

Northwestern University
Minutes of the University Senate Meeting
May 06, 2008

The University Senate held its only meeting of the 2007–2008 year on May 6 in Hardin Hall on the Evanston Campus. Provost Daniel Linzer called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM. *Meeting called to order*

I. The minutes of the May 17, 2007 meeting were unanimously approved with two emendations. On page 3, GFC chair John Elson was erroneously identified as co-chair. On page 4, it was erroneously stated that the Administration has agreed that the Provost's office and the Program Review Council could cooperate in an AAU-approved review conducted by the GFC. The correction, supplied by Vice President Marilyn McCoy, states that "The Administration has agreed that the Provost's Office and the Program Review Council will oversee a faculty survey approved by the AAU Provosts. The Administration has not supported the GFC proposal for an annual and public survey of faculty about administrator performance. Instead, the Administration has noted its reliance on program review for administrative units." *Minutes approved*

II. Donna Jurdy, Chair of the GFC Subcommittee on Benefits, reported that her committee had reviewed the open enrollment program. Only minimal changes have been made for people moving between plans. A larger change is that reimbursements are now being processed by PayFlex. The committee reviewed their performance and made suggestions for improvement next year. In addition, the committee discusses and identifies problems with our health plans; one outstanding problem at present is that people are not being reimbursed for physical therapy that has been approved. New plans and possible changes are under consideration, such as the question whether additional supplemental disability insurance is warranted as an elective offering to increase coverage, and an improvement in the dental insurance plan, which has a very narrow margin between the deductible and the cap. Plans are also being considered for change in plans for retirees. She invites anyone interested to make suggestions related to benefits, ask questions, come to a meeting of the subcommittee, send e-mail, or join the subcommittee. *Report of GFC Benefits Subcommittee*

III. John Elson, Chair of the General Faculty Committee, reported on recent activities of the Committee. He remarked that this is the first time a major effort has been made to publicize and encourage attendance at the Senate meeting. At most Senate meetings, attendance has hovered around 10–12 while today's attendance is closer to 40. Four major issues addressed by the GFC this year will be of concern in the future. *Report of General Faculty Committee*

The first issue concerns faculty representation on presidential and other search committees. On March 5, the Chair of the Board of Trustees announced that four faculty members would be chosen for the presidential search committee on the basis of nominations that could be submitted by anyone by March 24. Elson called Vice President McCoy on the morning of March 5 and expressed the view that faculty representatives on the search committee should be nominated by representatives of the faculty, *viz.* the GFC. The GFC strongly agreed at its meeting that evening, and determined to proceed with its own nominations for faculty members on the presidential search committee. Through various processes, members produced nominations from their schools (the Law School determined its nominees by election). At a specially called meeting on March 19, the GFC chose thirteen faculty members to submit to the Board of Trustees as its nominees for the search committee. The Trustees subsequently expanded the search committee from its originally intended four faculty members to six, but it chose only one of the GFC nominees, GFC Chair-elect Laurie Zoloth. The dissatisfaction felt at this outcome was not, to be sure, with the five members on the search committee *Faculty representation on administrative search committees*

not nominated by the GFC, who could well, in fact, have been GFC nominees. The problem lay rather with the precedent created by the process of selection. Future faculty representatives could in the future be chosen by the Administration and Trustees for presidential and provost search committees and those faculty members might not represent faculty views. A second problem is the inevitable appearance that faculty representatives chosen by the Administration and the Board instead of by the faculty would feel some constraint not to oppose the decisions of the people responsible for their membership on the search committee. The action of the Trustees in March was not the result of precedent. When President Weber was chosen, there was a direct election by all faculty members of faculty representatives to the search committee. When President Bienen was selected, the General Faculty Committee submitted their nominees, all of whom were accepted by the Board of Trustees for the search committee. The Administration and Trustees are not being blamed for the present situation: rather it is the absence of any rules specifying how faculty search committee members are to be chosen. When there are no constraints on the Administration's powers to act, it is more likely than not that the Administration will exercise the powers that it sees fit to employ. The experience of the presidential search process so far in one of the reasons the GFC feels a more effective structure of faculty governance would be helpful.

