

Academic Senate
Meeting of September 18, 2013
University Club, Scriptorium Room

MINUTES

Present: M. Apostolos, D. Blaine, B. Brown, L. Carver, G. Clark, E. Collins, S. Curran, C. Daley, D. Davies, R. Davila, B. Edwards, C. Gomer, H. Greenwald, J. Kagan, J. Kunc, R. Labaree, A. Lakoff, P. Liebig, T. Lyon, M. Marx, O. Mayer, S. Mosley, K. Murphy, L. Palinkas, B. Rathbun (alternate for A. Crigler), D. Richter, P. Riley, P. Rosenbloom, D. Ruddell, M. Schroeder, J. Silvester, A. Trope, E. Webb, R. Weisberg

Absent: R. Ben-Ari, P. Cannon, P. Conti, Y. DeClerck, G. Miller, A. Ouellette, S. Palmer, R. Paulson

Guests: A. Carry, E. Garrett, K. Howell, B. Kosko, M. Levine, J. Moore, M. Safonov, F. Udwadia, C. Zachary

President Charles Gomer called the meeting to order at 2:02pm:

1. Dialogue with Provost Elizabeth Garrett

It has been another great year. We have had more undergraduate applicants than ever - more than 47K. This is the 3rd or 4th largest pool of any private university. Our admit rate is 19.8% and will include 2922 freshmen. We typically aim for 2650, but it is good to overshoot our target. All schools are over-enrolled. Our current yield is circa 31% - we are aiming for 40%.

The entering class is in the 95th percentile in SAT scores - this reflects an increase of 8 points. Average GPA is 3.73. 22% of the class are under-represented minorities. There is no majority ethnic or racial class. It is comprised of 51% female, 49% male students. 21% are SCIONS and 15% are international students. 48 states are represented - no one from the Dakotas. We are showing better regional diversity; less than 1/2 the class is from California.

Transfer students are down a bit but still over target. This year we had 1450; last year 1600. The yield rate on transfer students is 58%

We have had 35,500 applications in traditional graduate programs, with another 2,700 in online programs. This includes 532 new PhD students, down from last year at 618. This is not troubling - it is better to have smaller numbers but higher quality. The number of professional doctorates is also down at 782. This is largely because fewer people are opting to go to law school.

We have 4721 enrolled in traditional master's programs - 400 more than last year. Online we are up to around 1,000, which reflect an increase from 853 last year.

Q: Our yield rate at 31% - are these the students we want? How do we compare?

A: Stanford is in the 90's. Some of our schools are that high - Cinema is in the 90's as well. The fact is that we are relatively new into the top 25 and we are now competing against schools such as Penn, Stanford, Yale, UCLA and Berkeley. It is hard to get a high yield rate when we are going for the very top students. The University Village will be a big draw, including a much

46 expanded honors college, but we will never be at a 90% yield rate. Dornsife drives the numbers
47 - their yield is around 23% as is Viterbi.
48

49 **2a. Introduction of Ainsley Carry, Vice Provost for Student Affairs – Elizabeth Garrett**
50 Ainsley began at USC on August 1st. He came to the interview with a tremendous amount of
51 energy and was without exception our top choice. He knew more about USC during interview
52 than anyone in the room. Prior to coming to USC, Ainsley held positions at SMU, University of
53 Arkansas, University of Florida, Temple and finally at Auburn where he oversaw 15 units.
54

55 **2b. Comments by Ainsley Carry**

56 One of my primary goals is to see how student affairs can be more engaged in the academic
57 mission of the university. Many things shape the structure and focus of this goal:
58 USC is a 21st century global research institution. Hosting students from around the globe
59 changes the parameters about how we think of student affairs. 50% are graduate students - we
60 must think about student life for grad students who have different needs. At many institutions,
61 the office of student affairs was born out of undergraduate needs.
62

63 We must focus on a commitment to student success - in academic, personal and career terms.
64 We will look at our programs through this lens - does this help the student graduate? Achieve
65 personal goals? This shouldn't only be left up to academic units.
66

67 These priorities are forcing us to rethink student affairs at a very exciting pace.
68

69 Structural priorities:

70 Operational Efficiency: we must be good stewards of funding and finance. We must do the best
71 with the resources we have and review what we are doing.
72

