ACADEMIC SENATE

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


Absent: S. Ahmadi, S. Asgharzadeh, L. Grazzette, A. Justice, M. Mohammadi, J. Musso, J. Steele, S. Wickersheimer


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
Bar-Cohen reminded the Senate that there is a town hall-type forum on Tuesday, March 19th from 4:00-5:30pm, hosted by the Senate, Staff Assembly, Undergraduate Student Government, and Graduate Student Government. Our various groups will be able to talk about the issues that affect all of us, with members of the administration (including President Austin) there to listen as well. There will be a room on HSC for people to remotely participate. There will not be remote participation from other locations at this time, but we need to think about this for future forums.

Bar-Cohen asked Senators to email him with ideas for potential topics of this forum, which he will discuss with the Senate Executive Board and the other bodies to set the agenda. President Austin can also give input about topics she would like to address as well, but the agenda will be set by the four governing bodies.

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

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

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

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

**Information Security Risk**

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

The presenters then compared current policies to proposed policies and drew attention to three
particular areas: acceptable use, data protection and third-party security risk management. They
stressed that these policies will require a tailored approach to certain projects, and that if an
exception is needed because it is preventing a faculty from doing their work, they will work with
that person to make an exception.

The presenters requested the Senate work with them to give input, think about how the new
policies will impact faculty work, and raise awareness that these policy changes are happening.
They stated that they have presented this information to the Executive Board, the Committee on
Information Services, some deans, and the Information Risk Committee that has faculty
representation. They requested the Senate review at least the three policies highlighted above,
and contact them if there are questions.

A question was asked if there is information that can be brought back to the school Faculty
Councils. The presenters stated they can provide a “kit” with FAQs as well as a Sharepoint site that
lists policies and changes to policies. They are also willing to do a presentation if requested. They
requested faculty reach out to them if anyone believes they could benefit from having more
engagement on the front-end of this update.

Another question was asked about Keck’s involvement with these policies; the presenters stated
that they are working with Keck to look at hospital policies in an effort to have more alignment. It
was also clarified that these policies presented today are baseline policies for the University, and
that schools or units can create their own policies that go beyond these if needed.

Dialogue with Provost Michael Quick

Provost Quick stated he looked forward to the Joint Provost/Senate Retreat this weekend, to
discuss what we can do better as a university. He stated the Presidential Search is down to the
finalist stage. Quick gave an update on Dean searches as well, stating that the Dworak-Peck Dean
search is in a holding pattern waiting for the new president to be announced, but they are working
on developing a short list from their pool of candidates. For the Marshall School of Business, Quick
and Andrew Guzman are co-chairing the Dean search, and the Marshall faculty search committee
met recently for the first time. They have contracted with a search firm to help them in this
search.

Regarding Deans’ reviews, Quick stated Andrew Guzman (Gould) is currently up for his first
renewal, and they are implementing the new processes discussed previously at Senate meetings.
They will use the Gould Faculty Council to collect and summarize faculty input. There will be a
smaller committee, with members jointly chosen by Quick and Bar-Cohen as President of the
Senate, who will take the Faculty Council summary along with other information from the Office
of Professionalism and Ethics and other investigatory units to advise in the review so there is
faculty input throughout the process. Quick stated he also just met with the Rossier and Price
Faculty Councils to discuss the upcoming Dean reviews for those schools. He has upcoming
meetings with those Deans, as well as President Austin, to determine if both parties are interested
in continuing. The Rossier Faculty Council later thanked Quick for having a candid conversation
with them.

Quick stated in the search for a Vice President for Student Affairs, he has reached out to faculty,
staff, and students seeking input about what we should change in our Student Affairs operations.
He also thanked the Sustainability Committee for their work and stated he would like to put
together a university-wide initiative on research and education for sustainability, to circumvent
siloing and duplication of efforts. Quick also reported the Research Committee is discussing undergraduate research, how it relates to courses, loads, mentoring, and teaching, and stated he would like to have a unified approach on this in the future.

Regarding shared governance, Quick stated it has been great to have Bar-Cohen attend the Provost cabinet meetings every other week. He also stated that in the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees which he co-chairs with David Bohnett, they had great substantive conversations with the Senate Executive Board at the last meeting, and they have invited the entire Executive Board back to the next meeting as well.

