

1 Academic Senate  
2 Meeting of May 9, 2012  
3 University Club, Banquet Room  
4 University Park Campus  
5

6 **MINUTES**  
7

8 **Present:** R. Ben Ari, D. Blaine, J. Brecher, A. Capron, L. Carver, N. Chopiuk, R.  
9 Chung, G. Clark, P. Conti, P. Ethington, R. Flick, V. Folkes, J. Goad, C. Gomer,  
10 S. Gupta, M. Jordan-Marsh, J. Kagan, R. Lonergan, A. Lynch, V. Marmarelis, E.  
11 McCann, P. Mills, E. Muhl, J. Nyquist, J. Orr, G. Peters, P. Riley, J. Silvester, S.  
12 Wenzel, W. Wolf

13 **Absent:** R. Brinton, P. Cannon, Y. DeClerck, G. Ehresmann, J. Farver, L. Feters,  
14 H. Greenwald, D. Larsen, M. V. Marx, O. Mayer, E. McCaffery, T. Morgan, K.  
15 Murphy, R. Pancheva, P. Pattengale, J. Steele

16 **Guests:** M. Flynn, E. Garrett, H. Gillman, K. Howell, M. Levine, R. Rasmussen  
17 C. Zachary.

18 President Gupta called the meeting to order at 2:03pm. The presence of a quorum  
19 was noted:

20 I want to thank you all for coming to the last meeting of the year where we  
21 traditionally recognize service.  
22

23 **1. Presentation of the Distinguished Faculty Service Awards**  
24

25 Professor Lucinda Carver, chair of the Committee on the Distinguished Faculty  
26 Service Awards, was introduced:  
27

28 It was a great pleasure to serve on this committee. We have decided on four awards  
29 this year which speaks to the great amount of service of our faculty.  
30

31 The first award was presented to Alex Capron, former President of the Faculty and  
32 University Professor and Scott H. Bice Chair in Healthcare Law, Policy and Ethics,  
33 Professor of Law and Medicine, Co-Director of the Pacific Center for Health  
34 Policy and Ethics, who was presented by Dean of the Law School Robert  
35 Rasmussen.

36 *“For Your Outstanding Work in Fostering the Theme of USC as a ‘Living*  
37 *University,’ Your Leadership in a Large Number of Senate Activities, Especially in*  
38 *Implementing Wellness, Your Outstanding Contribution to Ensuring the*  
39 *Importance of Ethics at USC, Nationally and Internationally, And for Your Past*  
40 *Service as President of the Faculty of the University of Southern California”*

41  
42 The next award was presented to Philip Ethington, Professor of History and  
43 Political Science in the Dornsife College, who was presented by Dean of the  
44 Dornsife College Howard Gillman.

45 *“For Your Outstanding Service to the University and Dornsife College,*  
46 *particularly Your Dedicated Service and Leadership on the USC Joint Senate-*  
47 *Provost University Research Committee and Your Contributions to the Dornsife*  
48 *College Faculty Council”*

49  
50 The next award was presented to Maryalice Jordan-Marsh, Associate Professor of  
51 Social Work, who was presented by Dean of the School of Social Work Marilyn  
52 Flynn.

53  
54 *“In Recognition of Your Commitment, Leadership, and Exemplary Service on*  
55 *Behalf of Students and Faculty at the University of Southern California”*

56  
57 Professor Patricia Riley, Academic Vice President, was introduced:

58  
59 It is traditional to recognize the President's work and success at this time so we  
60 present this plaque to President Sandeep Gupta:

61  
62 *“For His Outstanding Leadership, Intellectual Integrity, Innovation, and*  
63 *Dedicated Service as President of the Faculty, 2011-2012”*

## 64 **2. Approval of April Senate Minutes**

65  
66 Giving the members a moment to review them, the minutes of the April 18, 2012,  
67 Senate meeting were approved unanimously.

## 68 **3. Results of the Senate Elections, Introduction of Officers and Executive** 69 **Board Members for 2012-2013**

Academic Vice President Patricia Riley announced the results of the Senate elections and introduced the officers for the coming academic year:

Academic Vice President:

Charles Gomer, Professor, Keck School of Medicine

Secretary General:

Lucinda Carver, Associate Professor, Thornton School of Music

Members-at-Large:

Diana Blaine, Associate Teaching Professor, Dornsife College

Ginger Clark, Associate Clinical Professor, Rossier School of Education

Edwin McCann, Professor, Dornsife College

John Silvester, Professor, Viterbi School of Engineering

#### **4. Dialogue with Senior Vice President and Provost Elizabeth Garrett**

I would like to heartedly congratulate all the new elected members of the Executive Board.

