

1
2 **ACADEMIC SENATE**
3

4 **UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**

5 Meeting of November 20, 2019

6 Doheny Memorial Library, Room 121

7 2:00 - 4:00 p.m.
8

9 **Present:** P. Adler, S. Ahmadi, Y. Bar-Cohen, B. Blair, S. Bucher, T.A. Brun, P. Cannon, J. Cederbaum, D. Crombecque,
10 G. Davison, A. Elefano (alternate for M. Daniels-Rauterkus), E. Fife, R. Filback, D. Griffiths, L. Gross, S. Gupta, L. Holding,
11 J. Israel, A. Imre, M. Jacobson (alternate for C. Pike), G. Kung (alternate for D. Armstrong), R. Labaree, R. Lonergan,
12 T.J. McCarthy, J. Parr, D. Pecchenino, G. Polidori, G. Ragusa, C. Redfearn, A.U. Simon, C. Tucker, G. Ulkumen, J.Walker,
13 T. Wattenbarger, A.G. Wilcox, A. Wu, A. Zoto

14 **Absent:** M. Crowley

15 **Present Online:** M. Apostolos, B. Belcher, L. Grazette, A. Mackay, D. O'Leary, C. Park, J. Pascarella, M. Press, C. Resnik
16 (alternate for J. McLaughlin Gray), S. Rich, T. Sandmier, A. V. Speybroeck, S. Wickersheimer, G. Zada
17

18 **Guests Present:** R.E. Cislowski, D. Kelly, M. Levine, B. Shuster, C. Zukoski
19
20

21 **AGENDA**
22

23 Rebecca Lonergan, Academic Senate President, called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm.
24

25 **Approval of October Senate Meeting Draft Minutes**

26 Ashley Uyeshiro Simon, Secretary General, presented the October 2019 draft minutes for discussion and
27 approval.
28

29 *Chimene Tucker moved to approve the minutes; Jessica Parr seconded. Motion passed with 30 in favor, 0*
30 *opposed, and 2 abstentions.*
31

32 **Nominating Committee Introduction of Candidates and Vote**

33 Paul Adler, Academic Vice President, asked for nominations from the floor of candidates to serve on the
34 Nominating Committee, which is charged with creating a slate of candidates to serve on the Executive
35 Board. No nominations from the floor were offered. [Each candidate](#) then briefly introduced themselves, as
36 [short bios](#) had already been distributed prior to the meeting. Ballots were then completed and collected,
37 with results scheduled to be announced at the end of the meeting.
38

39 **Dialogue with Provost Zukoski**

40 Provost Zukoski began by offering the Senate brief updates regarding various priorities he and President
41 Folt have been discussing:

- 42 • Improving affordability for students to assure diversity of socioeconomic status, focusing on
43 undergraduates first
- 44 • Sustainability research, education for students, and operations (including transportation)
- 45 • Early discussions following the [announcement of the Lord Foundation of California gift](#) of \$260M of
46 how these funds might be spent, as the gift is technically unrestricted
- 47 • Efforts to support students in crisis this semester, including 40 faculty who have volunteered their
48 time to offer counseling to students, expanded mental health care on campus throughout the
49 semester, and suggested faculty talking points to assist students in crisis that were just sent out
- 50 • Exploring the issues around our current investigation processes, as well as possible solutions to
51 these issues
- 52 • Looking at budget cycles to better understand our incomes and expenditures and why our costs are
53 rising faster than our revenues, determine what we are going to do regarding tuition, distributions,

54 “taxes” on units, and more

55
56 Lonergan stated she is working with people from administrative finance to offer faculty education about
57 the University’s budgets and financial flow. Rob Filback, Senator for Rossier, stated their Faculty Council
58 was able to host two such educational sessions with their faculty that were very helpful in better
59 understanding their own school budget later. Lonergan offered to coordinate the same presentation for
60 any Faculty Council or school faculty meeting, and asked interested Senators to contact her.

