peterfreund responded that his sense is that goals are moot unless style is addressed. Where we want to go is a function of how we agree to get there i.e. appropriate leadership style—innovative, seeks input from all sectors, respect for all sectors, fosters openness—a president and steward of the entire university. Prof. Peterfreund's sense is that if we get there the right way, we'll get the right thing.

Professor Powers-Lee concurred with Professor Cokely in that the next President should be a top-ranking person, a major presence in the external world who will elevate NU's reputation and lead to larger endowment funds. She expressed that management is key.

Professor Glod [speaking as SAC chair] indicated that there are three things she has heard consistently: building the endowment; building the academic reputation of the university including promoting faculty research, increasing the number of tenure-track and tenured faculty, and strengthening the faculty; and issues surrounding the general characteristics of the next president. There is also a strong sentiment that the person be an academic leader and scholar who has a record of fostering a collegial sense of university governance.

Professor Futrelle commented that an intellectual heavy-weight would give NU instant recognition.

Trustee Chamillard asked for role models to which Prof. Futrelle replied that any major university President (Yale, Princeton, MIT) is a role model. Mr. Chamillard then asked about non-traditional candidates who may not have a totally academic background. The discussion then turned to Harvard's president and Dean Zoloth mentioned Donna Shalala as an example of a non-academic coming into the Presidency and building upon that with extraordinary management skills, understanding of students, and respect for faculty.

Professor Bruns reported that CBA faculty opinions mostly agree with Prof. Futrelle's view. Ten years ago NU had a very different set of issues. The new President does not need the internal focus that was needed in the past but someone external, regardless of their background, who will improve the endowment; raise funds, and increase the stature of NU while having a proper respect for academics and NU's tradition of shared governance, which may be unique to us.

Trustee Chamillard said that when it comes to fund-raising there are two areas—alumni and foundations. Alumni generally do not give to the university but to the college, and the burden of nurturing that rests with the deans.

Professor Peterfreund said that he is very much encouraged by Vice Presidents Moynihan and Bartolini who have their finger on the pulse of alumni giving. The new President should be looking to a larger and broader sector than alumni for fund-raising.

Professor Herman commented on two things. He agreed with Prof. Peterfreund that we are seeing change for the better with the two new Vice Presidents. As to a scholar versus someone from outside the institution of higher education—NU is a unique institution trying to bring its unique education to a new level, one that integrates experiential education. We want someone who has bought into that mission—that the education of NU students involves what goes on both inside and outside the classroom.

Professor Kruger agreed with the importance of raising new money as a top priority. The President also needs to see the value of investing in the academic side, including research funding. NU needs resources to support research as research raises visibility and reputation. There also needs to be investment in graduate education, particularly in attracting top-notch doctoral students. In terms of skills, Prof. Kruger agrees that collaboration and the importance of building around the tradition of shared governance is important. The current President did an excellent job of clarifying this University's identity but there must be a shared sense of purpose or identity across both the non-academic and academic side. Academic excellence is important to our history right now. In terms of strategic thinking, the new President must be able to articulate NU's strengths because, if we are going to move ahead, it will be on those strengths: practice-oriented education, student-centered faculty and culture. The new President should see shared governance as a problem-solving resource. But more than articulating these strengths, can the candidate articulate how they will build upon them?

Professor De Ritis spoke of a spirit of entrepreneurship at NU and a project at the Music Dept. that fosters that and brings visibility to NU.

Trustee Chamillard indicated that the committee is hearing some common themes. Everyone has a common purpose in solidifying NU's gains and not losing ground. Another is the challenge around economics. NU is tuition dependent. That tuition has been raised and is near the top so there is little room to increase it more or to incur significant new debt. Money now must come from more efficiency and productivity, and from outside resources. The challenge therefore becomes how to get money from more efficiency and productivity because anything else is going to take time.

Trustee Daniels asked the Senate to visualize sitting here ten years from today and assessing what proof has determined how successful we have been. Assuming we had increased our endowment, got well into the top 100, improved alumni giving, and had the best and brightest clamoring to be here. Assuming all of those things, how do we measure our success?

