Academic Senate  
Meeting of November 28, 2012  
CHP Building, Room 102  
Health Sciences Campus

MINUTES


Guests: M. Levine, B. Maceo, M. Quick, C. Lane, H. Bovia

President Riley called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm.

1. Dialogue with the Executive Vice Provost

Vice Provost Michael Quick was introduced:

I want to begin with an updated regarding the GE revision and the status of graduate programs. The Provost asked Gene Vickers and me to head up the review of the GE program. It has been 15 years since we looked at making significant changes. We met last semester with a committee of faculty members who put together a list of recommendations and changes to float by the faculty/student community. We received feedback in September and October and received around 300 responses, circa 50% faculty and 50% students. It was interesting but not perhaps surprising to note that the student responses never made it past the first recommendation, which is to increase the number of GE courses from six to eight. Faculty input, however was excellent with many thoughtful responses. Several things were suggested which we had completely missed.

By the end of the semester the provost will come out with a memo appointing the next committee. We are now soliciting suggestions from the deans of most schools for faculty to serve on the oversight committee. The majority of these will be from the Dornsife College. The memo will contain a charge from the provost regarding things we want to see happen. It is thought that we are light on GE and should increase from six to seven classes, including at least one in the arts. It is hard to imagine that students are getting a good general education without courses in the arts. The idea here is that students can satisfy minors while taking these courses. Schools other than Dornsife will now be able to offer GE courses as long as the content is rigorous.

There is a great deal of value for students to have small course experiences, i.e. for freshmen, in the residential colleges, etc. It is important to do this early in the undergraduate career. While it is still the case that GE is GE, we feel we are missing an opportunity for students to have a signature experience at USC. We are in a unique geographical space and our university is unique in a number of ways. There should therefore be some unique component in our GE that our students can experience at USC. What is this experience? I look forward to working on this with a new committee if given the charge from the provost—a way of getting feedback from faculty regarding this signature experience. We believe it will take two to four years to fully implement this transformation.

Q: If faculty are not on this committee, how can they give feedback?
A: One possibility is to have Senate representation on the committee.
Q: Can you give us an example of universities who have this sort of signature experience?
A: None off the top of my head.
C: I want to reiterate that it would be more effective to have a program with a small number of courses
because this can stress a common core of knowledge across all disciplines. We don’t want students to
take courses that are comfortable to them in order to fulfill requirements.
A: I believe it will be a more restrictive set of offerings.
Q: I am teaching a freshman class for the first time in 20 years. There are very different experiences
based on what courses are being taken. Do you have information re the current experience?
A: The committee needs to flush out and make arguments for what those categories stand for and mean.

The provost has also been considering doing a revamp of a portion of the funding it give for grad
programs (mostly PhD). There are presently two ways these are funded from the provost’s office:
1) A couple of initiatives – e.g. the Provost Fellows Initiative
2) Block Grant Program – not restrictive and really subvention to the schools
We could like to create a third category. It will take some money from block grants, and will include
other new money. This will create a pot of resources from which schools can request funds via proposals
submitted to the provost. We want all PhD programs to be as excellent as possible. This is a hard task
and a long-term process. It is even more difficult than the undergraduate program and will mostly take 20
years to implement. But there are medium term gains – things that the provost would like to promote.

We have asked the deans to create proposals to fund the following areas: external training grants and
external fellowships that students can obtain. One strategy would be to increase the number of post-docs
at USC (we are much lower than our peers). This is more important in some fields than in others. We
have an amazing post-doc program in the humanities. We would like to increase the diversity from this
pot and so far have received a great deal of feedback from the deans. We hope to have this plan in place
by the end of the month. Overall the provost funds 34-35 million dollars through various initiatives for
MFA’s, PhD’s, etc.

Q: A few years ago President Sample pushed the idea that the post-docs would be the culminating level
in developing scientists etc. and that they may have the place that PhD’s have in some of those areas. He
wanted to elevate the structure and the offerings at the post-doc level. We don’t hear much about that any
more. Is there any further discussion about this or has it been tabled?
A: I am happy to report that we now have an office of post-doctoral affairs, which answers to me. We
have a post-doc governmental group, we now have more offerings and have managed to get the fringe
rate reduced. We are starting to do the kinds of things that were done with PhD education a while ago.
Not only are post-docs an important for the scholarly mission of university, they are a major step in our
students’ careers. In my personal opinion we are late to the game on this and a lot of other places have
been doing a better job.

