

1 **ACADEMIC SENATE**

2  
3 **UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**

4 Meeting of April 10, 2019

5 Doheny Memorial Library, Room 121

6 2:00 - 4:00 p.m.

7  
8 **Present:** S. Ahmadi, S. Altman, M. Apostolos, J. Armour, F. Bar, Y. Bar-Cohen, R. Beatty, S. Bucher,  
9 T.A Brun, J. Cantiello, D. Crombecque, R. Davila, E. Fife, L. Grazzette, S. Gruskin, A. Habibi (alternate for  
10 D. Griffiths), J. Israel, A. Imre, R. Lonergan, R. MacKenzie, P.T. McNiff, M. Nichol, J. Parr, D. Pecchenino,  
11 P. Rosenbloom, G. Siassi, J. Silvester, A.Uyeshiro Simon, J. Steele, T. Tambascia, T. Tucker, D. Whitsett  
12 (alternate for C. Castro), A.G. Wilcox

13 **Present Online:** D. Armstrong (alternate for S. Asgharzadeh), B. Belcher, P. Chang, R. Filback, M. Frey,  
14 A. Gilbert, A. Mackay, T.J. McCarthy, J. McLaughlin Gray, G. Ragusa, C. Tucker, G. Zada

15 **Absent:** J. Ailshire, E. Grossman, A. Justice, M. Mohammadi, J. Musso, D. O'Leary, M. Polikoff,  
16 S. Wickersheimer, E. Wojciak

17 **Guests:** P. Adler, A. Arnani, P. Bhatia, B. Blair, P. Cannon, S. M. Carnicke, G. Condell, R. Jubran, S. Little,  
18 M. Levine, B. Marcus, C. Nueman, M. Quick, P. Riley, N. Warren, J. Zevin  
19

20  
21 **AGENDA**

22  
23 Yaniv Bar-Cohen, Academic Senate President, called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

24  
25 **Approval of February 20 Senate meeting draft minutes**

26  
27 Ashley Uyeshiro Simon, Secretary General, presented the March draft minutes for discussion and approval.

28  
29 *Rebecca Lonergan moved to approve the minutes; Sofia Gruskin seconded; 27 in favor; 0 opposed; 2*  
30 *abstentions.*

31  
32 **Senate Nominating Committee & Introduction of Candidates**

33  
34 Rebecca Lonergan, Academic Vice President and Chair of the Nominating Committee, presented the slate  
35 of candidates for next year's Senate Executive Board. She reviewed the Senate voting bylaws, including  
36 which Senators had voting rights, how many votes each person could cast for each position, and  
37 instructions for voting. Senators need to return completed ballots by April 22, 2019. Results would be  
38 announced at the May 1, 2019 Senate meeting.

39  
40 The candidates were then given two minutes each to introduce themselves.

41  
42 Candidates for Academic Vice President (will serve one year as Academic Vice President, one year as  
43 President, and one year as Immediate Past-President; one candidate is selected)

- 44
- 45 • Paul Adler, Harold Quinton Chair of Business Policy, Professor of Management and Organization,  
46 Marshall School of Business, and Professor of Sociology and Environmental Studies, Dornsife  
47 College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
  - 48 • Margo Apostolos, Associate Professor of Dance, Glorja Kaufman School of Dance

49 Candidates for Administrative Vice President (two-year term; one candidate is selected)

- 50
- 51 • Tracy Poon Tambascia, Professor of Clinical Education, Rossier School of Education
  - 52 • Daniel Pecchenino, Assistant Professor of Teaching, Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences

