

Academic Senate
Meeting of January 18, 2012
University Club, Pub Room
University Park Campus

MINUTES

Present: R. Ben-Ari, D. Blaine, J. Brecher, P. Cannon, A. Capron, L. Carver, P. Conti, L. Feters, R. Flick, J. Goad, C. Gomer, S. Gupta, M. Jordan-Marsh, R. Labaree, R. Lonergan, A. Lynch, V. Marmarelis, M.V. Marx, E. McCann, P. Mills, E. Muhl, T. Morgan, K. Murphy, M. Nichol, J. Nyquist, J. Orr, P. Riley, J. Silvester, S. Smith, J. Steele, J. Tilson, R. Weinberg (alternate for J. Kagan), S. Wenzel, W. Wolf, D. Yett

Absent: R. Brinton, N. Chopiuk, Y. DeClerck, G. Ehresmann, J. Farver, H. Greenwald, D. Larsen, O. Mayer, E. McCaffery, R. Pancheva, P. Pattengale, G. Peters, K. Venegas

Guests: E. Garrett, L. LaCorte, M. Levine, I. Rhimes, M. Suarez

President Gupta called the meeting to order at 2:03pm.

1. Approval of December Senate Minutes

Giving the members a moment to review them, the minutes of the December 14, 2011, Senate meeting were approved unanimously.

2. In Memoriam: Sidney W. Benson, 1947 Secretary to the University Senate

Professor Walter Wolf:

Professor Sidney Benson passed away at the age of 93. He was the secretary of the first University Senate. He was honored with a living memorial a few years ago because, in the early days, the faculty had little input into university decisions. Professor Benson led a 97 percent response rate in information gathering from the university, and he led the change as our Faculty Senate began to be and became a positive force in decision-making.

Vice Provost Martin Levine:

Sidney Benson was a great scientist, highly cited, and a distinguished professor here at USC. He was one of our first members of the National Academy of Science and, even in retirement, came to faculty club and visited with us to share his wisdom.

His memorial obituary is on the university website, and a memorial service will be held next Wednesday.

3. Dialogue with Provost and Senior Vice President Elizabeth Garrett

Provost Elizabeth Garrett was introduced:

Happy New Year. I cannot attend all your meetings, but I will be sending some great people to talk to you and share our ideas and our plans.

I am very excited about the upcoming retreat, and the topics and the people will make this a terrific experience for the new strategic vision to provide a foundation for our discussions.

As we speak, the bike summit is going on as we continue to figure out how we can build a more perfect environment here on campus.

I have brought a handout update on freshman enrollment for next year. The news is very good, but different in some ways because this is our first year with the common application. We do, however, have a supplement that is required for our applicants. Now, MIT and Georgetown are the only elite schools not using the common application.

We should have 45,000 applications this year, our highest ever pool. For Spring enrollment, each school will have exceeded its target. January 10 is the deadline for Fall applications; and we are beginning our evaluation. With the common application so far, we have seen our demographics remain about the same but first-generation applications are up, SAT scores appear to be up about 15 points, and we are 32 percent up in SAT total scores over 2100. We have seen substantial increases in the College, Business, and Engineering which will allow us to be very selective. We are seeing increases in the East Coast and Mid-Country applications, and no longer will more than one-half of our class come from California.

International applications have shown a substantial increase. But, since our ultimate enrollment will not increase, we will really be able to choose the best students possible.

Vice Provost Michael Quick will be distributing a memorandum on beginning the analysis of our general education curriculum. This is an auspicious time to be looking at GE, which has not been changed in the last 15 years. We will be asking for lots of input, both as to where we are and where we should be going. This will include a faculty committee looking at the big picture: what is the best foundation for our critical thinking students. We are looking forward to strong faculty input with a plan for recommendations finishing in the middle of next fall.

Q: What are the financial aid ramifications for the new cycle?

80 A: We have the largest aid pool, and we are increasing the financial aid charge on
81 tuition because federal and state allocations will be decreasing. There will be cuts
82 coming from outside sources, and we need to be prepared for our students.

83
84 Our last few classes have needed more support than in the past, especially because
85 of the reduced value in the family home. We will continue to make certain all
86 students admitted can afford to come to USC.

87 We do anticipate our lowest tuition increase in the last decade; all of our students
88 will be able to afford to attend.

89
90 Q: Are you happy with the numbers of transfer students?

91 A: We are happy where we are. As reflected in the strategic vision, we are
92 committed to accessibility for these students. We have a nice mix of students
93 across the categories; we are not trying to change anything.

94
95 Q: But as state problems persist, will there be more pressure to come to a private
96 school like USC?

97 A: There is a problem developing at the state schools of graduating in four years;
98 but we have a four-year plan for each of our students; and we will continue to
99 lobby for Cal Grants for them.

100
101 Q: Are there changes in students not stating their mixed ethnicities?

102 A: There is no sense of our commitment to URM students changing.

103
104 Q: Is there data on retention?