Q: How much money in the new fund will come from the block grants?
A: For the first year it will be 5-7%, 10% at the most. Part of the goal is to get measurable outcomes.
We lose control of block grant money. It is hard to trace and determine what the benefit has been. It also
turns out that some restricted money has been sitting around from endowments. Some funds are available,
others are restricted. This year we have been able to allocate over 1 million dollars for the new category
from these funds.

Q: We don’t allow our clinical fellows to get masters degrees paid for by USC. Other schools do this. In
pediatrics it would help us be competitive.
A: Good idea – let’s discuss it further.
President Riley brought up the Junn study, published in the Chronicle of Higher Education, which suggests that USC has had difficulties in granting tenure to women and minorities. The Senate leadership has had meetings with Elizabeth Garrett, Beth Meyerowitz and Marty Levine. They talked about the fact that the senate president can go to the office of diversity and see the data. President Riley has asked the Office of Diversity to re-do research on these issues and wants the senate member to know that they are working on this issue in an effort to get the best possible data so people can be comfortable with the University’s response.

Vice Provost Quick: Jane Junn is a political science professor in Dornsife College. She did a retrospective analysis of tenure rates at USC going back 14-15 years. I believe the research was haphazard – looking at course catalogs to see who is here then who is not here. Are there reasons around differential tenuring?

My understanding is that the last UCAPT manual includes tenure data verified by Equity and Diversity. That process is being undertaken right now and the updated version of the manual will include the updated analysis. This is due to come out at the beginning of next semester.

It is important to stress that we invest a great deal of money and time in our junior faculty. Sometimes in the sciences we spend millions of dollars setting up a lab for their research. We do have to set the goal high and make sure we bring in people who can succeed.

Why don’t we do a full-scale examination and see if we can find any reasons why our junior faculty fail? One problem is too many non-scholarly assignments. This evaluation would be of great value to the University. This is a scholarly question – let’s take a look at it.

Q: It seems to me that the studies of this issue are inherently flawed because it does not even address the numbers of faculty who are told not to go up for tenure. I despair of any study that focuses solely on the analysis of those going up for tenure.

A: It is incumbent upon deans, program coordinators, etc. to use checkpoints and oversee the process. It doesn’t help any of us if people go up for tenure and don’t succeed.

C: In pharmacy, we limit the number of teaching hours and discourage heavy committee membership in the first two years of a junior faculty member’s career precisely so that they can get everything in line to have a picture leading to tenure.

C: The Junn report was formerly submitted to the Dornsife faculty council and we will be meeting next week about it. We should formerly recognize that this is now a Senate issue. I have had very productive conversations with Equity and Diversity, with Provost Garrett and President Riley. We all care deeply about promoting diversity and equity. We would like to see real solid numbers, not so much as an expose but as a diagnostic tool.

2. Approval of the September and October Minutes
The September minutes were approved with 24 ‘yes’ votes, 1 ‘no’ and no abstentions. The October minutes were also approved with 27 ‘yes’ votes, zero ‘no’ votes and one abstention.

3. New Business/Announcements
President Riley: I have been serving on a committee exploring the possibility of electronic student evaluations. This is a direct initiative by the provost’s office. They understand the form used by majority of campus is imperfect, but they don't want to change it - just make it electronic.

The committee has put together preliminary report. There are a lot of universities who do evaluations completely online. The primary concern is that USC currently has one of the highest return rates in the country because they are on paper. Response rates typically fall when they go online. How can we prevent this happening?
Several ideas are being put forth where is tipping point between incentives and punishments. One possibility is to can give incentives, e.g. faculty cannot see evaluations until grades turned in. The process will be handled by a third party vendor. The student request on the committee is to do evaluations after they see the final.

C: We tried this in Marshall - it didn't work because we were getting 10% response rate. This number went back to 80% when went back to paper. Students will be angry at getting a notice that their grade will be withheld and this will reflect negatively on faculty.

C: I am concerned - if it ain’t broke don’t fix it. Why are we doing this if we have such a high success rate?

A: It is very expensive and time consuming - many schools spend money to have comments transcribed. It is also a part of the USC Sustainability Initiative.

