

Interview with Philip Beukema

1

July 22, 2002

**Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi
Marquette, MI**

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

RM: Phil, let's start with the first question, what's your birthdate?

PB: February 3, 1943.

RM: Okay. Could you give us a little background... I want to get it down, what is your Dutch heritage? Was your family originally from the Grand Rapids/Holland area?

PB: Yes it was. On both sides of my family, the greater Grand Rapids area. One of my grandparents came from Holland directly. All of my great-grandparents did. However you call it, second or third generation, Hollander, as they say down in the Grand Rapids area.

RM: And you grew up in the area there?

PB: Yes. My family and I grew up about half way between Grand Rapids and Holland in a small town, two small towns, Byron Center and Cutlerville. From the time I was 9 ½ my parents transplanted all of us to southern California. They were advised for medical reasons to relocate to southern California or Florida, as many were at that time with chronic bronchitis problems and this and that. My parents were some of those that just had to move to another climate. So we wound up in the Redlands, California. I continued schooling there all the way through high school, where I met my wife-to-be. I went to San Diego State University and so forth. I don't know how far you want to go from that.

RM: Where did you get your final degree?

PB: My final degree, both my M.BA and my doctorate in organizational behavior was from the graduate school at the University of Southern California.

RM: What was your teaching and academic career after you got your degrees?

PB: I began teaching at Loyola Marimount University for two years while I was completing my doctorate for the school of business at Loyola. My first full-time position was at the United States International University, previously California Western University. I taught both in the undergraduate and graduate schools of business at the university for a short time. Then I became the assistant Dean of the School of Business. After a year or so I found myself doing some teaching overseas. The university had several campuses abroad. So I staffed...I was one of the staff members that was sent to England in Sussex. I taught there for a short extent. Then a few months later I went to Nairobi, Kenya. I was there for about 2 years. I taught in the undergraduate program and also established the bachelors degree and the predecessor to the master's degree. My role was to hire and staff that campus in the business program and to develop a business

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

relationship with the business members of the community for internship opportunities. There was a lot of curriculum development work at that time. It really was exciting. Laying the groundwork for a whole degree program in an overseas location. It continues to operate to this day. There are several people in that program that come to San Diego to that university to complete their degrees.

RM: So it's connected to the San Diego branch. Have you been back?

PB: No. I keep in touch with friends, but I've never been back since the mid-1970s. After returning to San Diego I made the decision to leave that university and go to Witier College where I served for 5 years as the director of the business program. I developed and launched a Master of Business Administration MA degree. We thought that would add to a good compliment of course offerings as a private college serving this particular clientele. Following my stint at Witier, I was appointed Dean of the School of Business at Eastern Washington University in Spokane, WA. From 1982 to 1986...the president called me one day and asked if I would be willing to serve as interim as the Academic Vice-President Provost, which I did for the next two years. Following that I served as specialist President. I worked across the state of Washington on outcomes assessment. The Higher Education Board had just been established at that time. I headed up a task force state-wide of four year universities and two year colleges. 26 colleges. During that time I was in that special assistant to the president capacity, I got very involved both academically and politically. There was a tremendous amount of existence in outcomes assessment and there was a lot I had to sort out in the process.

RM: Did you make a conscious effort to get into administration or did you just fall into it and it worked out that way?

PB: I did not make a conscious effort to get into administration. I thought about that quite a bit. My additional teaching activity, the combination of undergraduate and graduate courses, I enjoyed it quite a bit. I hadn't the foggiest idea I would go the administrative route. One day the Dean of the School of Business called me up and said Phil I need an assistant Dean for the undergraduate school on this other campus. The university is located at two different places in San Diego...What was the old California Western campus and the brand new larger campus inland. So I told the dean I would have to think about it. It was early in my academic career. I had just gotten my doctorate. After thinking it over a good while I decided I'd give it a try and see how this administrative stuff works. I did and I continued with it. So it was that that got me started on the administrative path.

RM: What was the process of coming to Northern? You were out at Washington State.

