

ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
February 19, 2020 Meeting
Hall of Faculty, Doheny Memorial Library (DML) 121
Zoom access: <https://zoom.us/j/706620956>
2:00 - 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

	<u>Approx. Times</u>
1. Call to Order – Rebecca Lonergan, Senate President	2:00 pm
2. Approval of January Senate meeting draft minutes Daniel Pecchenino, Administrative Vice President	2:00 - 2:05 pm
3. Dialogue with President Carol Folt & Provost Chip Zukoski	2:05 - 3:00 pm
a. Budget considerations of interest to faculty: - fair pay increases for faculty (e.g., RTPC faculty) - classrooms need renovations - paying not only for students' financial aid but also support services (i.e. Norman Topping Scholarship Fund)	
b. Shared governance & the role of faculty councils	
c. USC's position re: divestiture from fossil-fuel industry & reinvestment in clean energy sector	
4. Presentation re Presidential Working Group on Sustainability Dan Mazmanian, Chair of the Working Group See attached list of WG members and Recommendations	2:45 - 3:15 pm
5. Discussion regarding OCAP proposed resolutions See attached Resolution from Gould and "Open Letter"	3:15 - 3:55 pm
6. New Business?	3:55 pm.

Announcements

- (a) March 2: deadline to receive nominations for the Distinguished Faculty Service and Walter Wolf Awards
- (b) Next Senate meeting March 11

ADJOURNMENT

Presidential Working Group on Sustainable Education, Research, and Operations

1. Paul Adler
Vice President, USC Academic Senate
Harold Quinton Chair in Business Policy
USC Marshall School of Business
2. Christina Bellantoni
Director of the Annenberg Media Center
Professor of Professional Practice
USC Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism
3. Marlon Boarnet
Department Chair, Urban Policy and Spatial Analysis
Professor of Public Policy
USC Price School of Public Policy
4. Stephen Bradforth
Divisional Dean for Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Professor of Chemistry
USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
5. Ellen Dux
Associate Director, USC Office of Sustainability
6. Mark Ewalt
Executive Director, USC Administrative Operations
7. Elizabeth Graddy
Executive Vice Provost
Jeffrey J. Miller Chair in Government, Business, and the Economy
Price School of Public Policy
8. Nicholas Hudson
Project Specialist, USC Office of the President
9. Nathaniel Hyman
Undergraduate Student Representative
Bachelor of Science in Public Policy
USC Price School of Public Policy
Class of 2021
10. Kyle Konis
Assistant Professor of Architecture
USC School of Architecture
11. Andrew Lakoff
Divisional Dean for Social Sciences
Professor of Sociology
USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

12. Rebecca Lonergan
President, USC Academic Senate
Professor of Lawyering Skills
USC Gould School of Law
13. Manuel Pastor
Director, USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity
Director, USC Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration
Distinguished Professor of Sociology and American Studies and Ethnicity
USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
14. Dan Mazmanian (Chair)
Professor of Public Policy
USC Price School of Public Policy
15. Rob McConnell
Professor of Preventative Medicine
Keck School of Medicine of USC
16. Mahta Moghaddam
Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering
USC Viterbi School of Engineering
17. Marty Sargeant
Chief Operating Officer
Keck Medical Center of USC
18. Gale Sinatra
Stephen H. Crocker Professor of Education
Rossier School of Education
19. Tianna Shaw-Wakeman
Student Representative
Bachelor of Art and Master of Science in Psychology and Social Entrepreneurship
USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences and Marshall School of Business
20. Detlof von Winterfeldt
J.A. Tiberti Chair in Ethics and Decisionmaking
Professor of Industrial and Systems Engineering
Viterbi School of Engineering
Professor of Public Policy
Price School of Public Policy
21. Charles Zukoski (ex officio)
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Shelley and Ofer Nemirovsky Provost's Chair

**President's Working Group on Sustainable Education, Research, and Operations
Recommendations for undergraduate and graduate sustainable education**

December 2019

Sustainability education and research at USC aims to advance understanding of the threats posed by climate change and other dangerous environmental trends to the well-being of people and planet.

UNDERGRADUATE

Recommendation for Two Foundational Undergraduate Courses in Sustainability

Objective – To equip every undergraduate student to chart their own course of education and civic engagement with sufficient awareness of the threats posed by climate change and other dangerous environmental trends to the well-being of people and planet.

Strategy: Require all undergraduates to take two Foundational Sustainability courses that focus on how the existential threat of climate change is understood and approached through the lens of the school/field/discipline offering the course(s).

Implementation:

1. Introductory Sustainability Course

- *Require* every student to take an introductory course in Sustainability in their freshman year/first two semesters.
- *Allow* Sustainability introductory courses to be “GE tagged” (double counted) if they satisfy an existing GE or freshman-writing requirement.