The second issue of concern is the suspension of faculty governance. This arose in the spring of 2007 when the Dean of the Medill School of Journalism, with the apparent authorization of the then Provost, re-wrote the Medill curriculum and imposed it on the faculty without giving them the opportunity to vote. After complaints from some Medill faculty, several GFC members met with the Provost, who made it clear that he would not intervene to require a faculty vote on the new curriculum. At its June 2007 meeting, the GFC passed a resolution condemning this curricular change, which they considered a violation of the faculty's rights under the Statutes of the University to "prescribe and define the course of study." The resolution asked to work with the Administration to develop standards and procedures to avoid future such abrogations of faculty rights. On January 16, 2008, President Bienen announced that the Medill Dean's term would be extended and that the Medill faculty would be allowed to vote on the new curriculum in the fall or spring of 2009, 4½ semesters after the curriculum was imposed on the faculty. GFC committee members met with the Provost at the end of March and asked for two things: they submitted a draft of procedures that they suggested should be followed to limit the Administration's discretion to suspend faculty governance in the future, and failing that, they asked that the Administration state in writing that it would not in the future unilaterally suspend the faculty right to vote on its curriculum as it had in the Medill situation. The Provost did not agree to either of these requests. The final meeting of the GFC in June will consider a second resolution concerning this matter.

*Suspension of
faculty
governance*

The third issue of concern is the ombudsperson program. This was discussed at the May 2007 Senate meeting. Many of our peer institutions have active programs of this kind, and the GFC judges that such a program would provide valuable assistance, especially to young faculty, and would reduce the likelihood that grievances might result in more formal proceedings. At first, the Administration seemed very reluctant to move in this direction out of a concern for litigation arising from such a program. Now it appears to have Administration support for the basic principle, and University Counsel is making final checks to be sure there are no problems in Illinois that would make the program inappropriate. Some well qualified emeritus faculty are eager to serve as ombudspersons.

*Development of
ombudsperson
program*

The fourth issue is faculty salaries in light of the recent AAUP report on the economic status of the profession, calling attention to an overall decline in the purchasing power of average full-time faculty salaries nationwide for the third time in four years, and a widening gap between faculty and administrative

*AAUP survey of
faculty salaries*

salaries. GFC chair-elect Laurie Zoloth took the floor to lead discussion of this subject. She began by asking for a show of hands indicating how many in the room had never been to a Senate meeting, and another to learn how many knew what the GFC is and does. She explained it is the sub-committee of the Senate, which is the meeting of the faculty as a whole, essentially a town hall meeting between administrators and faculty to talk together about the future of the University and the nature, goal, and meaning of being in the University. The lack of such discussions, she said, has a bearing on ethics and public life in a community with an almost unique self-governance opportunity. A particular question that calls for discussion by the faculty is the economic status of this and other faculties. The AAUP website shows a significant gap between what women and men are paid across all academic ranks. The largest gap is at the assistant professor rank, where women are paid \$10,000 to \$13,000 less annually. Northwestern fits this general trend. It is an aspect of a larger downward trend in the buying power of academic salaries in which Northwestern participates. Everybody in the Senate has a chance to be heard on this and other issues with a bearing on the University as a whole.