A question was asked if there is a rubric of Dean priorities for use when Faculty Councils are asking for input during a Dean’s review. Quick stated he tries to leave things open to what is important at each School. For example, Gould was given a template of questions, then the school could add or modify questions. He stated that there just needs to be alignment between what the faculty and the Dean are asked to reflect upon. A follow-up question about considering length of Dean terms was posed; Quick stated he is a proponent for soft term limits, in which a dean may be eligible for two terms, but then may need to compete with outside candidates for a third term. He noted that he believes this should apply to the Provost as well and stated he will continue to advocate for this as he has in the past. Another follow-up question was asked regarding whether the Board is looking at term limits for the presidency; Quick stated he does not get this sense, but this is something he will pass on. He stated they are looking at their own governance now, including possible term limits for Board members.

A question was posed about what metrics of teaching will be applied to the Dean’s review; if Deans will be asked to justify their effectiveness in enhancing teaching quality. Quick stated that the review done in the dean’s fourth year of their five-year term needs to be more prescriptive in this way, as the annual reviews he does with Deans are very prescriptive. He stated that he would like to get input from the Senate about the content of items he requests from Deans about their progress.

A comment was made that a barrier to sustainability and undergraduate research is competition between Schools, and that these things may not be resolved unless the funding and power dynamics of centralized and decentralized systems work at USC. Quick stated that looking at these systems quickly leads to larger questions such as what counts as a unit of teaching, when faculty should get credit for mentoring, and more. He stated we need to rethink our Revenue Center Management (RCM) system because in his opinion this is why we have siloes, and we should think about where the funding should be located.

**USC Financial Report**

Bar-Cohen stated that we will be learning about USC’s financial organization in this meeting as a primer for the retreat this weekend as we are talking about siloes and Revenue Center Management. This idea stemmed from the Committee on Finance and Enrollment (CoFE) that
thought this would be a good opportunity to work through a few misunderstandings about our finances and how they work.

Erik Brink, USC Comptroller and Greg Condell, VP for Finance presented the 2018 USC Financial Report. The presenters focused on the page 12 net income statement, which shows the revenues for the year as just under $5B (which does not include endowment performance), and operating expenses of $4.8B. The net increase is $108M, which is a thin margin relative to the size of the operation but is to be expected from a non-profit organization.

Continuing on page 12, the presenters reported that our biggest source of revenue is tuition, but we give back $556M in financial aid, so our net income from tuition is $1.48B. Healthcare services are the next largest source of revenue. Line 22 shows the “spendable” portion from the endowment ($236M) that is made available to the schools, which has a floor and ceiling so the academic units know about how much they will get.

A question was asked about the difference between direct and indirect costs and expenses. Pages 36 until the end of the report break down designated (e.g., contracts and grants, received gifts, completed research), undesignated (current unrestricted operating budget; driven by tuition), and total budgets. Page 38-41 show budgets for each school.

It was clarified that the direct revenue comes from tuition, then financial aid and facilities fund costs are subtracted. The indirect revenue lines were clarified: “Participation” was the tax on tuition, which is accumulated into a provost account to be redistributed to schools and programs; “Academic Initiatives” is money coming back to the school; “Provost Initiatives” is similarly money coming back to the school for Provost initiatives; “Graduate Programs” comes from a different money source and are grants to support PhD students as described on page 45. A clarification was made that participation tax rates vary by school and type of revenue; after the general education credits were changed, USC switched from uniform participation taxes to unique rates to accommodate for those changes. However, the participation tax rates range from 9.4-10%, so there is minimal variability. Most schools are at 10% to fund strategic initiatives.

Direct expenses include things like faculty salaries. Indirect expenses are central costs and facilities fees. Thirty-three cents per dollar is accumulated towards benefits such as health benefits, retirement contributions, tuition remission, and more.

It was stated that USC’s list price makes USC look very expensive. However, with the amount of financial aid we give out on average, we are not that high in cost.

A question was asked if there is a sense of what budgets might look like in the next few years. The presenters surmised administration will continue to support keeping tuition low, but this means there will be less income. Another question was posed about whether there are mechanisms in place to ensure our investments reflect the values of this university. The presenters asked that these types of questions be directed to the Chief Investment Officer.

Announcements
(b) The Senate meeting schedule and venues for 2018 - 2019 is posted on the Senate website: https://academicsenate.usc.edu
New Business

None reported.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Uyeshiro Simon
Secretary General of the Academic Senate