Q: Did anyone think of administering this online - in class?

A: Yes - this could solve it. One possibility is that a box of iPads could be distributed for that purpose for students without laptops.

Q: My understanding is that there are some schools that believe the students would not have the technology. Is there discussion about giving all incoming students an iPad?

C: Evaluations of the teaching faculty are weighted heavily on evaluations. For better or worse, they are extremely important.

Q: Are there studies regarding this - does the vendor have data?

A: The committee has only had two meeting so far but we believe one implementation will be in place by end of year.

Q: What about response rate, data skewed, group dynamics - are there studies?

A: Yes committee has asked for research from a couple of vendor groups. One of the provost’s staff assistants is providing data for the committee. The greatest harm people are worried about is lower response rate.

C: The medical school has been doing online evaluations for years – we went online 6 years ago and have had a high response rate.

A Senate task force is in place to look at entire faculty evaluation process.

Q: Is Blackboard being looked at as a piece of this?

C: We use system called Course Eval in Pharmacy. An integrated solution would be best.

C: One important question should be included on the evaluation: ‘What is your expected grade in this course?’

A: There are some units on campus who have already added this If anyone has something to say, email me and I will bring it to the committee.

Brenda Maceo was introduced:

We have very few opportunities to get 100K people to come USC other than football games. This provides a different type of engagement with the University. This year will be the third year in a contract with the LA Times that runs through 2016. We have worked to move the event further away from exams, etc. and get more opportunity to get the students engaged. We typically have circa 50 faculty involved in some capacity and have established an academic advisory committee. We would like your input in how to stimulate discussions on campus. Let us know if there are authors we should bring in; we would appreciate your feedback. The event will take place 4/20 and 4/21. Next year it will be earlier. We will also be having a writers conference Email Oliver Mayer or me with feedback.

Q: What kind of efforts in outreach to surrounding community?

A: We are doing so through existing family programs, neighborhood associations, literacy programs, book drives in local schools, children's activities through the Head Start programs. Last year we ran
shuttles from HSC. We have book drives 1 month before with drop locations at bookstore, campus entrances.

Q: What about Spanish language and media?
A: Yes - all materials are bi-lingual. LA Times is helping with promotion. MTA will help - have had no bottlenecks.

5. Discussion re Campus Sustainability
Charlie Lane and Halli Bovia were introduced:
Sustainability program is in its infancy. We need your input and are in need of a good definition of sustainability for credentialing process. Two years ago we began getting LEED certifications for active energy, water conversation and LEED standards.

We have a 350 million gallon thermal energy storage tank under Cromwell field that saves USC $500,000 per year. Lights are being retrofitted, most recently in parking center. LADWP provides all power to USC. We have brought in recycling mowers that turn clippings to mulch and are doing drought resistant planting. We now have green trams, campus cruisers, Zip Cars, etc. and over 20 van pools. USC has two LEED Gold buildings – the Tutor Center and the Broad Center for Regenerative Medicine. In housing we have implemented low energy lighting, reduced water use and recycled carpet where individual tiles can be replaced.

USC offers over 50 course offerings and our office has two staff members with student workers. We are looking for a definition of sustainability in the curriculum to be developed by a committee of a minimum of three faculty members who teach courses in different departments. Committee may also include students, staff and other stakeholders.

We are also working on tailgate waste diversion. In the future hope for sustainable venues e.g. Coliseum and Galen Center. USC is listed in the top 100 sustainable institutions, but we are behind our peers in the Pac 12.

Q: What is thought about using solar energy?
A: Our director is entertaining this. One thought is solar panels on the Galen Center and Parking Center. One problem is that we are with LADWP, which prevents us from using a power purchase agreement.

Q: Why is it difficult to implement drought resistant landscaping?
A: Because donors like the way the campus looks now.

Q: Are there consulting companies that we could turn to for best practices?
A: We did work with Rocky Mountain Institute to assess our some of our current needs.

6. Announcement of Nominating Committee Election
The following members were elected: Robbert Flick, Vasilis Marmarelis, Victoria Marx and Oliver Mayer. They will be joining these Executive Board Members: Ginger Clark, Charles Gomer, Sandeep Gupta and Patricia Riley to serve on the committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucinda Carver, D.M.A.
Secretary General of the Academic Senate