Elson then opened up the floor to discussion of issues raised by the GFC report. Sandro Mussa-Ivaldi asked about the University's withdrawal of an honorary degree offer to Rev. Jeremiah Wright. Dr. Wright was quoted by Vice President Cabbage as saying that the degree had been removed because he was "not patriotic enough." This was denied, and it was affirmed instead that the degree offer had been removed "in light of controversies surrounding statements" made by Dr. Wright. Mussa-Ivaldi commented that this is not an acceptable argument for withdrawing an honorary degree. Universities are not supposed to penalize controversy, he said. On the contrary, civil controversy is an important ingredient of cultural, social, and political life. If, for example, an honorary degree had been conferred on Senator McCain, who is certainly not immune from controversy, as when he shouted "Bomb Iran!" he might not have had an honorary degree offer withdrawn. While one may disagree with Dr. Wright's statements, they are in the realm of legitimate debate. The honorary degree was decided prior to the recent controversy for reasons that are unrelated to it. There is no legitimate ground to change the original decision, and no reasonable supporting argument had been offered. The retraction of the honorary degree appears to be a somewhat clumsy and inappropriate political statement by the University, one that he, an a faculty member, cannot endorse. Elson added that Professor Mussa-Ivaldi is also a member of the GFC. On a related theme, it was remarked that after each subsequent campus shooting President Bienen has been urged to use his public platform to condemn the widespread availability of guns in the U.S. As Bienen has not responded to this suggestion, it would perhaps then fall to the Senate or the GFC to use their platform to join other university faculties to issue a statement on that subject. Returning to the question of honorary degrees, Al Hunter asked whether faculty governance gives the Senate the power to vote on honorary degrees. Elson answered that the Statutes provide for an Administration-appointed honorary degree committee (currently chaired by Janice Eberly). They present their recommendations to the GFC, which then advises the President on the recommendations. The President then transmits the recommendations to the Trustees, who make the final determination. Charles Thompson remarked that the Board of Trustees can take the initiative to add names to this list without consulting the faculty. As to the rescinding of an offer, Elson added that the Trustees had not officially approved the award to Rev. Wright at the time it was withdrawn. Doris Garraway observed that there are conceivably reasons why one could justifiably rescind an honorary degree offer, but she is not in agreement with the reasons provided, as they are potentially inconsistent with other values that the University upholds, such as academic freedom. Anupam Garg asked whether it is also in the President's discretion to rescind a degree before the names are conveyed to the Board of Trustees. Elson replied that the Statutes do not cover that situation, and the President evidently judged it to be within his authority. There were, he believes, informal discussions between the

Discussion

Administration and at least the chair of the Honorary Degree Committee, and that faculty members who brought Rev. Wright's name before the Committee were also consulted. But the Statutes do not cover this situation. Carol Simpson Stern asked whether Rev. Wright's name was presented to the Senate for a vote as has usually been done at its fall meeting. Zoloth pointed out that the Senate did not meet in the fall of 2007 and did not therefore have the presentation of honorary degree candidates such as was last made at the November 9, 2006 Senate meeting. The self-inflicted breach of governance, Stern remarked, was not to have had the regular fall meeting of the Senate and thus not to have conducted the business appropriate to the University. Zoloth took this opportunity to announce that the regular fall meeting of the Senate will take place next year and is scheduled for October 28. She asked members of the Senate to reserve that date on their calendars. Until then it is appropriate to think about what should be brought up and what colleagues should be present. The date will be posted on Planet Purple. This is an important moment for the University: to act like the faculty we want to be, with a real stake in governance. Provost Linzer remarked that a discussion about how to make things even better is a valid aspect of democracy, which does not always require unhappiness with something.

IV. Elson called upon Paul Arntson to present the GFC proposal for reform of faculty governance. Arntson recalled that this subject has been on the table for about two years. At the beginning of the present year, he began work with an administrative assistant and consulted with past GFC chairs about research in other universities. He prepared a spreadsheet for this meeting showing faculty governance at eight universities including Northwestern. The University Senate created the GFC in 1939 and expanded its membership in 1975. It asked the GFC to take up the problem of the revised statutes and the question of the most effective organization of the University Faculty. The GFC has acted on that mandate to consider the governance of the University by the Faculty. This is University-wide governance, having nothing directly to do with departments, schools, or the College. The most important faculty governance occurs at the department and school levels, where matters of faculty hiring, promotion, tenure, graduate student selection, regeneration of the profession, and teaching at every level are decided, including curriculum and course staffing. What happens at the University-wide level is in many ways less important to the faculty, but it is important enough. The question now to be considered is whether we should continue with a structure instituted when the Statutes were written and last amended in 1975, or is it now time to make some more changes? A study of our peer institutions reveals a similar trajectory of development in faculty governance. Many realized in the '60s and '70s that it is no longer feasible to have a university senate whose members are not elected. Faculty members simply do not flock into meetings, and what we need is an elected representative body of the Faculty that works in collaboration with the Administration, so that the President, Provost, and other senior officers would be part of the proposed Faculty Senate. By contrast, the GFC now works by itself, sometimes bringing in administrators and then going to the Administration to discuss issues. At some point in time, Stanford, Emory, and other faculties surveyed went from an unelected to an elected body that then became a faculty senate. The GFC has looked at options ranging from doing nothing—which they feel is not a viable option—to strengthening the GFC and leaving the Senate to remain as it is, to creating an elected faculty senate that would include the President, Provost, and other senior administrators as non-voting members. The last of these options is traditional in many parts of the country. We would also establish a strong subcommittee system, without which research shows significant change does not happen. The infrastructure support of faculty governance lies in strong subcommittees that include administrators. For example, an education subcommittee would need the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education to meet with it at appropriate times. An elected faculty senate that includes the President and the Provost would have the needed connection with administrators as well as necessary research and information. In summary,

