Faculty Senate
Executive Committee
Friday, February 8, 2013
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. – Adelbert Hall, Room M2

AGENDA

9:00 a.m.	Approval of Minutes from the January 14, 2013 Executive Committee Meeting, *attachment*	R. Dubin
9:05 a.m.	President's Announcements	B. Snyder
9:10 a.m.	Provost's Announcements	B. Baeslack
9:15 a.m.	Chair's Announcements	R. Dubin
9:20 a.m.	Honorary Degree Nominations, *attachments*	B. Baeslack
9:30 a.m.	Art History/Museum Studies PhD-Discontinuation of Program, *attachment*	C. Rozek
9:35 a.m.	WSOM Undergraduate Majors, *attachment*	J. Johnson
9:40 a.m.	Tobacco Free Campus Update	B. Snyder C. Gregory E. Click
9:55 a.m.	Member report (SON)	P. Higgins
10:05 a.m.	Member report (MSASS)	D. Crampton
10:15 a.m.	Approval of February 20, 2013 Faculty Senate Agenda, *attachment*	R. Dubin

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the February 8, 2013 Meeting
Adelbert Hall, Room M2

Committee Members in Attendance

Bud Baeslack	Patricia Higgins	David Singer
Gary Chottiner	Joseph Mansour	Martin Snider
David Crampton	William Merrick	Barbara Snyder
Robin Dubin	Dale Nance	Rebecca Weiss
Steve Garverick	Leena Palomo	

Committee Members Absent
Dick Buchanan

Others Present
Charles Rozek
Jennifer Johnson

Call to Order
Prof. Robin Dubin, chair, Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the January 14, 2013 meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee were reviewed and approved.

President's Announcements
The President made no announcements.

Provost's Announcements
The Provost reported that the strategic planning steering committee and the working groups met on February 4th. The session was very productive. Additional information will be shared with the Senate later in the semester. The college/schools are working on their annual budgets.

Chairs Announcements
The chair of the Faculty Senate made no announcements.

Honorary Degree Nominations
The Honorary Degree Committee unanimously approved the awarding of honorary degrees to Peter B. Lewis and Frank Gehry. An honorary degree is a means of recognizing excellence in any valued aspect of human endeavor. The Executive Committee approved the awarding of the degrees. *Attachment*

Art History/Museum Studies PhD -Discontinuation of Program
Professor Catherine Scallen, CAS, presented a proposal to discontinue the PhD program in Art History and Museum Studies. The PhD program has graduated just six students in its history and one since 2001. Aspects of this degree program will be incorporated into the remaining PhD in Art History. The proposal was approved by the CAS in 2012 and the Faculty Senate Committee on Graduate Studies on January 28, 2013. The Executive Committee voted to place the proposal on the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting. *Attachment*

WSOM Undergraduate Majors
Professor Jennifer Johnson, WSOM, presented a proposal to change the three concentrations in the B.S. of Management to majors for the fall of 2013. This change will help students better understand the offerings of the business school. The new majors are in Finance, Marketing, and the Dean's Approved Major. In changing from concentrations to majors, the curriculum has been updated and courses have been added. The majors will be reflected on the student's transcript and the diploma. The Executive Committee voted to place the proposal on the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting. *Attachment*

Report from the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel (replaced report on SON)

Professor Patricia Higgins provided a report on the activities of the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel. The committee has been reviewing proposals to revise the emeritus faculty provisions and the pre-tenure extension provisions of the Faculty Handbook. The proposals will be presented to the Executive Committee. Prof. Higgins informed the committee that under the Conciliation and Mediation provisions of the Faculty Handbook, the Conciliation Counselor is required to report to the Committee on Faculty Personnel on an annual basis. There is a need to address issues related to contingent faculty but the Committee on Faculty Personnel has not been charged with doing so.

Tobacco-Free Campus Policy Update

President Snyder introduced a draft plan for a Tobacco-Free Campus which, if approved, could be ready for implementation in the fall of 2014. The plan will be vetted by a number of different campus groups and presented to the Faculty Senate next year. In July of 2012, the Ohio Board of Regents recommended that all public universities adopt tobacco-free campus plans. Adopting a plan at CWRU would promote the health and well-being of the campus community and surrounding areas. The policy would prohibit the use of tobacco products in all spaces owned or leased by CWRU, including but not limited to all interior space, outside property or grounds, private vehicles while on CWRU property, university vehicles, etc. In the draft policy, employees would be prohibited from using tobacco products during work hours, whether on or off university property. University Hospitals has a similar policy for its campus and the Cleveland Clinic does not hire employees who are smokers. CWRU is interested in incentivizing its employees not to smoke.

There was considerable discussion about the various provisions of the draft. Some of the proposed policies were felt to be too intrusive. President Snyder said that this is just the first iteration of the draft plan and that it is likely to change as they receive feedback and comments.

Member Report (MSASS)

Professor David Crampton reported on recent activities at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences. The school has completed its 5-year strategic plan and is looking to engage with the university in its current strategic planning process. Administration of the online MSSA has been labor intensive but the program is going well. The first cohort of students will begin the MNO program in June. MSASS is interested in contributing to undergraduate education at CWRU. In planning for future programs, the school will be more strategic with respect to budgetary considerations.

Approval of the February 20, 2013 Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

The Executive Committee voted to approve the proposed agenda for the February 20, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting. In her announcements at the Senate meeting, Prof. Dubin will inform the Senate that Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook is being revised to reflect changes to the Budget Committee language. The Faculty Senate By-Laws will also be revised accordingly. These changes are provisional as they have not yet been approved by the University Faculty. They will be presented to the University Faculty at the annual meeting next fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20a.m.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Rebecca Weiss
Secretary of the University Faculty

INVITATION TO NOMINATE FOR HONORARY DEGREE

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Case Western Reserve University invites nominations for honorary degrees by which the university can recognize persons who exemplify in their work the highest ideals and standards of "excellence in any valued aspect of human endeavor, including the realm of scholarship, public service, and the performing arts." (Faculty Handbook, 3, III.X)

The honorary degree committee is chaired by Provost W. A. "Bud" Baeslack and includes: Gerry Matisoff, Arts and Sciences; John Lewandowski, Engineering; Leena Palomo, Dental Medicine; Michael Scharf, Law; David Clingingsmith, Management; Nathan Berger, Medicine; Diana Morris, Nursing; Sharon Milligan, Applied Social Sciences; Patrick Kennedy, Physical Education and Athletics; and *ex-officio* members University Marshal Robin Dubin; and Deputy Provost Lynn Singer. Nominations for honorary degrees to be conferred at a future commencement may be submitted throughout the year. *Current members of the faculty, the staff, or the Board of Trustees are not eligible for an honorary degree.*

The university community is invited to submit nominations, preferably by e-mail, to the office of the provost, c/o Lois Langell (lois.langell@case.edu), or to any committee member by September 14, 2012, for consideration during the fall semester 2012. **Nominees should not be informed of the nomination**.

For full review, please include the information listed below. Incomplete nominations cannot be considered.

RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD OF AN HONORARY DEGREE

Submit by September 14, 2012 for review in the fall term.
Please do not inform the nominee of his or her nomination

Nominee: Frank O. Gehry

Attachments:

_X_ Nominating letter

_X_ Nominee's vita or biography Several available on the web

_____ Maximum of five letters of support (optional)

_X_ Other materials (optional). Chapter from Managing as Designing

Nominator: Richard Boland and Fred Collopy

Contact information: boland@case.edu; collopy@case.edu

Status (student, faculty, staff, alumna/us) faculty

Dear Provost Baeslack,

We write to nominate Frank O. Gehry to receive an honorary Doctorate Degree from Case Western Reserve University. He is recognized as one of the greatest architects of all time, and he has also made significant contributions to the CWRU community and particularly to the Weatherhead School of Management.

Frank O. Gehry has received most major awards given to artists and architects, including the Pritzker Award in Architecture, and the National Medal of Arts. His buildings have pushed the boundaries of traditional materials and forms, and opened new horizons in what architecture can be. From his eclectic house in Santa Monica, to the amazing sculptural presence of the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, Spain, Frank Gehry's artistic expression has redefined the built environment.

It is important to note that he is not just a great artist, but has also made fundamental contributions to the technology of design and construction. He has recaptured the role of architect as master builder by being the leader in incorporating advanced digital technologies into both architectural design and the construction process. His adoption of three dimensional digital tools from the aerospace industry changed the economics of construction and expanded the possibilities for shaping the spaces we inhabit. Even though he personally is not a computer expert, his firm has developed the most sophisticated digital design tools and integrated them with materials acquisition and construction scheduling software to reduce the cost and improve the quality of what can be built.

