Northwestern University
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
Pancoe Auditorium - Evanston, Wieboldt Hall 421 - Chicago
March 2, 2016

The meeting of the Faculty Senate of March 2, 2016 took place on the Evanston Campus in Pancoe Auditorium with videoconferencing to the Chicago Campus in Wieboldt Hall 421. A number of Senators participated remotely. President Edward FX Hughes called the meeting to order at 4:15 PM. There were 67 of 85 members in attendance, with 38 attendees in Evanston, 5 in Chicago, and 24 participating off-site. The quorum of fifty-one percent was met. Also in attendance on the Evanston Campus was one guest Faculty member, several Northwestern reporters, Provost Daniel Linzer, Vice President for Research Jay Walsh, Associate Vice President & Associate Provost of Academic Initiative Jake Julia, Professor Jackie Stevens, Professor Jorge Coronado, and several Graduate students.

1. Welcome and Greetings:
President Ed Hughes welcomed everyone and made introductory remarks. New Senate attendee Hollis Clayson from the Art History Department introduced herself. Benjamin Din, reporter for the Daily Northwestern, and Jason Mast, reporter for North by Northwestern introduced themselves.

2. Review and Approval of Minutes of February 3, 2016 Meeting:
Motion to approve the minutes of the February 3, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting carried unanimously.

3. Introductory Remarks: The Progress the Senate is Making:
President Ed Hughes remarked that the Senate is continuing to make important strides in winning the trust and respect of fellow Faculty and the Administration. He mentioned specifically the effort made to solicit genuine Faculty opinion regarding the appropriateness of the various recommendations in the Report of the Task Force on the Undergraduate Academic Experience. The feedback has been seriously considered and to date 25 reports have been received.

4. The Summit Meeting
The Summit meeting is a quarterly meeting which brings together the Executive Committee members of the Senate and the Administrative leadership of the University. It took place on Friday, February 26, 2016. President Hughes explained that this meeting is an extremely significant event in terms meaningful dialogue between the Faculty and the Administration and promotes collaboration.

The bulk of February’s meeting dealt with Feedback to the Administration from Departmental reports received to date regarding the Report of the Task Force on the Undergraduate Academic Experience – see below.
5. The Report of the Task Force on the Undergraduate Academic Experience:
President Ed Hughes reported that the Summit meeting of February 26, 2016 began with a report from Senate Task Force representative and Vice President of the Faculty Senate Laurie Zoloth on the reactions of Departments, 15 reports received at that point, to the recommendations of the Report of the Task Force on the Undergraduate Academic Experience. The modal response in those reports was the unequivocal rejection of the change of the calendar, but also affirmation of a number of the suggestions of the Task Force and, significantly, some creative suggestions for dealing with issues such as undergraduate depression, workload, etc.

President Hughes remarked that in his view the early dialogue of the Summit meeting represented the Administration defending the recommendations of the Task Force report, particularly the calendar change recommendation. The Executive Committee members however, stood firm stressing the feedback from the Faculty. He went on to say that at the conclusion of the discussion, President Schapiro made a strong statement that “the Administration will not do anything against the will of the Faculty.” This statement represented a major breakthrough. President Hughes reported that at the Summit meeting and in a follow-up email from Provost Daniel Linzer, the Faculty Senate was invited to serve as a channel providing information from Faculty peers regarding the Task Force Report, evaluating its recommendations, advancing the positive recommendations, and pointing out where deficiencies might exist. The Senate will also share with the Administration all of the Department reports that are received.

President Hughes acknowledged the work of Vice President Laurie Zoloth and Educational Affairs Committee Chair Michele McDonough who jointly vetted 10 of the 25 Department reports received, collating responses and producing a document that serves as a preliminary example of the type of document the Senate will send back to the Administration. Laurie Zoloth reported on some of the early findings and Senators asked questions and made comments.

