

## **Minutes: December 6, 2022**

### **College of Liberal Arts Faculty Senate**

<https://cla.purdue.edu/faculty-staff/facsenate/>

Prepared by Ian Lindsay, Secretary <[ilindsay@purdue.edu](mailto:ilindsay@purdue.edu)>.

*Approved by Faculty Senate, January 10, 2023.*

### **Roll**

---

Senate Chair Michael Johnston welcomed CLA faculty to the meeting, called meeting to order at 3:32pm.

**Guests:** Dorsey Armstrong, Melanie Beasley, Sherri Briller, Mung Chiang, Stacey Connaughton, Marlo David, Fritz Davis, Joel Ebarb, Arne Flaten, Wei Hong, Trenton Jones, Cherie Maestas, Sorin Matei, Marifran Mattson, Erin Moodie, Zoe Nyssa, David Reingold, Linda Renzulli, Parvaneh Rezaee, Holly Tittle-Hudson, William White, Diana Zulli.

**Senators absent:** Browning, Marsh, Sanchez-Llama, Sypher, Veldwachter

Professor Brian Kelly present as alternate for Beth Hoffman (Sociology); Prof. Andrew Flachs present as alternate for Sen. Amanda Veile (Anthropology); Prof. Robert Marzec present as alternate for Sen Nancy Peterson (English); Prof. Dwayne Woods and Swati Srivastava present as alternates for Sen. Ann Clark and Melissa Will (Political Science).

### **1. Remarks from Purdue President-elect– Dr. Mung Chiang**

---

Chair Johnston introduced Dr. Chiang to the Senate, providing an introduction and short bio of his career achievements. He turned the floor over to Dr. Chiang who offered a few words of greeting and how he is looking forward to leading Purdue starting in January. He noted that on his listening tour he has been meeting college leadership and department heads, which has deepened his understanding and appreciation for Liberal Arts and our role in the University, noting especially its importance to a well-rounded education. Since he is on his listening tour, Dr. Chiang said he would like to spend his brief time on our agenda to listen to our input and respond to any questions the Senate may have for him. Chair Johnston moderated questions from the Senate.

**Questions:** Sen. Woods asked Dr. Chiang if he has a vision for what integrated or synergistic relationships between colleges, particularly Liberal Arts and STEM disciplines, would look like under his leadership. Dr. Chiang responded by saying his general philosophy is to hire the best faculty and then get out of the way of individual and team efforts. He believes in providing necessary resources, incentives, and support without micromanaging the direction of scholarship or teaching. He acknowledged the excellent scholarship within humanities, social sciences, and arts, and much of it is flourishing and thriving without collaboration with STEM field, so he does not see that as a requirement or a definition of excellence. If CLA faculty want to build partnership with STEM fields, he wants to be there to help facilitate, but that he isn't going to force research efforts together that are not aligned organically. He cites some existing partnerships such as Theater and Engineering, Engineering Ethics, Cornerstone and others as fruitful collaborative interactions, and he would like to encourage those partnerships without requiring them, since "excellence comes in many different forms and shapes".

Sen. Klein-Pejsova raised the topic of the increase in hiring in AI and closely related fields, including cluster hires, and that job candidates have been asking if Purdue plans to build an STS program here given many of the pieces are already in place. She put the question to Dr. Chiang of how he sees the pieces fitting together into a larger vision of STS at Purdue. Sen. Lindsay posted in the chat a link to the existing [undergraduate STS Certificate program](#) that currently exists in CLA. Dr. Chiang responded to the question by noting that he would be supportive of an STS program if there was faculty interest and leadership to help build one, and if the new provost would support it as well. He notes personal interest in the topic, but the requirement would be for a faculty to take on the substantial project of building the program which is not a trivial investment in time and effort.

Sen. Flachs asked with the transitions happening in upper administration what his vision is for investment across the colleges and how that might impact CLA and the kinds of work we do. Dr. Chiang notes that his philosophy is to identify areas of strength, and then recruit and retain the best faculty members that we want to bring here (including attracting top faculty from other institutions). He does not think it should be a top-down process where he tells us what our priorities and strengths should be, he just wants to bring in the best leaders in those areas.

Sen. Gray asks about an initiative he says has been raised in the past about starting a museum at Purdue, and what Dr. Chiang would like to see in such a proposal before approving that kind of initiative. Dr. Chiang responds by saying he's a big fan of museums and brick and mortar bookstores which he cites as a sign of his passion for the humanities. He would like to build on the existing galleries and performing arts venues on campus and sees room for a museum that could result from a substantial donation for the arts. He doesn't think a potential museum needs to be tied to Amelia Earhart collections or other engineering history, but we should think about what types of materials we'd want to exhibit in a new museum space and how to access that material (rotating exhibits, gifts, etc). He reminded us that there are additional priorities for construction on campus including student housing, but a museum could be a possible goal in the medium to long term to add to the enrichment of life on campus.