PB: I was at Washington State and, of course this whole business...the state-wide process of converting to outcomes assessment approaches. As that was winding down my role as head of the task force was completed. I made my final presentation to the

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

Higher Education Board and legislature. As chair of the committee I had to make many presentations. My president, Alex Schilt at that time he and I explored possible avenues of my continuing at Northern at that stage. I told him I didn't think it was appropriate for me to go back at that time. I had served as dean for 4 years. I then stepped out and served as interim vice president for 2 years while a presidential search was going on. The president wanted to appoint his own, it was a colleague of his from Houston with the board approval. That was fine for me. I knew my own days were numbered in that respect. I had been appointed by the old president and the new president had his own hand. So one thing lead to another and I made the decision at that point that I would reach out and seek a position of my own. I didn't know what direction I wanted to go. Whether it was dean of a business school in the northwest or one of the larger state universities, such as Oregon State. I looked at those options. And I looked at the option of continuing the broader more generalized route of academic administrator, which I then decided to pursue. Even though I had some feelers out for positions in business schools, most of my effort was looking at universities and colleges across the country that had a good match for me with my background, interests, and training and the needs of that institution. I knew something about Michigan from my academic acquaintances and also I had my eye out for what was going on in Michigan anyway. It turned out there was an opening at a place called Northern Michigan University. I submitted my paperwork and I was ultimately selected by Dean Appleberry. That's the path by which I finally wound up here.

RM: When did you get here?

PB: June of '89.

RM: Appleberry was...

PB: Appleberry was in his 7th year then.

RM: Had he resigned?

PB: No. Appleberry continued at the university that year and the following year.

RM: He left in 91. When you first got here in the position, what were some of the things you had to deal with? Were there any outstanding developments, or lack of developments that you had to deal with on campus?

PB: You're testing my memory.

RM: Any major things that jump out?

PB: There was a major piece of unfinished business that was occurring when I came. It was this round of 5 year programs. There were about a dozen or so. The departments

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

had to go through reviews to complete that whole cycle. It was an effort that Jim Appleberry and my predecessor had launched around 1986. In the next 10 year round ??? I very quickly became deeply involved in academic programming for those dozen or so departments that had just begun to do it that fall, or were slated to do it the following fall. I got to know those departments well and worked with them as closely as I could to make sure the program review was conducted openly and I could have a hand in providing support that was necessary for the department to make improvements. Beyond those dozen or so departments, I made an effort in my first year at Northern to get to know them. I made the rounds. Not all that uncommon. That was the first major area I became involved with was academic programming. Part of what I learned and uncovered that year in interesting ways formed the foundation for what I was interested in doing and trying to bring about during my tenure as the academic vice president in subsequent years. There were themes that had to do with development, program review and development and ongoing improvement across the entire campus. I was keenly interested was the business of the academic senate for changes. Because of the vice president's connection with the academic senate as things are established at Northern through the contract and bylaws and so on, in pursuing matters of program evolution and improvement of the individual departments.

RM: The other thing you had to deal with...I don't know if it began that early, but I know with my own experience, you were also dealing with departmental bylaws. They had to go through the union and through your office.

PB: That came much later. It was still underway and still was when I left. The whole business of the bylaw review in every academic department in conjunction with contract changes in 1997 or '98 resulted then. A large amount of attention and not a small amount of stress in many of the departments. Making bylaw reviews and in the contract itself. Dave Carlson and I jointly developed a set of guidelines to help the departments go through that process of bylaws. Many departments, maybe 60% of them had great difficulty coming to grips with conceptual changes that had occurred within the contract and applying them to their bylaws as ways of operating within their department and ways of evaluating performance, ways of promoting, ways of regarding promotability and so on. There were some very large changes having to do with that particular contract that I was involved helping to negotiate. It did have some large consequences for bylaw changes. I wish I could say today that I had a really had a good handle on the final outcome for that. The reasons for the contractual changes and bylaw changes were something that is very close to my heart. We can cover those later. The reasons were very dear to me. And yet in so many instances the changes the departments had to go through threw them into absolute fits to come to grips with matters of performance review and evaluation and criteria that would be applicable in Northern's institutional setting for both tenure and promotion. Some of the departments responses came as a surprise to me and others did not. Since I left the institution, midway through that process, I don't know to this day what the results of that have been and how they've been applying out from year to year. I'm going to ask you that question. But I do not know