President Hughes made the concluding remarks, thanking everyone who submitted a report and requesting reports from departments that have not yet submitted one. He further commented that the Administration is looking to the Senate to be the voice of the Faculty so the Senate will continue its efforts to collate and vet thoroughly the input from each report that is submitted, gathering new ideas and facilitate discussions around content in the reports.

6. Updates:
   A. “Dinner at Morty’s,” February 8, 2016:
      President Ed Hughes briefly talked about the dinner at President Schapiro’s home attended by members of the Faculty Senate and many Senior Administrators. It was a successful and rewarding event. He hoped it will continue each year moving forward.
B. The Provost Faculty Excellence Initiative:
President Ed Hughes summarized the proceedings of the Faculty Advisory Committee Meeting of February 11, 2016, which included a preliminary review of the salary gender equity study. The Administration is planning to disseminate the ladder report and the two remaining survey reports over the course of this academic year.

7. Board of Trustees’ Luncheon– March 4th, 12 – 1:40pm:
President Ed Hughes reminded Senators about the upcoming Board of Trustees’ Luncheon on Friday, March 4th, 12 – 1:40pm in the Harris Family Atrium Prentice Women’s Hospital on the Chicago Campus. The discussion Topic is “Free Speech/Academic Freedom.” President Hughes will be moderating the proceedings and Faculty Senate Vice President Laurie Zoloth, Law School Professor Andrew Koppelman, and Vice President and General Counsel Philip L. Harris will be the members of the panel. The Administration is providing roundtrip transportation from the Block Museum Arts Circle at 11:00 a.m. to the Chicago Campus and back.

8. The Leadership of the Buffett Institute:
President Ed Hughes asked all guests attending to introduce themselves, which included Political Science Graduate Students Adam Howat and Sean Diament; Undergraduate students Neha Reddy from GlobeMed, a work-study student from the Buffett Institute’s Center for Forced Migration Studies, and Kate Gladstone; and speakers Professor Jackie Stevens, Professor Jorge Coronado, Senator Michal Ginsburg, Provost Daniel Linzer, Vice President for Research Jay Walsh, and Associate Vice President & Associate Provost of Academic Initiative Jake Julia.

Senator and Professor of French and Italian Michal Ginsburg made introductory remarks. She believes the most important task of the Senate is to protect the interest and rights of the Faculty and when a search overseen by the Central Administration produces an appointment that a large number of Faculty finds unacceptable and an appeal to the Central Administration to reconsider is ignored then it is appropriate for the Faculty Senate to intervene. The job description clearly stated that a strong record of significant and sustained research and publication in international affairs is preferred, as is related teaching experience. Senator Ginsburg stated that there is evidence that some members of the search committee did not think that Retired Lieutenant Karl Eikenberry fits the job description, not having a strong record of significant and sustained research and publication or much teaching experience. The job description specifies that the “position may or may not be filled by a tenured professor depending on career background” which is seen as written expressly to make Karl Eikenberry’s hiring possible regardless of his lack of research.

Reservations expressed by search committee members and protests of Faculty members when Karl Eikenberry was announced as the finalist for the Buffett Leader position were ignored by the Central
Administration. Senator Ginsburg and other Faculty concluded that this lack of interest in hearing and engaging with opposing opinions strongly suggests that the Administration had a candidate picked out and were intent on imposing their will. In such a situation, insistence on confidentiality begins to look like deliberate lack of transparency so she urged the Provost to lift the veil of secrecy imposed on the search committee and allow access to accounts of the process other than the account given by Central Administration.