61
62 Questions were taken from the floor. A question was asked about whether any budget issues were related
63 to payouts from the George Tyndall class action settlement. Zukoski replied USC carries a lot of insurance
64 which can cover some of the claims against us, but there are many things in flux that could affect how
65 much of the claims insurance will actually cover, and he is not able to give more specific numbers at this
66 time, but more clarity should be forthcoming. A suggestion was made that faculty (particularly RTPC)
67 salaries be addressed and discussed as part of the conversation around budget, as the cost of living in Los
68 Angeles gets higher. Zukoski agreed it would be important to make this a clear priority, and that while he
69 has influence, many issues with increasing faculty salaries create complicated trade-offs at the local (unit)
70 level that are important to understand in relation to many other needs around campus and within units.

71
72 A question was asked about how affordability for our students relates to budgets; Zukoski replied most of
73 our money for undergraduate scholarships comes from tuition (\$.30 of every dollar), and that we have a
74 high tuition, high scholarship model. He stated it would be difficult to increase the amount of scholarships
75 without increasing tuition and acknowledged this affects each school differently due to differences in
76 student body makeup. Another question was asked about the possibility of having differing tuition rates for
77 those going into professions which are not highly paid. Zukoski stated this is being discussed, but it is
78 complicated considering the current Revenue Center Management (RCM) model.

79
80 A concern was voiced about the new governance criteria for the Board of Trustees relating to age, and
81 Zukoski stated he would be happy to bring this issue up with the Board.

82
83 A question was asked if any of our budget is going towards counseling and expanding help for students and
84 crises. Zukoski stated the number of student counselors has been increased by 50% this year, and the fifth
85 floor of Engemann Student Health Center has recently opened for psychiatry services. Forty faculty have
86 also volunteered for counseling in the short-term. He stated this is where they have chosen to prioritize
87 funding for now, but we likely would not be able to support long-term, intensive mental-health care like
88 this for most members of our community. To try to avoid crises like the recent ones, Varun Soni has been
89 working for a long time to develop upstream efforts to help students be more resilient and well. This is a
90 problem that many universities are experiencing nation-wide. Zukoski elaborated we should think about
91 what success means to us as an educational institution, that it is not just about knowledge but also success
92 as human beings. He stated this is ultimately a faculty decision, and that we are the point of asking
93 ourselves these questions that do not have clear solutions as of yet.

94
95 A follow-up question was asked regarding how we are communicating with students about the dangers of
96 drug use. Zukoski stated there are indications that drugs and mixing drugs have played a role in the recent
97 student deaths, but a lot of information still lies with the coroner or is not shared out of respect for family
98 requests for confidentiality. He clarified two communications about drug use went out to students about
99 this, including information about fentanyl moving into the recreational drug space, and encouraged faculty
100 to talk with students about the issue.

101
102 **Explanation and First Read of Proposed Handbook Changes**

103 Sandeep Gupta (Co-Chair), Paula Cannon (Co-Chair), and Steve Bucher (member) of the Handbook
104 Committee presented the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook for discussion. Cannon stated any
105 changes to the Handbook must have two readings in the Senate; this is the first reading, and next month
106 will be the second reading with a vote to be conducted afterwards. These changes stemmed from pain

107 points heard from faculty about investigations after a complaint has been made about a faculty member,
108 but clarified that while the two current proposed changes are issues that could immediately improve the
109 process, they will continue to improve more issues after this.

110
111 Cannon provided a [graphic](#) to give clarity about what may happen if a complaint is filed against a faculty
112 member, but explained this graphic is not currently in the Handbook. The committee also provided a [red-
113 line document of the proposed changes](#). Cannon and Gupta explained the steps of the investigative process
114 as outlined in the graphic and red-line document. Gupta noted the “investigative offices” includes many
115 different bodies depending on the complaint (e.g., Office of Equity and Diversity, Office of Research, Office
116 of Compliance), and that while harassment is described in the Handbook to an extent, other issues are not
117 as thoroughly explained. Cannon highlighted the two currently proposed changes:

- 118 1. The Sanctioning Panel determines the appropriate sanction, based on the investigative offices’
119 findings and conclusions (violation of any policies). Currently, there is no opportunity for the
120 accused or accuser to communicate mitigating or aggravating circumstances to the Sanctioning
121 Panel. The proposed change is to allow the accused and accuser to have the option of sending a
122 two-page letter about mitigating or aggravating circumstances relevant to the sanctioning decision
123 to the Sanctioning Panel prior to a decision.
- 124 2. Currently after the faculty member has been notified that they have been found in violation of a
125 university policy and a sanction has been imposed, they have seven calendar days to appeal either
126 the finding or the sanction. This seemed like a very short window, especially given that it can take
127 many months to reach the sanctions process and decision. The proposed change is to increase this
128 window to appeal from seven to 30 calendar days.