*Proposal for
Reform of
Faculty
Governance*

the proposal is to change our current structure in a way that would better ensure an effective flow of information and ideas. In shared faculty governance, the board of trustees has all the power; however, AAUP standards suggest there are limits to the board's power in functions such as selection of faculty, promotion and tenure, curriculum, and classroom staffing. These are typically left to faculty governance. Arntson showed flow charts contrasting the present organization of faculty governance with the proposed re-organization. The coming change in the Central Administration makes this re-organization especially timely, setting in place a more robust structure of faculty governance. The new administration would be engaged with an energized faculty body that is ready to work with a new President. The two bodies that ensure continuity are the Trustees and the Faculty; administrations come and go. This makes the connection between Trustees and Faculty particularly important, assuring the institution the benefit of shared governance. An elected Senate based on a strong subcommittee system would under current proposals be established in the Statutes as it is at many other universities of our stature. At present, neither the GFC nor the Senate have bylaws. Such bylaws could ensure a more direct relationship with the Administration and establish joint communication with the Board of Trustees as can be seen at other institutions around the country. The base of the proposed structure, instead of the University Senate, is what is now being called a University Town Hall meeting, and is sometimes called the university assembly or university forum at other universities. An elected Faculty Senate would bring representative democracy; the University Assembly or Town Hall meeting is a form of direct democracy, constituting a potential check and balance on the Faculty Senate. Failing a quorum at an Assembly, its resolutions would be passed to the Faculty Senate, which would be required to respond to them. This system is in place at some of our peer institutions. A quorum at our present Faculty Senate is set by University Statutes at 40 members — a level of participation reached only twice in recent memory. A quorum of an Assembly or Town Hall meeting is variously set at 20% or 1/3 of the faculty at other institutions. These levels were met at Northwestern's Senate during the Vietnam War but seldom if ever afterward. Today's proposal is a first reading of the idea of an elected Senate, a University Town Hall meeting that would take place twice a year, and a subcommittee structure. A supportive response at the present Senate meeting would result in the drafting of bylaws and statutes identifying exactly how an elected Senate would operate, specifying accountability for faculty and administration alike. One example of operating rules is how presidential and provost search committees are constituted. AAUP presidential search standards strongly emphasize that faculties should choose their own representatives on such committees. This standard helps to ensure the legitimacy of the search process; but at present Northwestern has nothing written down. Instead, we have relied upon an oral culture surrounding governance procedures. In a university environment that has become increasingly corporate, an oral culture no longer works. Compared to many of our peer institutions, Northwestern is late in responding to the need for clearly defined accountability.

Al Hunter asked what the benefits to the Administration would be under the proposed new structures. The foremost benefit, Arntson replied, would be clarity. Administrators would know whom to go to for discussion of what kinds of issues, they would know what we expect of them. A great deal of GFC activity over the past two years has been arguments over process. The better the understanding of process, the sooner discussion can focus on content. It would also be to any administrator's advantage to feel that shared governance is collaborative rather than confrontational.

Questions

In response to a question about the role of lecturer faculty, Arntson remarked that this is a new subject for the Senate and GFC. Up until now, participants have been tenure-track faculty. Peer institutions are again ahead of Northwestern in the realization that a large amount of the teaching and

Lecturer faculty

research is done by non-tenure track faculty who are full time and have been teaching at Northwestern for a dozen to twenty years. Here, they have no voice at the university level. As they are professional colleagues, this exclusion is a wrong that should be corrected. It will therefore be proposed that about 20% of the Faculty Senate be non-tenure track and that the University Assembly include all tenure and non-tenure track full time faculty in its voting membership. Sandro Mussa-Ivaldi asked whether this proposal was being put forward for adoption in a first reading, and if so in what form suggestions for improvements would be accepted. Arntson replied there is ample opportunity for amendments, particularly as the goal is consensus. No vote is being requested at today's meeting beyond a full airing of the issues between the present meeting and the next Senate meeting on October 28. Proposed bylaws would be made available about the end of September. Elson added that the GFC is hoping to get a sense at the present meeting whether a change in faculty governance is worth pursuing. If there is no enthusiasm, the project will be dropped for lack of support.