73 Student Health and Wellness: there are health initiatives all over campus. The question is, how
74 do students know to access these opportunities? We want to increase accessibility. Faculty need
75 to be on the front line in seeing challenging mental health issues in the classroom. More and
76 more students are in college who are taking care of a mental health issue because of improved
77 medical treatment.
78

79 Student Advocacy and Support: We have a team that works 24/7 on crisis management, in
80 addition to the Center for Women and Men. We want to have programs in place for students
81 with learning disabilities.
82

83 Student Engagement: This involves what students do in recreational facilities, student
84 government, Greek life, etc. All of this needs to be focused on student success. We want to
85 spend more time doing high impact practices - bringing to bear things they learn in the classroom
86 in to real life experiences outside the classroom.
87

88 Q: Internships are becoming increasingly important, but I know from personal experience that
89 there are paid and unpaid internships. Concerns have been raised about the exploitation of
90 students. How do we monitor these and identify when red flags are raised?
91

92 A: (Elizabeth Garrett) Michael Quick is taking a hard look at internships that are for credit but
93 not paid. We want to make sure that anything for which a student receives credit is rigorous and
94 academic. We anticipate changes in oversight to ensure that these are meaningful experiences.
95 (Ainsley) We are creating a more integrated approach to career services by collaborating with
96 schools to think about career development in each area.

97

98 Q: What about the party incident with LAPD last spring?

99 A: I met with those students before I came to campus. They are very actively working with DPS
100 to ensure that DPS is the first line in response, with LAPD as backup. The students are
101 interested in how to move forward and make the community heal. LAPD still has to issue their
102 report and we will be ready. We don't know when this will be.

103

104 **3. Approval of May Senate Meeting Minutes**

105 21 yes; 0 opposed.

106

107 **4. August Planning Report Preliminary Report – President Gomer**

108

109 Both President Nikias and Provost Garrett attended. The retreat covered four major topics: 1)
110 The Future of Teaching, 2) Faculty Health Promotion, 3) Research Activities - Bridge Funding,
111 etc., 4) Faculty Governance

112

113 The Senate Executive Board will invite each of the moderators to formulate a report in their
114 areas and then they will be invited to share their reports at a full Senate Meeting to explore ways
115 in moving forward.

116

117 **5. Plans for This Year's Committee on Teaching and Academic Programs - Andrew Lakoff**

118 Last year the committee took a hard look at USC's online educational strategies. This year we
119 are looking at the issue of academic integrity in a rapidly changing climate. This is partly driven
120 by a shift in technology, where laptops, etc. are ubiquitous in the classroom. We also have a
121 changing demographic in the university, one that is requiring us to better communicate what it
122 means to be a good citizen in an academic community.

123

124 C: There is a problem with grade inflation. Several programs require students to have a 3.0 in
125 their area to graduate. A professor gets punished if they give a C.

126

127 A: I don't know if this is under the purview of academic integrity. We deal more with issues of
128 plagiarism, cheating, etc.

129

130 **6. Update on Executive Board's Summer Activities – President Gomer**

131 In 2005 the Senate adopted a recommendation is that all full-time TT and NTT faculty be allowed
132 fully to share in the responsibility of faculty governance of their schools. Furthermore, the Senate
133 voted unanimously to amend the constitution in 2011. Among these amendments, was Article 1,
134 Section 2 of the that states that all members of the faculty assembly (e.g. all full time faculty) are
135 eligible to participate in faculty governance, including membership on the Academic Senate,
136 faculty councils and committees. It was made clear that there were specific activities that would
137 be restricted from NTT involvement, specifically those related to tenure issues.

138
139 Last year under the leadership of President Riley, there were continued discussions with the
140 Viterbi School so that the NTT faculty could participate actively and fully in that faculty council.
141 And yet as of today, there is still not resolution in Viterbi for full participation in school
142 governance. This summer, when I took over as President of the Senate, it was clear that there
143 was still non-compliance in Viterbi for NTT participation in faculty governance. The Executive
144 Board met this summer and felt that it was urgent to initiate a way to resolve this issue, so that all
145 faculty councils adhere to the constitution. The Executive Board met with Viterbi faculty,
146 discussed the issues, generated the letter that is in your packet and presented it to the faculty as a
147 means to a resolution that will allow full NTT participation. That is the background of what the
148 Executive Board did this summer.