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

what the results of that have been. So much of that was up in the air when I left. When I left, from the checklist that Dave Carlson and I were maintaining, less than 1/3 of the departments had completed everything and signed off up through my level. So there were at least 2/3 of the departments that were still in the throws of reviews or getting approval from my successor. And in some cases departments really hadn't gotten very far along at all and needed some additional prodding. I wish I knew more about just how well it worked out. I'd like to think it had beneficial effects and will for a long while. Interestingly, the changes in the contract back in 1987 that were intended to give much stronger play to the teaching aspect of the faculty member's role and to give life to the meaning of teaching performance review and evaluation, rather than continuing the historical emphasis that so many faculty were complaining about that as a teaching institution we continued to reward people on the basis of their research and publications and activity. My intent, both through my involvement in the Carnegie Teaching Academy which I launched with the support of 160 faculty back in 1987, but was subsequently dropped shortly after I left, but through our involvement in the Carnegie effort and so much that I had picked up from my meetings with faculty in the program review effort and other ways led me to conclude that there really were significant changes that we could make as an institution that would give us both the face and the substance of being a strong teaching institution that we thought we ought to become known for. In making that transformation into the focus on teaching, which was in many ways more difficult for faculty to get their arms around...you didn't have the normal measures that we had in academe for decades of how many conferences you presented papers at or articles of this level you wrote and so forth and so on. The real difficulty of defining effective teaching, of establishing measures for it, of finding ways to ??? within each department to observe and measure, to make it part of ones record of performance for promotion or tenure or both...that turned out to be a not insignificant task for many departments. It seems to me as I look back on it that there were some departments that had traditionally worked very hard at defining for themselves effective teaching performance, who tended to have an easier time of making those bylaw conversions. I'm thinking of one of the departments in the College of Nursing. Behavioral Sciences, Human Services, and Education caught the concept early on and were able to make that conversion with the possible exception of one department. That had more to do with departmental leadership in my mind. There were some departments here and there, more on the Social Science side, the Arts and Sciences college that were able to grasp the concept and make the conversion more easily. One of the interesting facets as best I knew them when I left, the science departments in Arts and Sciences, as I was witnessing it then, had the greatest difficulty coming to grips with the changes that had to occur. There were faculty who were absolutely hell bent in those departments at that time on continuing to maintain scholarly activity as the basis for tenure and promoting. They didn't give a damn...and several of them told me that to my face...about the changes in the contract and bylaws that were supposed to occur to the teaching aspect of one's job. That was a battle that played out in private most often between individual faculty and department heads and myself. It had some interesting consequences during the last year or two that I was there that can be seen with the changes in the department heads. People

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

aren't doing what they're expected to do in a position of responsibility in the university. When the contract says you're supposed to do something it applies to the vice president, it applies to the department head, it applies to a dean. And of course it applies to the faculty who sign the contract. The vice president signs the contract too. When I sign off on a contract it's part of my policy. It's also something I had to help enforce jointly with the faculty. So that gets more into the bylaw business than I anticipated we would get into.

RM: Your involvement with the outcomes assessment in the state of Washington fit well with what you eventually went into here.

PB: Like a glove.

RM: But you didn't know that.

PB: No. One can't predict that. Given the national movement toward outcomes assessment in the 1990s we were under the gun at Northern to implement a full board outcomes assessment model. One of the stipulations was that we had to install that and agree to become part of a pilot program. We did launch that outcomes assessment right at Northern in 1996. I don't have any idea where it is today. Northern and every other university is nowadays to have on a regular basis, programs of outcomes assessment to inform the faculty and administration on how things are doing from the standpoint...

RM: Continuing...what were some of the other major efforts you were engaged in as academic vice president?