Professor Herman said the proof would be that not only do we have the best academics and students knocking down our door, but we are able to provide them with a range of educational opportunities so that when they leave the University they feel their money has been well spent. We currently have wonderful students and wonderful undergraduate programs but not the resources to support them.

Professor De Ritis agreed, adding that the students are our customers and should feel that they've received a quality education which will translate into alumni giving in the future.

Professor Glod [speaking as a search committee member] added that, looking back, the Committee will hopefully have done a very good job and that students will recognize that NU

provides a very good education and place to do research; that faculty feel it is a good place to stay; and that we want to continue to build and grow.

Professor Morrison said that he's a big believer in the top 100 goal and that ten years from now he'd like to see NU so entrenched in that top 100 that the words "*US News & World Reports*" will never be heard again because we can pursue our own visions of academic excellence with little regard to how it would affect rankings in *USN&WR*.

Professor Hall underscored that adding that NU has massaged those areas which are most easily massaged to gain in the rankings.

Professor Janikian expressed appreciation of Trustee Chamillard's concern to retain the fine students we have and that resources need to be increased. He would be very pleased to have no students come to his office with resources issues. He added that he was pleased with the path of NU over the last ten years but that our resources are not in the top group of universities right now.

Trustee Daniels asked for clarification on whether there is a lack of resources or whether there should be a different allocation of current resources because the Committee has heard different things. It is obvious that the endowment needs to be increased. But the question of allocation of resources as opposed to availability of resources are different challenges.

Professor Peterfreund noted that Prof. Janikian alludes to something that needs to be addressed. It's not a resources-based question. Ultimately, the President will need to look his or her senior VPs in the eyes and, upon report of these resource issues, say "fix it" and they'll need to be fixed. He reported that there are numbers of "horror stories" he could tell and, without going into them, the end of each one was "and nobody took the fall for this." Something terrible happened, and no one stood up accountable: that needs to end.

Prof. Peterfreund continued that, as far as financial implications, it's both a gross issue—that is, we need more—and a net issue. Most people on the academic side agree that more of the revenue stream needs to come to academics and a new President needs to figure out how to make that happen.

Provost Abdelal said that in comparing ourselves with our competition, NU could do better in the percentage applied to academic resources in order to be competitive.

Professor De Ritis said that the specifics mentioned by the Provost at the retreat indicated that a very large campaign would be needed to raise money for the academic side and, since that is not going to take place very soon, proposed that a simple reallocation of funds would help tremendously.

Professor Herman said that the point is that we all feel like we are operating on the edge. There is no flexibility to try something extra for students. If we can reach the point where we don't have to worry that we are stealing from one program to pay for another, we'll have succeeded.

Trustee Chamillard added that if you're on the edge because it's an ambitious program where much has been accomplished, it's a good thing. But if there's a high level of tension because there's a risk of not delivering on the expectations of the students, that may be at the edge.

Dean Finkelstein, in responding to Trustee Daniels's question, said that NU has very ambitious goals but the question remains whether there are resources to achieve them. So it's not a question of just resources but of do we have the resources to be where we want to be.

Trustee Daniels, in following up on Prof. Herman's input, said that his question is how does the Search Committee translate all of this into qualifications criteria.

Professor Futrelle said that, in his view, the experience of doing a Ph.D. thesis is very important for a candidate. It's a unique experience where one becomes expert in a subject and is close to a requirement for the position of President.

Professor Peterfreund said that he wants someone who will embrace and build on the vision we have of NU; someone who has the financial creativity to make that work.

Professor Willey added that integrity is important. Looking back ten years, who could have imagined this campus today. Someone with foresight brought this university up to this stage. Foresight is another quality needed. Does the person have the foresight to take NU to the next level, whatever that level is.

Mark Putnam said that most of these issues have to be worked out simultaneously to improve and move forward. But there are some things that might have a disproportionately large impact on that point ten years from now. He asked the Senate for those things that have added leverage to move the University forward in an accelerated way or that have positive impact.