On the CWRU campus, his iconic Peter B. Lewis Building has had an immediate positive impact on the vibrancy and self-understanding of our university community and the city at large. The Lewis Building is a bold assertion of the importance of innovation and invention to the University and is a daily inspiration to students, faculty and visitors of what can be achieved with bold vision, advanced technology, and human ingenuity. The effect on the Weatherhead School of Management has been profound.

Frank Gehry's architectural design, advances in technology, and project management approaches inspired the Weatherhead faculty to see design as a mode of cognition and as an approach to solving difficult problems in creatively productive ways that are important and powerful for management leaders. Our faculty has used that realization as a stimulus for a growing global effort to transform management education. The "Manage by Designing" movement he has stimulated educates the whole person and combines the analytic, technological and computational logics needed for evaluating situations that require management intervention, as well as the creatively synthetic and abductive logics required to envision a better world, along with the design and constructive skills to bring those ideas into being.

The Weatherhead faculty saw that Frank Gehry's adoption of full three dimensional digital modeling software was a uniquely humanistic approach to the incorporation of advanced technologies in modern business. The school has received several National Science Foundation grants to study over a dozen of his projects, to gain insights for how management can benefit from his examples. That research has produced significant contributions to our understanding of organizational and technological innovations and created a score of high profile publications, including the widely recognized statement of reinventing management education, Managing as Designing (Boland and Collopy, Stanford University Press, 2004)

Architecture, engineering and construction are highly traditional fields with established practices that have evolved over centuries. Yet Frank Gehry has transformed the field in a matter of decades, not only through designing dramatically shaped structures and spaces, but also by inventing new organizational processes, new project management techniques, new contractual arrangements among all the parties that collaborate on a large building project, and new ways of integrating advanced computing technologies into the daily practice of design and construction.

For the importance of his accomplishments as an artist and architect and for the significant impact he has had on our university in its teaching, research and community life, we proudly nominate Frank O. Gehry to receive an honorary Doctor of Philosophy in Arts and Sciences.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Boland, Jr.
Professor and Chairman,
Department of Information Systems
Treuhaft Professor of Design in Management,
Weatherhead School of Management
Professor of Cognitive Science,
Case Western Reserve University

Fred Collopy
Vice Dean
Professor of Design & Innovation
Weatherhead School of Management
Professor of Cognitive Science,
Case Western Reserve University

2

Reflections on Designing and Architectural Practice

Frank O. Gehry

WHEN AN artsy type like myself is confronted with going to a business school, I wonder how to talk about things that would be of interest to business school people. It's easy to think, "Well, business is a bunch of greedy guys who are just trying to make a lot of money, they'll do anything for a buck." Business has gotten a bad name in the course of the last few months, which is something I hope you all are going to correct in the near future. But I've read through the papers that you've written for this workshop and I'm staggered by the depth of thinking in them, by the literary references, and by the art references. The papers are brilliant and wide-ranging. The breadth of interest represented here is humbling to me. I'm very impressed with them. So I know very well that I am in the presence of a very serious group of people who are agonizing about things that are in a way very similar to the things that I agonize about, although our language, our vocabulary, is different. In your papers, you are asking, among other things, what is good design? Let me start by saying that I don't know if the Lewis Building is any good or not. At this point, after several years working with the faculty, having the presidents and deans change several times, and having just completed the building, it's hard to know if it's good or not.

The client is very important to me because you need a partner. It can't be the sound of one hand clapping. The best building, the best work, is done in concert with the client. The right client was an important part of making the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, Spain a success. The Basque government

---

Frank O. Gehry, *Gehry Partners, L.L.P.* This chapter is an edited transcription of Mr. Gehry's keynote speech at the Managing as Designing Workshop.

made a business decision to change the persona of the city in order to attract more people. They selected Jim Sterling, who was alive then, to do the railroad station. He was a really brilliant architect in London. They selected Norman Foster to do the subway, a thirty-kilometer underground rail. They selected Santiago Calatrava to do the airport, and he also did a bridge across the river, near my building. They had a competition to create a new museum and made an agreement to develop it with Tom Krens of the Guggenheim, who was looking for a way to globalize his collection. He was a painter and he has an MBA, so he's got a background in both disciplines that he's playing with, and he's quite brilliant at it.

On this project, Dick Boland has been the stalwart, has been the constant for me. In my mind, he's been the client, the person who is most interested in and most excited about the project. In the Lewis Building, I'm looking for a way to have the architecture complement the issues that the faculty are concerned about and also the issues that you discuss in your papers. The Lewis Building was intended to be a background that is not predictable—you can get lost in it. When it's filled with students, it should be pretty exciting. It's a simple plan. It's really a box with offices around the perimeter and classrooms in the middle. The circulation patterns, the ways that people will get around in it, are built in a way so that students and faculty will collide with each other—will come across each other in unexpected ways. They will find certain places where they want to go when they need to sit down and talk. Those places are going to be their niches, their favorite places to be with each other. And that's what a building needs to do. It has to facilitate that type of spontaneity and comfort of interaction and that was the intent here.

When I make a building, I tell clients at the start that we are going to be in a liquid state for a lot of the time. In the liquid state, there is information gathering and agonizing about program issues like adjacencies, land use, materials, and bureaucracies that we have to deal with. During that liquid period, we make a lot of study models, and some of the models are pretty scary looking. When we show them to a client, they get pretty nervous. We call them *schreck* models. It's a Yiddish expression for making people nervous. I do that so they can follow along with the trajectory of my thinking, which I believe is linear, actually. It's not predictable, but it is linear. I push something here, and then I see something, and then I take that and incorporate it. I think it's an opportunistic kind of process that evolves with the inputs that I'm getting from the client and the world around and all of the issues that have to be dealt with to bring a building from the beginning to the end. As it crystallizes, I tell the clients, it's more difficult to go back. Because by the time the building becomes crystallized, the ineffable has become more precise, and by then we've

invested in engineering and we've invested a lot of time in model making, and to start retrofitting at that point is costly. So we try to keep the process liquid in the early stages—liquid, but with direction because we've got to produce a building. We know that. We have a goal to produce a building that has got to cost X, has to stand up, has to keep the rain out, and all of those things.

Staying liquid allows the freedom to make choices for quite a long time in the process so that there are a lot of opportunities for the design of the building. Some of my colleagues work quite differently. They will come in at the beginning with a kind of idea and then later show a finished model of it and say to the client, "This is it." And the clients, in many cases, prefer that because they don't want to think about it. It's over their heads. They can't really think that way. They're not trained for it and they're scared. They don't want to show their ignorance. If you do work for corporate America, you almost have to do it that way and that's why I don't do a lot of corporate work. On corporate projects, you are always working with the executive vice president, and when you are finished, you go to a meeting with the president. The president hasn't been involved in the process and comes in and looks at this thing and says, "Are you kidding? We're not going to build that." And it's just because they are not complicit in the process.

In our process, I require that the person who is going to make final decisions be involved in the process all the way through, so I don't have that terrible day of meeting with somebody who hasn't been there but has the final decision on the project. When the decision makers are complicit in the process, they are involved in the design with me. They have seen the *schreck* models. They understand the choices. They understand the priorities that were set and why they were set. And they understand that their money is being spent in a prudent way for the things they are interested in.

For example, when I started working with MIT on their building, I had a seven-hundred-person client. I had the president of the university, two hundred-some faculty, and four hundred students. They were suspicious by nature of architecture. They said, "Architects spend money on their ego trip and it's going to be at the expense of my office. I'm not going to have the office I want." They all care about their office. We took a big risk and created a Web site that all seven hundred people could access. At the end of each week, we put all of our thinking on the Web site—as raw as it was and maybe unreadable to a layperson. They had our email and they could respond to what was on the site or anything else. In the first year, I got a lot of hate mail, and they were relentless. Some of them even went so far as to interview old clients, back to twenty years before, and reopen old wounds and post that on the site. But by the end of the design process, the letters were constructive and bordering on sympa-

thetic. They went the other way and were begging for more architecture. They were begging for more sculptural forms.

We showed MIT in the first three or four months what their budget would allow. It was a brick box, with a hole in it. Most clients start out with budgets that are unrealistic. They have a contractor or developer on their board who says, "Oh, I build buildings for $100 a square foot. Just double it and we can do whatever we want." So, you take people through and show them what their budget will allow, and that's not why they came to me. Then you develop what a normal budget would be for a building of their type. You can find that out on the computer, of course. You can say, "Cleveland, Ohio, business school building, X number of square feet." You push the button and they will give you the range for all the comparable buildings that have been built. Those costs are then indexed for the day you are going to start the construction and they will tell you that the range for the Lewis Building would be from $300 to $400 per square foot. I think we are somewhere in the middle of that range. We had a construction cost of about $340 per square foot. When we started, the budget was $240, so we had to make that budget become real. The biggest variable is the marketplace, and when we began the Lewis Building, the marketplace was hot. You couldn't get bidders for concrete and steel. Those are the two big industries that you can't corral. They're too big. So you are left to the winds, and those are the main things that fluctuate. If you get just one concrete bidder like we did for a building in Boston, they just put any price on it. So there is de facto collusion in this industry. And when the Lewis Building was bid, we talked to our architectural competitors and we were all getting 20–30 percent overpriced across the board in our projects. Now the economy is slowing down, and although prices are starting to become more reasonable, the donors are disappearing. So I think there is always a difficult balance in these projects.