As you know, we have two new deans, Pinchas Cohen in the Davis School of Gerontology and Steve A. Kay in the Dornsife College. We had two wonderful searches. Both Deans are intellectually curious and will work for more interdisciplinarity. They will need all our help in learning about our institution and how to make successful connections. Dean Cohen will begin in August and Dean Kay on October 1, with Michael Quick as the interim administrative Dean at Dornsife.

I am pleased that we are celebrating awards to two of our faculty, Kelvin J. A. Davies, from the School of Gerontology, and Enrique Cadenas, from the School of Pharmacy, at the French consulate this evening.

The fall admissions cycle is completing. We have received 2948 deposits, on a plan of 2650, and are currently in the appeals process, with over 900 applicants asking us to review their denials.

Every unit looks good, and we plan about 200 spring admissions.

We are beginning on the transfer admissions and expect about 1400 acceptances.

Our admission rate was less than 20 percent this year; we expect that yield will be around 31 percent.

It has been a challenging year, including our going to the common application and the competition is getting stronger; we are competing with the true top schools.

And the UC system is showing up in out-of-state recruiting.

110 Twenty-three percent of the admits are scions. First generation represent 14.2  
111 percent; URM 21.4 percent; and international admissions are down slightly, to 13  
112 percent. The SAT score is 2065 from 2055 last year, exceeding our expectations.

113  
114 There will be a letter released from the President about new security measures; we  
115 are looking at all ways to enhance security and are going to add security training to  
116 our orientation discussions. We are going to put out more information to our  
117 international and graduate students about housing available and all our security  
118 measures and protections. We are also going to introduce them to the  
119 neighborhood watch programs.

120  
121 Q: The average GPA of the new class?

122 A: I do not have it with me, but there was not much change.

123  
124 Q: Is this a good year?

125 A: Yes. We worked really hard on this, as we do each year.

126  
127 Q: Do we know of the differences in Asian students, for example, in scholarship  
128 aid?

129 A: I do not have the full particulars with me; but aid is different because  
130 international students only qualify for merit aid. Katharine Harrington has all that  
131 information. And, of course, undergraduate aid is different from graduate  
132 applicants.

133  
134 Q: Any update on the timing of University Village?

135 A: We are planning on 3000 beds, the majority for graduate students. We are still  
136 in the regulatory process. This development is a priority for the President, but we  
137 are still waiting on governmental processes. This will be accomplished in stages,  
138 and the first stage will be the housing.

139  
140 Q: What will tuition be this year?

141 A: There is a 3.7 percent tuition increase this year, the lowest since 1969; for next  
142 few years, we should be on the lower end of our peers. We also increased the  
143 traditional 29.5 percent to 30 percent in contribution to the aid pool.  
144 Fifty percent of admitted students applied for aid; 45 percent demonstrated need.  
145 The average university grant is \$22,000, and \$22,000 in indebtedness is our  
146 average, about the national average in this category.

147  
148 Q: What came out of the bike summit?

A: We are looking at the results of the study, and these will be presented to the President soon. We are in the process of making the decisions, and we certainly are going to increase education, as well as signage. We may also try some things in pilot ways.

Q: In this first year as Provost, have there been any surprises?

A: I love my job. I try to plan for challenges; I was surprised by how quickly hiring transformative faculty has really gotten off the ground; people are reaching out to talk to us.

## **5. Presentation of the Distinguished Faculty Service Awards (continued)**

The next award was presented to Peter Conti, former President of the Faculty and Professor at the Keck School of Medicine and Director, PET Imaging Science Center, who was presented by Vice Dean of the School of Medicine Judy Garner.

*“For Your Extraordinary Dedication and Excellent Service to the Academic Senate and to the Faculty of the University of Southern California”*

## **6. All year-end committee reports were distributed to the Senate members and individual reports were presented:**

<http://www.usc.edu/academe/acsen/AboutUs/facultyCommittees.htm>

Chair Jeremy Kagan presented the summary from the Task Force on Annual Faculty Evaluations:

Following the results of our series of questions to the schools, we came to the unanimous conclusions:

1. Though there are varying feelings across the campus and schools about the numerical grading of faculty, there is a very clear preference to change the process to be qualitative rather than quantitative;

2. Each faculty member should have a one-on-one meeting with the chair or head of the evaluation team regarding his or her evaluation;

3. Teaching performances should not be dependent on the student evaluation system that presently exists, as it is too arbitrary and subjective, and does not always reflect the abilities of a teacher and often ends up being about popularity;

4. The entire process should be transparent so that everyone knows exactly how and by whom they are being evaluated.

188 The responses to the questionnaire can be found at:  
189 <http://www.usc.edu/academe/acsen/AboutUs/FacultyCommittees/TaskForceOnFacultyAnnualEvaluations.htm>

190 C: I would have been happier in point three if the prohibition was opposed to  
191 “only” using student evaluations; because they are important, but we need to  
192 including other metrics; the idea of quality not quantity in evaluations is the  
193 problem; how to create these measures that are objective is the need.

