

1 Academic Senate  
2 Meeting of January 18, 2012  
3 University Club, Pub Room  
4 University Park Campus  
5

6 **MINUTES**  
7

8 **Present:** R. Ben-Ari, D. Blaine, J. Brecher, P. Cannon, A. Capron, L. Carver, P. Conti,  
9 L. Fetters, R. Flick, J. Goad, C. Gomer, S. Gupta, M. Jordan-Marsh, R. Labaree,  
10 R. Lonergan, A. Lynch, V. Marmarelis, M.V. Marx, E. McCann, P. Mills, E. Muhl,  
11 T. Morgan, K. Murphy, M. Nichol, J. Nyquist, J. Orr, P. Riley, J. Silvester, S. Smith,  
12 J. Steele, J. Tilson, R. Weinberg (alternate for J. Kagan), S. Wenzel, W. Wolf, D. Yett  
13

14 **Absent:** R. Brinton, N. Chopiuk, Y. DeClerck, G. Ehresmann, J. Farver, H. Greenwald,  
15 D. Larsen, O. Mayer, E. McCaffery, R. Pancheva, P. Pattengale, G. Peters, K. Venegas  
16

17 **Guests:** E. Garrett, L. LaCorte, M. Levine, I. Rhimes, M. Suarez  
18

19 President Gupta called the meeting to order at 2:03pm.  
20

21 **1. Approval of December Senate Minutes**  
22

23 Giving the members a moment to review them, the minutes of the December 14,  
24 2011, Senate meeting were approved unanimously.  
25

26 **2. In Memoriam: Sidney W. Benson, 1947 Secretary to the University Senate**  
27

28 Professor Walter Wolf:

29 Professor Sidney Benson passed away at the age of 93. He was the secretary of the  
30 first University Senate. He was honored with a living memorial a few years ago  
31 because, in the early days, the faculty had little input into university decisions.  
32 Professor Benson led a 97 percent response rate in information gathering from the  
33 university, and he led the change as our Faculty Senate began to be and became a  
34 positive force in decision-making.  
35

36 Vice Provost Martin Levine:

37 Sidney Benson was a great scientist, highly cited, and a distinguished professor  
38 here at USC. He was one of our first members of the National Academy of Science  
39 and, even in retirement, came to faculty club and visited with us to share his  
40 wisdom.

41 His memorial obituary is on the university website, and a memorial service will be  
42 held next Wednesday.

43

### 44 **3. Dialogue with Provost and Senior Vice President Elizabeth Garrett**

45

46 Provost Elizabeth Garrett was introduced:

47 Happy New Year. I cannot attend all your meetings, but I will be sending some  
48 great people to talk to you and share our ideas and our plans.

49 I am very excited about the upcoming retreat, and the topics and the people will  
50 make this a terrific experience for the new strategic vision to provide a foundation  
51 for our discussions.

52 As we speak, the bike summit is going on as we continue to figure out how we can  
53 build a more perfect environment here on campus.

54 I have brought a handout update on freshman enrollment for next year. The news is  
55 very good, but different in some ways because this is our first year with the  
56 common application. We do, however, have a supplement that is required for our  
57 applicants. Now, MIT and Georgetown are the only elite schools not using the  
58 common application.

59 We should have 45,000 applications this year, our highest ever pool. For Spring  
60 enrollment, each school will have exceeded its target. January 10 is the deadline  
61 for Fall applications; and we are beginning our evaluation. With the common  
62 application so far, we have seen our demographics remain about the same but first-  
63 generation applications are up, SAT scores appear to be up about 15 points, and we  
64 are 32 percent up in SAT total scores over 2100. We have seen substantial  
65 increases in the College, Business, and Engineering which will allow us to be very  
66 selective. We are seeing increases in the East Coast and Mid-Country applications,  
67 and no longer will more than one-half of our class come from California.

68 International applications have shown a substantial increase. But, since our  
69 ultimate enrollment will not increase, we will really be able to choose the best  
70 students possible.

71 Vice Provost Michael Quick will be distributing a memorandum on beginning the  
72 analysis of our general education curriculum. This is an auspicious time to be  
73 looking at GE, which has not been changed in the last 15 years. We will be asking  
74 for lots of input, both as to where we are and where we should be going. This will  
75 include a faculty committee looking at the big picture: what is the best foundation  
76 for our critical thinking students. We are looking forward to strong faculty input  
77 with a plan for recommendations finishing in the middle of next fall.