Charles Thompson declared his enthusiasm for the change and added some suggestions of his own for its realization. The problem, he said, is that the University Statutes created a Senate to perform specific tasks; a previous Senate, acting within the Statutes, created a GFC that works better at some times than at other. When the GFC works less well, it is often because some faculties do not conduct the necessary elections to fill vacancies in the GFC or because some of the members elected do not serve. Members who do serve lack clear procedures, and things that need to be done are left undone. The result is a shortage of confidence in the GFC. Of the actions recommended by Arntson, he agreed with the second (a strong subcommittee system for the GFC) in preference to the third (a University Assembly). The several plans proposed, Thompson said, appear to require action by the Trustees to revise the statutes in ways that transfer power from the current Senate to an enlarged and re-named GFC, in some ways turning the Senate into a toothless voice for constituencies other than the collective faculty of the University. None of these measures deal directly with the problems. The main suggestion is to develop some bylaws directed to these problems. These should specify how members of an elected Senate are to be selected, identify members' rights and responsibilities, establish standing subcommittees, and describe a decision-making process. His draft of bylaws, he believes, captures the needed changes within the existing bylaws of the University. Arntson responded that he welcomes Thompson's suggestions.

Carol Simpson Stern remarked that it would be a mistake to introduce changes as many and as substantive as are proposed for the present moment. Concerns have been expressed about the selection of the presidential search committee and the suspension of faculty control over the Medill curriculum. The first of these could be addressed today by a Senate resolution taking exception to the method of selecting a search committee. It is a mistake, she said, to lose control of the transition period to a new president because we are lost in a venture that is so ambitious. Until recently, we have had a weak GFC and an administration without a strong commitment to shared governance processes. We should not, therefore, be surprised that the College has managed for the past five or six years to have appointments to nearly all its committees made by Associate Dean Marie Jones. One of the prerogatives of the Senate lies in the University Faculty Reappointment, Tenure and Dismissal Appeals Panel, the mechanism that tries to assure due process for new as well as senior faculty and that has remained active. But in other respects we do not have evidence that we have been able to get the kind of leadership and participation that the GFC requires. With change coming at the top level of administration, she would feel more confident if administrators at the school level were being held accountable for correct procedures for searches and faculty governance. During the Weber presidency, administrative micro-management was offset by heavy faculty participation. In the Bienen years, faculty participation dropped off drastically. Rather than change the

structures, she argued, the faculty should fill GFC positions, attend meetings, advance governance at the school level, and try to see for the next two years whether the faculty role can be restored. Prior to the appointment of a new president, she said, it is unlikely the Trustees would accept any changes in the Statutes. John Elson replied that the GFC had trouble filling its membership early in the present academic year. Starting in January, the membership was filled and the GFC is the most active and concerned he has seen in the six years of his membership. One of the most useful aspects of the proposal for restructuring is that it provides for effective subcommittees. With 21 GFC members, there are too few to ensure an effective subcommittee process with all the issues that need attention. An elected Faculty Senate would make strong subcommittees more feasible. Christine Froula said that on the basis of her experience on the GFC she would feel more inclined to invest time in the work of the GFC and the Senate if the proposed governance structure were adopted. She supported Stern's suggestion that the new structure be better articulated before the arrival of a new president, as this would energize the faculty to work with a new administration. It was then remarked that the number of faculty present at this meeting showed a strong interest in the current proposal. It is unrealistic to expect the full Senate as it is now to function effectively in faculty governance. When the proposal has been fully drafted it should be put to a secret ballot.