PB: One that comes to mind immediately is the First Year Experience program. It probably would be at or very close to the top of the list of my own interests and beliefs in something that was implemented across the university and really made a difference. Often times in a university setting programs and initiatives of one kind or another occur under presidential leadership directly or as the result of faculty members serving as something particular from a department. But so often in the life of an academic administrator it seems like 95% or more of what we're involved in from day to day has to do with that ??? of ??? as it's called from time to time. You're engaged in 40 meetings a week. You are problem solving and troubleshooting, you are conducting meetings, attending meetings. You are processing things. Activities and efforts are in some stage of processing constantly between committees, senate executive group, and so forth and so on. So it's not too often that it becomes possible for an academic administrator to become deeply involved in the leadership and mounting an initiative. This was one effort that I had an opportunity to mount and work through with committees. Thank heavens I had full support from Dr. Bill Vandament at that time in helping to move that effort ahead. I don't think that without Bill's strong support of that that it would have been possible to pull it off at that time. It was going to require a high level of cooperation between the student affairs and academic affairs division. Bill wanted me to take the

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

leadership of it. I felt I needed to take the leadership of it, that it should come from academic affairs, not student affairs. At the same time I didn't want to make that a problem of leadership choice as between my fellow vice president Karen Reese and myself. Given the dimensions of what several of us felt of the First Year Experience program would entail, it seemed to make sense that academic affairs is where that needed to be housed and led and so forth and so on. So from the very beginning I met with the task force that Karen Reese and I jointly did appoint that would be the template for the overall program. Based on the research that I had done about First Year Experience programs across the country and some consultation from Bill Vandament on the subject as well, I developed a possible template for the First Year Experience program and a timeline for program development over a two year period. Based on everything that I had been observing it appeared that it would take more than one year to put everything together. So I proposed to the committee a way of approaching a FYE program, but at the same time didn't want them to simply take what I gave them as the template to adopt. I said here are some other programs that I think it would be worth while to take a look at. Feel free to adapt, adjust, or modify. This is a model that I think could work well, but take a look at these other possibilities and see what you can come up with. That's what they did. In a couple months, after meeting with them a couple more times, that FYE program took shape. After it's final presentation to me and the vice president of student affairs, I took it to the Senate Executive Committee and talked to them about it on 2 occasions, then took it to the Academic Senate. It then had a review and became adopted as the way to go. There are some nuances to that, but that was the big path that I took.

RM: At any point was there opposition, penetrating questions where people were unhappy with it?

PB: There weren't at that stage. There were later. I'll get to that. Each of these questions trigger something in my memory which is helpful. The concept of the FYE program and what it could potentially do for the university and to strengthen us academically, strengthen the performance of our students as they came in as freshmen and build that performance in a way that would provide a great improvement in student retention was very much on the minds of all of us as we looked at ways to make this a stronger institution. At any rate, upon adoption by the Academic Senate, I moved to implement the program. One of the things the senate felt strongly about, and there was certainly no argument on it from my side, was that we needed to have a strong academic leader in charge of it. It had to be an academic affairs person who would promote and support and advance the cause of the FYE program. We did do that. I understand that right now there is not an academic person in charge of it. I think it's Susan Berdine who used to serve as the executive administrator to Karen Reese. You might know more about that, but that is the last I heard about it. . It would be interesting because the senate had itself sanctioned that, but oh well. That was then, this is now sort of thing. At any rate, the FYE program got off to an extremely good start. It was a positive thing and had support from across the campus. There were some folks in student affairs who were nervous of this being an academic enterprise because they were familiar with first year

