

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Academic Senate
Meeting of December 11, 2013
University Club, Scriptorium Room

MINUTES

Present: M. Apostolos, D. Blaine, B. Brown, L. Carver, E. Collins, P. Conti, A. Crigler, S. Curran, D. Davies, R. Davila, A. Dowd, B. Edwards, L. Fetters, C. Gomer, H. Greenwald, S. Gupta, J. Kagan, P. Liebig, T. Lyon (alternate for N. Straudt), V. Marx, O. Mayer, G. Miller, S. Mosley, A. Ouellette, L. Palinkas, D. Richter, P. Riley, P. Rosenbloom, D. Ruddell, M. Safonov (alternate for J. Kunc), M. Schroeder, J. Silvester, A. Trope, C. Wang, E. Webb, R. Weisberg

Absent: J. Barnes, R. Ben-Ari, P. Cannon, G. Clark, Y. DeClerck, K. Murphy, S. Palmer, R. Paulson, V. Regnier, C. Russell, S. Sanudo-Wilhelmy

Guests: C. Daley, M. Levine, B. Meyerowitz, C. Zachary

President Chuck Gomer called the meeting to order at 2:03pm:

1. Dialogue with Beth Meyerowitz, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

We have made two changes based upon recommendations from the Academic Senate:

- 1) We are now publishing the names of people who sit on UCAPT panels at the end of every academic year with a memo thanking people who served for the past two years.
- 2) We have tried to make parts of the UCAPT manual more transparent, but essentially the rules are the same as they've always been. Thanks to Marty for being involved in this.

We have begun holding a series of monthly meeting for various groups of professors and mentors. The goal is that people aren't surprised at the result of a promotion decision. We want people who aren't going to succeed to see it coming.

We have formalized the mid-probation process in the 3rd or 4th year by providing written feedback from the deans. The dossiers come to my office where it is read by Beth and the chair of UCAPT. If anything is not consistent, we will give it back.

Q: Is there any information regarding the average percentage of successful tenure cases?

A: This past year it was circa 70%. Whether or not this is trend, I don't know.

Q: We are seeing fewer and fewer tenure-track faculty – is that a trend?

A: No

We have seen a significant downturn in funding by the NIH – expectations have changed. Candidates need to be at the top of their peer comparison group.

Q: What about people claiming ethical or gender issues for tenure denial? During the review period, can we mitigate against that happening? What questions should be asked to anticipate that there may be a problem?

A: Our data doesn't support any tenure denial based on gender or racial bias.

48 Comment from Marty Levine: UCAPT committees are diverse by both gender and ethnicity.

49
50 We have a newfaculty.usc.edu website – designed for any faculty with instructional duties. We
51 are also working on a new faculty gateway website.

52
53 Q: newfaculty.usc.edu website – is that for part-time faculty as well?

54 A: yes

55
56 Advancing Scholarship in the Humanities and Social Sciences – there are three different types of
57 grants.

- 58 1. TT faculty – writing grants for foundations
- 59 2. Research and Creative grants – now with our office (previously through Zumberge).
60 Language is not inclusive of artists of all sorts – not just research. 16 of 49 were funded
61 – two to NTT faculty
- 62 3. Early sabbatical for TT faculty (after 3 years instead of 6) and NTT in area in which
63 doing work at USC. We have had 20 applications with 11 funded; 6 were for NTT

64
65 We are looking at how faculty self-nominate for committees and thinking through the process.
66 We typically receive 300-350 self-nominations. Those go to Senate and usually 5% end up
67 getting appointed to the committee of their choice. John, Chuck and I are talking about a way to
68 improve this process.

69
70 Chuck: We want to have individual faculty councils take a leadership role in suggesting people.
71 Also we are thinking about moving up the time frame so we have more time to do a thorough
72 selection. We did change rotations to shorten them in order to include more people.

73
74 **2. Approval of November 20, 2013 meeting minutes – Lucinda Carver**

75 Approve: 36

76 Disapprove: 0

77 Abstain: 3

78
79 **3. Update on the Faculty Evaluation White Paper – Sandeep Gupta**

80 We did not focus on things to do with scholarship, creative work but rather focused on how
81 evaluation should be done. We felt that there is a need on the teaching side - weaker and
82 required attention.

83
84 Concerns have been raised in various schools. The general consensus is that a performance
85 evaluation conveyed by a numeric score is not adequate – the outcome should be conveyed in
86 words, not a quantitative score.

87
88 There should be a substantive conversation about this in meeting with a chair and faculty
89 member (or dean if a small school). How did the faculty member do and how does the faculty
90 member feel they did?

91
92 We are also questioning the timing of the evaluation process- a shallow evaluation every year is
93 not optimal; better to have a deeper and more thorough evaluation every other year.
94 Of course new faculty need evaluate every year for feedback. Both parties can request an
95 evaluation in any particular year and it is better to do just before raises rather than just after.