53 Member-at-Large (one-year term; four candidates are selected)

- 54 • Shafiqah Ahmadi, Associate Professor of Clinical Education, Rossier School of Education
- 55 • Brent Blair, Associate Professor of Practice, School of Dramatic Arts
- 56 • Sharon Marie Carnicke, Professor of Theatre Critical Studies, School of Dramatic Arts, and Professor
- 57 of Slavic Languages and Literature, Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
- 58 • Anikó Imre, Professor of Cinematic Arts, School of Cinematic Arts
- 59 • Rima Jubran, Professor of Clinical Pediatrics (Education Scholar), Keck School of Medicine
- 60 • Elizabeth Fife, Associate Professor of Technical Communication Practice, Viterbi School of
- 61 Engineering
- 62 • Sharoni Little, Professor of Clinical Business Communication, Marshall School of Business
- 63 • Alison Wilcox, Professor of Clinical Radiology and Internal Medicine, Keck School of Medicine
- 64 • Jason Zevin, Associate Professor of Psychology and Linguistics, Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and
- 65 Sciences

66

67 **Dialogue with Provost Michael Quick**

68

69 Provost Quick thanked the Senators for their service this year. He announced that he will be stepping down  
70 from his position as Provost on June 30, 2019 and that he is looking forward to coming back to the faculty.  
71 He stated that searching for a new Provost is a priority for President Elect Carol Folt, and that she is also  
72 focused on finding a new Vice President for Student Affairs. They are putting together a transition team for  
73 Dr. Folt, so she is able to begin working effectively as soon as she starts on July 1<sup>st</sup>.

74

75 Bar-Cohen thanked Quick for partnering with the Senate, particularly his collaborative work in diversity,  
76 equity, and inclusion, during his tenure as Provost. Quick stated he would like to reinforce any progress  
77 made thus far during his last few months, and asked the Senate to let him know how he can support this  
78 effort.

79

80 A Senator inquired about progress made on salary benchmarking through the Provost's Office and also  
81 stated that the issue of space inequity between schools was raised at the University Forum, asking if space  
82 audits are ever conducted for efficiency and quality.

83

84 Quick stated Executive Vice Provost Elizabeth Graddy's office has been looking at salary benchmarking and  
85 understanding salaries, particularly comparing to UCLA's writing program and languages and to Berkeley's  
86 business school. He stated the best comparison school is UCLA, given that it is an elite school, in the same  
87 city, and their information is public. The Provost's office thinks they know how to obtain the right data and  
88 make sense of them, so the next step is to work with schools to show them how to perform benchmarking.  
89 Regarding space, Quick stated the last space audit started about ten years ago, was completed 6 years ago,  
90 and looked at equipment along with what the University can manage in terms of enrollment to preserve  
91 the quality of students' experience. Changes like upgrades to the desks in THH were made due to this audit,  
92 but he stated it is probably time for another one. Currently, there is a full audit of seismic needs of each  
93 building being conducted. Another major audit is needed to look at security (locks on classroom doors,  
94 etc.), and they need to decide on the best way to perform this.

95

96 A follow-up question was asked if the space audits include dormitories, the larger environment (e.g., bikes),  
97 or other things that influence the student experience. Quick suggested the Senate ask David Wright about  
98 bike safety, as there was an environmental audit, and they just completed ideating how to make the  
99 internal part of campus safer for everyone.

100

101 A question was asked about faculty being able to be involved in fundraising and having interactions with  
102 donors on things like research, equity work, and more, as fundraising is important to the University. He  
103 opined that this would also increase faculty-shared governance.

104

105 Quick stated that this is a good idea as faculty are best able to articulate the importance of their work, and  
106 that Central Development is enthusiastic about the concept but the execution is difficult. He stated that  
107 there are already issues with coordination of communication, even with just the Deans, and we need to  
108 have a well-coordinated approach so we do not drive donors away. In the past, the focus has historically  
109 been on very large gifts, but he hopes in the future we can have faculty assist in getting mid-range gifts  
110 (e.g., more chairs for faculty).

111

## 112 **Romantic Relationships Between Faculty and Students**

113

114 Bar-Cohen opened the discussion by presenting [Resolution 18/19-05 Proposal on Prohibiting Romantic or](#)  
115 [Sexual Relationships between Faculty and Students in Supervised Roles](#). He clarified that a vote in favor of  
116 the resolution signifies support for making a change to the Faculty Handbook to reflect the spirit of the  
117 Resolution, but that the exact language to be changed in the Faculty Handbook is still to be determined.

