

1  
2 **ACADEMIC SENATE**

3 **UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**

4 March 9, 2022

5 Virtual Meeting

6 2:00 - 4:00 pm PST

7 **Present (Senate Members):** P. Adler, D. Armstrong, M. Apostolos, J. Baker, D. Becker, C. Beckman,  
8 D. Brooks, A. Campbell, P. Cardon, K. Carlson, B. Carrington, J. Clements, D. Cole, E. Collins, P.  
9 Crispen, M. Crowley, C. Finch, A. Foster, L. Gale, S. Gruskin, S. Gupta, L. Hoffman, K. Imagawa, A.  
10 Imre, J. Israel, C. Jones, L. Klerman, G. Kung, R. Labaree, F. Liley, K. Lincoln, T. Mayfield, D. Milstein,  
11 A. Motamed, J. Moore, J. Nyquist, R. Parke, J. Parr, A. Parra, M. Press, B. Pyatak, D. Pecchenino, L.  
12 Perin Gallandt, A. Rechenmacher, S. Rao, A. Sanchez, T. Sandmeier, T. Tambascia, A.  
13 Tzoytzoyrakos, A. Uyeshiro Simon, A. Van Speybroeck, L. Vest (alternate for T. Kobza), J. Walker, E.  
14 Warford, N. Warren, R. Watanabe (alternate for S. Iqbal), C. Young, E. Zeamer, S. Zweig

15  
16 **Absent:** J. Chatterjee, J. Dopheide, W. Mack, C. Resnik, B. Salhia, L. Serna, C. Soto, A. Yang, G. Zada

17  
18 **Guests (Senate Member alternates & invited guests):** Y. Bar-Cohen, M. Blanton, P. Cannon, P.  
19 Cates, K. Culpepper, E. Fife, M. Levine, R. MacKenzie, C. Neuman, Andrzej Rutkowski, B. Shuster,  
20 M. Townsend, B. Turner, F. Washington, C. Zachary, C. Zukoski

21  
22 **AGENDA**

23 **Call to order: Tracy Tambascia, Senate President**

24 Academic Senate President Tambascia called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm.

25 **Approval of minutes from the last meeting: Devon Brooks, Secretary General**

26 Secretary General Brooks presented the [February 16 Academic Senate meeting minutes](#) for  
27 approval.

28 ***Motion to approve the February 16 minutes.*** Seconded and passed: 28 in favor and 0 opposed.

29 **Update from Provost Zukoski**

30 Provost Zukoski expressed how glad he was to be in attendance before offering important  
31 updates.

- 32
- 33 • He announced that we have three new University Professors and two Distinguished professors, and that the new Dean of the Keck School joined the University the week prior.
  - 34 • With help from Anthony Bailey, Vice President for Strategic and Global Initiatives, the  
35 University is exploring how we might respond to the horrendous events taking place in the  
36 Ukraine and specifically how to support students and faculty impacted by the events.
  - 37 • The University no longer requires masking indoors, although there are exceptions; masking is  
38 still required in patient care buildings, testing sites, and on public transportation, including USC  
39 shuttles. With less than 1% positivity among students and employees, we are in a low risk of  
40 transmission category. Faculty cannot require masking in their individual classes, but anyone  
41 can wear a mask and we are mask friendly.