Professor Jackie Stevens and Professor Jorge Coronado presented the following:
A) Timeline of three Faculty missives sent to Henry Bienen and the Administration, two of which were private and one public.
   • September 30\textsuperscript{th} private missive: The letter was from twelve Buffet Institute affiliated faculty requesting the search be opened and that other finalists outside of Policy Studies be considered. It was sent to Chair of the Search Committee Henry Bienen and the Administration, but only the Administration responded.
   • November 23\textsuperscript{rd} (also the date the appointment of Eikenberry was announced) private missive: A letter with sixty seven plus signatures was sent to President Schapiro and Provost Linzer. Provost Linzer responded, who did not accede to the Faculty request that Eikenberry not be considered for that appointment.
   • February 9\textsuperscript{th} public missive: An open letter was published in the Daily Northwestern which had forty-six Faculty signatures. The signatures for that letter were sought on a Friday afternoon February 5\textsuperscript{th}. On February 8\textsuperscript{th} Professor Coronado received an invitation from Vice President for Research Jay Walsh to discuss the message sent in November. Faculty met with Vice President Walsh on February 10\textsuperscript{th} and had an informative and collegial discussion which represented and opening up of dialogue with the Administration.
   • Online Petition: A petition was posted online several days ago which has been signed by 130 colleagues at Northwestern, students, alumni, graduate students, and other from beyond Northwestern.

B) Items considered disinformation on the part of the Administration:
   • Selected candidate without qualification
   • Narrow range of candidates passed on, exclusive emphasis on policy expertise even though Buffett is not a policy institution
   • Absence of serious consideration of global talent pool
C) Reasons Karl Eikenberry is not qualified to lead the Buffett Institute:
   • Does not fit several criteria in official search document indicating position requirement of bona fide scholarship
   • He does not have a PhD and has published no peer reviewed articles
   • Stanford seems to hold view of NU faculty
• Administration and Trustee motives in conflict with goals of higher education

D) Other items to consider:
• Karl Eikenberry was recommended by Henry Bienen
• Overstated credentials for Karl Eikenberry
• The Buffett Institute has been an institute for humanistic and social scientific research which implies that there must be a scholar in charge of it.

Provost Dan Linzer thanked the Faculty Senate and President Hughes in particular for fostering the discussion and for providing a forum in which the discussion can take place. He also thanked Senator and Professor Michal Ginsburg for introducing the matter and Professor Jackie Stevens and Professor Jorge Coronado for their remarks. In response to Professor Jackie Stevens and Professor Jorge Coronado’s remarks, Provost Linzer responded as follows:

A) The process, its rationale, and how it compares to common hiring practice:
• Henry Bienen was invited by President Schapiro to lead the search. He is a distinguished Political Scientist, and former Dean of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International at Princeton University. He was the founder of the Center for International and Comparative Studies and got Roberta Buffett involved early on to support the center financially. A series of gifts from Roberta Buffett enabled NU to create the Buffett Center and transformed it into the Buffett Institute.
• The search committee was made up of the following five fulltime Faculty:
  • Distinguished Senior Faculty Brian Edwards, English Department in the Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences, and Director of Mideast and North African Studies
  • Professor Vinayak Dravid, Material Sciences and Engineering in the McCormick School of Engineering, and Director of Global Initiatives
  • Professor Soyini Madison, Performance Studies in the School of Communication - does Global Studies on performance
  • Professor Hendrik Spruyt, Department of Political Science in the Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences, and Former Director of the Buffett Center
  • Professor Ellen Wartella, Communication Studies in the School of Communication – studies communications largely TV and global contexts in childhood education and one of the originators of Sesame Street.
• The search committee was made up of the following three tenured Faculty that have primary administrative appointments:
  • Jay Walsh, Vice President for Research, to whom the Buffet Institute report to
  • Sally Blount, Dean of Kellogg
  • Ron Braeutigam, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education
• The inclusion of “position may or may not be filled by a tenured professor depending on career background” in the job description was driven by the uncertainty of who would
apply for the position and to ensure that someone not eligible for a tenured position, such as a government official coming out of office with a global leadership position, would still be considered.

