MINUTES

Present: M. Apostolos, D. Blaine, B. Brown, E. Collins, G. Clark, N. Cohen (alternate for P. Liebig),
R. Labaree, O. Mayer, S. Mosley, K. Murphy, L. Palinkas, P. Riley, P. Rosenbloom, M. Safonov (alternate
for J. Kunc), M. Schroeder, J. Silvester, J. Steele, A. Trope, C. Wang (alternate for D. Davies)
Absent: J. Barnes, R. Ben-Ari, P. Cannon, L. Carver, R. Davila, Y. DeClerck, H. Greenwald, M. Marx,
E. Webb, R. Weisberg, M. Weinstein

Guests: M. Gaeke, E. Garrett, A. Hollingshead, K. Howell, M. Levine, C. Zachary

Meeting called to order at 2:00

President Gomer introduces Professor Andrea Hollingshead for report on Annenberg
Faculty Council.

Professor Hollingshead is the FEC Chair. Overview of FEC in Annenberg offered. Full
time faculty 98, evenly split TT/NTT, 100 Adjunct. New hall opening 8/14. FEC
composition represents both schools, 3 from Communication, 3 from Journalism. 2 TT, 1
NTT. Elected each year, chair chosen by FEC members, chair rotates between two
schools. FEC meets with Dean Wilson once per month for 90 minutes. School directors
and Associate Deans also attend. If Dean cannot meet, meeting is not held. FEC Chair
sets agenda and runs meeting. Faculty, FEC, staff and dean input solicited ahead of time.
Report made by FEC Chair at monthly faculty meetings.

Representative issues considered at Annenberg FEC include faculty office space in new
building, e.g. Also technical team hiring, use of Adobe Creative Cloud by faculty, update
on Journalism Director Search.

Best practices: elected representatives; both TT and NTT FEC members; rotate
leadership between two schools; control agenda w dean; ask tough questions; invite guest
speakers; require dean’s attendance.

q. what about Associate Deans?
a. we try to have the Dean or we don’t meet

q. how do you stay on task?
a. Chair watches clock and lets only productive conversations run over. Agenda items
prioritized by putting time-sensitive issues first.

q. do you ever meet without the dean?
a. we have a preparation meeting first to see what FEC members’ opinions are before we
meet with the dean.

Next, Professor Sandeep Gupta presented on recommendations to revise Faculty
Evaluation Guidelines. Item added to report about importance of service. Also
mentoring was added and elaborated upon. These were in response to the suggestions from the floor of the Senate in December.

Some changes are extreme, for example, that student scores should not be considered. This opposes previous version that used them for half of evaluation.

We tried to separate out models good for evaluation rather than those that make better teachers. It is structured to be practical and so it’s not always possible to include things like time spent during the week on activities that might add up to a fraction of a course.

Moved and seconded to discuss

q. Thank you to the committee for such specific recommendations. This document is the result of two years of work.

q. the earlier version was helpful to our FEC to revise standards for performance evaluations. We discussed mentoring last week; in Social Work mentoring is considered service not teaching. Consensus was found that it is teaching. So how do you evaluate the quality of mentoring? It’s not anonymous to ask someone mentored how the mentoring activity worked.

a. as a Chair I struggle with this. It’s a good question. We have a committee that is elected. This committee looks not at quality but quantity. We provide the full reports. Awards, best paper awards, etc. Mentoring might be in service or teaching. We let the judgment of those in the room evaluate quality. Faculty look at quantitative numbers, c.v.s., department evaluations, and then everyone is given a number. Discrepancies in number are accounted for and addressed. It’s a judgment all at some level, and there’s really only an issue at the extremes.

q. there are well recognized evaluations for mentoring. NIH tracks what happens to mentees. We are sending this revised document to the Provost. Do we want to send it to UCAPT for review?

a. we will probably send it to the Provost and then Beth Meyerowitz will view it. She may have it go out, per our request, to other groups. But it is an NTT as well as TT relevant document.

q. are you comfortable taking the weight of student evals from 50% to 0%? Are they completely uninformative?

a. evaluations do reflect teaching quality for the most part. The Provost will be looking at this document. This will be raised and probably won’t stand at 0%.

q. it sounds like you’re saying let’s take a radical position and the grown-ups will take care of it. Should we not be the grown-ups here?

a. evaluations are subjective, based on appearance etc at times, so they can be used best as a flag, high or low, to inquire for more information. Observations are a good way to evaluate teaching, as are methods of testing student performance.
a. and the Provost will come up with a system that allows for autonomy at the various
schools.

q. what is your expectation feedback in terms of time?

a. hard to say. We would like to hear back about the thought process and get feedback.

q. how do you judge the balance for different types of faculty across the research,
teaching and service? Not everyone does the same amount of teaching. How do you
compare teaching-release and publishing record against those without the release time?
Additionally how are we to evaluate part-time adjunct faculty as required?

a. we have adequate information on the service-side even when faculty don’t report their
own service. But data collection is a fundamental problem. There are mechanisms for
evaluation, sample student work, etc. We can create a living data base. As to adjuncts,
there is a challenge. In Engineering, e.g. in research as well as service, plotting
performance is difficult. Teaching scores from students however do not vary greatly one
from the other, perhaps a standard deviation of 1.

q. peer evaluation of teaching can provide constructive feedback. Schools will need a
reliable and valid way to do that. Looking forward we need to think about how to do
meaningful peer evaluations.

