

Academic Senate
Meeting of February 15, 2012
University Club, Banquet Room
University Park Campus

MINUTES

Present: R. Ben-Ari, J. Brecher, A. Capron, G. Ehresmann, L. Fетters, R. Flick, V. Folkes, J. Goad, C. Gomer, S. Gupta, E. Jonckheere (alternate for J. Silvester), R. Labaree, R. Lonergan, A. Lynch, V. Marmarelis, M.V. Marx, O. Mayer, E. McCann, T. Morgan, K. Murphy, J. Orr, G. Peters, P. Riley, J. Steele, K. Venegas, S. Wenzel, W. Wolf, D. Yett

Absent: D. Blaine, R. Brinton, P. Cannon, L. Carver, P. Conti, Y. DeClerck, P. Ethington, J. Farver, H. Greenwald, K. Howell, J. Kagan, D. Larsen, E. McCaffery, P. Mills, E. Muhl, J. Nyquist, R. Pancheva, P. Pattengale, S. Smith

Guests: E. Garrett, M. Levine

President Gupta called the meeting to order at 2:02pm. The presence of a quorum was noted

1. Dialogue with Provost and Senior Vice President Elizabeth Garrett

Provost Elizabeth Garrett was introduced:

I want to thank all of you for attending the joint retreat; it was the best of all the retreats we have had; we had a really nice dialogue among veterans and first-year retreat attendees.

You should have received the memo from Executive Vice Provost Michael Quick that we are looking at general education. We are looking forward to considering what our students need to know as citizens of the world and are specifically looking for the best GE curriculum for the twenty-first century. Our review is not being driven by financial considerations; we are looking at what is best for our students and their complete education.

There are four finalists in the the Dean of Gerontology search. Marty Levine is the point person and has done a spectacular job. All the finalists are from outside USC. We have a great school and are going to find the best leader because people want to come here.

38 There are four finalists in the Dornsife Dean search; there will be an announcement
39 in about a week. The finalists will meet with faculty and the faculty council and
40 USC supporters to really see the Trojan family we have here.

41 Of course, the Dean review at Keck is underway.

42 After meeting with the finance committee of the Board of Trustees, we know the
43 endowment payout will be flat, the same as for the last five years. It has never been
44 cut, even in these economic times.

45 The Board authorized a tuition increase of up to 3.9 percent, but we are only using
46 3.7 percent, the lowest since 1969.

47 All schools are in the process of reviewing their budgets; our fringe rate is now
48 33.5 percent, lowered 0.5 percent from last year, and we hope to repeat this next
49 year.

50 The undergraduate tuition charge was raised 0.5 percent to 30 percent against the
51 undergraduate tuition rate specifically to increase the financial aid pool.

52 The professional schools recommend their own tuition increases because the
53 markets are so different.

54
55 Q: How did we lower the fringe rate?

56 A: Through the committee chaired by Elizabeth Graddy certain benefits were
57 changed, but these changes affect no one here:

58 1) tuition assistance that does not affect faculty; staff assistance now vests after
59 two years, while faculty remains immediate. This change was necessary to prevent
60 staff from coming here just for the aid and then leaving as soon as graduation;

61 2) there is no longer absolute vesting after 15 years;

62 3) the employer retirement portion only fully vests after four years;

63 4) there have been changes in the health benefits; we looked at what other
64 comparable institutions do, and we negotiated well with our insurance providers.

65
66 In mentoring and programmatic issues, we have expanded our funds for
67 scholarship. We have granted five early sabbaticals, three awarded to NTT faculty
68 and two to tenure-track.

69 The rest of the deadlines are February 17 for grant writing, and the Mellon
70 mentoring award nominations are due February 27.

71 We are trying to build the culture of recognizing faculty for their distinctions and
72 their good work. UCAR is continuing to be an opportunity to identify our great
73 faculty.

74
75 C: It is desirable for us to establish a committee on the history of USC. We need to
76 maintain the historical knowledge and its significant documents as we continue to
77 grow in order to analyze what has happened over the years.

A: We are working through this.

C: We are already doing this in the School of Engineering.

A: A lot has been going on in the various schools, and we intend to link them.

C: We need to get this done soon, because much of this information is ephemeral.

A: Yes. We are working on it.