78

79 Q: What are the financial aid ramifications for the new cycle?

80 A: We have the largest aid pool, and we are increasing the financial aid charge on  
81 tuition because federal and state allocations will be decreasing. There will be cuts  
82 coming from outside sources, and we need to be prepared for our students.

83  
84 Our last few classes have needed more support than in the past, especially because  
85 of the reduced value in the family home. We will continue to make certain all  
86 students admitted can afford to come to USC.

87 We do anticipate our lowest tuition increase in the last decade; all of our students  
88 will be able to afford to attend.

89  
90 Q: Are you happy with the numbers of transfer students?

91 A: We are happy where we are. As reflected in the strategic vision, we are  
92 committed to accessibility for these students. We have a nice mix of students  
93 across the categories; we are not trying to change anything.

94  
95 Q: But as state problems persist, will there be more pressure to come to a private  
96 school like USC?

97 A: There is a problem developing at the state schools of graduating in four years;  
98 but we have a four-year plan for each of our students; and we will continue to  
99 lobby for Cal Grants for them.

100  
101 Q: Are there changes in students not stating their mixed ethnicities?

102 A: There is no sense of our commitment to URM students changing.

103  
104 Q: Is there data on retention?

105 A: We have a task force on retention and graduation, and the only significant  
106 differences we are seeing is in international students. We have to seriously look at  
107 this, knowing that retention is always harder the further the student is from home.  
108 This issue has our full attention to make certain we have specialized interventions  
109 for each situation.

110  
111 Q: How much is social and how much is programmatic?

112 A: The experts will answer these questions for us.

113  
114 Q: Is there data on graduate students?

115 A: Not yet; this is handled much more at the school level, especially in  
116 professional degrees.

117  
118 Q: And in Ph.D. programs, do we know how this impacts our foreign Ph.D.  
119 students?

120 A: This number has been flat over the last few years. What we want are the highest  
121 quality Ph.D. students and and to provide more grants that target excellence, which  
122 requires a real targeting of great Ph.D. programs. The quality is moving up, but we  
123 hope to accelerate this trend.

124  
125 A lot of this discussion will be the topics for the retreat, and I look forward to  
126 seeing you all there.

127

#### 128 **4. New Members of the Academic Senate Were Introduced**

129

#### 130 **5. Report about the Bike Summit**

131

132 Patricia Riley, Senate Academic Vice President, was introduced:

133 As part of the “We Are Considerate, We are USC” campaign, the bike summit is  
134 going on right now. This is not a traditional meeting; it is set up like a career fair  
135 with discussions of current policies. The design consultants are there to develop a  
136 new plan, and the university is committed to making something happen. The  
137 discussions include a group considering bike paths to and around the campus and  
138 through the community. Then, at 3pm, there will be a second part, small group  
139 discussions about the plan and how sustainability issues enter into this.

140 We are trying to be innovative and successful so that, at 4pm, there will be a  
141 session to try to come up with a real USC community position.

142

143 C: The Provost’s office has been extremely approachable on this issue.

144

145 Any ideas and comments can be sent to [bikesafe@usc.edu](mailto:bikesafe@usc.edu).

146

#### 147 **6. Update on the Provost-Senate Retreat**

148

149 President Gupta described the retreat to be held this weekend:

150 You all have the agenda and there is homework. The website for the retreat will  
151 give the links to the background readings and scenarios for you to read so you can  
152 create your own scenarios, and then they will be compiled and will inform the  
153 interview with Warren Bennis at the Fairmont Miramar. Over 100 attendees have  
154 confirmed at the moment. The plan is that every school has been challenged to  
155 meet its own strategic plan for the vision. This is our chance as the assembled  
156 faculty to add to these plans.

157 Our goal is to start the conversation. This is clearly the right time, among other  
158 things, to really re-envision the future of general education.

159

160 C (Marty Levine): Financial considerations will not be part of your discussion; the  
161 questions for you are what are the proper issues to be considered.

162 A: The separate panels which will be presenting have been meeting, but most of  
163 the work will be done at the retreat and then afterwards as the issues are identified.

164  
165 Q: Those who are not part of the panels participate with their ideas how?