Vote: proposed recommendations to update policy on Faculty Evaluation.

22 yes, 0 opposed. No abstentions.

Professor Patricia Riley introduces Melissa Gaeke, Executive Director and Faculty
Liaison for Academic Partnerships.

Civic Engagement a department within Community Relations. We orient our work
around the cultivation of our students and stake-holders in a service role. We are
furthering the academic mission of the university. 1992 was the foundational year for the
five community initiatives at USC. Private research universities don’t commonly get
federal funding but we have for a long time. We convene thought-leaders around issues
we find pressing.

We seek to enhance the brand; expand the richness of experience; engage with external
stakeholders. Our strategy is underscored by partnership. We work cooperatively and
collectively, specifically focused on education at all levels, esp. K-12 and Head Start.
Educational partnerships affect 17,000 students.

We have governmental programs, Federal and local, including TRIO, Minority Business
Enterprise, and Head Start; we have educational partnerships; also support for faculty
initiatives and engagement with the community and elsewhere; also development work.
Faculty members get connected to community organizations. Faculty are also assisted in
their projects, e.g. Penny Harvest, to collaborate with USC schools teaching children to
be philanthropists. Also community placements can be recruited for service learning
projects.
Currently working on an inventory of current civic engagement projects across both campuses. Will be on a searchable database. Also requests faculty send information about their work to their center, gaeke@usc.edu

q. this document says average students give 2.5 hours to service. Do they know of all the opportunities there are for service?

a. we are working to make sure students hear about opportunities. The Volunteer Center in Student Affairs has a website. We track these and document it for reporting purposes.

q. JEP is great but small-scale. Can we get the prominence to other service-learning opportunities like the Good Neighbors has?

a. this is a fantastic question. There’s an ad-hoc committee coming back on board that can work on promoting and publicizing the work that students are doing. We have a listing in the schedule of classes to identify service learning courses.

q. have we looked at what impact we want to have on these communities?

a. we will dialogue about this after the state of the neighborhood project. Do we go deep or do we go wide? So far it’s been entrepreneurial, allowing little projects without unified focuses.

q. we are looking always to write impact into our grant proposals so you can help us to search for and document opportunities.

a. yes new faculty needing to look at making broader impact can use us.

q. who enables corporate partnerships that could work with the Volunteer Center?

a. Monique Sosa, through Student Affairs, would be the way to go.


q. there is some controversy over the decision to fence this off.

a. not by administration or parents. The community has not complained. A few students object. But this decision will not be changed.

q. will Jefferson be closed during the project?

a. for some months it will all be infrastructure. Ultimately there will be some street closures.

Provost advises to watch for memo coming out on Informatics workshop. Grants will be available to integrate technology into their online graduate programs. You might test different tools for example to see which work best.
A post-doc program in Informatics and Digital Knowledge with an emphasis on diversity is being announced. Promising fellows can be offered Assistant Professorships with incentive packages from the Provost’s Office included.

Approval of minutes postponed until next meeting.

Update on Provost/Academic Senate Retreat. Final agenda should have been received. We have outstanding individuals involved. President Gomer encourages interactions between all attendees. Thanks to Professor Riley, we are also having a website that will include all Power Points, slides, etc. Interactivity online possible during conference as well as after. Also there will be a page called Experts page for anyone not on a panel but has materials to contribute. Should be an event useful to utilize as we move forward in our global enterprise. Connie has given confirmation to those who have reserved rooms. Let us know if you have not heard. We anticipate 130 attendees. Thank you to Marty Levine and the organizing committee.

Announcements: Professor Gomer will be getting someone to update the Senate on WorkDay. There have been some bugs in the system, including PayDay, which is not working.

Other topics invited to be submitted to the Executive Board from Faculty Councils.

Meeting at Children’s Hospital planned again for this year.

Deadline for submission for nominations for Distinguished Faculty Service Award. Due March 3.

There will be sustainability information going online soon, including the chance to make a video on the topic. $2500 award.

New business: n/a.

Adjourned at 3:48

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Blaine

Member-at-Large of the Academic Senate