129
130 A question was asked if the Sanctioning Panel receives full investigative reports. Cannon stated the
131 Sanctioning Panel does receive the charges, results, and findings, with some sort of explanation. Lonergan
132 clarified the Sanctioning Panel sometimes receives the full report, but this changes depending on the
133 investigative body, so she is working on ensuring the full report is always given.

134
135 A question was posed about why there can be tenure/tenure-track (T/TT) faculty on an RTPC sanctioning
136 panel, but not RTPC faculty on a T/TT panel. Gupta replied this is something that is throughout the
137 Handbook, and is a bigger issue than just for sanctioning. The issue was noted by Lonergan.

138
139 Jerry Davison, Co-Chair of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee (FR&R), noted the human cost
140 of procedures that are not well spelled-out, including faculty who are currently dealing with the seven-day
141 appeals window, and not being able to appeal a misconduct finding until after a sanction has been
142 imposed. Cannon clarified that since the Handbook Committee decided to include this language, the Office
143 of Conduct, Accountability, and Professionalism (OCAP) and the Office of Professionalism and Ethics (OPE)
144 have also changed their letters to reflect the current appellate procedures.

145
146 A recommendation was made to include the graphic that explains the misconduct investigation process in
147 the handbook. Lonergan stated they are discussing having graphics and processes made clearer with the
148 investigative offices now. She also stated the Senate will discuss how to improve our misconduct
149 investigations more in-depth in future meetings, starting with OCAP at the next meeting.

150 **Discussion regarding Revised Resolution 19/20-02 (Misconduct Investigations)**

151 Lonergan stated based on the conversation at the previous Senate meeting, the Executive Board modified
152 the language in the Resolution to shift towards an analysis of the root-cause of our recent scandals and
153 steps that have been taken and will be taken to address issues found. The language in [Revised Resolution
154 19/20-02](#) was also expanded to include all of the problems USC has faced (not just the Puliafito case). Adler
155 added this Resolution is not only asking for causes common to all the scandals, but both common and
156 specific causes. He stated he and Lonergan have clearly expressed the need for something specific and
157 detailed to the President and Provost.
158
159

160 A comment was made that this request feels very broad, and it was suggested the Senate ask for separate,
161 individualized reports for each scandal by changing “analysis” to “analyses” in line 29. Lonergan stated if
162 we receive a report without enough specificity we will ask for more. She also stated Folt has assured
163 Lonergan she will be discussing this report with the Senate as it is being completed.
164

165 A suggestion was made to add a time dimension to the Resolution. Lonergan stated there had been
166 discussions of writing a deadline into the resolution, but due to the desire for thoroughness, a timeline was
167 omitted. She noted this report may come in separate pieces, as administration provides what they can,
168 when they can.
169

170 A suggestion was made to add the athletic admissions scandal to the list in the third paragraph. An
171 argument was made that the athletic issues are larger than just admissions, and that the two should be
172 separated. Lonergan stated President Folt is setting up a working group to do a deep-dive into athletics, like
173 she did at the University of North Carolina.
174

175 Sentiment was voiced that the Senate should be the voice of the faculty without worrying about how the
176 President will respond. Lonergan stated this Resolution is just the start; we will follow up by having Folt at
177 the Senate meetings and asking her important questions for discussion.
178

179 *Jessica Parr moved to approve Resolution 19/20-02 with the following modifications:*

- 180 1. *Line 17: add “admissions, athletic programs,”*
- 181 2. *Line 29: change “analysis” to “written analyses”*

182 *Rob Filback seconded. Motion passed with 38 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.*
183
184

185 **First Read and Discussion regarding Proposed Resolution 19/20-03 (Direct Elections of Board)**