In your papers, I think it was Paul Kaiser who made a reference to John Cage and the role of randomness in design collaboration, and I would like to comment on that. On a building, I don't know where I'm going when I start. If I knew where I was going, I wouldn't go there, that's for sure. It's not interesting to me to go do something that is preordained. And the randomness is part of an opportunistic process of working with the clients and with the constraints and the way they stimulate you in developing the buildings. The problem is that when Mies van der Rohe developed his vocabulary, he followed a line of work that began in the nineteenth century. In developing his corner detail, he drew from his teacher, Schinkel, who had borrowed from Behrens. If you go back to Schinkel at the Altes museum, you'll see that corner detail. And if you go back to Behrens House, you'll see the beginning of that same corner detail. And Mies developed it into a language that he used on almost all of his

buildings. When you start messing with the kinds of shapes we have in the Lewis Building and the collision of forms we have here, it would be difficult to develop a vocabulary for each and every collision that has the refinement that went into what Mies did in his corner detail. When I come to the Lewis Building now, I see all of those collisions of forms as being very raw and unresolved—and I cringe because they are embarrassing in places. Over the next three years, I'll probably end up thinking they are very positive things in the end and wonder: "How could I have thought of that?" But right now I'm cringing at those things. So it's that kind of process.

Clients are complicated, too, like we are. When I went to interview for the MIT project, I told them a story about doing a psychiatric clinic at Yale for schizophrenic adolescents. As part of my research, I asked the doctors to let me be included in the patient groups, and I met with all of the different groups from young kids to teens and up into their early twenties. When I got to the oldest group, I sat in a sort of living room in their old facility, and I was the only person in the room who wasn't schizophrenic, I guess—at least not diagnosed as schizophrenic. I went around the room and they explained to me what they would like in their new building I was designing. They were very intelligent young people, and one quite beautiful young lady, who was very well dressed and obviously from a wealthy family, described what she thought were the important issues in the new building. And I was the only one who realized what she was doing. She was describing in detail the room we were in, with impeccable detail down to the moldings. It was scary—I was sitting there holding on to my seat. At MIT, I told them that when they would tell me what they wanted, they would do the same thing. I got the job anyway. Once we started the work, I met with eight or ten faculty representatives to discuss what they wanted. Before the meeting I had my office make a photographic dossier on each one of their offices. When they spoke, they actually did exactly what the young lady did. They described in a very detailed way their own offices. And I threw it on the table and I said, "See, I told you. You don't even know you're doing it."

At that point, they said, "Okay, but how do we bust out of this? What do we do now?" So we said, "Let's examine the cultures around here and how you deal with communal spaces where people have to work together and live together." We said, "What if you took the idea of a Japanese traditional house, with the shojis sliding panels?" We made a model putting their department in such a building, and we showed them how it did everything they said they wanted. They said they wanted to be alone, and they also wanted to be together. And so we showed them how they could have their own little rooms, and how they could just push the walls away and be together. They hated it.

So we tried a colonial house. In a colonial house, you come into a central space, the stairway goes up, and the rooms are around the top. So we laid them out, putting the senior people up in the rooms around a balcony with the students and their assistants in the space underneath. They looked at that and they hated it. They couldn't see themselves in that. Then we went to an orangutan model where the older orangutans are up in the trees, similar to the colonial house, and everybody else is down on the ground, and they can see each other and get down. We also did a hedgehog model with the offices below and trenches where people can come up. We tried a bunch of things that bordered on idiocy, and we made models of each of them and tried out separate departments in each of them. In the end, they built the orangutan village, although they didn't know it.

But I don't think we got very far from where we started with them to where we ended. Clients are often an immovable body. What we got is a building that has an image, like this one does—they are each different, but they both have a persona. People will come from all over and gaga over them. On the inside, though, they will have a building that will do what their president and faculty said they wanted. They will have a building for seven departments that need to talk to each other. The reclusive ones among them will find ways of interacting and the building will function to facilitate that interaction. It's simple. Just putting the cafeteria in the middle and putting their breakout space in view of the cafeteria means they can see when other professors are going to lunch and say, "Oh God, I'd like to talk to that guy. He's going to lunch, I'm going to go to lunch." It's that dumb, and I think it's going to work that simply.

We did a cafeteria for Condé Nast in New York and Sy Newhouse asked for the same exact thing. He had Anna Wintour and David Remnick and other high-profile editors. They were all people who don't want to meet with the other editors. They have their own little fiefdoms, they are all famous, and they are all well known. When they go to lunch, they meet whichever fancy designers they want to meet with at Four Seasons or some other restaurant, and interaction between the editors didn't exist. We created a cafeteria that made fifty or more power tables. You know how people go into a restaurant and look for the corner? Well, I put fifty of those places in the cafeteria. By making the walls glass, you can see each other. And because the cafeteria had an architectural persona, the people who have lunch with Anna Wintour ask her, "Can we have lunch in your cafeteria?" People cannot go into the cafeteria unless they go with somebody that works at Condé Nast. It was set up so that was the only way to get in, and since it was publicized everywhere and everybody

wants to go there, it has worked. Newhouse could have built a cafeteria for $6 million, but he spent $12 million. He says it was worth every penny because it does work. They all come there and they all meet. And he said that, believe it or not, David Remnick and Anna Wintour occasionally have lunch together. Their people are interacting. But one important thing, and I think this may be more important than the architecture, is that Sy Newhouse has lunch there every day as well. That is critical to the issue. So architecture can facilitate and play a role in helping to create desired interactions.

Why then is there so much mediocrity in our landscape? Why then doesn't the world at large realize it? I'd say 98.5 percent of buildings are mediocre—I call them *buildings* because I wouldn't even list most of them as architecture. It's dangerous to say but I don't see much architecture on this campus. And maybe I'm being a snob, but it's just not among people's priorities, I guess. The amount of architecture in the world is getting better just because a lot of us are being publicized more. Popular press has gotten more interested in it. People are going to Bilbao, and the popular press is excited about Bilbao. It gets a pretty high mark. The architectural critics and my colleagues try to disparage it, try to knock it. You've heard the words *star architects*, *starchitects*, or some other despicable term. One of the philosophers started using the term *spectacle architecture*. That's a value judgment. I go to a client, and they say, "You make spectacle architecture. I don't really need a spectacle, or a Bilbao effect." Maybe the world thinks of those as positive things. I think of them as disparaging. Because Bilbao was done with a lot of heart and soul, working with the community, and trying to make a building that would fit in, and that worked for art. I've gotten hundreds of letters from artists who don't find the building threatening to art. Bob Rauschenberg, who hates architects, came over to me and even kissed me on the lips and thanked me. He said he was going to make better art at his old age. And a lot of them said that Bilbao is a building that challenges them. There is a serious intention in making these buildings. There is a very serious intention in the Lewis Building to create a building that does the things that Dick Boland and his colleagues are interested in.

I want to say something about how I run my world. Because it is very business-like, and you will probably be shocked to hear that. People think that we're flaky artists, and there is no bottom line, but I have a profitable office. I started in 1962 and for the first fifteen or so years, I did not have the backup that was needed and I couldn't attract the technology we have now. Because the ideas were strange to the worlds of architects, the people that I had working with me were not the very technical guys who knew how to put such build-

ings together. The technical guys wanted to work with an office where they had a predictable future. And they knew that I would work on a project until I had it right, regardless of anything else, and that the end product was more important to me than the money. That was the perception.

In fact, it was not exactly that way. I started my office with very little money. I didn't have a rich uncle or father or anybody. I established a discipline in 1962 that whatever fees I got, and they weren't very much at that time, would have to pay for the work. I could work day and night myself for free, as long as everybody working for me was being paid. When they are starting out, lots of architects use student labor because it's very easy to recruit kids who will work for nothing. A lot of my friends do that. That's like taking drugs. Once you're on it, you can't get off it. And you develop a culture of that. It fits the system of job-getting, though, because more and more projects are gotten by competition. Clients have found out that for very little money they can get five architects to jump through hoops and give them models and drawings, and they think they are getting something because they have a lot of choices. And then they pick somebody. The reality is that for me to do a competition, for a building like the Lewis Building, would cost me a half million dollars. The normal stipend for competition for a building like this is about forty or fifty thousand dollars per architect. So the pressure to use freebee students is great. From the beginning, I was somehow blessed with the problem that I couldn't do that.