118

119 He clarified that the Resolution today would prohibit romantic or sexual relationships between faculty and  
120 students only when a supervisory or mentoring relationship exists. He gave examples of other universities  
121 who have policies with bans on faculty-student relationships, including University of Michigan, University of  
122 Pennsylvania, Stanford, and University of North Carolina. At Princeton, the prohibition of romantic  
123 relationships between faculty and undergraduates was just expanded to include all graduate students.

124

125 Bar-Cohen provided the Senate with the [University of Michigan's policy](#), which provides a good example of  
126 how our own policy could be laid out (although the prohibitions in the University of Michigan's policy were  
127 different than what we were discussing). He noted there is an exception statement in Michigan's policy  
128 that seems to apply to limited circumstances, but may give some people more comfort in establishing a  
129 policy such as this one. He acknowledged concerns about a policy like this, including legal challenges and  
130 difficulty with enforcement. Despite these concerns, Bar-Cohen stated he still believes the Senate should  
131 move in this direction to protect students and faculty, to clearly state these relationships are harmful, and  
132 because the potential negatives outweigh the potential benefits of these relationships.

133

134 All Senators who opined were in support of protecting students and faculty, and in the belief that faculty  
135 should generally not have romantic or sexual relationships with students they supervise. However, there  
136 were differing opinions about whether a ban of these relationships would be effective, enforceable, and  
137 clear enough to make a difference.

138

139 A comment was made that banning relationships does not ban "hitting on" students. Bar-Cohen replied  
140 that the policy wording needs to be very clear that romantic or sexual advances are equally prohibited and  
141 harmful.

142

143 A suggestion was made that the words in the Resolution "likely to be supervised" would be more clear if  
144 changed to "majoring, minoring, or getting degrees in the department or program." A later comment was  
145 made that we need to redefine the "faculty," as there may be staff who teach, or other people who are not  
146 technically considered faculty now that this policy should cover.

147

148 Another Senator asked if there are data about efficacy of these policies, as she had heard from a colleague  
149 at another school that a policy similar to this one did not work well. Bar-Cohen stated information about  
150 efficacy of these programs is limited, and most have not been in place for a long time.

151

152 Another comment was made that the policy needs to clarify who is included in the policy as the faculty  
153 supervisory-type role sometimes can be performed by a graduate student. Bar-Cohen clarified that we as a  
154 Senate can only set policy for faculty, but the Senate can pass this Resolution knowing this needs to be  
155 considered in a wider context. For example, a policy prohibiting Teaching Assistants from having romantic  
156 or sexual relationships with their students may be implemented, but the Senate does not make policies for  
157 students.

158

159 A comment was made that ultimately this decision comes down to making USC a welcoming environment,  
160 which requires sacrifice from faculty and students. We want to continue to empower our students and not  
161 treat them paternalistically, but we also do not want to create environments where students cannot thrive  
162 because they feel they are unable to say “no” to a faculty member, and this ban would provide them an  
163 opportunity to say “no.”

164

165 Some Senators were concerned about voting on a Resolution before knowing all of the details this policy  
166 would entail. Bar-Cohen responded that he has heard from people with different opinions, and it is difficult  
167 to agree to move forward without first undertaking this vote. He clarified that today’s vote is only to decide  
168 if the Senate would like to move in the direction of determining a policy, for which the details would be  
169 discussed later.

170

171 A statement was made that having a policy is good, but enforcement, education, and resources will be  
172 paramount. Favor for the clarity of Michigan’s policy (their “Covered Relationships” definition,  
173 enforcement measures, etc.) was expressed. Education particularly for vulnerable populations (e.g.,  
174 international students who may not question power dynamics) will be very important.

175

176 A follow-up statement was made that investigating policy violations is very difficult: documentation,  
177 deciding where investigational information goes, if the results are confidential or released, and more.