96
97 Everyone agrees that just based on student evaluations is inadequate, but anything beyond that is
98 full of problems. We have tried to take a graduated approach.
99

100 Q: Is mentoring a part of this?

101 A: It is generally considered part of service

102 C: This could be a particularly effective added metric

103
104 We are asking for a full vetting of the parameters - what is acceptable to evaluate someone on?
105 What are appropriate measures of success?
106

107 C: Chuck - this is separate from tenure or promotion decisions; it has more to do with annual
108 evaluations. Tenure decisions are focused on impact while the APR is focused on activity.
109

110 Q: For units doing multi year evaluations, are there strategies for handling salary increases?

111 A: (Marty) Some schools keep evaluations untouched; there could be some sort of brief annual
112 update, but scores remain stable for 3 years.
113

114 Q: What are the plans for task force paper?

115 A: It would be useful to have a motion to focus on certain recommendations. We can boil it
116 down to 4-5 recommendations.
117

118 Q: Should we now develop a resolution?

119 A: (Marty) Sandeep will adjust the report to take account of excellent these recommendations,
120 then have this submitted to Provost's office.
121

122 **4. Update on Mellon Mentoring Awards and Nominations – Oliver Mayer**

123 Nominations are due January 31st. There is probably in some process at each school for
124 nominating candidates, but we request that you but go back to school and bring it up
125

126 Every school has yet to be represented - see where you are with relation to your exceptional
127 faculty. One difference this year is that we are incorporating distance learning, so applicants can
128 also include online faculty
129

130 Will have the Spring Mellon mentoring forum in early March. The date and topic are not yet set.
131 If you have suggestions, please contact me or Varun Soni.
132

133 This would be final year of Mellon grant, but we have approached them and they have given us a
134 no-cost extension to September 2014.
135

136 Is there any unfinished business we should address? We should continue to award our
137 outstanding faculty without foundation grant even with no monetary award. We want to keep it
138 going; as far as we know Provost's office does as well.
139

140 **5. Faculty Council Updates – Thomas Lyon (Gould School of Law) and Clay Wang** 141 **(Pharmacy)** 142 143

144 **Gould School of Law:**

145 The Law Faculty Council has three responsibilities:

- 146 1) To meet with dean several times to discuss proposed budget, final budget and changes,
147 We are seeing declining enrollment and pressures at the employment end. As a result we are
148 having to deal with budget issues.
149 2) We look at the composition and performance of schools' administration. We do performance
150 reviews and give substantial feedback. We also emphasize review of junior faculty.
151 3) We are an ad hoc group for the Dean but we also proactively do things.

152

153 Q: Is it true that everybody votes? Everybody runs?

154 A: That's right

155

156 In essence the most highly respected faculty win, and the council usually tends to be diverse.
157 The only people ineligible are those with dean appointments. We include NTT.

158

159 Q: How many TT to NTT full time faculty?

160 A: 35-40 TT, 6 NTT (not counting joint appointments)

161

162 Q: What role do you play on budget?

163 A: It is advisory. The dean comes to us with tentative proposal. It is fairly transparent

164

165 **Pharmacy**

166 The president elect is one who attends Senate meetings.

167 Currently we have 70 full time faculty and 729 doctor of pharmacy students.

168 We enlarged classrooms to also accommodate 407 PhD and MS students and have 159 online
169 students for working professionals.

170 The faculty council meets once per month. The council president meets with the dean and
171 executive vice dean one week prior to the faculty council meeting.

172 Issues we are currently addressing are:

173 1) UCAR review

174 2) Requirements - we have the most stringent requirements; most of our students are from UC
175 system.

176 3) We are primarily a NIH research unit and funding dropping.

177 Pharmacy schools are very popular. Many schools are building them. We face more
178 competition and we are seeing the pressure.

179 Most of our students are from California. We need change mission requirement in order to
180 increase the admission pool.

181 Faculty recruitment is an issue. It takes a long time for people to finish their training. They are
182 often in their 40s starting first faculty job.

183 It is hard to find clinical chair since there are so many deanships out there. The majority are
184 NTT. The line between clinical faculty and TT faculty is very blurred and tension between TT
185 and NTT is being brought up in our UCAR review.

186

187 We have a total of 8 members on council

188

189 Q: Does the dean meet with the group?

190 A: Yes but dean has been told to go raise money.

191

192 Q: Do you make budgetary decisions?

193 A: No we are informed.

194

195 Q: What about underrepresentation of minorities?

196 A: We have a large Asian female population - more than 1/2. White males are in minority.

197 We feel we have done a good job to get more minorities and the dean wants to raise more money
198 for this.

199

200 Q: What about the issue of conflict of interest with drug companies? Do you get involved?

201 A: Not really. My department gets most of its funding from government.

202 That has not come up as an issue. I don't know of any direct support from drug companies.

203

204 C: This was looked at two years ago in the Senate

205

206 **6. Announcements**

207 The Christmas party is tomorrow night. Our next meeting will be on 1/22.

208 The joint Provost/Senate retreat will be at the Fairmont Hotel in Santa Monica. The topic is

209 Globalization at USC - Where we are trying to go and what resources we need to stay at the
210 cutting edge.

211

212 Several faculty have asked re Plan C. The Senate board met with Lisa Macchia and Mike Nichol.

213 Several schools have had a number of complaints. We met with them again last week. In

214 moving forward, to make sure that the senate hears the plans for the future year far enough ahead

215 to have active input and conversation. There will be more changes when Obamacare is fully
216 rolled out - it is very important that we get involved.

217

218 There is faculty representation on the Employee Benefits committee but they only meet once
219 term.

220

221 **7. New Business:**

222 None.

223

224

225 The meeting was adjourned at 3:50pm.

226

227 Respectfully submitted,

228

229

230 Lucinda Carver, D.M.A.

231 Secretary General of the Academic Senate

232

233

234