I also insisted that people who worked for me got a Christmas bonus, a cost-of-living increase every year, vacations, and all of those things. That was built into the culture from the beginning and it exists to this day. As that business practice became apparent to the architectural world, and that took about fifteen years or more, I started to recruit technical expertise. We now have an office that has 120 people. The last two years, the younger people have noticed that I've gotten older, and they've asked, "What happens to us now? Where are we going?" I said there is no way that, if I leave, this office is going to be able to do what I do. It's a very personal kind of work. I design every building now, although I have fantastic people. Edwin Chan, who worked on the Lewis Building with me, has been with me for eighteen years. He is a very talented designer. He could do work on his own. For reasons that I don't understand, he has stayed with me all these years and I am grateful. If I left tomorrow, he could design a very nice building on his own. His buildings would be different. They would start out maybe nodding in my direction, but they would take off. Just because his mind is that inquiring. I know he pushes me all the time, to push somewhere else, so I would guess if I wasn't there, he would just go fly off into his own land. The office is now called Gehry Partners. It's got seven

partners, plus me. Two of them, Edwin Chan and Craig Webb, are the designers, the rest are project management and technical people. Jim Glymph, who worked on the Lewis Building, is a senior partner.

I'm seventy-three. Most business people retire by seventy-three, or by sixty-five. In order to facilitate my getting out, although I'm not planning to get out, I've separated the office so that there are fees to the Gehry Partners for architecture and then a design fee that is allocated for Frank Gehry, for me. For now, all fees are in the same pie. I don't take the design fee for me. It's all shared. We've been doing this for five or six years and the clients have been very receptive to that idea that there is a separate fee for what I do. And that sets the stage for when I leave. Say that next year I decide to only work half time. At that point, I would take the design fee for the two projects that I do, which would be more than adequate to cover my lifestyle, which isn't very fancy. And it would allow the office to grow as Gehry Partners, but with its technical expertise and with the younger designers front and center. What I've done in the press over the last few years is identify the young designers so that they are known by the architectural press and the universities. I've encouraged them individually to go around to the schools and lecture and create their identity and write their papers and we support that.

The office has a major commitment to the computer and Jim Glymph has led that effort. It started because I couldn't figure out how to delineate some of the curves I was playing with in a way that they could be built. When you go to Rome and visit San Ivo or San Carlo by Borromini, you see curves that would be difficult to do, even today. I haven't a clue how he figured out how to build them. He must have been on the scaffold himself just visually making them because you couldn't represent some of those shapes and the twists that he played with. Jim went to the aircraft industry way back—fifteen years ago—and he hired aircraft engineers and I think that was fairly unprecedented in an architect's office. We developed the process using three-dimensional Catia software that Dassault Systemes had developed for the aerospace industry. At the time, we thought it was pretty much useless to the rest of the world and that it was only relevant for the kind of work I was doing. So we didn't think there was any future for it in architecture. In our projects around the world, we work with local construction companies and associate architects, who we train with our system. When our project is done, we track what they do and find that they continue using our system. So there seems to be a continuing use of this software and process. And it's not just the software. It's the way we use the software, it's the way we helped change the software, and it's the way we integrate it into our work process.

What we are doing now is we set up a small subsidiary that will train people to use our process. We are also developing new processes for incorporating the computer into project management for detailed design and construction of our buildings. Now you should know that I'm illiterate on the computer. I know how to turn it on. I barely know how to use my cell phone. I don't know how to retrieve messages, I can't turn on a VCR, I don't know how to do all that stuff. I knew years ago that at some point you become obsolete, but right now, the State Department of the United States government, who wouldn't in their wildest dreams ever hire Frank Gehry to do a building—never, never, never hire Frank Gehry—has come to us for training in our process. They are amazed by how we control the complexity in my buildings with our computers and our process, and they want to know how we do it.

You would imagine that offices like Skidmore, Owings and Merrill or KPF have this kind of business-oriented practice. I worked with a lot of those firms, and we are way ahead of them on these issues. We are way ahead of them technically, we're way ahead of them organizationally, and it's startling to me when I go to work with them. I just can't believe it. I'm starting to say, "Wait a minute, what am I missing?" I always thought of them as the business guys. I always thought of them as having their organizations together. I never thought of myself doing that. I think it just happened because I set these very simple rules for myself. That I wouldn't borrow money. That everybody was going to get paid. And that I had to get enough peace to do the work the way that I wanted. Dumb simple, but it has led to what we are doing. And it is a very comfortable kind of process. Architects are supposed to make 20 percent profit. We are lucky if in a year we make 7, 8, or 10 percent profit. But doing the work, having the kind of pleasure doing it that we do, that's very adequate. If you put the bonuses that we pay back in, the profits would crumble even more. Irrational, but that is my story. I think I've talked too long. Are there any questions?

LUCY SUCHMAN: *Thank you for the story. It was wonderful. My question comes out of an idea from studies of technology about agency. The ways that we talk about how things happen tend to emphasize single people, such as yourself, being the source of the creation. But another way of thinking about it says that your agency is distributed in all sorts of interesting ways across all these people that you told us about as well as the technologies, and I wondered if you could reflect on that a bit. If that makes sense to you. I think there is an interesting tension between the ways in which you are actually working and are at the same time seen as a single agent in your buildings. You did design the Lewis Building. And at the same time, you didn't.*

I'm not sure I can formulate it, but when we work together, it is play. When you are a kid, your play when you are a child is the beginning of work. Those patterns of interaction and accomplishment in play are the patterns that establish how you are going to work. Creativity, the way I characterize it, is that you're searching for something. You have a goal. You're not sure where it's going. A serious CEO, you would imagine, does not think of creative spirit as play. And yet it is. And that CEO, you could also imagine saying, "Let's take senior management up to whatever lodge and play around." They use the word. And business people are creative, I always thought, when they let themselves be. So when I meet with my people and start thinking and making models and stuff, it is like play. On Disney Hall, when I was getting excited, there was a Frankie Laine song from the television series, *Rawhide*, that I played. I got the record and I had a little tape machine and when we were rolling, I would put it on, "rollin', rollin', rollin'." The whole office heard. It was characterizing the excitement we were having to more people and it brought more people into it. The people who aren't architects wanted to know what the hell was going on. I heard Peter Lewis talk about similar issues in his business, worrying about how he can bring people willingly and with excitement into the game—into the play.

Now, Edwin, who I mentioned earlier, is incredible. The first five years working with me, he sat there and didn't say a word. He was in awe, I guess, that he was there. Then I would say to Edwin, "What do you think about what we're doing?" He would look at me and say, "I don't know, what do you think?" That went on for the next five years. Then I realized he became a monster. He started moving stuff around. We have a joke because in doing a project, a building becomes like a Rubik's cube. You start moving one thing and everything else starts to go. We were doing a project in Korea that never got built, but every time I went on a trip and came back, he had moved the auditorium. He was impeccable. He had incredible reasons for it. He's really brilliant. He doesn't sleep at night and he comes back the next morning and moves the auditorium. Now, we rely on him to do it. I said, "Edwin, I'm going out of town. You just move the auditorium and I'll be back." And he does.

The funniest thing is to see this group trying to design our new office. Without a client, it's hilarious. Luckily, I left, and Edwin moved the auditorium and he faxed me and he claimed it was just dumb simple. We have a culture that invites a lot of interaction and it pushes me and I love it because it keeps things going. It keeps my mind going, and I'm open to it. At some point, I freeze like everybody does, and I am caught in my own inability to move. I am not infinitely able to free-associate. I do fall in love with the thing and that's danger-

ous for me and I recognize it. I do lead in that kind of way. I do rely on Edwin or somebody to change the game, change the rules, because the dangerous thing for us is to crystallize before we have all the information, before we know what the issues are, and if we've addressed all of them.

MARIANN JELINEK: *I'm very curious. I'd like to bring you back to the earlier statement about the State Department. I would love to have the State Department work with you. But I'm curious about why they want to get involved?*

The government agencies that build buildings are inefficient. They have a process of building where there is a battery of stuff you go through and they are all written in documents. It's frozen in time, but in an earlier time. And it's based on a culture of how our buildings were built. And the culture of how buildings get built has evolved with the American Institute of Architects. The AIA has developed documents and processes to protect the architect, but it's become overprotective. It is like overprotecting your kids and then finding that they don't learn and grow, and that's what happened in the architecture profession. The government contracting system has built into it this infinite democracy. It's created a very complicated world that adds money to the process. It adds time to the process and time is money. When they see me riding away above that, they ask, "How do you get away with it? How do you build those things?" Real people are willing to pay for them, and *Engineering News Record* has pointed out that the construction industry has learned from our processes. And they are interested in where we are going because I think inevitably we are going to a paperless process. We did it in Seattle at the Experience Music Project, where about one-third to one-half of the building was done paperless. We went from computer to computer, and the steel was fabricated from our program. You could print the paper if you wanted, but they didn't have to. And so they are trying to figure out how we do it because I guess there aren't many other people doing it. We have tied into our group some of the best structural engineers in the world. We haven't got a formal partnership with them, but we have an intellectual partnership.