Donna Leff remarked that the Senate's current problems are not entirely structural, though she supports the call of the GFC for changes. The constituent most affected by the lack of faculty governance has been Medill, where the faculty role was suspended. It is impossible to get an answer from the Administration why or even whether this role was suspended. On a certain level, it does not matter what the structures are: there is a perfectly good set of bylaws at the Medill School of Journalism, but it has a Dean who has hired a consultant to find a better set of bylaws instead of trying to function under those that exist. The faculty did not refuse to accept the new curriculum imposed upon it, she said: they were simply never consulted at all. The Administration never attempted to live with the existing governance structure. The Dean, Provost, and President declared a kind of emergency under which they would act by themselves to alter the curriculum. The same could happen to any academic unit of the University. This is a private university that can do anything the Administration wants. The functioning of a governance system depends upon mutual trust and respect, failing which it does not matter what the structures of governance are unless you are the power behind the governance. The fact that the faculty's power is subordinated to that of the Trustees and Administration obviates any present or contemplated procedures of shared governance, she said. What happened at Medill was entirely without faculty consultation, even with the most senior faculty. Arntson commented that research about such practices is conclusive, finding that traditional faculty roles in governance are being set aside nationwide. Research published in 2003 that surveyed about 2000 faculty and administrators across the country found that shared governance is under some duress. Clearly, structural and procedural changes alone will not change that state of affairs. Appropriate structure that builds a collaborative environment can, when there is trust, result in a degree of shared governance. In the meantime, suspension of shared faculty governance is a continuing concern of the GFC, which made a strong statement about the Medill situation at its June 2007 meeting. The most recent Provost was able to tick off six times during his tenure of office when faculty governance was overridden prior to its suspension at Medill. When this condition is anticipated, how can it be avoided, and after it has started, how can the faculty get out of it? This is part of the case that is being made for new procedures.

*Suspension of
faculty
governance at
Medill*

Charles Thompson offered to send copies of his suggestions for restructuring by e-mail to anyone who did not get a copy at the present meeting. Sandro Mussa-Ivaldi stated that the underlying idea of an elected Senate representation, far from being a novelty, is in place and working well at many

universities. It benefits the administrative process to have representative faculty views known and discussed. John Elson pointed out that the GFC did vote favorably on the faculty governance proposals put before the Senate at the present meeting, including the proposal for an elected Faculty Senate of 50 members with an Assembly of all faculty. He then asked for a show of hands on the question of asking the GFS to move ahead with the proposal outlined by Paul Arntson for an elected Faculty Senate. Some thirty of those present signified their support for the project, marking a substantial majority in favor. Three voted opposed. He also said that he would present to the GFC the proposal supporting a gun ordinance. He also announced that the presidential search committee would hold an open meeting on May 8 for staff and faculty to voice their opinions about the qualifications and qualities to be sought in the new president. He urged members of the Senate to attend that meeting and express their views.

V. Provost Daniel Linzer urged members of the faculty present at this meeting to sign the attendance list in circulation. As this is the only Senate meeting in the present year, he undertook to mention some of the highlights of the year. While it is appropriate to grapple with issues requiring faculty attention, it is also a time to reflect on accomplishments we have seen and consider what we are as an institution going forward. He began by acknowledging Larry Dumas' contributions to Northwestern as Dean of the College and later as Provost, and by regretting the health situation that led him to step down from that role last summer. This led to Linzer's move from Dean of the College to University Provost, and the move of Alson Morris, then Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the College, to Acting Dean. Linzer expressed his personal gratitude to Dumas for his service to the University and to Morris for agreeing, on four days' notice, to postpone a research leave of absence in favor of duty as Acting Dean of Weinberg.

*Remarks of the
Provost*

Highlights of the 2007–2008 year at Northwestern included an agreement with the Qatar Foundation signed in November to open our first undergraduate campus in Education City near Doha and to offer Northwestern Degrees there in Communication and in Journalism. This great opportunity and undertaking in November to develop an entire academic program, to be followed in August of the following year by the readying of students, faculty, courses, administrators, space, and many other details, was possible only by the efforts of a great many people, including James Hurley who led the budget and planning process as head of the Office of Budget Planning, University General Counsel Tom Cline who negotiated details on the contracts, the leadership and several members of the School of Communication and the Medill School of Journalism who created the academic programs and recruited faculty participants. Susan Dun of the School of Communication worked on recruitment of high school seniors for the entering class at Northwestern University Qatar (NUQ); as of the last tally, we already have fifteen students coming into the program in Communication and twelve into Journalism, out of the maximum sought of twenty in each program. Linzer also thanked John Margolis, who has served here for 26 years as Associate Provost and will now serve as inaugural Dean of the Qatar Campus. He will be leaving this summer for his new post in the Middle East. The Qatar enterprise dovetails extremely well with the University's commitment to build up in the Middle East. A year and a half ago, Carl Petrie of the History Department led a task force that reported on the state on Middle East studies here and at other institutions. That report was presented as part of the annual plan for the College and led to an immediate decision by the Central Administration to support Middle East studies by aggressive hiring in this area. A number of the resulting searches have already been successful; as part of the process, there have been commitments to the Library to build up collections in this field. These are some of the multiple facets of Northwestern's development in the Middle East and engagement of students and faculty in this exciting enterprise.