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

freshman programs that were housed in student affairs. So they weren't entirely confident that academic affairs could carry it and make it a success. But never the less they participated as a review and development team. The director reported to the vice president for the first two years of the program. But the program team that worked to support the efforts of the FYE program, it included vita acquisition and analysis. I wanted it, the board wanted it, president wanted, Paul Dubie and a couple others were instrumental in designing a statistical way to measure the effectiveness of us meeting the objectives of that program. We had several defined objectives and we had performance standards for each of us. It was very important to all of us that we could measure from day one how we were doing. One of the key measures of success had to do with performance of the freshmen in that program and what difference did it make for them versus all other freshmen who were not in the program. So indeed, within a two year period, the president was convinced, the board was convinced, that this was one of the finest endeavors that the university had ever undertaken. For an investment of \$65,000, and that's what I budgeted for, that was one of the best investments the university ever made in helping to improve freshman success and strengthen the institution in terms of freshman retention and freshman, sophomore, junior, senior interaction and development as freshmen continue to grow. The contact points that those freshmen continue to have with their FYE teachers all the way through their 4 year academic life is just remarkable. They would often go to each others homes or get together on the streets, they continue to do that. There's a bond formed at the freshman level from the experiences they have together. The main force of resistance to the FYE program occurred as the first year of the program got under way. The director of the program and myself were in contact with department heads trying to free up little pieces of resources, that is individual faculty who could be assigned a FYE course of 20 students or less some time during that year and to become part of those modules that we had established. There's not much more I can say about that, it was just a natural source of concern from department heads to have those resources. They were feeling pressure on the part of their deans, but here was the vice president who was also spearheading the FYE program. They knew how much I supported it and wanted it to be the fabric of the institution. They felt they were being pulled from both sides. They were being measured on productivity by the dean but they were also expected to play ball with this new program the senate adopted and the vice president was supporting. They were the proverbial men and women in the middle and being pulled on both sides. So it became my job to get back with the deans and say I understand there is a problem over here. You really do need to have this resource replaced. You can't just free up this faculty member for FYE for next fall. You have too many demands to meet. I will augment your budget by \$1800. Get some part time assistants in there to meet the requirements for the course you're missing because this faculty member is being pulled out. We managed to do that. It became more routine to do that mixing and matching during the 2nd and 3rd years. During the 1st year everything was so new and the department heads were still feeling under the gun and in some cases did give them up without any replacement. After talking with them and having several meetings with the deans we decided we were very unfair to the individual departments for placing these multiple conflicting expectations on their shoulders. They've got to

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

have the resources to meet the need. By the time we had sorted through all that and worked through the difficulties involved, the program was getting on it's feet quite well by the end of the second year. Laura Sobern, bless her heart did a great job in helping to talk up the program and being it's champion at the grass roots level across the campus. As the first person heading up that program, she just did an outstanding job in moving that ahead. Jim of the education department...not even Jim...Steve Oats. Steve then took over the program. I appointed him to serve the year before I resigned. He continued to serve under Fred Joyal, but I understand he is not head of the program any more. Now it's a lady from Student Services who is. But in so far as my own involvement was concerned and the impact we were beginning to see from the program, I interviewed students. I talked with the faculty involved. We had group sessions throughout the years. Looking at the statistics, never mind the vibrations I was getting throughout the year, all positive from the students. Everything I was picking up on all sides convinced me that it was an outstanding program that needed to continue to have support from across the entire university. I think as far as I can tell that it was also supported by Judi Baily at the time she came aboard. We never talked about it a lot, but I did sense that it was something she supported. She didn't initiate it. It was ongoing from the time she came aboard. But it was appointed pride. Because of the tremendous support that Bill Vandament gave to me and to that program during his 6 years here, I would share equally with him the pride. I don't know if he ever mentioned the FYE program for him, but I think he was. Something that I mentioned earlier that I also would say was a point of pride for me and was a significant effort is working with the faculty and moving ahead with the tenants of the Carnegie Teaching Academy. I don't know if you had gotten involved in that or not. I thought you had. Both in the committee sense, there were conferences that faculty attended and there were things on campus from time to time. My goal was for Northern to have as one of the feathers in it's cap was charter membership in the Carnegie Teaching Academy. One of the top 100 across the country that was fully involved. Had full faculty and so on. We could spend hours talking about this. One of the things I could say right now is that one of the regrets...there aren't many, but one of the regrets I had in following my decision to retire from the university was that the Carnegie Teaching Academy effort had so much potential for the institution. Yet I was having to say goodbye to that and was not able to carry that forward. I felt then, and certainly it has been proven since then, that it was a fragile effort at that point yet. The degree of faculty leadership had not come together to be strong enough and be dynamic and have enough staying power to continue that effort on its own without strong administrative support. With no criticism to the current administration, it is a fact that that effort after I left was not one of the items assigned priority. I think the career administration's position is that it either had to live or die on home based faculty support. If it didn't have faculty support on it's own feet, it wasn't worth continuing. My counterpoint to that had I continued to serve would have been no, it's not evolved to the point yet. All things take time to happen. Evolve to the point where it can sustain on it's own, faculty led effort to survive on it's own. It has to have continued administration nurturing, guidance, and so on. It had nothing to do with ego on my part. Most of the individuals I worked with recognized that ego never got in my way of anything. We all