166 A: The first day discussion is in the large group as a whole, then there are two sets  
167 of breakouts on the second day, all to understand and develop the few organizing  
168 principles for the best way to train students for unknown future career paths that  
169 we probably do not yet even know.

170  
171 Q: The final outcome will be what?

172 A: To work with the Provost's office on general education and on capstone  
173 experience opportunities. And WASC asked USC to consider this idea. We are  
174 trying to develop our way to feed into those two issues and provide more insight  
175 and to provide input in growing the curriculum here.

176  
177 C: There is a need for general education to focus on competencies, not just content,  
178 what skills will our graduates need and have.

179 A: That is exactly on the radar screen as was discussed in the moderators' meeting;  
180 research is different because it is more de-centralized, and this difference needs to  
181 be considered, also.

182  
183 C: Some of the discussion will be driven by flat NIH and other funding and not  
184 whether this is proper. But the reality exists, and the question is how we are going  
185 to handle this situation.

## 186 187 **7. Report from the Committee on Information Services**

188  
189 Maryalice Jordan-Marsh and Julie Tilson, co-chairs of the CIS Committee, and Ilee  
190 Rhimes, Vice Provost and Chief Information Officer, Maria Suarez, Director of  
191 Information Security, and Laura La Corte, Associate Senior Vice President for  
192 Compliance, were introduced.

193  
194 This is a joint Provost and Senate committee. People self-nominate and serve to  
195 create an on-going dialogue between ITS and the faculty and how our technology  
196 affects and reaches scholarship and learning.

197  
198 Vice Provost Rhimes:

199 We have been talking about encryption and data lose protection, and the idea was  
200 to further discuss our goals here. Some of our peers already have policies in place  
201 for these issues and to meet federal and state guidelines. We are giving you an  
202 opportunity for feedback because we do not yet have a time-line for these  
203 procedures.

204

205 Professor Jordan-Marsh:

206 We are about to offer you something wonderful to protect your confidentiality as  
207 you exchange files. The university is embarking on an initiative to provide  
208 software to mitigate any concerns in e-mail sending.

209 There are two parts, encryption and data loss protection. We are considering two  
210 vendors for resources to protect us and to encrypt. We are just beginning the  
211 process, so we need faculty input as to your concerns, and we are looking for  
212 volunteers for beta testing.

213 Off-the-shelf dictionaries and individual dictionaries will be tailored to USC, and  
214 we will only be proceeding when we feel we will be successful.

215

216 Director Suarez:

217 I started here at USC at end of August and began a survey about security concerns.  
218 The results showed strong concern for encryption and protection of sensitive data  
219 and credit information; and we immediately established a task force. We began to  
220 look at outside technologies and those that had already been implemented at Keck.  
221 We felt those should continue but that we needed a lot more information and to dig  
222 deeper to really discover what the true needs are here.

223

224 Q: Most people would say why not encryption and can it be quickly provided  
225 transparently?

226 A: Simply using an out-of-the-box product brings two problems, the most  
227 important is that the first-time receiver of an encrypted message needs to be  
228 registered, not for USC to USC communication, but for all inside to outside the  
229 USC system addresses.

230

231 Q: Is this a monitoring of e-mails?

232 A: No. Every day we send e-mails; but sometimes we send e-mails that have legal  
233 requirements for protection, including times we do not know what is not allowed  
234 or is embedded in another document. The service merely checks the e-mail to see  
235 that it is not out of compliance. Then, if it requires encryption, first time receivers  
236 will be required to register.

237

238 Q: Why only requiring some encryption; why not every document?

239 A: The primary idea comes from compliance.

240 A: There is an overhead related to all encrypted e-mail, and we do not want that  
241 burden.

242  
243 We will take as much feedback as we can to see what we need. So we are looking  
244 for volunteers for the questions and the studies. We will then go over those ideas  
245 with an expanded study group.

246  
247 Q: For schools that have our own servers, does this apply?

248 A: Yes, even if there is a different USC address.

249  
250 C: We are reassured because Ilee Rhimes is part of a national group on these  
251 issues.

252  
253 Q: If an e-mail is encrypted automatically, does the sender find out?

254 A: Yes. The approach we will take is to auto-notify. So we will not send until you  
255 are notified.

256  
257 Q: Are you primarily focusing on e-mail at his time?