NU Qatar

The inaugural year of the Kellogg certificate program in Financial Economics is

Financial

leveraging one of our professional schools to create an opportunity for undergraduates. The students in that program are remarkable; they number 45, well above the minimum of 20 expected.

Economics

Next year we will begin a program in Managerial Analytics for students coming to the McCormick School of Engineering. The Kellogg faculty are thrilled to be teaching some of the brightest undergraduates that we have.

Managerial Analytics

A new curriculum in the Kaplan Humanities Scholars Program, formulated by Ken Alder and his colleagues on the nature of the good society, offered courses in the fall and winter and was selected as their top choice by 3–4 times the number of freshmen that could be accommodated.

Kaplan Humanities Scholars Program

While we see a huge interest in economics, management, and pre-med, we also saw an impressive interest by entering undergraduates in a deep engagement with the humanities. This broad student interest is fostered even more with the inauguration of the Brady Scholars Program for Ethics and Civic Life, directed by Laurie Zoloth, Director of the Center for Bioethics, Science, and Society. This takes a strong foundation in the humanities and applies it to deep questions about the behavior of individuals, neighbors, and citizens.

Brady Scholars Program for Ethics & Civic Life

This year's admissions process brought over 25,000 applications, a very large increase. Acceptances, due to be postmarked May 1, and still trickling in. By the metric of applications, it appears our efforts to improve the student experience have had some success. We are one of the universities that have adopted a no-loan program for the neediest students. Unlike many of our peer institutions, we evaluate need in addition to income, allowing us to respond to families with a higher income but more needy circumstances.

Admissions and financial aid

That was made possible in part by the success, through our technology transfer office, not only in optimizing quarterly revenues but also in a one-time monetization of a portion of the future revenue stream of Lyrica, the technology transfer product. Those funds have all gone into endowment to support the future of the University and into the primary endowments that have been created in addition to our new tuition and financial aid program. Also supported are graduate student support, the Office of Research for setup costs and shared facilities, and Facilities Management to maintain the buildings where our work is conducted.

Technology transfer revenues

In addition to renovations, major new facilities are under construction, among them Silverman Hall. We have announced planning for construction of a new music building, for which a committee has been appointed and architect interviews are under way. Planning is also under way for new buildings at the Medical School and Kellogg. Building needs are not only for the size of the faculty but also for the important advances they are making in a variety of scholarship and creative work.

Construction projects

To give one example, Teresa Woodruff led an effort that earned one of the NIH Road Map grants, a \$25M+ project on oncofertility, a word she coined to describe fertility preservation for women undergoing cancer chemotherapy. The project is multidisciplinary and multi-institutional, part of a larger enterprise here on women's health research, which in turn is part of a Northwestern project called Cells to Society that is enabling us to combine a variety of research fields that investigate health disparities based on social and economic status. Important as that is in itself, it also positions us to compete for a population research center, a goal that we have for coming years.

Oncofertility

Another important area is the nanosciences and the recruitment of Sir J. Fraser Stoddart; Northwestern is building what is arguably the strongest

Nanoscience and Nanotechnology

program in the country in nanoscience and nanotechnology. Our partnerships across departments and schools and with Argonne National Laboratories are critical to this effort. Stoddart, who was directing the Nanotechnology Institute of California, is an important addition both as a statement that it is happening here and because he is one of the strongest scientists in the world in this area.

Another development is in the School of Music, where Dean Toni-Marie Montgomery and her colleagues successfully recruited Victor Goines, who had developed the jazz program at Juillard, to run a jazz program here. We therefore have a lot to be proud about at Northwestern. This has been a very good year, he concluded, and he looks forward to many more.

Jazz program for Northwestern

VI. There being no new business to bring forward, the meeting was adjourned at 5:07 PM.

Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel
Secretary to the University Senate

H.

Garrison