194  
195 Q: Did we look at our peers?

196 A: We do know others do other things, but we did not specifically look at them at  
197 this time.

198 Our present five-point system used to be a three-point system which also needs to  
199 be reviewed.

200  
201 Q: About the third recommendation, what is the evidence we can point to that  
202 shows this gap objectively?

203 A: It is anecdotal at this point.

204 A (Marty Levine): There are research studies which correlate these issues, and we  
205 need to evaluate these.

206  
207 Q: Given the dissatisfaction with the student evaluations and the difficulties of  
208 using different objective methods in ensuring outcomes, it has been suggested that  
209 there be more peer-to-peer evaluation as we do in the law school. Have any of the  
210 schools done anything else, especially because these are very time intensive, and  
211 do we know how our peers handle peer-to-peer?

212 A: CET is interested in examining some of these issues; we do have knowledge,  
213 and we should work first through CET.

214  
215 Q: Law school evaluations are done when?

216 A: In our law school, the final exam comes after the evaluation which is on-line.

217 C: Our CDIUP committee has taken your report into account in our  
218 recommendations.

219  
220 This discussion shows that two things needed: what would a qualitative system  
221 look like and what is the true value of the students evaluations and how do we look  
222 into this objectively.

223 A (Marty Levine): Meeting the standards is a qualitative judgment. Outcomes and  
224 peer evaluation are methods we need to consider, and a third possible way is  
225 examining the teaching materials and the teacher’s growth in effective teaching.

226 C: It is time to have the Provost invite the Deans to discuss these issues.

Recommendations 2 and 4 we should work on this year. And the NTT committee is looking at the issue 3, also.

Q: What is the unfairness that has been seen so these recommendations were seen as necessary?

A: This was based on the faculty responses, and these were the general views we saw. It is a mood that this present system makes them feel uncomfortable .

C: This might also be helped by an exit interview of the graduates.

Chair Phil Ethington presented the summary from the University Research Committee:

The committee had a high degree of curiosity and interdisciplinarity as we completed the following activities this year:

1. “Guidelines for Assigning Authorship and for Attributing Contributions to Research Products and Creative Works” and “Conflict of Interest in Research” policies were approved;

2. Other policies not requiring Senate approval, included a plan to support fundraising, recharging of Center policies, a plan for animal care facilities, and policies and procedures on research repositories of biospecimens from human subjects;

3. Ongoing oversight of the Department of Contracts and Grants, including reorganization and overhaul of administrative software;

4. Preparation of the final “Report on the State of Digital Scholarship at the University of Southern California.”

Q: What happens next?

A: There are action items, and our job is to make them useful in continued discussions. But a lot must be done to make these ideas happen.

Q: Are the comments about IT needs to be picked up by the CIS committee?

A: Yes; the ideas need to go to this committee for faculty response. And the natural home for these issues and their prioritization is in this community

Co-chair Walter Wolf presented the summary from the Committee on Development and Implementation of University Policies:

We addressed the following topics this year:

1. The role of the Academic Senate in the review and approval of university policies;
2. Procedures for the review of faculty and department chairs;
3. The operational policies of the faculty councils.

C (Marty Levine): Academic Senate policy only applies to long-serving department chairs; there has not been any consistent review of chairs, largely in the medical school.

C: The new medical school faculty council at Keck has implemented a procedure for reviewing chairs, both with faculty and with external individuals involved in these reviews.

Q: If this has not been done before, what criteria will be used?

A: We are working on criteria, and this will emerge over time.

Q: But do faculty have input?

A: Yes, so other schools can also see what we have done.

Co-chairs Ginger Clark and Rebecca Lonergan presented the summary from the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Affairs:

Our main thrust this year was updating the White Paper, and the results were presented to the Executive Board, where we realized that many of the issues are also faced by tenure and tenure-track faculty, so the ideas should be applied across the faculty community. The key recommendations dealt with:

1. Profiles, and that every faculty member should have a specific profile;
2. Workload, which should match the faculty profile;
3. Merit pay, and that written criteria (as, for example done in Rossier) should be provided;
4. Promotion, and specific criteria should be provided regularly;
5. Governance, with full opportunities in all schools.

We will continue to track the recommendations and the issues we have begun this year and identified in the White Paper.

## **10. Announcements**

The Annual Planning Retreat will be held on August 22nd from 9:00am to 4:00pm at the Huntington Library;



305 The Academic Senate End-of-Year dinner will be held tonight at the Altadena  
306 Town and Country Club.

307

308 The meeting was adjourned at 4:09pm.

309

310 Respectfully submitted,

311

312 James Brecher, J.D., PhD.

313 Secretary General of the Academic Seante