

1
2
3 **ACADEMIC SENATE**
4 **UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**
5 Meeting of November 16, 2022
6 Hybrid Meeting
7 2:00 - 4:00 pm PST

8 **Present (Senate Members):** S. Altman, M. Apostolos, J. Armour, D. Armstrong, N. Ashe-McNalley,
9 C. Barrio, D. Becker, D. Beltran, L. Berntsen, M. Bodie, D. Brooks, K. Carlson,
10 M. Chatterjee, D. Cole, P. Crispen, A. Das (alternate for D. Armstrong), J. Dopheide (alternate for T.
11 Church), S. Faris, A. Foster, S. Gruskin, L. Hoffman, S. Hsu, K. Imagawa,
12 N. Jia, E. Jonckheere, C. Jones, R. Jubran, S. Kim, T. Kirkland, G. Kung (alternate for
13 F. Liley), R. Labaree, L. Lewis, W. Mack, R. MacKenzie (alternate for J. Walker),
14 J. Matsusaka, T. Mayfield, C. Neuman, S. Nye, E. Ochi (alternate for S. Niemiec), L. Olvera, R.
15 Pacula, C. Pantano-Rubino, T. Patel, D. Pecchenino, L. Perin Gallandt, S. Rao, C. Resnik,
16 A. Rutkowski, B. Salhia, A. Sanchez, A. Seigel, T. Tambascia, A. Tzoytzoyrakos, A. Uyeshiro Simon, E.
17 Warford, K. Wilber, C. Young

18
19 **Absent:** J. Clements, d.S. Grimes, S. Fereshteh, S. Iqbal, M. Nadim, C. Soto, C. Smith,
20 O. Trujillo

21
22 **Guests (Senate Members alternates & invited guests):** B. Bell, E. Collins, J. Dinalo, E. Fife,
23 H. Jaddoud, C. Hannigan, P. Hoen, J. Israel, J. Dove, J. Keim, M. Levine, S. Moldin, J. Moore,
24 L. Nguyen, I. Puri, G. Ragusa, H. Rojas, K. Savla, S. Shahriar, D. Shook, C. Zachary
25

26 **AGENDA**

27 **Call to Order**

28 Academic Senate President Pecchenino called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm.

29 **Approval of Minutes**

30 President Pecchenino presented the September and October Academic Senate meeting minutes
31 for approval.

32 ***Motion to approve September and October minutes.*** Seconded and passed.

33 September minutes: 27 in favor, 0 opposed, with 2 abstentions.

34 October minutes: 34 in favor, 0 opposed, with 2 abstentions.

35 **Announcements**

- 36
- 37 • ITS will be making upgrades to the Faculty Hall including additional microphones and an
38 additional camera to the room.
 - 39 • President Pecchenino acknowledged Connie Roque on her retirement at the end of the
40 year after 28 years of working for the Senate at USC. Connie will join the Senate in May for
the end of the year celebration to properly celebrate her.

41 **Introduction of Nominating Committee ballot and voting procedures: Margo Apostolos,**
42 **Academic VP**

43 Academic Vice President Apostolos described the purpose and makeup of the Nominating
44 Committee and its importance. She explained the structure of the committee which includes the
45 four nominees that will be elected at this meeting along with four members of the Executive
46 Board: Pecchenino (President, Dornsife), Apostolos (Academic Vice President, Kaufman), Young
47 (Secretary General, Libraries), and Tambascia (Immediate Past President, Rossier). She shared her
48 plan to meet with the members in order to identify qualified candidates from across the campus
49 who will be placed on the ballot to serve on the Executive Board for 2023-2024. Apostolos also
50 explained that anyone, including those not on the Nominating Committee, can recommend
51 themselves or others to a slate. Apostolos presented nominees for the Nominating Committee:
52 Devon Brooks (Social Work), Steve Hsu (Dornsife), Clifford Neuman (Viterbi), and Julie Nyquist
53 (Keck). President Pecchenino explained the in-person ballot voting process and Secretary General
54 Young launched the electronic ballot for Senators online. All four nominees were elected to serve
55 on the Nominating Committee, with each receiving a majority of the vote. Results of the elections
56 were announced at the end of the meeting.

57 **Discussion with Vice President of Research Ishwar Puri and Interim Vice President of Research**
58 **Strategy and Innovation Steven Moldin about USC Stevens and other research issues**

59 Ishwar Puri, Vice President of Research, discussed USC Stevens and the [Research Committee](#)
60 [Report](#) issued last year. He explained the Bayh-Dole Act which gives universities that have
61 conducted federally funded research the first right to commercialize intellectual property (IP). If
62 the university does not want to commercialize it, inventors can go back to the federal government
63 and claim the IP. This led to the establishment of university tech transfer offices, of which USC was
64 a pioneer. These university tech transfer offices and legal assess whether or not a creative work
65 falls under the Bayh-Dole Act. If it doesn't, the intellectual property goes back to the creative
66 artist, who can then use it to present it at galleries, as a work of art, etc. Puri then addressed
67 issues brought up through the Research Committee around tech transfer and about
68 entrepreneurship. There are three main frustrations that have arisen:

- 69 • It often takes several years to create a work and the artist/researcher would like to know
70 before they have done the work, rather than after, whether or not the work will come back
71 to them as IP.
- 72 • Tech transfer offices often work on determining different positions to value startups.
73 Startups prefer tech transfer offices to take equity positions but these offices are often
74 reluctant to do so.
- 75 • Tech transfer offices typically have a limited budget to patent, which can be very costly.