258 A: Yes, but we will then look at mobile devices quickly.

259  
260 Vice President La Corte:

261 There is a concern for compliance with federal and state rules and regulations to  
262 protect confidential information, especially in the medical area; some systems are  
263 already at Keck and other medical units, including social security numbers and  
264 credit cards because, again, of federal and state laws and obligations. We know  
265 security of research data is also important. This is not an unusual issue, especially  
266 as to personal information in old databases. We are hoping, with your help, for a  
267 system that is transparent and automatic.

268  
269 Professor Jordan-Marsh:

270 We will soon provide a list of best practices for all users. The goal is still  
271 transparency with no effort on behalf of the users. That is why we are bringing this  
272 to you early in the process, so we can easily live with the ultimate results. We are  
273 asking the Senate to be ambassadors for the project. If you have expertise in  
274 marketing change, please let us know.

275  
276 We can never be completely transparent; so we want to roll this out with as many  
277 obvious questions answered up-front from your input.

278

279 Q: The user satisfaction on HSC is not high; this difference needs to be considered.  
280 A: We will look into it; we are working on all levels of satisfaction.

281

## 282 **8. Discussion of Proposed Changes to the Senate Constitution**

283

284 Alex Capron and Michael Nichol, co-chairs of the Committee on Rules,  
285 Membership, and Elections, were introduced.

286

287 Professor Capron:

288 This resolution, through the Executive Board to the full Senate, seeks to make  
289 certain clarifications in the constitution and bylaws and to standardize certain  
290 language throughout all the relevant documents.

291 The resolution is a set of generic descriptions, so we ask you to pay attention to  
292 attachments A and B of the resolution.

293

294 The central substantive changes are:

295 Article I, section 2, and reflected in the deletion of Article V, sections 6 and 7. It  
296 has long been understood that all members of the full-time faculty are members of  
297 the faculty assembly with no distinction for tenured, tenure-track, and NTT, and all  
298 schools would give a role in governance to all faculty; so section 2 makes this  
299 clear.

300 The second set of changes relate to updating certain practice related to school  
301 assemblies, some use it for their representative body's name in conflict with  
302 assemblies as the faculty as the whole.

303

304 C: Some schools have already changed the name to councils from assemblies.

305

306 The only other substantive changes are in Article II, section 1, to faculty  
307 governance and environment, as the short hand term for the collection of concerns  
308 about benefits and programs for wellness that make up the academic environment  
309 of the university; and in Article III and its parallel in article VI, changing emeritus  
310 to retired faculty so that participation includes all retired faculty.

311 A final note is the removal of Article XI, because it is not needed.

312

313 In the bylaws, they are mostly changes in formatting and grammar, except Bylaw 1  
314 so we need not change the bylaws every time there is a new edition of *Robert's*  
315 *Rules*, and in Bylaw 18 to be more specific on the Committee on Faculty Rights  
316 and Responsibilities, so the chair is tenured and the vice-chair is NTT and familiar  
317 with NTT issues.

318



319 C: Time will be reserved at the next meeting for full discussion of the issues for the  
320 second reading.

321

322 Q: It seems like only tenured and tenure-track faculty can vote on the bylaws,  
323 because it affects tenure issues.

324 A: It is in amendments of the constitution and the bylaws that they are amended by  
325 vote of Academic Senate.

326

327 Q: But is this not issues of tenure and tenure-track?

328 A: But that concerns the tenure system, not the system of faculty governance.

329 A: The tenure system is specifically excluded in section 2 and section 3.

330 A: And the faculty handbook rules. These are not tenure issues, but policies and  
331 procedures and, even if changes were made, the faculty handbook rules.

332

333 Q: But it seems a dilution of the tenure system if NTT vote on the bylaws.

334 A (Marty Levine): The faculty handbook rules, not the Senate constitution.

335 A: But the point is that the structure of the Senate is not part of the university  
336 policies on tenure or the tenure system .

337 A: Would adding that the handbook overrules in section 3 assuage your concerns?

338

339 This will be on the agenda for the Executive Board this week and before the next  
340 Senate meeting..

341

342 The meeting was adjourned at 3:59pm.

343

344 Respectfully submitted,

345

346 James Brecher, J.D., Ph.D.

347 Secretary General of the Academic Senate