- The charge to the search committee was exactly the same as for other Senior Administrative searches:
  - Develop the position description
  - Identify candidates to interview
  - As a common practice, members of the search committee are able to suggest candidates in addition to those who are identified through the search firm. The Administration does not state who should be on the candidate list or whom the committee should interview.
  - Conduct interviews
  - Decide which candidates are clearly above the bar and should be finalists in a search. The task of the committee is to identify people any one of whom they feel would be an excellent person in that role.

- The names of three finalists were put forth unanimously by the search committee and the Administration began to plan for the visits.

- From interview to recruit mode: the search committee initiates the process but the final selection of the candidate is up to the President and the Provost on all Senior Administrator searches including the Buffett Institute search.

- Confidentiality: the process for Dean searches, Vice President searches, and other Senior Administrator searches is confidential because it is the only way to get top candidates. Top candidates are often in positions where they do not want to reveal that they are looking at another job. The members of the search committee agreed to this process.

B) Selection of Karl Eikenberry:

- The President and Provost decided that Karl Eikenberry, out of the people put forward, was a terrific person to run Buffett because:
  - He will accomplish the goals set in the position description to enhance opportunities for Faculty and students.
  - He will increase Global visibility and impact: Karl Eikenberry has a huge network of colleagues throughout Asia and other parts of the world.
  - He is an invited speaker frequently.
  - He is already expanding opportunities for NU Faculty to engage and to give talks in getting them invitations in ways they have not before.
  - He will attract prominent visitors and speakers to campus with his connections in military and government.
  - He will expand resources through his own interactions with potential donors and foundations.
There was no conspiracy in his selection. Henry Bienen and Karl Eikenberry reported that they may have met each other once but Karl does not remember that meeting. They were at the same event.

Karl Eikenberry is qualified based on the job description. Currently he is the Oksenberg-Rohlen Distinguished Fellow at the Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center but is also a Professor of the Practice at Stanford University and has taught courses each year both graduate and undergraduate. He has interacted with students extensively. His courses are oversubscribed and he often has to turn away students interested in interacting with him. He has a Master’s Degree in Political Science from both Harvard and Stanford. He was accepted into the PhD at Stanford but was unable to finish because of being called back to Washington.

Karl Eikenberry has been at a peer institution now in his fifth year with extensive student and faculty engagement.

Karl Eikenberry brings a breadth that Northwestern has lacked and the goal in filling the position was to expand not replicate what is currently in place.

The floor was opened for discussion and a robust discussion ensued. Senator Michal Ginsburg again expressed concerns. There were a number of clarifying questions including the appropriate title for the Eikenberry position and how financial decisions within the Institute might be handled.

Senator Carol Simpson Stern stated that “Part of me is really saddened by the tenor of this discussion and this predicament we seem to find ourselves in because I find it extraordinarily narrow-minded to think that the definitive qualification is a PhD; that that’s the measure of what this man or woman needs to have to head the institute. At least from my own generation some of the finest minds I encountered and was educated by did not have a degree higher than a BS or BA so I don’t think that’s compelling. Everything I’ve heard this evening convinces me this was a properly conducted search. There were twelve names that got narrowed down. Members of that search committee agreed to that list of the twelve from which eventually Eikenberry is selected. So I think the selection process sounds to me wholly correct and I think a judgement was made. It takes us in a new direction. It certainly convinces me of greater global outreach than a great many moves we’ve made as an institution and now of course…he’s been offered the job. What on earth are we proving or demonstrating by this discussion, these petitions, these, I’m going to call them, antics. Now I think we should try and capitalize on this appointment that could prove to be very wonderful.”

Provost Linzer acknowledged the Faculty concerns about the hiring of Karl Eikenberry stating that he hears a legitimate concern that an unknown with a background that is different from what might have been expected, will take things in a new direction and not respect the kind of work being done currently. He assured everyone that all who were involved in the process, including members of the search committee, did their due diligence and the best candidate was selected.
9. Adjournment:
There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Diana Snyder
Administrative Coordinator