1

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
Meeting of February 20, 2019
Doheny Library, Room 121
2:00 - 4:00 p.m.

Present: J. Ailshire, S. Altman, M. Apostolos, J. Armour, S. Bain, F. Bar, Y. Bar-Cohen, R. Beatty,
S. Bucher, T. A. Brun, R. Chung, D. Crombecque, R. Davila, E. Fife, D.Griffiths, S. Gruskin, J. Israel, **A. Imre,** R.
Labaree, R. Lonergan, R. MacKenzie, T.J. McCarthy, J. McLaughlin Gray, P.T. McNiff,
J. Parr, D. Pecchenino, M. Polikoff, P. Rosenbloom, A. Uyeshiro Simon, T. Tucker, D. Whitsett (alternate for
C. Castro), A. G. Wilcox, E. Wojciak
Present Online: B. Belcher, J. Cantiello, S. Cermak, P. Chang, M. Frey, E. Grossman, A. Justice,
A. Mackay, D. O'Leary, J. Parga, C.Tucker.
Absent: S. Ahmadi, S. Asgharzadeh, L. Grazzette, A. Justice, M. Mohammadi, J. Musso, J. Steele,
S. Wickersheimer
Guests: G. Anagnos, E. Brink, G. Condell, M. Levine, B. Marcus, C. Neuman, V. Papapetrou, M. Quick, S.
Taylor, C. Zachary

AGENDA

Yaniv Bar-Cohen, Academic Senate President, called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm.

Bar-Cohen requested Senators attending virtually to hold up a white piece of paper to place their
votes for the meeting.

Moment of Silence and Comments (Professor Robert Coffey), Burton Marcus
A moment of silence was observed for Professor Robert Coffey, who retired in 1998 after 35 years
of service at Marshall School of Business. "Bob" was a man of commitment; to family, friends,
students, and this university. He was also a former president of the Senate, focusing on faculty
compensation, promotion, facilities for students, and the need for faculty guidance in decision-
making. He was a warm, kind individual who always offered his time to others.

Approval of March Senate meeting draft minutes
Ashley Uyeshiro Simon, Secretary General, presented the January draft minutes for discussion and
approval.

Rebecca Lonergan moved to approve the minutes; Scott Altman seconded; 25 in favor; 0 opposed;
4 abstentions.

Senate Update and Open Discussion
Bar-Cohen reminded the Senate that the Joint Provost/Senate Retreat is this weekend, and we will
be discussing two topics: faculty composition and working across schools.

Bar-Cohen commented on the recent email sent from the Senate Executive Board (EB) about the
Gibson Dunn investigation into the former Dean of the Keck Medical School, Carmen Puliafito. The
EB had an opportunity to have a conversation with Gibson Dunn, but much of what was said was
confidential, and the statement released by the EB was as complete as possible without breaking

50   confidentiality.

51

52   Bar-Cohen reminded the Senate that there is a town hall-type forum on Tuesday, March 19th from
53   4:00-5:30pm, hosted by the Senate, Staff Assembly, Undergraduate Student Government, and
54   Graduate Student Government. Our various groups will be able to talk about the issues that affect
55   all of us, with members of the administration (including President Austin) there to listen as well.
56   There will be a room on HSC for people to remotely participate. There will not be remote
57   participation from other locations at this time, but we need to think about this for future forums.
58   Bar-Cohen asked Senators to email him with ideas for potential topics of this forum, which he will
59   discuss with the Senate Executive Board and the other bodies to set the agenda. President Austin
60   can also give input about topics she would like to address as well, but the agenda will be set by the
61   four governing bodies.

62

63   Comments were made that hopefully administrators will be present on both campuses, not just
64   UPC, and that the style will be one of collective problem-solving, not just a one-sided
65   conversation.

66

67   Rebecca Lonergan, Academic Vice President, asked what the Senate can do to better serve the
68   needs of faculty. At the last meeting, she presented the recommendations from the Task Force on
69   Communication & Engagement report, in which she noted the possibility of a private intranet to
70   continue discussions outside of meetings amongst Senators, or to pose questions to other
71   Senators (e.g., how other Faculty Councils are structured and operate).

72

73   Comments and questions were posed about what methods would be best to facilitate
74   communication between Senators outside of meetings. Points discussed included in-person
75   gatherings versus online forums, formal or informal opportunities for discussion, level of
76   integration with existing methods (e.g., already integrated platforms like email, semi-integrated
77   platforms like Blackboard, or new platforms like Slack), confidentiality or discoverability issues
78   that affect openness of conversation, transparency, ease of use, and frequency of use.

79

80   A question was asked if the Senate has support from USC IT to do any sort of anonymous online
81   forum, as this has taken months to set up in their own school due to difficulties with IT. A
82   comment was made that opportunities to discuss issues and network (online or in-person) help to
83   build community. A suggestion was made to first pilot a platform such as Slack with smaller groups
84   like the Executive Board, the Committee for Information Services, or the Faculty Council Chair
85   group. Another suggestion was made to organize networking opportunities for people to talk
86   informally in-person around certain topics.