2. In Memoriam: Nancy Wood, 1987-88 Faculty Senate President

Professor Robert Labaree, Senate Historian and Head of the VKC Library, was introduced:

Nancy Wood, former President of the Faculty, passed away last year. The historical documents show her great impact on policies for fringe benefits, for faculty evaluations, on NTT faculty reviews, against harassment, and for procedures in closing units on campus. She will be missed.

3. Approval of January Senate Minutes

Giving the members a moment to review them, the minutes of the January 18, 2012, Senate meeting were approved unanimously.

4. Approval of Executive Board Member-at-Large Appointment

President Gupta introduced Professor Valerie Folkes, USC Associates Chair in Business Administration and Professor of Marketing, Marshall School of Business.

We have had an interesting year as the administration has poached many of our Executive Board members. Our Bylaws allow the Executive Board to nominate a replacement member if there is less than a year remaining in the term. We have unanimously recommended Professor Valerie Folkes.

A motion was made to endorse the nomination, was seconded, and was adopted unanimously.

5. Review of the Senate-Provost Retreat and Next Steps Discussion

President Gupta described the retreat of January 27 and 28:

It was very informative and many different viewpoints were represented. There were many proposals from radical to incrementalism. There was much productive

discussion about collaboration but also about solo work; truly a whole spectrum of ideas was presented. All of the panels included questions and comments about administrative functions and ideas for improvement and especially included the discussion of developing a true academic medical center and looking at what and where we want to be in ten years.

This information will also help with the WASC ideas on capstones and GE review, investigation, as well as future development of curriculum. The Executive Board is meeting with Ed Finegan of CET, and then we will begin discussions on these ideas and how to examine and begin the discussion to present new solutions. There was an interesting contrast between learning and the research, the “give us this and leave us alone” attitude. We need to really think about what this difference means and how to make the proper changes and create our future actions.

Professor Patricia Riley, Senate Academic Vice President:

The scenario website continues to be populated with new information, and we will present the analysis as we work our way through the information. The average score for the faculty was positive, way above the average for the future. Typically, you see more clustering and more certainty that we did not see. This fact makes us more aware of the disciplinary differences in how the future is seen.

The question is what would you recommend we do differently next year; what would make the event even better, including ideas on other people, other topics, other time structures.

Q: It would be interesting to see the results of past retreats. Has there been follow-up? Which were the most long-term productive in order to determine the kinds of things we want to focus on in the future?

Q: The question is not in the novelty but a sense of continuity for each year. Can we have a structure which tries to take account of the action items and the results and to continue to ponder the ideas which were raised, to use the process to build year to year?

It was my first retreat, and it met the high end of my expectations. The most salient moment was the sense of the preeminence of the role of the faculty in developing the future. We must find the way to bring the faculty into all areas of administration of the university.

The continuing website is: www.usc2022.net

C: There is a lot to be said for faculty and the senior administration coming together, and hearing and exchanging their views; but we may see less in the next few years because these are long-term ideas we discussed and the communication itself must be seen by all as valuable.

A: The moment does matter.

C: The retreat was colored by the Strategic Vision, and we were more aspirational than previously. We really need to think decades in advance with these aspirational ideas to make the incrementalism work.

A: The first panel on outtakes made us realize how much we still need to consider that were not parts of the Strategic Vision yet.

We are still doing follow-up on the August Senate retreat; so the process is always on-going.

6. Resolution 11/12-02 on Proposed Changes to the Senate Constitution and Bylaws, second reading

Professor Alexander Capron was introduced:

This is the first reading of these changes, trying to determine how to make the best substantive changes and also making the handbook more user-friendly to enhance clarity.

Q: In Section 3, is there a time frame for this committee?

A: It is still under discussion.

Q: But it needs a time frame, does it not?

A: Noted.

Q: Given that the faculty at Keck have two sources of income, has there been discussion about the medical practice side not the university side?

A (Marty Levine): Those days are gone; the medical faculty work for USC; all income is under USC rules; clinical work is USC work governed by university policy.

Q: In media matters, people may not get the reporting correct even if I have said I am speaking for myself.

A: That is why it is worded as it is; the faculty member has the responsibility and how it is reported cannot be controlled

195 Q: In Section 7, what is the procedure if there is a problem; who does one address?

196 A: The faculty rights committee or the Senate President.

197

198 Q: Is there preliminary work that should have occurred before approaching the
199 committee, at the department level?

200 A: We would hope so; but there is no formal requirement. However, if there is an
201 impasse, the approach can be made.