105 A: We have a task force on retention and graduation, and the only significant
106 differences we are seeing is in international students. We have to seriously look at
107 this, knowing that retention is always harder the further the student is from home.
108 This issue has our full attention to make certain we have specialized interventions
109 for each situation.

110
111 Q: How much is social and how much is programmatic?

112 A: The experts will answer these questions for us.

113
114 Q: Is there data on graduate students?

115 A: Not yet; this is handled much more at the school level, especially in
116 professional degrees.

117
118 Q: And in Ph.D. programs, do we know how this impacts our foreign Ph.D.
119 students?

A: This number has been flat over the last few years. What we want are the highest quality Ph.D. students and to provide more grants that target excellence, which requires a real targeting of great Ph.D. programs. The quality is moving up, but we hope to accelerate this trend.

A lot of this discussion will be the topics for the retreat, and I look forward to seeing you all there.

4. New Members of the Academic Senate Were Introduced

5. Report about the Bike Summit

Patricia Riley, Senate Academic Vice President, was introduced:

As part of the “We Are Considerate, We are USC” campaign, the bike summit is going on right now. This is not a traditional meeting; it is set up like a career fair with discussions of current policies. The design consultants are there to develop a new plan, and the university is committed to making something happen. The discussions include a group considering bike paths to and around the campus and through the community. Then, at 3pm, there will be a second part, small group discussions about the plan and how sustainability issues enter into this.

We are trying to be innovative and successful so that, at 4pm, there will be a session to try to come up with a real USC community position.

C: The Provost’s office has been extremely approachable on this issue.

Any ideas and comments can be sent to bikesafe@usc.edu.

6. Update on the Provost-Senate Retreat

President Gupta described the retreat to be held this weekend:

You all have the agenda and there is homework. The website for the retreat will give the links to the background readings and scenarios for you to read so you can create your own scenarios, and then they will be compiled and will inform the interview with Warren Bennis at the Fairmont Miramar. Over 100 attendees have confirmed at the moment. The plan is that every school has been challenged to meet its own strategic plan for the vision. This is our chance as the assembled faculty to add to these plans.

Our goal is to start the conversation. This is clearly the right time, among other things, to really re-envision the future of general education.

C (Marty Levine): Financial considerations will not be part of your discussion; the questions for you are what are the proper issues to be considered.

A: The separate panels which will be presenting have been meeting, but most of the work will be done at the retreat and then afterwards as the issues are identified.

Q: Those who are not part of the panels participate with their ideas how?

A: The first day discussion is in the large group as a whole, then there are two sets of breakouts on the second day, all to understand and develop the few organizing principles for the best way to train students for unknown future career paths that we probably do not yet even know.

Q: The final outcome will be what?

A: To work with the Provost's office on general education and on capstone experience opportunities. And WASC asked USC to consider this idea. We are trying to develop our way to feed into those two issues and provide more insight and to provide input in growing the curriculum here.

C: There is a need for general education to focus on competencies, not just content, what skills will our graduates need and have.

A: That is exactly on the radar screen as was discussed in the moderators' meeting; research is different because it is more de-centralized, and this difference needs to be considered, also.

C: Some of the discussion will be driven by flat NIH and other funding and not whether this is proper. But the reality exists, and the question is how we are going to handle this situation.

7. Report from the Committee on Information Services

Maryalice Jordan-Marsh and Julie Tilson, co-chairs of the CIS Committee, and Ilee Rhimes, Vice Provost and Chief Information Officer, Maria Suarez, Director of Information Security, and Laura La Corte, Associate Senior Vice President for Compliance, were introduced.

This is a joint Provost and Senate committee. People self-nominate and serve to create an on-going dialogue between ITS and the faculty and how our technology affects and reaches scholarship and learning.

Vice Provost Rhimes:

We have been talking about encryption and data loss protection, and the idea was to further discuss our goals here. Some of our peers already have policies in place for these issues and to meet federal and state guidelines. We are giving you an opportunity for feedback because we do not yet have a time-line for these procedures.

Professor Jordan-Marsh:

We are about to offer you something wonderful to protect your confidentiality as you exchange files. The university is embarking on an initiative to provide software to mitigate any concerns in e-mail sending.

There are two parts, encryption and data loss protection. We are considering two vendors for resources to protect us and to encrypt. We are just beginning the process, so we need faculty input as to your concerns, and we are looking for volunteers for beta testing.

Off-the-shelf dictionaries and individual dictionaries will be tailored to USC, and we will only be proceeding when we feel we will be successful.

Director Suarez:

I started here at USC at end of August and began a survey about security concerns. The results showed strong concern for encryption and protection of sensitive data and credit information; and we immediately established a task force. We began to look at outside technologies and those that had already been implemented at Keck. We felt those should continue but that we needed a lot more information and to dig deeper to really discover what the true needs are here.

Q: Most people would say why not encryption and can it be quickly provided transparently?

A: Simply using an out-of-the-box product brings two problems, the most important is that the first-time receiver of an encrypted message needs to be registered, not for USC to USC communication, but for all inside to outside the USC system addresses.