LES GASSER: *I'm really interested in something that you haven't spoken so directly on and that is the effect of time on a building because it exists without maintenance or without evolution. It doesn't stay as a solid, stable thing forever.*

Well, when I was starting out, I thought a lot about that issue. I thought about flexibility and felt that buildings should be nondenominational. If you

look at Versailles as a model, the rooms are interconnected in a linear way. The king had his bedroom, and when it was winter, he moved his bedroom to the south side, and when it was summer, he moved his bedroom to the north side. They didn't have plumbing that tied them down, so they would bring the bedpans and all that stuff with them. There was this kind of flexibility and ability to move, and that was nice because the character of the room was different. You had variety, change, so there was flexibility. Once I designed a store for Joseph Magnin, and the store was designed with Cyril Magnin, who was alive then. He was a great entrepreneur and merchant. We spent hours talking about the industry and the changes and problems that he faced. The fashion industry has rapid flips. In six months, it goes from one thing that is hot to another thing that is hot, and the fixtures had to change. The minute it was built, it was obsolete. And that is why I started making cardboard furniture, because it represented a disposable fixture. By the second store, it was completely changed. They wanted to change the color, change the graphics, do a lot of stuff that Rem Koolhaas did at Prada. But it was done decades ago. I had a series of columns with carousel projectors and a wall 150 feet long above your head, where the projectors could project images of their models. It was like a moving picture. Two years after the store opened, I told Joseph Magnin how we had failed Cyril. I asked him, "What did we do wrong?" He said, "I don't know but I noticed they haven't changed the projected displays." They invited us to a staff meeting of a store we did. I listened to each person and toward the end, the young display guy requested $200 per month more for his $400 per month display budget. And I put up my hand, and I said, "Young man, is this the reason you haven't changed anything?" And he started crying. He said, "Yes, Mr. Gehry, I know this place is like a wonderful instrument. I could play it like a violin. I'm dying to do it. But they won't give me the money to do it. I can barely change a light bulb with the budget." So I said, "It's easy. Triple his budget and we're all set. It's not that much money." And the store manager said, "It's not in my profit-and-loss accounts. I can't do it. It's not in my budget. I can't do it." And I think the same thing could happen with the Prada store in New York. If they are going to keep changing, they have to train somebody to be an advocate during the continuous use of the building, someone who advocates and gets a priority from the management to have enough money spent doing that.

What will happen in the Lewis Building is that this room will become obsolete, but these rooms will last and become relics because people will have nostalgia and say, "I went to school here. You can't change it." That's when you get the environmental and the protectionist agencies that are going to protect every inch of the building, every screw. We are working on one of the Hughes

buildings at Playa Vista. It's an old, nondescript building, but there is a corridor in the building where Howard Hughes walked and the historic preservation guys won't let you move that corridor. That's ridiculous, you know?

As far as the maintenance issues that you bring up, technology does change and there are new materials. Titanium, which we used in Bilbao, is inert. It's an element. It's a pure element and doesn't rust or corrode. But the architectural world goes back to the history of Vetruvius who talked about commodity, firmness, and delight. That's our architects' mantra. When we go to school, we learn about Vetruvius: commodity, firmness, and delight. And that's what an architect's job is to do. And there are architectural groups that have fastened onto firmness. And firmness has become a fixation for using stone. But they somehow don't factor in that the great monuments of the world that were made in stone are deteriorating, and they are very difficult to keep clean because of pollution. I attended a conference in Switzerland a few years ago where they were trying to argue that guys like me are irrelevant. We shouldn't be doing this stuff. We should go back to stone, to what is solid because that represents the real thing. At that meeting, I got up and talked about how a third of a millimeter of titanium would be longer lasting than all the stone they ever had. Then Jean Nouvel got up and talked about his glass buildings, which look fragile, but aren't. He was much more poetic about it than I was and talked about how glass is more lasting than stone and doesn't change.

DICK BOLAND: *I have heard some of your colleagues say that there are many really brilliant, creative architects. But, only a few of those really creative architects become really great architects because they compromise and that you do not compromise.*

Well, what is compromise? I mean, we compromise all day long. I'd rather be on a beach somewhere or on my boat than here, so that's a compromise to come here. The point is you strive for certain excellence. You have a sort of model in your head of what it is you are going to do and you stick to it. I stick to it because I can't do the other. And when I have to do the other—whatever the other is—to get the job or to do anything, my body doesn't do it. It's not constructed in that way, it doesn't allow me to. I've developed ways of working where I can talk openly with my clients and they are all happy with the process we follow and how we work with them. And they would say I have listened to them.

So I have developed behavior that endears me to the people who pay money to get me to do work. That's a kind of pandering to the audience. I try to make buildings that feel good, so that's pandering. There are architects'

frames of mind and there are artists' frames of mind that are very critical of things I do. For that reason—because I have a particular personality. I like people. For me, the building of a building, the process of working with people, is more exciting than the final building. I can prove that endlessly in my life. I have built a way of working that includes dealing with the world in the way I want to deal with it, and there is compromise in that.

I could have come to the Weatherhead School and said, and I have the power for the most part to do it, "You build it the way I want it or forget it." And I could have built an incredible sculpture that had nothing to do with the faculty and students. There are many buildings that don't function. Some architects sell buildings that are irrational and irreverent about how people use a building. That wouldn't happen to me. I do listen. I compromise, and I compromised here. I spent time listening to the people on campus. I worry about the neighborhood. You may not think I did, but I spent a lot of time worrying about the law school. I listened to their objections and made the building as a result more interesting. I compromised in a way. So I think the word compromise is not so pure. I'm very happy with the building. I don't think I compromised my level of where I wanted to be with it, so I can be proud of it. Steve Litt, the architectural critic, is here. He's going to tell me whether it was any good, as will others in the press. There are things they can argue about, things that are failures and that are not failures. I think the word compromise is a difficult one.

As an aside, I am so excited that this room works for a seminar discussion like this. Because we spent a lot of time on this room. This is an old model, but only Dick and Scott at the time were willing to try it. Everyone had trepidation about it. There are a lot of examples of it in the world, but to me it came from Thomas Jefferson's conference table at the University of Virginia, which is this shape—an oval. You have the ability to see each other and hear each other around such a table, and I hope to build one in our new office, too. A rectilinear room wouldn't be doing this. And a circular room spins somehow. There's kind of a quieter feeling of this shape, and I'm just sitting here so pleased with myself.

FRED COLLOPY: *Later we will all be putting words on the board that should be part of a manager's design vocabulary. What word would you put up?*

Well, I would put the word *functional* up, and I would urge you all to think about the word *functional*. Because traditionally, architects use the word *functional* and clients use the word *functional* when they look at a building and say, "This guy produced a very functional building." And it means to them that

they can use it, that it works. But that doesn't say anything about how it brings emotionality to the table and doesn't consider if it is human. Is it humanistic? Functional is boom! There it is, it's functional. Functional for me has a broader meaning than that. It means achieving a building that does all of the things we want as humans from our buildings. Building the Lewis Building, and having it here, right now, and using it, is functional, but that embodies all the processes, all the people, all the budgets, all of the building departments, and the whole history of architecture. All of those issues come together over time and arrive at a conclusion that stands here. It doesn't look like anything else we've seen, it has something to do with people's pride, I hope. People identify it as a nice place, something you want to come to, something that will attract students to come here, something that will make people think "Why is it like that?" and ask those kinds of questions. That's functional. I think in the world you're all in, you should expand the word *functional* to encompass more than just the simplistic notion of doing something well, but to encompass all these other issues. When I make a building I want it to feel easy on the hand for people. This means we give a lot of attention to all the little details of how the building will feel to them, from door handles to passageways. I think about how to give people a kind of handrail, so that the unfamiliar can become familiar for them.

Reading your papers, I was pleased to see that many of you do talk about those broader issues, and I think, given the crummy thing that has happened to big business like Enron, you should continue to do so. The business world is suffering, and I think that a commitment to being functional in this broad sense is something that will pull us out of this terrible situation. I'm encouraged that people in this room are interested in it.