202

203 Q: This is going in the section on faculty grievances. Is this not before there is any
204 basis for a faculty grievance?

205 A (Marty Levine): Yes.

206 Q: Then should it go before the grievance section?

207 Q: Why not in section 6, then?

208

209 Q: Is the confidential agreement section required.

210 A: We felt it crucial that we not disclose early in the process, but it needed to be
211 discoverable in a legal process.

212 A (Marty Levine): This is the Senate's language from a few years ago.

213

214 Q: So, in section 8, is the person possibly working for free?

215 A (Marty Levine): No, this is so that the person not work for the period of time; it
216 is a suspension without pay.

217

218 Q: Do we need to add that the faculty cannot be from the unit?

219 A: Noted.

220

221 Q: Back to section 3, I have never seen the disclaimer in the popular press as it is
222 in, for example, academic writing. Is it clear in that case to outsiders that the
223 person is not speaking on behalf of the university?

224 A: No, it speaks to the responsibility of the individual faculty member.

225 A (Marty Levine): Should this be part of the biographical note? The committee
226 probably needs to work on this.

227 Q: Should it not read that the faculty member must do what can be done to make
228 this clear?

229 Q: Could it be stated in the negative, as long as the faculty member does not
230 represent?

231 A: We will take the section back for discussion.

232 A: The key idea is that it is okay as long as the faculty member does not represent
233 him or herself as speaking on behalf of the university.

234

235 Q: What does temporary tenure mean?

236 A (Marty Levine): If formerly tenured faculty members are recalled to service,
237 they may be granted tenure status for that period of recall.

238

239 Q: Why is the second clause needed?

240 A: This recognizes we have done this in the past. We wanted to make it part of the
241 handbook.

242 Q: Is such a person then employed?

243 A (Marty Levine): No, it is volunteers.

244

245 Q: Why is it not in a different paragraph?

246 A: We will make it 10-e.

247 C: We regularly propose retired faculty for university committees; this is consistent
248 with the point that tenured faculty are required to deal with tenure matters.

249 A: Yes.

250

251 Q: Can retired faculty accept or decline this invitation?

252 A: Yes.

253

254 Q: How does this apply to NTT faculty?

255 A: That is the rest of the paragraph.

256 Q: Is the phrasing, "may ask the Provost," better served by "the Provost at the
257 request of the department?"

258 Q: But is it school or dean?

259 Q: And is this subject to renewal?

260 A: That was then the first reading. We will present the second version before the
261 next meeting.

262

263 Professor Alexander Capron then introduced the second reading of Resolution
264 11/12-2:

265

266 After last meeting, the Executive Board restated some of the provisions, including
267 the requirements of Senate President as senior tenured faculty who is drawn into
268 personnel matters. So we removed that language; the other change is in Article III,
269 section 1, where the language was simplified

270

271 Q: The retired faculty very much concur with this amendment and the new
272 wording. It is important that faculty not emeritus receive the appropriate benefits.
273 And this does the retired faculty a big favor.

274

Also, in Article I, section 2, since questions about the manner of amending this document making no difference between NTT and tenured and tenure-track faculty. So we needed to be clear that faculty councils only include full-time faculty members and when NTT do not participate in certain committees.

Q: But should the provision on the Senate President be included, since this has been our custom?

A: The discussion at the Executive Board in removing that language was that there is an institutional memory and, as long as that argument is persuasive, the point is clear. But, if at some time this is not necessary, the Executive Board wanted to leave that opportunity open and not have the constitution restrict.

A (Marty Levine): It has not been in the document, and we have done just fine in the past. It should be a question of individual merit.

C: The NTT committee favors not having the language.

C: The Bylaws are the same as last reading.

Q: In the last line of Bylaw 18, could it be a two person committee?

A: The panel on collegial disagreements used to have only one person. You are right, but the idea of the permissive language is to add members.

C: And the Academic Senate President sat in on all grievances; so that the Executive Board could be involved in any concerns for appointment of a full committee.

The question was called and seconded and passed unanimously (17 yea).

7. Announcement

The next meeting, March 21, will be held at HSC in CHP 102, and Tom Jackiewicz, Senior Vice President and Chief Executive Officer for USC Health, will attend the March meeting in lieu of Provost Garrett.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:08pm.

Respectfully submitted,

James Brecher, J.D., Ph.D.

Secretary General of the Academic Senate