- 42 • Several key searches are underway. The University has contracted with Isaacson, Miller to  
43 support our search for the Director of the Shoah Foundation Institute, which Zukoski expects  
44 to be a robust one. The search committee has been approved and is comprised of faculty  
45 deans, administrators, and trustees. Zukoski will oversee the search and Executive Vice  
46 Provost Elizabeth Graddy will provide oversight for day-to-day activities. We are also searching  
47 for a dean of the Kaufman School and are down to four candidates. Additionally, we are  
48 searching for a dean of the Thornton School. The search committee has identified nine semi-  
49 finalists and we are now in the process of narrowing the list. Interviews of the finalists are  
50 expected to begin the week of March 28<sup>th</sup>.
- 51 • Regarding the resolution on the cost of living increase recently passed by the Senate, the  
52 Provost noted that Central Leadership recognizes the fact that the cost of living goes up on a  
53 regular and terrifying basis. However, the University has determined it will not be establishing  
54 a cost of living increase. Zukoski indicated that addressing salary gaps is his highest priority this  
55 year and will continue to be a high priority for him and President Folt. This year, he has sought  
56 to understand the University's financial situation so that gaps in salaries can be closed.
- 57 • In 18 months, the tool currently being used for tracking student performance and advisement  
58 will no longer be supported. A process has begun to identify a single, comprehensive academic  
59 advising platform that can be utilized to support both undergraduate and graduate students.
- 60 • On April 14, with leadership from Andy Stott, the Office of Academic Programs will be hosting  
61 an event called 'What Should a Trojan Know?' The event will bring together teams from across  
62 the University to think ambitiously about core education, with an aim of initiating dialogue  
63 about the next iteration of general education at USC.
- 64 • There will be forthcoming changes to the Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards  
65 (SJACS) in response to concerns about behavioral issues among students and the way the  
66 University addresses academic integrity issues. We are moving towards a system that is more  
67 transparent and supportive than is currently the case. SJACS will be reorganized into two arms:  
68 the Office of Community Expectations and the Office of Academic Integrity. The former will  
69 focus on behavior and community standards, and fall under student affairs. The latter will  
70 focus on academic issues and fall under the Provost's Office—specifically, under Academic  
71 Programs and Andy Stott. Restructuring is expected to begin this semester and to be  
72 completed by the fall.

73 Zukoski closed with a discussion of the Supervisor File Review underway. He explained that the  
74 Office of Civil Rights (OCR) informed the University that it is under an order from them to ensure  
75 that we have high quality processes in place to address allegations of sexual assault or protected  
76 class issues. The OCR would like to give the University an amnesty period, which requires a review  
77 of our files to ensure that any allegations that were not reported in the past have now been  
78 identified and reported. If in the future it is determined that allegations required to be reported  
79 were not in fact reported, there will be serious consequences. All faculty are required to complete  
80 the review because of their supervisory role. According to Zukoski, the review is not meant to be a  
81 "heavy lift" or a forensic review. Felicia Washington, Senior Vice President of Human Resources,  
82 offered additional context for the review. She clarified that OCR was trying to help USC remedy  
83 the concerns it found during its directed investigation into the Tyndall matter. Specifically, there  
84 were concerns that information regarding reports of sex and gender-based harassment were not  
85 in a centralized personnel file but diffused throughout the university in various personal files. The  
86 OCR's directive was for everyone to review their files in the hopes of centralizing how this  
87 information is accessible. If personnel documents are not maintained in a personnel file, other  
88 records where personnel documents may have been maintained should be reviewed back to 2016

89 in order to ensure that there are no unreported allegations.

90 The Provost then took questions from the floor. Tambascia asked the Provost if he could talk more  
91 about the deliberation that took place among Central Leadership around the cost of living issue.  
92 Zukoski suggested that the debate on cost of living increases turns on guaranteeing salaries when  
93 the future is unknown. He further suggested that when it comes to the closing of the salary gaps  
94 being impactful, there is a floor on the salaries that the University has aggressively increased and  
95 will aggressively increase again this year. That floor is always moving up, which gives rise to salary  
96 compression that then has to be dealt with through the monies that the deans have and are able  
97 to generate and that, of course, will vary from school to school. The heterogeneity from individual  
98 to individual, school to school, and department to department is large across the campus from  
99 what Zukoski says he is able to see. He asserted that there is no evidence to support that  
100 everyone's salary is behind aspirational peers and he expects that gap closing efforts will not be  
101 uniform.

102 A Senator suggested that the Provost's indication that the OCR review is not forensic is at odds  
103 with the details called out in the FAQs that Washington referred to in earlier comments. The  
104 Senator expressed deep concerns about being directed to execute a detailed review of  
105 voluminous files, with the threat for some, of punishment up to and including termination. He  
106 further suggested that faculty have been asked to attest to the fact, not that they have not  
107 identified any circumstances of sexual or gender-based harassment, but that they actually  
108 reviewed these files. The Senator asked the Provost if he was sure the review is not forensic  
109 because it appears to be. The Provost replied that the review is not meant to be forensic, but a  
110 best faith effort. Washington added that the Provost was suggesting that the review is an  
111 opportunity to think about where relevant information might be maintained. If the information is  
112 in the personnel file, then that is the only place to look and that is what should be indicated.  
113 However, the personnel file does not have to be the individual faculty member's, it can be the  
114 personnel file of the department. If the habit and custom is for the department to maintain  
115 information in its personnel files, those are the records that need to be reviewed.