2. Experiential Learning Sustainability Course

- *Require* every student to take a Sustainability experiential learning course or a supervised Sustainability research activity as a condition of graduation during their tenure at USC

3. General Provisions for Foundational Sustainability Courses

- Enrollment in Sustainability introductory and experiential courses should be seamless (*no D clearance*).
- Introductory and experiential Sustainability courses offered jointly across schools/fields/disciplines with joint-attribution should be encouraged.
- Joint-school/field/discipline introductory courses should be supported by school(s) and the university.
- Class size for experiential learning courses should be limited to 20-25 students.
- The pedagogy of experiential learning will vary, including though not limited to team projects and research on campus and in the community, field-based projects and research, client-sponsored projects and research, service-focused projects and research, individual directed field projects and research.

- Sustainability designated courses should be prominently displayed and accessible for enrollment by all USC undergraduate students.
- The number, name, and enrollment of undergraduate Sustainability-designated courses should be collected annually by the offering schools and shared with the Provost.

Recommendations for Advanced Undergraduate Sustainable Education

Objective – To create options that allow interested undergraduates to pursue majors and minors focused on sustainability, unconstrained by the various administrative/budgetary boundaries of departments and schools

Strategy: Create incentives and support for USC schools that are committed to providing in-depth sustainable education and co-curricular activities. Schools that make this commitment should be recognized through designation as a *USC Sustainability School*. The designation would ensure the School of recognition and priority in university support and funding.

Implementation:

- Request for Sustainability School designation should be approved by the faculty and administration of the school, and university governing bodies.
- Sustainability Schools should be required to provide:
 - **A Vision Statement**
A school-relevant definition of sustainability as it relates to its fields/disciplines to guide faculty, students, and class creation, approved by the Provost.
 - **Sustainability Minors**
Provide one or more Sustainability minors within the school as extension of the foundational Sustainability courses in the school.
Participate in joint-school/field/discipline Sustainability minors.
 - **Sustainability Majors**
Develop as many Sustainability majors as feasible.
Develop as many joint-school and joint-fields/discipline majors as feasible.
 - **Sustainability Co-Curricular Activities**
Provide within school and participate in joint-school sustainability co-curricular activities, e.g., symposia, conferences, speaker series, artistic displays and performances, school-community activities.
- Sustainability Schools should be required to submit a 5-year *Sustainability Educational Plan* with a summary of existing activities within the school and cross-school, and new/proposed within and across schools for review and approval by the Provost.
- Approved Sustainability education 5-year school plans should undergo an internal review in the 3rd year, submitted to the Provost.

Recommendations for University Support of Sustainability Undergraduate Education

Convening and Outreach

- Host an annual USC President's sustainability campus/community event highlighting the richness of the experience in sustainability learning at USC – courses, research, co-curricular activities, Clubs, community engagement activities, etc.
- Reach out to public, private, and non-profit communities in Sustainability educational and engagement activities, within the Los Angeles region and beyond.

- Enhance USC sustainability education through participation in multi-university sustainability groups and associations.
- Reach out to other universities in collaborative sustainability efforts within the Los Angeles region and beyond.

Internal Support and Activities

- Support the development of “new” sustainability introductory and experiential learning course; joint-school, jointly taught Sustainability introductory and experiential course, and; joint school Sustainability minors and majors curriculum plans.
- Secure scholarships for sustainability majors with demonstrated commitment to sustainability in courses, co-curricular activities, and in the community.
- Encourage USC administrative to engage and mentor students, e.g. housing, residential education, orientation programs, etc.
- Produce enrollment modules for undergraduate applicants and admitted students focused on student engagement in sustainability activities/courses/research/outreach
- Produce an annual university summary of undergraduate student activities including a survey of student awareness and enrollment in sustainability courses, participation in sustainability co-curricular activities, involvement in faculty sustainability research, and level of concern with sustainability issues.

GRADUATE

Curricular Requirements

The Working Group does not recommend any university-wide courses or curricular requirements for graduate-level sustainability education or programs. This is based on the belief that the graduate curriculum should be the purview of professional and doctoral programs commensurate with market demands in their area of expertise and specialization.

University Support

The university should support development of graduate-level sustainability courses, certificates, degrees, and co-curricular activities that span two or more schools, fields or disciplines.

It should also seek student scholarship for those enrolled in multi-school Sustainability masters and doctoral degree programs as the university strives to be a place where students and faculty are at the leading edge of sustainability scholarship.