87

88   **Information Security Risk**
89   Gus Anagnos, Chief Information Security Officer, Vickie Papapetrou, Information Security
90   Governance, and Sandra Taylor, Information Security Governance and Risk Management Director,
91   provided information about a new policy revision proposal for Information Security at USC. They
92   stated our current policies are mostly compliance-driven, and there are some gaps in policies that
93   need to be closed. Their goals are to reduce risk, empower faculty, schools, and units to know the
94   foundational aspects of security for their work, enable academic freedom, and meet compliance
95   demands. They compared this proposal to Stanford's security program, which is more mature. The
96   discussion covered what to change, but not how to change things.

97

98   The presenters then compared current policies to proposed policies and drew attention to three

99 particular areas: acceptable use, data protection and third-part security risk management. They
100 stressed that these policies will require a tailored approach to certain projects, and that if an
101 exception is needed because it is preventing a faculty from doing their work, they will work with
102 that person to make an exception.
103
104 The presenters requested the Senate work with them to give input, think about how the new
105 policies will impact faculty work, and raise awareness that these policy changes are happening.
106 They stated that they have presented this information to the Executive Board, the Committee on
107 Information Services, some deans, and the Information Risk Committee that has faculty
108 representation. They requested the Senate review at least the three policies highlighted above,
109 and contact them if there are questions.
110
111 A question was asked if there is information that can be brought back to the school Faculty
112 Councils. The presenters stated they can provide a "kit" with FAQs as well as a Sharepoint site that
113 lists policies and changes to policies. They are also willing to do a presentation if requested. They
114 requested faculty reach out to them if anyone believes they could benefit from having more
115 engagement on the front-end of this update.
116
117 Another question was asked about Keck's involvement with these policies; the presenters stated
118 that they are working with Keck to look at hospital policies in an effort to have more alignment. It
119 was also clarified that these policies presented today are baseline policies for the University, and
120 that schools or units can create their own policies that go beyond these if needed.
121
122 **Dialogue with Provost Michael Quick**
123 Provost Quick stated he looked forward to the Joint Provost/Senate Retreat this weekend, to
124 discuss what we can do better as a university. He stated the Presidential Search is down to the
125 finalist stage. Quick gave an update on Dean searches as well, stating that the Dworak-Peck Dean
126 search is in a holding pattern waiting for the new president to be announced, but they are working
127 on developing a short list from their pool of candidates. For the Marshall School of Business, Quick
128 and Andrew Guzman are co-chairing the Dean search, and the Marshall faculty search committee
129 met recently for the first time. They have contracted with a search firm to help them in this
130 search.
131
132 Regarding Deans' reviews, Quick stated Andrew Guzman (Gould) is currently up for his first
133 renewal, and they are implementing the new processes discussed previously at Senate meetings.
134 They will use the Gould Faculty Council to collect and summarize faculty input. There will be a
135 smaller committee, with members jointly chosen by Quick and Bar-Cohen as President of the
136 Senate, who will take the Faculty Council summary along with other information from the Office
137 of Professionalism and Ethics and other investigatory units to advise in the review so there is
138 faculty input throughout the process. Quick stated he also just met with the Rossier and Price
139 Faculty Councils to discuss the upcoming Dean reviews for those schools. He has upcoming
140 meetings with those Deans, as well as President Austin, to determine if both parties are interested
141 in continuing. The Rossier Faculty Council later thanked Quick for having a candid conversation
142 with them.
143
144 Quick stated in the search for a Vice President for Student Affairs, he has reached out to faculty,
145 staff, and students seeking input about what we should change in our Student Affairs operations.
146 He also thanked the Sustainability Committee for their work and stated he would like to put
147 together a university-wide initiative on research and education for sustainability, to circumvent