Q: Is this a monitoring of e-mails?

A: No. Every day we send e-mails; but sometimes we send e-mails that have legal requirements for protection, including times we do not know what is not allowed or is embedded in another document. The service merely checks the e-mail to see that it is not out of compliance. Then, if it requires encryption, first time receivers will be required to register.

Q: Why only requiring some encryption; why not every document?

239 A: The primary idea comes from compliance.

240 A: There is an overhead related to all encrypted e-mail, and we do not want that
241 burden.

242

243 We will take as much feedback as we can to see what we need. So we are looking
244 for volunteers for the questions and the studies. We will then go over those ideas
245 with an expanded study group.

246

247 Q: For schools that have our own servers, does this apply?

248 A: Yes, even if there is a different USC address.

249

250 C: We are reassured because Ilee Rhimes is part of a national group on these
251 issues.

252

253 Q: If an e-mail is encrypted automatically, does the sender find out?

254 A: Yes. The approach we will take is to auto-notify. So we will not send until you
255 are notified.

256

257 Q: Are you primarily focusing on e-mail at his time?

258 A: Yes, but we will then look at mobile devices quickly.

259

260 Vice President La Corte:

261 There is a concern for compliance with federal and state rules and regulations to
262 protect confidential information, especially in the medical area; some systems are
263 already at Keck and other medical units, including social security numbers and
264 credit cards because, again, of federal and state laws and obligations. We know
265 security of research data is also important. This is not an unusual issue, especially
266 as to personal information in old databases. We are hoping, with your help, for a
267 system that is transparent and automatic.

268

269 Professor Jordan-Marsh:

270 We will soon provide a list of best practices for all users. The goal is still
271 transparency with no effort on behalf of the users. That is why we are bringing this
272 to you early in the process, so we can easily live with the ultimate results. We are
273 asking the Senate to be ambassadors for the project. If you have expertise in
274 marketing change, please let us know.

275

276 We can never be completely transparent; so we want to roll this out with as many
277 obvious questions answered up-front from your input.

278

Q: The user satisfaction on HSC is not high; this difference needs to be considered.
A: We will look into it; we are working on all levels of satisfaction.

8. Discussion of Proposed Changes to the Senate Constitution

Alex Capron and Michael Nichol, co-chairs of the Committee on Rules, Membership, and Elections, were introduced.

Professor Capron:

This resolution, through the Executive Board to the full Senate, seeks to make certain clarifications in the constitution and bylaws and to standardize certain language throughout all the relevant documents.

The resolution is a set of generic descriptions, so we ask you to pay attention to attachments A and B of the resolution.

The central substantive changes are:

Article I, section 2, and reflected in the deletion of Article V, sections 6 and 7. It has long been understood that all members of the full-time faculty are members of the faculty assembly with no distinction for tenured, tenure-track, and NTT, and all schools would give a role in governance to all faculty; so section 2 makes this clear.

The second set of changes relate to updating certain practice related to school assemblies, some use it for their representative body's name in conflict with assemblies as the faculty as the whole.

C: Some schools have already changed the name to councils from assemblies.

The only other substantive changes are in Article II, section 1, to faculty governance and environment, as the short hand term for the collection of concerns about benefits and programs for wellness that make up the academic environment of the university; and in Article III and its parallel in article VI, changing emeritus to retired faculty so that participation includes all retired faculty.

A final note is the removal of Article XI, because it is not needed.

In the bylaws, they are mostly changes in formatting and grammar, except Bylaw 1 so we need not change the bylaws every time there is a new edition of *Robert's Rules*, and in Bylaw 18 to be more specific on the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, so the chair is tenured and the vice-chair is NTT and familiar with NTT issues.

319 C: Time will be reserved at the next meeting for full discussion of the issues for the
320 second reading.

321

322 Q: It seems like only tenured and tenure-track faculty can vote on the bylaws,
323 because it affects tenure issues.

324 A: It is in amendments of the constitution and the bylaws that they are amended by
325 vote of Academic Senate.

326

327 Q: But is this not issues of tenure and tenure-track?

328 A: But that concerns the tenure system, not the system of faculty governance.

329 A: The tenure system is specifically excluded in section 2 and section 3.

330 A: And the faculty handbook rules. These are not tenure issues, but policies and
331 procedures and, even if changes were made, the faculty handbook rules.

332

333 Q: But it seems a dilution of the tenure system if NTT vote on the bylaws.

334 A (Marty Levine): The faculty handbook rules, not the Senate constitution.

335 A: But the point is that the structure of the Senate is not part of the university
336 policies on tenure or the tenure system .

337 A: Would adding that the handbook overrules in section 3 assuage your concerns?

338

339 This will be on the agenda for the Executive Board this week and before the next
340 Senate meeting..

341

342 The meeting was adjourned at 3:59pm.

343

344 Respectfully submitted,

345

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

347 Secretary General of the Academic Senate