I was raised in a Jewish family where I was taught the psalmbook by my grandfather and the psalmbook starts with "why?" I was raised to question always. The other important thing in the psalmbook was the story of Rabbi Hillel meeting a man on a road who asked him to explain the Jewish religion while he stood on one foot as a skeptic. And he believed there wasn't anything to it, so he said, "If it's important enough, you can tell it while I stand on one foot." Rabbi Hillel said, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." I'm not quoting Judaism because I'm totally outside of it and don't believe in religion at all. But isn't that the driving thing? The Golden Rule? In the end, when I make a building, I think of my neighbor. I try to. When I talked about this building the other night, the one thing that I agonize about and that I've been worried about, even though friends are reassuring me that it's okay, is when Ag Pytte, the university president, asked me to squeeze the building into a smaller lot. I realized I had to build a building that was out of

scale with my neighbors. A lot of the angst in the design was to sort of make a design that pulled back and became a better neighbor even though it was out of scale. I am still very sensitive about that. As I look at it, I am very worried about that issue, although friends have said not to worry about it anymore. I don't know what Steve Litt will have to say about it, though. But for me, the important thing is to be a good neighbor. To not talk down to people. You give them back what they expect or what they deserve in your best work, but within the context of the Golden Rule, and it always has to be responding to the question, "why?"

I want to say something about Peter Lewis whose name is on this building. He couldn't be here, but I wish he was here. He was asked the other night at a symposium, how he managed. Because he started with a company that had one hundred people and now it's at thirty thousand—how did he do that? What he said was about how to deal with the future and how to build a company. He said that there are some core values that he started with. One of them was certainly honesty, which he is very much concerned about. And those core values are like the Ten Commandments. They can be stated while you are standing on one foot, like in Rabbi Hillel's story. Those core values have guided the expansion of the company. That's what holds it together. When new managers, new directors, and new people are brought in, they buy into and accept those basic core values, and that is how his company has expanded without him. He is now retired and the new guys who have taken over have tripled the value of the company. He feels it was because of those basic values that he passed on. Now that's a management thing that does deal with the future. I think you can get very complex about, and you can start to agonize about, all kinds of things about the future, but maybe it's simpler. Maybe if you start with a simple core of values. That's what I did. My office, with a few core beliefs, has grown very well. It's sort of dumb simple, but everybody's thinking of those values. It's not compromise. It's not a bad thing. It reflects nice values. It's that simple.

INVITATION TO NOMINATE FOR HONORARY DEGREE

Case Western Reserve University invites nominations for honorary degrees by which the university can recognize persons who exemplify in their work the highest ideals and standards of "excellence in any valued aspect of human endeavor, including the realm of scholarship, public service, and the performing arts." (Faculty Handbook, 3, III.X)

The honorary degree committee is chaired by Provost W. A. "Bud" Baeslack and includes: Gerry Matisoff, Arts and Sciences; John Lewandowski, Engineering; Leena Palomo, Dental Medicine; Michael Scharf, Law; David Clingingsmith, Management; Nathan Berger, Medicine; Diana Morris, Nursing; Sharon Milligan, Applied Social Sciences; Patrick Kennedy, Physical Education and Athletics; and *ex-officio* members University Marshal Robin Dubin; and Deputy Provost Lynn Singer. Nominations for honorary degrees to be conferred at a future commencement may be submitted throughout the year. *Current members of the faculty, the staff, or the Board of Trustees are not eligible for an honorary degree.*

The university community is invited to submit nominations, preferably by e-mail, to the office of the provost, c/o Lois Langell (lois.langell@case.edu), or to any committee member by September 14, 2012, for consideration during the fall semester 2012. **Nominees should not be informed of the nomination.**

For full review, please include the information listed below. Incomplete nominations cannot be considered.

RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD OF AN HONORARY DEGREE

Submit by September 14, 2012 for review in the fall term.
Please do not inform the nominee of his or her nomination

Nominee: Peter B. Lewis

Attachments:

✓ Nominating letter

✓ Nominee's vita or biography

_____ Maximum of five letters of support (optional)

_____ Other materials (optional).

Nominator: Gary John Previts, Professor of Accountancy

Contact information: GJP@CASE.EDU

Status (student, faculty, staff, alumna/us) Faculty

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

January 9, 2013

Honorary Degree Committee
Case Western Reserve University
c/o W.A.Baeslack
216 Adelbert Hall
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland OH 44106

Dear Committee Members:

"Problems are Opportunities." This expression is one of ten inscribed on the first floor surface of the Peter B. Lewis Building, which is celebrating the 10th Anniversary of its dedication as the home of the Weatherhead School of Management. These views which Peter B. Lewis has chosen to place before students, faculty, staff and visitors alike in an indelible fashion substantiate the role of the building as a functioning work of art. This idea and the others 'sketched' into Lewis Building have fortified us in periods of dismayingly rapid change, and provide us a set of ideas from which to frame an identity.

While I have never met him, I have benefited from his philanthropy and his success. For 35 years he led the development of Progressive Corporation as its CEO. That corporation is now among the very largest auto insurers in the nation. In a N*ew York Times* essay in 2011, best selling author Jim Collins commented on the visionary leadership of individuals such as Bill Gates and Peter Lewis. Collins noted how Lewis turned "bad news' for the insurance industry in California's 1988 Proposition 103 into 'the best thing that ever happened' to Progressive.

Lewis has spoken out about and spoken up for Cleveland's heritage and for its promise. In so doing he has captured the attention of those committed to the continuing ideals of progress and change that have exemplified his activities in our community and around the nation. His recent visioning has spurred the development of Uptown as a district in University Circle restoring vibrancy and a sense of neighborhood to an important part of our community.

For these reasons and for many more, which include his commitment to social justice and social change, I am pleased to place his name before the Committee for favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

Gary

Gary John Previts
Distinguished University Professor
E. Mandell deWindt Professor and Chair

cc: Biography of Peter B. Lewis

Weatherhead School of Management
Department of Accountancy

Mailing Address
Case Western Reserve University
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44106-7235

Phone: +1 216-368-6857
Fax: +1 216-368-4667

PETER B. LEWIS

Peter B. Lewis, born November 11, 1933 in Cleveland, Ohio, is the non-executive Chairman of Progressive Corporation, of which he acquired control in 1965 in an early leveraged buyout. At that time, the small insurance company with $6 million in revenues specialized in insuring those drivers who had difficulty finding auto insurance. For 45 years since, 35 as CEO, Lewis has overseen the transformation of the 100 employee company into a full-line auto insurer with 26,000 employees and annual sales of $14 billion. Today Progressive is the nation's fourth largest auto insurer.

Much of Progressive's success derives from Lewis' unique vision that the Mission of an auto insurer is to reduce the human trauma and economic costs of auto accidents in cost effective and profitable ways and his clarity about the Core Values governing his and Progressive's behavior. Lewis demands and pays for excellent performance, and separates the people who don't perform. Progressive revolutionized the staid auto insurance industry with 24-hour immediate response on claims and all service, mobile claim adjusters dispatched directly to accident scenes, offering free comparative rates via its highly acclaimed website, progressive.com and its 800 telephone number. Progressive is the only public company releasing complete monthly financial results.

Lewis, retired since 2000, invests through his philanthropy in people with purposes he shares and the management ability to achieve those purposes. He supports risk takers who break new ground and show results. Lewis has challenged many of the nonprofit organizations he supports to improve their management and finances. In 2001, Lewis, who had contributed $36 million to construct a Frank Gehry designed building for Case Western Reserve University's School of Management, began a boycott of all Cleveland charities, demanding replacement of the Trustees responsible for mismanaging the University. As Chairman of the Board of the Guggenheim Museum, Lewis demanded in 2002 that the institution cut its spending and operate on a sound financial basis. After ten years on the Guggenheim's Board and contributing more than $77 million to the institution, he resigned from the Board because of differences over management quality and strategic direction. Lewis serves on the Board of Princeton University, his alma mater (Class of 1955), where he is its largest ever contributor (over $220 million) including the largest gift in Princeton's history ($101 million) to expand its programs in the creative and performing arts. Lewis' other gifts to Princeton include $60 million for a Gehry designed science library and an endowment for the Lewis/Sigler Genomics Institute. His main challenge to Princeton is to improve on its already top-ranked excellence.

Lewis believes deeply in the value of individual freedom and tries to foster necessary governmental and social change. He supports the American Civil Liberties Union and helped finance the beginnings of the Democracy Alliance, Media Matters, the Center for American Progress, as well as other progressive efforts.

Lewis is an avid lover of sports, as both participant and fan. He is amicably divorced from Toby Devan Lewis, is the father of three and grandfather of five.