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

have one, but it's certainly nothing that would compel me that that would present a problem. For me it was a belief that in terms of institutional governance and how things happen with people over time that the Carnegie Teaching Academy involvement with Northern was still too young. It needed to have continued administrative support. The faculty committee told me that on several occasions. I still remember my last meeting with them. Bill we don't know what's going to happen without the support that you have provided to this effort. That support was in all sorts of ways. I attended meetings with them. I came there as a team member to work with them. I'll make it work. It was that kind of support I was talking about. But the faculty on their own, that effort didn't have a departmental base, it didn't have college base.

RM: When I was serving on a committee it was just getting started.

PB: It began in '97 maybe '98. But it had been in operation 2 years before I stepped down. But it was still a budding effort.

RM: It was very easy for it to slip through the cracks.

PB: It's also institutional reality. When people change from one role to another and people leave, this or that, new faces come onto the scene and they have their own interests. New priorities surface in the institution. It is a way of life.

RM: Would you want to comment on Bill Vandament and your interaction with him?

PB: Sure. He is undoubtedly one of the top two individuals with whom I've had the pleasure of working with in my academic life who I would characterize as being a truly renaissance leader. He had a sense of the people he was working with in his community, what it would take to refresh and invigorate the institution when he came in. He sensed some of the needs of the institution at that time and moving the university into a new direction. Bill gave the institution and the community a sense of the importance of history like nobody else I have ever heard of. In all sorts of visible ways he helped this institution make a mark on itself for the future and a mark on the community in terms of giving. In addition to that, helping to revitalize the campus in a relatively short space of time, in terms of infrastructure and the changes in it's layout. The way those facilities could accommodate interaction. Bill had a universal view of what it took to make up an institution and keep it growing and thriving and prospering. Considering all of his individual personal interests, and his professional ones, he is one of those rare renaissance kinds of academic leaders that we were indeed privileged to have. It was a privilege for me and I was thrilled to be able to work with him for the period of time that we did. We enjoyed many good times together. We played piano and horn together at home on a few occasions. We had him and Marge out to the lake for a visit when they returned from California. They came out and spent several hours with us. We had a wonderful time together. I did not have a close personal relationship with him. It was a professional one, very friendly, but professional by enlarge. He and I did not go out after

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

hours and have a beer together. That was not his style or mine. But certainly we were on very good terms. We had a tremendous amount of respect for each other. Every so often...because of his personality and his belief in things, he would find himself meddling a bit in this or that piece of business that would either drive Mike Roy or me up a tree. We'd have to pick up pieces after Bill to get things put back together again. But that was something wonderful about him too. Seize the moment. We would have to provide substance then when he had seized the moment.

RM: That was the same experience I had with him.

PB: That dome wouldn't be what it is today, to the community and what it would mean to the future. You know what that dome provides and the impressions it makes.

RM: When he came it was supposed to be closed. They built it and that was the end of it.

PB: He was one remarkable human being.

RM: Do you ever go out and visit with him?