Professor Bannister, citing his own history at NU, said that the transformation is remarkable in terms of the physical campus, the students, and the faculty. But these changes were necessary in order to be competitive and we will not push into the top 100 without them. Relative to NU, there is still a non-leveraged brand quality advantage and we should have a President who puts our uniqueness out there. Prof. Bannister believes that NU is the largest educational model in this country that includes both a quality academic experience and the potential for quality work experience and that this has been under-leveraged. Ten years down the road, no one should be able to compete with NU in that area. The new President should be able to take the University there.

Professor Alper sees two areas for which to strive: one is external funding in support of graduate education and funding of faculty. He expressed concern about dealing with the uniqueness of experiential education in terms of academic reputation in that NU may not attract students who are interested in going on to graduate school. The reputation of a university is partly made by the undergraduate students who go on to graduate programs at Yale and other universities. We focus too much on experiential education.

Peter Kunzel, student, said that the issue of resources is clear to the students.

Professor Bluestone said one of the nice things about sitting on the Search Committee is hearing very much the same kind of things from other groups. The suggestion regarding division of labor is a good way to run the University. NU is extraordinary in that its faculty have greater affection for it than some of its senior executives and trustees. They are ready to take NU to the next level and have expressed the division of labor needed in a President who will provide external resources as well as manage internally.

Trustee Chamillard said that some other groups used the word coop more openly. Language is important but coop means something different in each school and college.

Provost Abdelal agreed, adding that coop in Engineering and Bouvé is very clear but A&S, which is 40% of the student body, has been very creative in translating the coop model into the broader experiential education model. We like to say cooperative/experiential education model which bridges into professional colleges. The disciplines have their own unique languages. All of NU's

academic leadership is committed to a model that combines the classroom with practical experience. The specifics vary, the languages are different.

Dean Zoloth related an interesting discussion with students about the spirit of the NU. They are very aware of their own money going towards funding of a multi-purpose facility and the lack of forward movement in that area.

Professor Futrelle expressed concern that too much emphasis on experiential education will put off strong academic students who will go on to graduate school. We need to emphasize both our practice-oriented education and our strong academic faculty with international reputations.

Mark Putnam agreed and added that there is some dissonance on this point. Trustees speak in traditional terms about coop while students speak of more experiential forms of coop. There are different views emerging.

Professor Bannister said that if we want to be a blue-collar institution then we should be better at it than anyone else. His understanding is that we are not that anymore, but it is still how the Boston Globe describes NU. Likewise with the word coop: there are differences of opinion about what coop means and what it means strategically for the University and its reputation. If that is going to be part of our uniqueness then we need to be absolutely terrific at it or disband it.

Professor De Ritis said that coop is not directly opposed to academics. It's the joining of forces, the integration of real-world practical experience and academics, that makes NU unique.

Provost Abdelal, responding to Mr. Putnam, indicated that at a retreat a week ago of chairs and deans this was discussed and there is a great deal of support is for emphasizing coop and experiential education as the model for NU. Every college may do it differently but all believe it is a very important part of NU. The term 'experiential' is much broader than coop which is why A&S likes to apply that term. The Provost sees little dissonance. He expressed being comfortable with everyone trying to figure out how to apply it [within their own colleges].

Trustee Tempel asked the Senate to consider that today's research is tomorrow's business experience. NU has a reputation for graduating a tremendous amount of entrepreneurs. They have come from a place [NU] where these things live together and thrive. We need not to think of them as competing, but as reinforcing each other. She wonders if NU needs a President who supports that they survive together.

Professor Peterfreund agreed and suggested that this is an element that joins students and faculty in a manner not efficiently discussed. NU faculty are very entrepreneurial both outside and within the University—the way we think about setting and achieving goals is closer to the entrepreneurial spirit. A new President must do what she/he can to foster that in the students and the faculty and understand that it is a common value.

The Provost again offered the Senate's thanks to the Presidential Search Committee for joining the Senate meeting.

Adjourn 1:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart A. Peterfreund, Senate Secretary