178

179 Some Senators expressed concern that the Resolution mandated an absolute prohibition of romantic or  
180 sexual relationships without room for exceptions. However, it was later clarified that passing this  
181 Resolution would still require drafting of the policy itself, and first and second reads of these Handbook  
182 changes, into which exceptions can be written. It was later discussed that the wording of the resolution  
183 still allows room for rare exceptions (such as stated in the University of Michigan policy).

184

#### 185 **Vote on Resolution 18/19-05**

186

187 *Motion was made by the Executive Board of the Senate; resolution passed with 25 in favor, 5 opposed, and*  
188 *2 abstentions.*

189

#### 190 **First read of Proposed Changes to Faculty Handbook**

191

192 Jessica Parr and John Silvester, Co-Chairs of the Faculty Handbook Committee, presented proposed  
193 changes to the Faculty Handbook. Senators will be asked to do a second read at the next Senate meeting  
194 on May 1, 2019. After changes are voted through by the Senate, there are additional steps prior to being  
195 posted, including being sent to the President for sign-off.

196

197 The Co-Chairs asked the Senate for direction regarding the proposed change to Section 3G. If accepted, this  
198 modification would change disclosure of family, sexual, or other intimate relationships with supervisees  
199 from “recommended” to “required.” A comment was made that we should also consider faculty who have  
200 children as students at USC. The Co-Chairs stated they have modified the language in 3G to include more  
201 information about what qualifies as a supervisory or evaluative role.

202

203 A vote was held to determine if the language in Section 3G of the Faculty Handbook should change from  
204 “recommended” to “required” in regards to disclosure of family, sexual, or other intimate relationships.

205

206 *Motion was made by the Executive Board of the Senate; resolution passed with 25 in favor, 0 opposed, and*  
207 *1 abstention.*

208

209 The Co-Chairs also stated the changes in faculty bereavement leave will be made in the Handbook, then it  
210 will need to be approved by the President, and afterwards it will become policy and be reflected online.

211  
212 The Co-Chairs asked Senators to email them with any comments in anticipation of the second read on May  
213 1, 2019.

214  
215 **Upcoming benefits changes**

216  
217 Representatives from the Employee Benefits Committee (EBC), which is made up of faculty, staff, and  
218 administrators, presented proposed forthcoming changes to the health benefits plans for 2020. They  
219 reminded the Senate that the “benefits pool” of funding pays for many things such as healthcare,  
220 retirement, and tuition benefits and that the EBC works each year to manage costs and benefits. The  
221 monthly healthcare premium costs that employees pay is less than 25% of the actual premium cost, with  
222 the rest coming from the benefits pool. Healthcare costs have increased about 10% each of the past 5  
223 years, which is unsustainable, and the EBC is working to mitigate this rise in costs.

224  
225 Today about 25% of USC employees are enrolled in the USC EPO, and about 42% are in the PPO. The main  
226 differences between the EPO and PPO are that the EPO has a drug formulary (that was developed by our  
227 own School of Pharmacy in conjunction with a pharmacy advising company), and the EPO also gives people  
228 access to doctors only in Southern California, and does not cover certain out-of-network doctors or  
229 hospitals (e.g., Cedars Sinai). The PPO currently allows access to all drugs, and access to any doctor and  
230 hospital nationally and internationally. The EPO drug costs are 42% less than the PPO drugs costs because  
231 of the drug formulary. To assist employees who switched to the EPO, a drug transition plan was executed,  
232 including communication with members and providers prior to launch, a 90-day transition period for  
233 members to switch drugs, and a live concierge service with a dedicated pharmacist during the transition  
234 phase.