PB: No we haven't. Wrote to him quite some time ago. But it wasn't anything that required a response. It was just some information and so forth. I haven't heard from him for probably a year. There's nothing else, by way of single instances or initiatives that I would comment on at this point besides that 10 year time span that I served in that position. I think as administrators, whether it's academic or non-academic, we are all facing challenges from day to day of all sorts. More than half my time at Northern I was battling the budget. The stresses and strains that came from contractions of this kind and that kind. We were always faced with it. But that's part of the field. More than half of my time I wore two hats. That was something few people were aware of when they were wondering why this or that was presenting a problem. There were difficulties that we collectively had to attend to. We could not find a satisfactory solution. John Hemming left....

TAPE 2

PB: At the time that John Hemming left in 1993 to take on his doctorate, despite all best efforts at finding a full-time replacement for him, that could serve the kind of role he had in dealing with the interplay with the two faculty unions at Northern and a variety of other issues...we actually did recruit nationally and that did not pan out. One thing led to another. Bill Vandament and I decided the only thing we could do is for me to take on some of John's duties for the future. I did and continued for about 3 years to play about 50% of the role that John had otherwise been involved in, which resulted in Janice Book, who had been John's secretary, coming into the Academic Affairs area to assist me with all the union related matters that came into our office. It was not something desirable to

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

me. I did not feel that it was good business practice of the institution that it was appropriate for the academic vice president to be so closely aligned to the role of union relations that as I was placed in a position of being. Bill Vandament and I sorted this out in our own way over a period of time. As you know too, the quality of working relations between the faculty unions and the president, and in general around the institution, improved. The mood improved and became much more congenial over time. Bill felt that it was not going to be harmful and create a conflict of interest for me to continue to play the role I had unless there were times when I explicitly thought there was a conflict of interest to then remove myself from it or counsel with him, which I did on one occasion. I said such and such is happening, I think we should do this. He said right, yes, let me see if I can get a handle of this and make sure you're not placed in the direct line of fire. So we were able to work those things out. In retrospect there were other faculty that could be the judge. On balance it was probably a good thing for me to be directly at the negotiating table on two different occasions, talking face to face with the faculty. It's not that no one else could have. There were lots of other capable people. But when you have at the negotiating table the chief financial vice president who is looking at things from one perspective and a dean or department head who may be operating from the principle that they think they need to continue to posture in a way that is purely administrative and forget that it is not faculty versus administration. It's probably a good thing for an individual to be at the table along with the dean and department head or representative and the financial vice president. An individual who is also working with the faculty from day to day on a variety of venues, who understands them and made known, whether it's through senate executive or FRC meetings and hearing their concerns or the things I would pick up through academic senate meetings, whatever it might be. For an individual such as myself to be at that table and hopefully provide some balance to what is being said and concluded upon. Talking about negotiations. I prefer to avoid that setting as much as possible. But I have worn two hats on quite a few occasions. It was because John Hemming left that I then became much more involved directly in union relations as you will. That's not just contract. I'm talking union relations. I developed a closer working relationship with both the unions over a period of years than I think I otherwise would have. Was that good for the institution? I know Bill Vandament thought it was. Whether all the faculty think it was, probably not. I suspect that if you were to talk in depth with some faculty they would probably say that no there were times that Phil Beukema was too close to the union side or times that he was bending too much in terms of the interests of a group. Mike Marsden and I certainly had some interesting discussions from time to time where he and I were not necessarily on the same side of the fence regarding what needed to be done. There were some late night discussions that we had to have where I told him Mike I know what your position is on this, but I have made this decision. Stand aside and I will take care of whatever it may be. So history will be the judge of whether that kind of working relationship that did develop...it evolved happenstance from the time Vandament was there and the time that Hemming stepped down and I came into that role of being a more pro-active person in terms of union relations. I think it helped for me to serve a stint, not willingly, but because I was asked. On two different occasions, as interim dean for the college of