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY EST. 1826

W. A. "Bud" Baeslack III
Provost and Executive Vice President

10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-7001

Visitors and Deliveries
Adelbert Hall, Room 216

Phone 216.368.4346
Fax 216.368.4325
E-mail Baeslack@case.edu

www.case.edu

CONFIDENTIAL

To: Robin Dubin
Chair, Faculty Senate
Executive Committee

From: W.A. "Bud" Baeslack III
Provost and Executive Vice President
Chair, Honorary Degree Committee

Date: January 30, 2013

The honorary degree committee met on January 29 to review recommendations for honorary degrees. After careful consideration, the committee voted to recommend that Frank O. Gehry and Peter B. Lewis be awarded honorary degrees. Mr. Gehry, noted architect who designed the Peter B. Lewis Building for the Weatherhead School of Management, was approved for award in 2002, but was not available to receive the degree at that time. The current committee affirmed its support of the award. Peter B. Lewis is nominated for long-time activities in support of social change and community progress, including involvement in spurring the development of the Uptown district of University Circle.

Nominating letters and biographical information on these accomplished individuals are attached. I hereby submit these recommendations for review by the Faculty Senate executive committee. If your committee approves these recommendations on behalf of the University Faculty, they will be conveyed to the president for submission to the Board of Trustees.

C: Rebecca Zirm, Secretary, Faculty Senate
Honorary Degree Committee
Gerald Matisoff
John Lewandowski
Leena Palomo
Michael Scharf
David Clingingsmith
Nathan Berger
Diana Morris
Sharon Milligan
Patrick Kennedy
Robin Dubin – ex-officio
Lynn Singer – ex officio

Proposal to discontinue the PhD in Art History and Museum studies

The Department of Art History and Art proposes to eliminate one of their two PhD programs. They wish to terminate their PhD in Art History and Museum studies. They will maintain their other PhD program in Art History.

According to Professor Scallen, the Art History and Museum Studies Program graduated one student in 2011. The previous student graduated in 2001. No students are currently enrolled in the program.

This proposal was approved in the College of Arts and Sciences in 2012.

It was approved by the Faculty Senate Graduate Studies Committee on January 28, 2013.

Martin Snider, Chair

Faculty Senate Graduate Studies Committee

January 31, 2013

CWRU Action Form for Majors/Minors/Programs/Sequences/Degrees Docket # _____
(instructions on back)

APPROVED
A&S CEC 9-12-12
A&S Graduate Committee 9-20-1
A&S Executive Committee 10-11-12
A&S Faculty 10-19-12

College/School: College of Arts and Sciences _
Department: Art History and Art
PROPOSED: _____ major
_____ minor
program
_____ sequence
_X_ degree–drop

TITLE: Doctor of Philosophy in Art History and Museum Studies

EFFECTIVE: **fall (semester)** 2012 (year)

DESCRIPTION: CURRENT
The doctoral program in art history and museum studies is offered to a limited number of candidates. The program combines the academic requirements of the art history doctoral program with museum training, and is designed to provide experience in issues of museological practice and history, connoisseurship, conservation, and interpretation, as well as a planned program of academic course work and independent research. Coursework includes a year-long museum studies course and supervised internships. Admission to the program is made on the basis of academic record, experience, recommendations, and personal interviews. A master's degree in art history or its equivalent is required for admission. Applicants are required to submit GRE scores and two research papers written during their matriculation for a master's degree, or a thesis if completed by the time of application. Reading knowledge of one approved foreign language (normally French, German, or Italian) is also required for admission.

Is this major/minor/program/sequence/degree: _____ **new**
_____ **modification**
_____ **replacement**
X **drop**

If modification or replacement please elaborate: In the 45 years since our two doctoral degree tracks program created, only 5 or 6 students have chosen the PhD in Art History and Museum Studies (as opposed to the regular PhD in Art History). This is a degree that has never "caught on" in the field; indeed some museum directors have expressed suspicion about the validity of such a degree. We have decided therefore to eliminate this program while incorporating its most important feature—a year long required internship at the Cleveland Museum of Art or another approved art museum—into our revised doctoral program in art history.

Does this change in major/minor/program/sequence/degree involve other departments? _____Yes X No

If yes, which departments? _____

Contact person/committee: Catherine Scallen

SIGNATURES: **DATE**
Department Curriculum Chair(s)/Program Directors: Catherine B Scallen 20 August 2012
Department Chair: Catherine B Scallen 20 August 2012
College/School Curriculum Committee Chair: J. Korbin/cas 9-20-12
College/School Dean(s): J. Korbin/cas C Rozek/cas 9-20-12
~~**UUF Curriculum Committee Chair:**~~ _____

File copy sent to: _____Registrar _____Office of Undergraduate Studies/Graduate Studies
_____Other: Faculty Grads, C. Rozek, ARTH Dept, D. Fiske

Proposal to Change the B.S. in Management Concentrations to Majors, Effective Fall 2013
Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University

Rationale

Currently the B.S. in Management degree requires completion of 122 credit hours in General Education and Major Requirements. Included in the Major Requirements is a five-course concentration in either Banking & Finance or Marketing, or a Dean's Approved Concentration (an option for ambitious and focused students to pursue individualized programs of study). The Weatherhead School of Management proposes to change the three concentrations to majors, effective fall 2013.

Based on recent market research and input from employers, alumni, current students, the University Career Center, and Undergraduate Admissions, the Weatherhead School of Management has determined that revising the curriculum to offer majors is important for our students and the University. The current use of the term concentration puts us at a disadvantage during the admissions and advising processes, as well as in student placement efforts.

Feedback from prospective students and Undergraduate Admissions personnel leads us to conclude that offering majors within the B.S. in Management degree will enable us to better attract and engage student applicants. An academic major is a more familiar concept to prospective students and their parents who are evaluating universities and programs. In addition, high school guidance counselors or prospective students conducting Internet searches for programs offering majors in Banking & Finance or Marketing can easily overlook the Weatherhead School entirely.

Offering majors in Banking & Finance and Marketing also can help us engage with prospective employers. The more rigorous, market-focused majors can increase the attractiveness and marketability of our students, and, in turn, our ability to attract targeted employers to campus for career fairs, networking events, and other programs that significantly benefit our students. Changing the concentration designation to major will benefit the School and the University.

Curriculum Changes

Analysis of employment trends, as well as related faculty strengths, led us to identify areas of competitive advantage. The resulting majors will allow students to further develop skills, expertise, and depth in their selected fields of study. The major requirements consist of a total of 60 credit hours, which are outlined below.

Proposal to Change the B.S. in Management Concentrations to Majors, Effective Fall 2013
Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University

Principles Requirements		
Microeconomics - ECON 102		*3*
Macroeconomics - ECON 103		*3*
Introduction to Financial Accounting - ACCT 101		*3*
Management Accounting - ACCT 102		*3*
Statistics for Business & Management Science - OPRE 207		*3*
		15
Core Requirements		
Contemporary Business & Communications - MGMT 201		*3*
Corporate Finance - BAFI 355		*3*
Managing Organizations & People I - MGMT 250		*3*
Managing Organizations & People II - MGMT 251		*3*
Introduction to Information: A Systems & Design Approach - MIDS 301		*3*
Marketing Management - MKMR 201		*3*
Operations Research & Supply Chain Management - OPRE 301		*3*
Business Policy - PLCY 399		*3*
Advanced Seminars - MGMT 395 (one credit hour; each student must complete three)		*3*
		27
Management Requirements		
Students must complete an 18 credit hour Major in Banking & Finance or Marketing, or a Dean's Approved Major.		***18***
Banking & Finance Major Requirements[1]		
Money & Banking - BAFI 341	*3*	
Investments - BAFI 356	*3*	
Financial Modeling, Analysis & Decision Making - BAFI 357	*3*	
Intermediate Corporate Finance - BAFI 358	*3*	
Cases in Finance - BAFI 359	*3*	
Applied Financial Analytics – BAFI 361	*3*	
	18	
Marketing Major Requirements[2]		
Brand Management - MKMR 304	*3*	
Measuring Marketing Performance - MKMR 308	*3*	
Marketing Analytics - MKMR 310	*3*	
Customer Relationship Management - MKMR 311	*3*	
Selling & Sales Management - MKMR 312	*3*	
Strategic Internet Marketing - MKMR 348	*3*	
	18	
Dean's Approved Major Requirements[3]		
At least 18 credits of coursework, chosen in consultation with a faculty member who will provide supplemental advising. Must include one of: ECON 326, BAFI 361, or MKMR 310.	*18*	
TOTAL		***60***

(Continued on next page)

Notes on Course Changes from Current Concentrations

[1]*Addition of BAFI 359 (Cases in Finance) to create the Banking & Finance Major.*

[2]*Addition of MKMR 348 (Strategic Internet Marketing) to create the Marketing Major.*

[3]*Addition of three credit hours, including one of three quantitative courses to create the Dean's Approved Major.*

Additional information about each proposed major is included in the set of completed CWRU Action Forms that accompany this document.