186 Adler introduced [Proposed Resolution 19/20-03](#) by stating the Task Force on Shared Governance has been
187 working on this issue for the past year, and believes if faculty at-large elected the Senate Executive Board,
188 it may be a way to engage more people. The current system leaves faculty at a considerable distance from
189 their Senate leadership, as faculty elect their Faculty Councils, who then elect a Chair and/or Senator, who
190 then elect an Executive Board.
191

192 Adler went on to state the Nominating Committee will continue to work toward a diverse, balanced slate,
193 but allowing direct write-in nominations (as last year’s elections did) in conjunction with direct elections
194 could inadvertently create slate that does not reflect the diversity in our faculty. Therefore, this Resolution
195 suggests restricting write-in nominations to the At-Large Executive Board positions, but not for Senate
196 officers (Administrative and Academic VPs). He stated this Resolution would add more specificity to the
197 charge of the Nominating Committee, and it also notes and corrects a discrepancy between the 2019
198 Faculty Handbook, Ch. 2, section 2-B (1) and the Senate Constitution, where the “Faculty Assembly” is
199 defined. It was clarified that the Handbook has already been modified, but the Resolution is to modify the
200 Senate Constitution to reflect the Handbook and be more inclusive of part-time faculty.
201

202 A concern was voiced about how direct elections could be biased due to school size differences. Adler
203 responded that the Nominating Committee will create a ballot that minimizes that risk, and to the extent
204 that the risk persists, it is arguably offset by the benefit of improved faculty engagement overall.
205

206 A question was raised about the inclusion of part-time and Emeriti faculty in the “Faculty Assembly” that is
207 able to cast votes. Lonergan stated as the “Faculty Assembly” is currently defined, part-time faculty (no
208 matter what percent appointment they have) would be allowed to vote for the semester they are teaching.
209 In addition, after looking at current faculty voting rights in the various schools, about 75% of our schools
210 allow part-time faculty to vote for Faculty Councils, so changing this would mean taking voting rights away
211 from a lot of people. She also clarified that schools must allow part-time faculty to serve if desired, but are
212 not required to provide them with a vote. It was noted that defining which part-time faculty could or could

213 not vote would be very difficult, and that most people who are only teaching one class may not vote
214 anyway.

215
216 Another question was raised about whether part-time faculty could be voted into the Executive Board, due
217 to the need to pay for their service (in addition to paying for normal duties). Lonergan clarified there is a
218 University policy that part-time faculty be allowed to serve and be paid to serve, and that the school is
219 ultimately responsible for paying for any time serving.

220
221 Jerry Walker, Senator from the Emeriti College, commented retired faculty would be very pleased to be
222 asked to participate in direct elections.

223

224 **Announcement of the result of the Nominating Committee election**

225 Adler announced the Senators who were elected to serve on the Nominating Committee:

- 226 • Todd Andrew Brun, Viterbi School of Engineering
- 227 • Julie Cederbaum, Suzanne Dworak-Peck School of Social Work
- 228 • Luanda Grazette, Keck School of Medicine
- 229 • Jessica Parr, Dornsife College

230 These Senators will serve on the Nominating Committee alongside the four members of the Executive
231 Board as outlined in [Bylaw 10](#):

- 232 • Rebecca Lonergan, President of the Faculty, Gould School of Law
- 233 • Paul Adler, Academic Vice President, Marshall School of Business
- 234 • Dan Pecchenino, Administrative Vice President, Dornsife College
- 235 • Alison Wilcox, Executive Board Member-At-Large, Keck School of Medicine

236

237 **New Business**

238 No new business was discussed or brought forward.

239

240 **Announcements**

- 241 a) The next Senate meeting is on Dec. 11, 2019 at 2pm in DML 121.
- 242 b) Please hold February 7-8, 2019 for the Joint Provost/Senate Retreat. Venue: The Westin
243 Bonaventure Hotel & Suites, DTLA; Topic TBD.

244

245 **Adjournment**

246 Meeting was adjourned at 3:57 pm.

247

248 Respectfully submitted,

249

250

251

252

253

254 Ashley Uyeshiro Simon

255 Secretary General of the Academic Senate