116 Regarding the salary gap, another Senator expressed worry that communications are left primarily  
117 to the dean or the individual faculty member who may not know that they are underpaid, and he  
118 asked for more clarity on how these issues could be addressed. Zukoski indicated that this needs  
119 further study and that he would like to convene a group to examine it further. The Senator  
120 expressed his willingness to be part of such a group and went on to argue for a process that  
121 engages faculty, not just deans and associate deans, in the decision-making process, given the  
122 uneven access to information and the privileges that existed historically based on factors such as  
123 race and gender. Zukoski pointed out that the University is required by law to ensure that there  
124 are no institutional biases and that two years ago an external auditor found no evidence of  
125 institutional bias. The Senator then asked about the relationship between the Office of  
126 Community Expectations and the Office of Academic Integrity that the Provost had discussed  
127 earlier. The Provost clarified that the offices are designed to ensure that there is joint linkage and  
128 oversight over cases, and that a triage process is in place to ensure that both sides are aware of  
129 individual cases.

130 A Senator asked if the Provost could elaborate on 'What Should a Trojan Know?' and who would  
131 be invited to participate. Zukoski recommended that the Senator reach out to Andy Stott. Another  
132 Senator asked about processes for the current dean searches. The Provost explained that last  
133 year, the searches dragged out well past the end of the year, which was disappointing for  
134 everyone. He expects the current searches to be announced in the next two weeks. Still another  
135 Senator noted that the cost of living in Los Angeles went up 7.5% in the past year and 1.5% the

136 year before. Yet for those in his school who are making \$100,000 and above, increases over the  
137 past two years have been zero percent. The Senator shared his concerns about whether the  
138 disparity between increases in the cost of living and no increases in salary increases can be made  
139 up in the future. Zukoski said he did not know if it could be made up and that it depends on the  
140 finances and revenue stream of the University, and inflation. The Senator suggested that the  
141 notion that the only place increases in faculty salary can come from is increases in tuition pits  
142 students against faculty, and that is troubling given that the University's endowment rose 43.2%.  
143 Zukoski maintained that the endowment is tied to contracts and cannot be put into salaries if  
144 salaries are not designated in contract.

145 Another Senator asked the Provost for examples of the ways the SJACS process was adversarial.  
146 The Provost offered that memos to students sometimes stated that the student was under  
147 investigation and memos sometimes sounded like they were written by a lawyer. Finally, a  
148 Senator asked, given the circumstances of the war in Europe, whether USC had given any thought  
149 to reviewing its endowments or any Russian owned assets and divesting from them. Zukoski  
150 replied that he did not know the answer to the question and that he had not heard any  
151 conversations on the topic, but he suspects that divestment would be a natural outcome of a scan  
152 that revealed Russian owned assets.

153 Tambascia thanked the Provost and conveyed to him that she thinks there is quite a bit of  
154 disappointment about his message about the cost of living resolution. She encouraged him to  
155 continue having conversations with the Senate, the deans, schools, and Faculty about salaries and  
156 compression, and she stressed her belief that cost of living increases remain an extremely  
157 important topic to faculty. Zukoski agreed.

158 **Nominating Committee; timeline for spring elections: Dan Pecchenino, Senate Academic Vice**  
159 **President**

160 Senate Academic Vice President Pecchenino provided an update on the nomination process and  
161 timeline for spring elections. The Nominating Committee is preparing the ballot for elections of  
162 next year's Executive Board, which will be presented at the April 20 Senate meeting. As indicated  
163 in the Senate's bylaws, the Nominating Committee prepares a ballot, but nominations can also  
164 come from the faculty at large. Pecchenino explained that nominations require prior agreement  
165 from the nominee that they will serve if elected and endorsement of a minimum number of  
166 supporting faculty. For nominations for officer positions, the number of endorsements that can  
167 come from any one school is capped. The deadline for nominations has been pushed back to April  
168 1. In response to a Senator's question about the benefits of serving on the Executive Board, Past  
169 President Adler suggested that benefits of serving on the Executive Board be shared in a memo.  
170 Pecchenino indicated that the information could be included in the memo being sent out about  
171 the nomination process.