149
150 Q: I attended 100 senate meetings from 1998-2009. I never saw an action this heavy-handed
151 and over the summer? I support the inclusion of all full-time faculty, but urge this to be worked
152 out in a collegial manner.

153
154 A: The Senate constitution states that the Executive Board may act for the Senate between
155 meetings if there is urgency.

156
157 Q: Wouldn't a Senate motion be appropriate?

158
159 A: We have had two such motions. The Executive Board consists of individuals who are
160 extremely experienced and who want what is best for the faculty. We want a resolution that is
161 acceptable to the Senate and that is in keeping with the Senate constitution.

162
163 C: I am the person who wrote the letter of protest. The School of Engineering has circa 200
164 serious, tenured faculty, several of whom are members of national societies. We approach this
165 issue very seriously. We would like to accommodate NTT faculty but according to the will of
166 the faculty. The tenured faculty is the most important.

167
168 Q: How do we get to the point that we have full representation? The EFC has a set of bylaws
169 that governs how it operates: this must come to a vote of the tenured faculty. My fear is that
170 even fewer of the tenured faculty will vote under the circumstances because of the type of issues
171 that are happening. I see the motivation of the Senate to go around the existing procedures, but
172 I'm not sure it can be successful even in its current incarnation. We may want to find an
173 additional way to make it happen.

174
175 Q: I am wondering, have you looked at the best practices of the other schools at USC, all of
176 which have NTT representation of varying proportion on faculty councils and if you have found
177 anything of concern and if there is some reason why you're refusing to enfranchise your
178 colleagues?

179
180 A: You are wrong. We are not refusing. There were forces coming to the meetings that were
181 intimidating and some questions to which we could not find answers.

182
183 A: There is a procedural sticking point. In order to successfully revise those by-laws a 51%

184 majority vote of the tenure track and tenured faculty is required. We fell short of that amount.
185 Had that not fallen short, this issue would not be coming up. It is just a matter of getting over
186 51%.

187
188 C: I've been involved in Non-Tenure Track Committee and some of what you're describing as
189 aggressiveness with NTT faculty coming in to talk about this is really a sense of devaluing of the
190 work that they're doing. Even the description of having serious faculty members who have the
191 vote in your school implies that those who don't have the vote are not serious faculty who can't
192 come to the table with you and stand with you on some of these issues. This has been going on
193 for a very long time. When I came to the Senate and presented the NTT report, one of the
194 engineering faculty told me that if you want to vote, you must go after tenure, because the NTT
195 faculty are at risk if they vote their conscience. The implication of this is that the NTT faculty
196 can't vote their conscience because they don't have tenure. That is a pretty big assumption to
197 make. These are faculty members who are allowing tenure track faculty to do their research or
198 publish without understanding the value they bring to the table. This is very problematic to the
199 culture of the university.

200
201 C: It is hard for me to understand how, if this important to your department, how you can't get
202 51% of your people involved.

203
204 C: The concern is that tenure must be protected as must be freedom of speech.

205
206 C: We went after this specific proposal and got about 40-45%. The vote was 3-1 in favor of
207 NTT involvement.

208
209 C: I am convinced that the current configuration of the EFC is technically consistent with
210 Section 5 Article 5. This is the mechanism for addressing fairness. This looks to me as a
211 contrivance to cover a lack of leadership.

212
213 Thank you all for your comments and thank you to the engineering faculty for attending. The
214 letter has served its purpose to some extent to move things forward. I am concerned that the
215 NTT faculty do not have an opportunity to participate and I encourage you to rapidly alleviate
216 this. We want to work with everyone involved to get this accomplished.

217
218 **7. Announcements:**

219 Next month the Senate meeting will be at the Health Sciences Campus. We will be having a
220 Nominating Committee election.

221
222 The meeting was adjourned at 4:02.

223
224 Respectfully submitted,

225
226
227 Lucinda Carver, D.M.A.
228 Secretary General of the Academic Senate

229