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

technology and applied sciences, and you understand the union interplay that exists in that one college. So that happened on a couple occasions. Plus there were two other interim roles that I played also. Other individuals had stepped out of their positions and there was nobody else. One was at the time that Appleberry was here and it was for a 6 month period and I've already forgotten about it. I think that goes with the territory of individuals in the administrative position. We often do need to step in and wear multiple hats on occasion. It's just expected. Our week seems to be expandable. We only have 24 hours in a day, but it's how you manage that time to be able to get everything done that you would like to. In summary, what I would like to add is the time I served as academic vice president for Northern is one of the best times. I have some of the best feelings about my time at the university in my entire life. Every job has its stresses and strains. That is given. But the opportunity of working with good minds and good people and to be part of that vitality that is connected to this institution, full of young students who are eager. The youth of the institution and to be involved in interviewing new faculty that will add new blood to the department and the opportunity from time to time to spearhead a new initiative and see that grow and flower are part of my own memory of working in an institution and having the time of my life. It was a tremendous experience. I don't think I regret a minute of it. My wife and I have talked about it often wondering if I had any regrets since my leaving the university and the answer is no I don't have a single regret over having left. But at the same time I have some tremendous memories. It was a wonderful time. I believe very much that I was able to give something to the institution during my time there, but I was also able to take from it some tremendous experiences. Everybody with whom I worked helped share with me and make it a part of. After a while you forget about some of those more difficult times. Times when you made a decision and was it the best decision I could have made there? Did I play the most appropriate leadership role under that circumstance that I really could have? Yes I've had those thoughts. I suspect everybody does. I've had thoughts about the times where I should have done better or ought to have done differently. Maybe with better advice...but I would say those times are a relative minority and I ended up overall with good feelings about that time with the institution. I'm so very glad that I was at Northern Michigan University.

RM: What have you done since you retired?

PB: Since retirement...fascinating story...I no longer live in town. I'm about 30 miles outside Marquette. We and others operate a national business in the field of apparel. Casual, sweatshirts, polos, you name it. Jackets, sportswear of all kinds for athletic teams, community groups. It has two locations, in the Upper Peninsula and in Green Bay, WI. We are a growing company. We have 3 websites. We have developed a clientele of nearly 2,000 at this point. It is a family corporation. I serve as president and we have 3 partners within the corporate structure. We have hired several employees and continue to hire. We are moving to new offices this week. I need to get down to Green Bay shortly. We have a great deal going on in building a business from scratch. My son was in the resort apparel business. After doing some research for him in his business a

July 22, 2002

Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi

Marquette, MI

Transcribed: August 19, 2002

few years ago. I made the decision to get involved in the apparel business on the internet and work with him and with others in the family.

RM: Corporate apparel means...

PB: Corporate apparel in the industry means any kind of logo apparel. A lot of companies around the country use shirts embroidered with their logo when their sales force goes to a convention or trade show. There are also companies that give polos away. They cost \$20 a piece, to their top 100 customers. Companies like Aramar just sponsored a golf tournament. We produced about 1000 garments for them.

RM: So you're in the production of it.

PB: We do both. The sale of blank garments, where we do the embroidering and screen printing...we have a embroidering and screen printing facility in Green Bay. That's about half our business. It's an active internet business. There are three different websites.

RM: What's the name of it?

PB: Corporate Apparel Unlimited. It's a limited liability company established in the state of Michigan. When I retired from the university June 30, July 1 I was serving as president of this new company and have my hands full, which is also why I haven't been involved in Rotary very faithfully either.

RM: I sort of wondered. You were involved in Rotary. Part of the way people perceive you is they really didn't know all of your background. I've learned things today that now help explain things that happened like the outcomes assessment and all that. People knew you were doing that, but they didn't know you were coming with all this baggage like the faculty.

PB: And how would they know?

RM: You couldn't put out an announcement.

PB: And you wonder how far do you go explaining yourself. Explaining the context every time you talk about it.

RM: It's very good.

PB: You learned more than you thought you'd find out. I have no secrets.

RM: It was nice that you hit on the high points, the things you consider important. We can't go through your whole thing year by year. Thank you, very good.

Interview with Philip Beukema
July 22, 2002
Interviewer: Dr. Russell Magnaghi
Marquette, MI
Transcribed: August 19, 2002

15

PB: My pleasure.