76 The issue with USC Stevens is that there is an expectation that it should be self-sufficient but USC
77 hasn't had enough shots on goal for it to be successful. Puri explained that we must have a
78 different way of thinking so that we can balance revenues with expenditures. Another issue is
79 that Stevens has become engaged in more than gaining licenses for tech transfer but also acting as
80 a conduit for entrepreneurship and innovation. Puri explained that when he arrived at USC, he
81 suggested that there should be both research strategy and innovation (incubation of startups and
82 tech transfer) and shared that we are on the cusp of some changes to expand and add these
83 capabilities.

84 Steven Moldin, Interim Vice President of Research Strategy and Innovation, explained his role and
85 goals for his office, in particular with respect to the committee report as well as transparency.

86 Pecchenino asked for a timeline for a report on work. Puri asked for time due to the consultation
87 process and budgeting constraints.

88

89 A senator asked where the AI Mann (AMI) structure fit in this innovation, infrastructure and
90 generating novel IP? Puri stated that we would know more within a week.

91
92 A senator shared that the discussion around innovation was not fully encompassing around the
93 non-STEM fields and suggested this is something worth further expansion. Puri shared that USC is
94 working to develop a mechanism to address issues around creative arts.

95
96 **Discussion with Chief Information Officer Doug Shook about the work on finding a new**
97 **LMS and other ITS issues**

98 CIO Shook explained the process for assessing the LMS. His office would like to do an RFP to get
99 bids for a new LMS. His office submitted a proposal for funding for the current FY, but it did not
100 make the financial cut. It will be resubmitted for the next FY. President Pecchenino asked about
101 our obligation for the current LMS contract with Blackboard. Shook explained the LMS would
102 likely go on a year to year contract starting next year. Shook shared that the university should be
103 prepared to spend \$25 million, including converting current courses. Student workers may be
104 used to complete manual work and cut down costs.

105 A senator asked how they are adding faculty voices in which platform to adopt. Shook responded
106 that there was a year-long process to incorporate faculty and student voices including surveys and
107 meetings. A Senator asked about any Blackboard updates coming out. Shook noted that they are
108 rolling out an accessibility module (Blackboard Ally) in order to meet the needs for greater
109 accessibility for people with visual and auditory limitations.

110 Shook then reported that we are facing \$1 million increase yearly of storage fees due to a change
111 in how Google is pricing data storage. In order to avoid the fee, we would need to get our storage
112 down from 7 to 1.5 petabytes. This may be accomplished by removing unused accounts. Shook
113 also addressed issues over work on the use of encryption. A Senator asked about quarantined
114 emails. Shook said they are working with Proofpoint to retune blocks and reroute non-nefarious
115 spam. Shook directed the body to view the [LMS Assessment 2022](#) PowerPoint located on the
116 Senate website.

117
118 **Discussion with Patricia Hoen and Ben Bell about Conflict of Interest Policies**

119 Hoen and Bell from the Office of Culture, Ethics, and Compliance presented a training on [Conflict](#)
120 [of Interest](#) including changes to policies. Pecchenino asked to clarify “the gray zone,” in particular
121 around consulting or things that are closer to the line where disclosure might be in question. This
122 is particularly the case with Humanities and multidisciplinary fields rather than STEM fields where
123 there are external reporting mechanisms already in place. Marty Levine recommended that when
124 a faculty is in doubt that they report and get clearance. A Senator asked if there was a streamlined
125 way to contact key officers on the website. Bell agreed to make those changes since their titles do
126 not exactly match up. A Senator asked if there was someone to consult if there are questions
127 about what should be disclosed. Hoen shared that faculty can contact compliance@usc.edu.

128
129 **Senate conversation about ensuring engagement of Deans with Faculty Councils**

130 President Pecchenino introduced a guided discussion in efforts of normalizing or mandating
131 certain forms of consultation between FCs and Deans. Pecchenino shared that there will be a
132 discussion on Friday with FC chairs specifically on minimum standards within bylaws and what
133 could be in bylaws or other governing documents. He added context around previous work as it
134 related to changes to the Faculty Handbook pertaining to faculty involvement in decision making
135 in consultation with the Deans. The Executive Board’s intention is to restart this work via three
136 possible strategies:

137

- 138
139 • Focus on the Faculty Handbook
140 • The Senate could put forward a resolution calling for certain requirements for FC
141 engagement from the Deans
142 • Working with the Faculty Council chairs group to develop a collective strategy for general
143 engagement with their Deans

144 A Senator shared that administrative buy-in was necessary for success and a resolution may not
145 yield helpful results. Another senator asked for clarification about parallel groups and asked why
146 the EB felt the need for a separate meeting of FC chairs if the purpose of the Academic Senate was
147 to come together to discuss governance issues. Pecchenino explained that this came from a
148 recommendation from the Taskforce on Faculty Councils. The purpose is a convening of FC chairs,
149 who have very particular roles that are different from other senators, to talk to other chairs and
150 work on strategies where they see similar problems within their school. The expectation is for
151 chairs to bring these discussions back with their councils.

152 **Adjournment**

153 Pecchenino adjourned the meeting at 4:03 pm.

154

155 Respectfully submitted,

156

157

158

Christal Young

159

Secretary General of the Academic Senate