148   siloing and duplication of efforts. Quick also reported the Research Committee is discussing
149   undergraduate research, how it relates to courses, loads, mentoring, and teaching, and stated he
150   would like to have a unified approach on this in the future.
151
152   Regarding shared governance, Quick stated it has been great to have Bar-Cohen attend the
153   Provost cabinet meetings every other week. He also stated that in the Academic Affairs
154   Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees which he co-chairs with David Bohnett, they had great
155   substantive conversations with the Senate Executive Board at the last meeting, and they have
156   invited the entire Executive Board back to the next meeting as well.
157
158   A question was asked if there is a rubric of Dean priorities for use when Faculty Councils are asking
159   for input during a Dean's review. Quick stated he tries to leave things open to what is important at
160   each School. For example, Gould was given a template of questions, then the school could add or
161   modify questions. He stated that there just needs to be alignment between what the faculty and
162   the Dean are asked to reflect upon. A follow-up question about considering length of Dean terms
163   was posed; Quick stated he is a proponent for soft term limits, in which a dean may be eligible for
164   two terms, but then may need to compete with outside candidates for a third term. He noted that
165   he believes this should apply to the Provost as well and stated he will continue to advocate for this
166   as he has in the past. Another follow-up question was asked regarding whether the Board is
167   looking at term limits for the presidency; Quick stated he does not get this sense, but this is
168   something he will pass on. He stated they are looking at their own governance now, including
169   possible term limits for Board members.
170
171   A question was asked if the new lines of communication and shared governance reported today
172   could be solidified in the processes of the University (e.g., Senate president attending the
173   Provost's cabinet meetings, Senate communication with the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs
174   Subcommittee). Quick stated the next step is to examine what it would look like to make these
175   changes permanent. A comment was made that these reports today denote good progress
176   towards better shared governance and will make a difference.
177
178   A question was posed about what metrics of teaching will be applied to the Dean's review; if
179   Deans will be asked to justify their effectiveness in enhancing teaching quality. Quick stated that
180   the review done in the dean's fourth year of their five-year term needs to be more prescriptive in
181   this way, as the annual reviews he does with Deans are very prescriptive. He stated that he would
182   like to get input from the Senate about the content of items he requests from Deans about their
183   progress.
184
185   A comment was made that a barrier to sustainability and undergraduate research is competition
186   between Schools, and that these things may not be resolved unless the funding and power
187   dynamics of centralized and decentralized systems work at USC. Quick stated that looking at these
188   systems quickly leads to larger questions such as what counts as a unit of teaching, when faculty
189   should get credit for mentoring, and more. He stated we need to rethink our Revenue Center
190   Management (RCM) system because in his opinion this is why we have siloes, and we should think
191   about where the funding should be located.
192
193   **USC Financial Report**
194   Bar-Cohen stated that we will be learning about USC's financial organization in this meeting as a
195   primer for the retreat this weekend as we are talking about siloes and Revenue Center
196   Management. This idea stemmed from the Committee on Finance and Enrollment (CoFE) that

197 thought this would be a good opportunity to work through a few misunderstandings about our
198 finances and how they work.
199
200 Erik Brink, USC Comptroller and Greg Condell, VP for Finance presented the 2018 USC Financial
201 Report. The presenters focused on the page 12 net income statement, which shows the revenues
202 for the year as just under $5B (which does not include endowment performance), and operating
203 expenses of $4.8B. The net increase is $108M, which is a thin margin relative to the size of the
204 operation but is to be expected from a non-profit organization.
205
206 Continuing on page 12, the presenters reported that our biggest source of revenue is tuition, but
207 we give back $556M in financial aid, so our net income from tuition is $1.48B. Healthcare services
208 are the next largest source of revenue. Line 22 shows the "spendable" portion from the
209 endowment ($236M) that is made available to the schools, which has a floor and ceiling so the
210 academic units know about how much they will get.
211
212 A question was asked about the difference between direct and indirect costs and expenses. Pages
213 36 until the end of the report break down designated (e.g., contracts and grants, received gifts,
214 completed research), undesignated (current unrestricted operating budget; driven by tuition), and
215 total budgets. Page 38-41 show budgets for each school.
216
217 It was clarified that the direct revenue comes from tuition, then financial aid and facilities fund
218 costs are subtracted. The indirect revenue lines were clarified: "Participation" was the tax on
219 tuition, which is accumulated into a provost account to be redistributed to schools and programs;
220 "Academic Initiatives" is money coming back to the school; "Provost Initiatives" is similarly money
221 coming back to the school for Provost initiatives; "Graduate Programs" comes from a different
222 money source and are grants to support PhD students as described on page 45. A clarification was
223 made that participation tax rates vary by school and type of revenue; after the general education
224 credits were changed, USC switched from uniform participation taxes to unique rates to
225 accommodate for those changes. However, the participation tax rates range from 9.4-10%, so
226 there is minimal variability. Most schools are at 10% to fund strategic initiatives.
227
228 Direct expenses include things like faculty salaries. Indirect expenses are central costs and facilities
229 fees. Thirty-three cents per dollar is accumulated towards benefits such as health benefits,
230 retirement contributions, tuition remission, and more.
231
232 It was stated that USC's list price makes USC look very expensive. However, with the amount of
233 financial aid we give out on average, we are not that high in cost.
234
235 A question was asked if there is a sense of what budgets might look like in the next few years. The
236 presenters surmised administration will continue to support keeping tuition low, but this means
237 there will be less income. Another question was posed about whether there are mechanisms in
238 place to ensure our investments reflect the values of this university. The presenters asked that
239 these types of questions be directed to the Chief Investment Officer.
240
241 **Announcements**
242 (a) February 22-23, 2019 Joint Provost/Senate Retreat. Venue: The Westin Bonaventure Hotel
243 & Suites
244 (b) The Senate meeting schedule and venues for 2018 - 2019 is posted on the Senate website:
245 https://academicsenate.usc.edu

246 **New Business**
247 None reported.
248
249 **Adjournment**
250 Meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.
251
252
253 Respectfully submitted,
254
255
256
257
258
259 Ashley Uyeshiro Simon
260 Secretary General of the Academic Senate