235  
236 The EBC is proposing that the PPO have the same drug formulary as the EPO, with the following  
237 components:

- 238
- 239 • The PPO formulary will exclude:
    - 240 ○ High cost brand/generic drugs with cheaper generic identical alternatives are available
    - 241 ○ High-priced combination drugs where separate drugs can be taken
  - 242 • For drugs with multiple versions or formulations, members will be required to start with the first  
(cost-effective) version
  - 243 • For certain drugs, where a lower cost drug is available that is clinically similar, even if not  
244 chemically identical
  - 245 • Certain high-cost and sensitive maintenance drugs will be available only for 30 days quantity at a  
246 time
- 247

248 The EBC explained that the vast majority of anticipated disruption will result from people being switched  
249 from brand to identical generic drugs, which is also where the majority of savings will lie. When asked why  
250 the new formulary could not just consist of this one category, the EBC responded this change is about  
251 setting the expectation of how drugs will be prescribed, and also about ensuring the sustainability of the  
252 health plans long-term, which requires addressing all areas upon which the formulary touches. They later  
253 stated that as our employee population ages, the numbers of people who fall into these categories may  
254 change, so addressing each category furthers the sustainability of the PPO. They stated our peer  
255 institutions have formulary plans already.

256  
257 The EBC then gave examples of different types of drug transitions that could occur.

258  
259 A comment was made that if this new plan is implemented, the Senate would like to receive feedback  
260 about how it went, if it was smooth, and how people were impacted.

261  
262 A question was asked if those who will be switched to a new drug with a similar clinical effect (but different  
263 chemical composition), which accounts for the least number of people affected by this change, can just be

264 allowed to continue with their current drugs. The EBC replied this recommendation follows USFDA  
265 guidelines, but stated this category is the most difficult to implement, and there is still more work to be  
266 done to iron this out. They stated the concierge will give feedback to the EBC and Health Plans department  
267 as to whether certain categories are too difficult to manage.  
268

269 In response to a comment about the possible negative impacts of formularies, it was clarified that there are  
270 many different types of formularies, and the level that is being proposed is the least restrictive type. A  
271 follow-up statement was made that for those that will be most affected by this change (those who are  
272 asked to decouple drugs, and those who will be switched to a different chemical composition drug), we  
273 need to do anything we can to make sure they are okay.  
274

275 A question was asked if USC Health Plans is working with Keck IT, to integrate these changes into Keck's  
276 prescribing system. The EBC replied that they are working with Keck, and they anticipate these changes will  
277 be integrated into their system by the second quarter of 2020.  
278

279 Some examples were given that demonstrated the importance of having a live concierge, and a robust  
280 process for exceptions. The EBC replied that they are working on communicating with providers and  
281 employees, to educate people about why the formulary is there but also about how to obtain exceptions.  
282 They stated they will work hard on implementation to ensure the concierge service is done correctly.  
283

284 A follow-up question was asked if there is a communication plan for non-USC physicians, as people who  
285 have the PPO can see any doctor. The EBC stated they will try to educate members as best as possible, and  
286 will use Anthem Blue Cross to send letters to the physician community, but there are hundreds / thousands  
287 of providers. They plan to educate physicians at the most-visited sites (Keck, UCLA, Cedars, etc.), and ~~will~~  
288 there will be a lot of communication with the pharmacies.  
289

290 A second follow-up question was asked if part of the concierge process will be a conversation with another  
291 prescribing provider. The Committee stated that for those who are asked to switch to a drug with a similar  
292 clinical effect (but differing chemical composition), there will be a pharmacist on-staff who will do their  
293 own literature search, and who will then have a peer-to-peer discussion to determine if the drug can be  
294 used for that particular diagnosis.  
295

296 A question was asked concerning how often new drugs will be evaluated. The EBC stated they will evaluate  
297 new on- or off-market drugs every quarter.  
298

#### 299 **Announcements**

- 300 a) The Senate meeting schedule and venues for 2018-2019 is posted on the Senate website:  
301 <https://academicssenate.usc.edu/>  
302 b) The Senate End of the Year dinner will be held on Wednesday, May 1<sup>st</sup>. Cocktails: 5:00; Award  
303 Presentations: 6:00pm; Dinner: 5:30 to 8:30pm; Venue: Davidson Conference Center, Vineyard  
304 Room  
305

#### 306 **Adjournment**

307 Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.  
308

309 Respectfully submitted,  
310

311  
312  
313  
314



315 Ashley Uyeshiro Simon  
316 Secretary General of the Academic Senate