CWRU Action Form for Majors/Minors/Programs/Sequences/Degrees

(instructions on back)

Docket # _____

College/School: _____Weatherhead School of Management _____
Department: _____Banking and Finance_____

PROPOSED: __X__ major
_____ minor
_____ program
_____ sequence
_____ degree

TITLE: _____

_____

EFFECTIVE: _Fall_____ (semester) ___2013_____ (year)

DESCRIPTION:

See attached

Is this major/minor/program/sequence/degree: __X__ new
_____ modification
_____ replacement

If modification or replacement please elaborate: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Does this change in major/minor/program/sequence/degree involve other departments? _____Yes __X__No

If yes, which departments? _____

_____

_____

Contact person/committee: _____

SIGNATURES:

DATE

Department Curriculum Chair(s)/Program Directors: _____
Department Chair: _____ Nov 13, 2012
College/School Curriculum Committee Chair: Jennifer Johnson 11/16/12
College/School Dean(s): Jennifer Johnson 11/16/12
UUF Curriculum Committee Chair: _____

File copy sent to: _____Registrar _____Office of Undergraduate Studies/Graduate Studies
_____Other: _____

BS in Management with Current Finance Concentration:

- Required: BAFI 355 – Corporate Finance (Weatherhead Core)
- Upper-Level Coursework

Finance Concentration (15 credit hours)

- BAFI 341 – Money and Banking
- BAFI 356 – Investments
- BAFI 357 – Financial Modeling, Analysis and Decision Making
- BAFI 359 – Intermediate Corporate Finance
- BAFI 361 – Applied Financial Analytics

Proposed Finance Major

- Required: BAFI 355 – Corporate Finance (Weatherhead Core)
- Upper-Level Coursework

Finance Major (18 credit hours)

- BAFI 341 – Money and Banking
- BAFI 356 – Investments
- BAFI 357 – Financial Modeling, Analysis and Decision Making
- BAFI 358 – Intermediate Corporate Finance
- BAFI 359 – Cases in Finance
- BAFI 361 – Applied Financial Analytics

Notes:

1. ***More rigorous curriculum relative to concentration, with more courses.***
2. ***Same number of sections offered – 358 and 359 are one section per year, in the place of two sections per year of the old 359.***

CWRU Action Form for Majors/Minors/Programs/Sequences/Degrees Docket # _____
(instructions on back)

College/School: ____Weatherhead School of Management_____
Department: ___Marketing & Policy Studies_____

PROPOSED: _X____ major
_____ minor
_____ program
_____ sequence
_____ degree

TITLE: _____
_____

EFFECTIVE: ___Fall _____ (semester) __2013_____ (year)

DESCRIPTION:
A new marketing major is being proposed under the B.S. in Management Degree offered by the Weatherhead School of Management.

Is this major/minor/program/sequence/degree: __X___ new
_____ modification
_____ replacement

If modification or replacement please elaborate: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Does this change in major/minor/program/sequence/degree involve other departments? _____Yes __X___No

If yes, which departments? _____
_____
_____

Contact person/committee: _____

SIGNATURES: DATE
Department Curriculum Chair(s)/Program Directors: _____ 9/21/2012
Department Chair: _____ 9/21/2012
College/School Curriculum Committee Chair: _____ 9/21/12
College/School Dean(s): _____ 9/21/12
UUF Curriculum Committee Chair: _____

File copy sent to: _____Registrar _____Office of Undergraduate Studies/Graduate Studies
_____Other: _____

Marketing Major within BS in Management

Motivation:

Creation of Marketing major within the BS Management degree is a natural progression in the growth of Marketing group's involvement in undergraduate education. As recently as 2003-04, undergraduate Marketing offerings were limited to 2 courses, a Marketing Management course (which is now part of the Weatherhead core) and an option for Independent Studies. Two marketing electives were added in 2006, and Marketing became an option for concentration in 2007. Since its designation as a concentration, the Marketing group has made several changes to the curriculum to enhance student skill development and experience including aligning electives around distinct job tracks and adding electives that build depth around these tracks (see under "structure" below).

This changes have been deliberate, data driven and goal oriented. We carefully analyzed trends in student employment and job postings, in addition to assessing our strengths and identifying areas where we have competitive advantage. Thereafter, in 2009-2010, we deliberately revamped all electives to align with the job trends and our areas of competitive advantage. We believe it is time to secure a distinctive identity by offering a major in Marketing, as the next goal in the process of strengthening the BS in Management program at Weatherhead.

Not having a major in marketing is considered a weakness that is felt at the time of admissions and advising, as well as in placement efforts. Most of our competitive schools offer a major in marketing including schools with large undergraduate programs like Notre Dame, UT-Austin, Penn State as well as smaller, private schools like Washington University and Tulane University. Not having a comparable offering gives potential employers a signal that we are not serious about producing marketing graduates, or our offerings are not substantial enough. Both of these perceptions need to be dispelled, and we believe a time has come to get a distinctive identity to the marketing program.

Objective:

Offer a major in Marketing that provides a distinct identity to our offerings around distinct areas of our strength thereby making Case Western Reserve University one of the desired destinations for students and employers. This would grow the number of students, and enhance the quality and reputation of Case Western Reserve's and Weatherhead Business School's undergraduate programs.

Structure:

The Marketing major will focus on skill building around the themes of Analytics, Customer Relationships, and Interactive Marketing, and will allow students to develop advanced skills and expertise in one or more areas.

Major (for B.S.)

Hours required for graduation - 122

A. Required Marketing Courses (Total 21 hours):
   1. MKMR 201 – Marketing Management
   2. MKMR 304 – Brand Management
   3. MKMR 308 – Measuring Marketing Performance
   4. MKMR 310 – Marketing Analytics
   5. MKMR 311 – Customer Relationship Management
   6. MKMR 312 – Selling and Sales Measurement
   7. MKMR 348 – Strategic Internet Marketing

B. Additional Required Courses (Total 18 hours)
   8. ECON 102 – Principles of Microeconomics
   9. ACCT 101 – Introduction to Financial Accounting
   10. ACCT 102 – Management Accounting
   11. OPRE 207 – Business Statistics
   12. PLCY 399 – Business Policy
   13. MIDS 301 – Introduction to Information: A Systems and Design Approach

C. Students may be permitted to take one or two additional graduate-level marketing courses, and/or Independent Studies (MKMR 360) to strengthen the themes of Analytics, Customer Relationships, or Interactive Marketing.

CWRU Action Form for Majors/Minors/Programs/Sequences/Degrees Docket # _____
(instructions on back)

College/School: ____Weatherhead School of Management_____
Department: _____

PROPOSED: __X__ major
_____ minor
_____ program
_____ sequence
_____ degree

TITLE: _____Dean's Approved Major (under B.S. in Management)_____
_____

EFFECTIVE: __Fall__ (semester) ____2013___ (year)

DESCRIPTION:

A "Dean's Approved Concentration," requiring five courses, has been an option for students to satisfy the concentration requirement for the B.S. in Management. This alternative to existing 5-course concentrations in Finance and Marketing has provided a useful vehicle for students having passions in other areas of business. Nine students have completed Dean's Approved Concentration since 2008, in areas such as: Organizational Behavior & Human Resources; Health Care Finance; Sustainability in Management; and Public Administration & Nonprofit Management.

At this time, consistent with pending transitions from concentrations to majors in Finance and Marketing - each now requiring six courses beyond the introductory level - the Weatherhead School would like to preserve the option for ambitious and focused students to pursue individualized programs of study under the B.S. in Management.

The proposed Dean's Approved Major for the B.S. in Management will require:
- Completion of all core requirements for the B.S. in Management
- A proposal from a student, outlining his/her interests and rationale
- At least 18 credits of coursework, chosen in consultation with a faculty member who will provide supplemental advising, including one of: ECON 326, BAFI 361or MKMR 310
- Approval of the Weatherhead Undergraduate & Integrated Study Executive Committee

Is this major/minor/program/sequence/degree: ___X_ new
_____ modification
_____ replacement

If modification or replacement please elaborate: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Does this change in major/minor/program/sequence/degree involve other departments? _____Yes _X___No

If yes, which departments? _____
_____
_____

Contact person/committee: _____

SIGNATURES: DATE
Department Curriculum Chair(s)/Program Directors: _____
Department Chair: _____
College/School Curriculum Committee Chair: Jennifer Johnson 11-20-12
College/School Dean(s): Jennifer Johnson 11-20-12
UUF Curriculum Committee Chair: _____
File copy sent to: _____Registrar _____Office of Undergraduate Studies/Graduate Studies
_____Other: _____