Resolution Proposed by Gould Faculty Council

WHEREAS a number of faculty members have expressed grave concerns regarding the practices and procedures of the recently established **Office of Conduct, Accountability, and Professionalism (OCAP)**, which has jurisdiction over “egregious complaints, such as hostile work environment or violence in the workplace,” that fall outside the normal process for reviewing allegations of faculty misconduct and are not the responsibility of the university offices charged with upholding legally mandated obligations (such as the Title IX office, the Office of Equity and Diversity, and the various administrative entities that oversee regulatory compliance);

WHEREAS these concerns are exacerbated by the opaque process by which OCAP itself was created;

WHEREAS the handling of similar complaints against staff members can also raise concerns;

WHEREAS the President and Provost have recognized that changes must be made in OCAP’s practices, procedures, and jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS the imposition of sanctions on faculty and staff members for allegedly egregious behavior is a very serious matter, in which the faculty and staff legitimately have a substantial interest;

Therefore, be it **RESOLVED** that the Academic Senate recommends:

1. That the President appoint a committee, which shall include members chosen by the Academic Senate and Staff Assembly, to work with the Senior Vice President for Human Resources to recommend a set of responsibilities, procedures, and standards for the administrative unit(s) that will have authority to investigate and adjudicate allegations of faculty and staff misbehavior or other transgressions that fall outside the jurisdiction of the other university offices charged with upholding the university’s legally mandated responsibilities;
2. That this committee disseminate its conclusions and recommendations to the faculty and staff, including through the Academic Senate and Staff Assembly, so that they may provide the President with comments and suggestions before any changes are adopted; and
3. That, pending the establishment of the new unit(s) and processes, all activities of OCAP be suspended and its prior judgments re-examined.

OPEN LETTER
DRAFTED BY DORNSIFE FACULTY COUNCIL ON 1-15-19

(Includes revisions proposed by faculty from the Dworak-Peck School of Social Work, the Gould School of Law, and the Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences)

OPEN LETTER from the subscribed faculty councils:

We allege that the newly established Office of Conduct, Accountability and Professionalism (OCAP), one of the divisions of the Office of Professionalism and Ethics (OPE), has not properly described its procedures to faculty and staff and that any decisions from that office therefore lack fairness and legitimacy. Without making any judgment on the substantive complaints that OCAP has been adjudicating, we hold that its procedures lack due process, have not been adequately explained to the university community or outlined in the relevant governing documents, and therefore that the decisions of that office lack prima facie legitimacy and pose a danger to the well-being of the faculty and staff as well as USC's good name.

The core mission of the faculty of the University of Southern California is to carry out teaching, research, and service that supports the intellectual and personal development of our students, improves the lives of our patients, and adds to the knowledge and wellbeing of our community and the wider world. In order to best serve that mission, we believe that all of USC's administrative procedures should reflect: core values of fairness, appropriate transparency, due process, and the norms of academic freedom; must be clearly articulated and readily accessible; and must be administered in a consistent, even-handed, and respectful fashion. What is needed is a mechanism that aims both to avert and to remedy breaches of our duties to colleagues and students, not to enforce a criminal ordinance, and that does not weaken academic freedom or undermine the vital academic and economic security of tenure and long-term employment contracts.

We understand and agree that hostile work environments outside of the purview of both the Title IX Office and the Office of Employment Discrimination do exist at USC. And we agree that the administration continues to improve its procedures for addressing this crucial issue.

In order to reform USC's culture moving forward, it is vital to correct problems in the recent past and to establish a robust and fair mechanism to address them moving forward. For this to work, however, the procedures for redress need to be transparent and respect due process for all of those involved. This must include adequate discussion with faculty and staff representatives before the procedures are set in place, and a careful and deliberative analysis of best practices for handling workplace complaints at USC. Instead, the central administration quickly organized and launched OCAP in spring 2018 without meaningful input from faculty that we know of. The procedures have never been adequately explained or communicated to faculty and staff. (Ironically, even the official policy statement that accompanies the "Harassment Training" that faculty recently had to

complete includes nothing about the OCAP procedures.) Equally disturbing, OCAP has been staffed in part with former police investigators whose interview strategies and tactics are better suited to criminal settings than to conflicts in an academic environment, and who have a poor understanding of the administrative and academic specific to universities. The choice of criminal investigators for human resource inquiries has not been explained.

For these several reasons, we assert that the current configuration of OCAP is unsupportable and its activities should be suspended and reviewed immediately by a specially appointed committee of faculty selected by the Academic Senate, staff from the Staff Assembly, and representatives from central administration. All past and ongoing sanctions against faculty based on OCAP investigations should be included in this review, including an examination of how investigations were conducted, and when appropriate, the committee should have authority to revise or nullify previous and ongoing sanctions. Further, and taking appropriate account of the principles, objectives, and cautions set forth above, the central administration should work with the Academic Senate, as well as the Staff Assembly, to construct new means to address problems of the sort that had been assigned to OCAP and that cannot be handled by the school deans or the University's Human Resources Office.

Signed,