172 **Culture Journey Presentation: Patrick Cates, Director of Organizational Change – Ethics and**  
173 **Culture**

174 Patrick Cates, Director of Organization Change - Ethics and Culture, provided an [update](#) on the  
175 culture journey. He reminded Senators that the culture journey began in 2017, with the work of  
176 the Task Force on Workforce Standards and Employee Wellness that was prompted by a series of  
177 painful scandals at the University. The Task Force identified five culture focus areas to begin  
178 addressing in 2018: (1) Addressing Concerns of the USC Community; (2) Well-Being; (3)  
179 Professional Development; (4) DEI; and (5) Values. In 2019, input from over 24,000 faculty, staff,  
180 student leaders, and members of governance led to the identification of six unifying values.  
181 Subsequently, the University has been working to integrate those values into the five focus areas.

182 Cates then elaborated on the focus areas and some of the work underway in each area. He noted  
183 ongoing work to develop partnerships with schools and units and that new committees on  
184 Measurement and Reporting are working to define culture metrics and publish a Culture Report to  
185 the community.

186 **Update from Senate Committees: University Libraries Committee and Committee on**  
187 **Information Services**

188 Trudi Sandmeier, Co-chair of the Joint Provost/Academic Senate Libraries Committee, [reported](#) on  
189 the work of the Committee. This year, the Committee's charge revolved around working with  
190 faculty and staff of the USC Libraries as they engage in a three-year strategic planning process. To  
191 inform this effort, the Committee encouraged and helped facilitate implementation of a survey  
192 sent initially to faculty and subsequently to staff. The survey sought feedback on three items: (1)  
193 What do you rely upon most? (2) How can we collaborate to better support your work? (3) Share a  
194 useful program or service from a non-USC library. Sandmeier suggested that a key take away from  
195 results of the survey is that faculty and staff do not appear to know what the libraries do and what  
196 kinds of services they offer, as many of the things that were suggested are already available. This  
197 highlights a bigger issue involving communications and how to effectively get the word out about  
198 what is available through USC Libraries. Although the survey was also sent to students, the  
199 response rate was poor so it will be administered again given that students are a large  
200 constituency of the USC Libraries. Over these past months, faculty and staff of the USC Libraries  
201 have drafted components of a strategic plan. Sandmeier discussed each of the draft components,  
202 including the mission, vision, values and definitions, and themes for goal developments. The draft  
203 components have been presented to the Library Committee, the Board of Counselors, and other  
204 user groups and constituencies of USC Libraries.

205 Els Collins and Patrick Crispen, Co-chairs of the Joint Provost/Academic Senate Committee on  
206 Information Services (CIS), [updated](#) the Senate on the work carried out this year by the  
207 Committee. Collins explained that the Committee advises the Senate, the provost and the Chief  
208 Information Officer on a variety of issues related to academic technology infrastructure,  
209 technology-related policies, and information resources and services of the university. Membership  
210 of the Committee varies each year, but this year's membership reflects eight Schools; it also  
211 includes representatives from the Academic Senate Executive Board, USC Libraries, and the  
212 Provost's Office. Each year, the CIS begins with a survey of committee members to determine  
213 issues that will be addressed for the year and subcommittees are formed around those issues. This  
214 year's subcommittees addressed: (a) technology-enhanced teaching, learning and advising; (b)  
215 classroom and educational technologies; and (c) academic integrity. The CIS has been involved in  
216 technology-enhanced learning and disaster preparedness and recovery for several years. In 2019-  
217 2020, the Committee launched a pilot study of online learning/instruction. Results of the study  
218 informed some of the recommendations sent to ITS through the Center for Excellence in Teaching  
219 (CET) and to the provost as part of the March 11 through the 13th mandatory online teaching at  
220 the beginning of the pandemic. The CIS helped prepare a memo sent to the Senators, Faculty  
221 Council Chairs, and the Provost on advancing information technology services and equipment  
222 equity. The Committee engaged in numerous other activities and developed other resources,  
223 including a guide on teaching with Zoom, a location-based taxonomy for post-pandemic  
224 technology-enhanced didactic instruction, and Tech Share Live sessions.

225 **Adjournment**

226 Tambascia thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 4:02 pm.

227

228 Respectfully submitted,

229

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Devon Brooks". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

230

231 Devon Brooks

232 Secretary General of the Academic Senate

233

DRAFT