Dr. Chiang closed his time by thanking the faculty senate for its participation and engagement and reiterated his message that his priority across colleges is to recruit, reward, and retain the best scholars across all the field and sub-fields that we excel in across all disciplines.

## **2. Approval of the Minutes**

Chair Johnston presented the minutes from the meeting of November 8, 2022. (A few prior corrections were sent over email and incorporated).

The Senate had no further changes or corrections, so minutes were approved as submitted.

## **3. Chair's Remarks – Dr. Michael Johnston**

---

Chair Johnston opened the remainder of the meeting by highlighting some current and upcoming initiatives being worked on by Senate and external committees. These include the promotion guidelines for clinical professors and professors of practice drafted by the Faculty Affairs Committee that will be under discussion today. The FAC will also take up the issue of paid parental leave during the spring semester. The spring will also see new draft guidelines for

diversity and inclusion requirements for the CLA core coming out of the Educational Policy Committee. Chair Johnston also reminded us of other ongoing concerns surrounding sexual assault and harassment for which the DEI Committee is in dialogue with the University Senate about potential actions. He also reminded faculty to submit questions via Qualtrics for the annual Dean's Q&A with the CLA Senate at the January meeting, and asked for 4-5 faculty volunteers (not limited to Senators) for an ad hoc committee to discuss hiring practices in the College.

A copy of Chair [Johnston's full opening remarks](#) is available on the CLA Senate website.

#### **4. Dean's Report**

---

##### ***a) Research and Grants–Presented by Associate Dean Sorin Matei***

Dean Matei presented a review of external grant activities in CLA over the past few years. Compared to the past several years, both submitted proposals and funded awards were down in FY 2022-23 after a sharp jump in 2021-22. The latter year was exceptional since it included some large state-level grants. Another pattern he pointed to is that Associate Professors are submitting fewer grants than Assistant and Full Professors. There was not yet a clear explanation for these patterns, but he suggests one factor may be that we're now working in person again so there are more demands on our time with these readjustments. More analysis of the data will be needed. College-wide success rates were about 30% for external funds, which is encouraging, but he noted the campus wide success rate was closer to 50%. Numbers for individual departments were not available but are in the data if faculty want to dig into it. He encouraged faculty to apply for more proposals and try to make a bigger impact in this area in the coming year. He closed by reminding us that the new CLA Research Academy will be a resource for developing research proposals and collaborations as it continues to roll out this AY, and he encouraged everyone to reach out to Sen. Brian Kelly (inaugural Faculty Director of the Academy) for further information and support.

A copy of [Dean Matei's slide presentation](#) is available on the Senate website, and faculty are encouraged to share them with their departments.

**Questions/Discussion:** Sen. Lindsay asked whether the dip in grant awards and applications this year was due to the sharp growth in grant awards last year, resulting in fewer faculty seeking external funding. Matei said that's possible but not quite sure.

#### **5. Committee Reports**

---

##### ***a) Curriculum Committee Report***-presented by Assoc Dean Ebarb

Dean Ebarb presented the new courses and changes reviewed by the Curriculum Committee in November (see [link to document](#)), and notes that the new tech-focused courses display the interesting ways in which courses and curricula in the college are developing across our different disciplines. Chair asked for amendments (none suggested) and then a motion to approve.

Motion to approve: Sen. Woods  
Seconded by Sen. Flachs.

Chair Johnston suggests votes taken by voice vote. No objections.

**Discussion:** None

Chair Johnston put changes to a vote via voice vote. All ‘ayes,’ no negative votes, motion passes.

**b) Faculty Affairs Committee – Presented by Committee Chairs Nush Powell and Stacey Connaughton (report and discussion)**

Prof. Powell and Prof. Connaughton presented a brief overview of the proposed promotion guidelines for clinical faculty (<https://www.cla.purdue.edu/faculty-staff/facsenate/2022-23/clinical-promotion-draft-to-senate.pdf>), which the FAC assembled over the fall semester. Prof. Powell first defined the categories of ‘C&P’ or Clinical & Professional faculty that this document applies to, including Teaching Professors, Professors of Pedagogy, etc., as distinct from Lecturers and Research Professors who are categorized by the university as Staff. She outlined that this draft promotion document was informed by promotion guidelines from individual academic units in the college, as well as feedback from the Area Committee. The FAC is now asking for feedback on the draft document from the Senate and encouraged them to circulate it within their units for additional input. The target audience for this document is the Area Committee as they assess promotion cases for clinical faculty who fill many different kinds of needs across the college, so there is a conscious effort in the document to not be overly prescriptive and leave room for flexibility. The FAC would like to submit a revised draft of the document early in spring semester for a vote by the senate.

**Questions/discussion:** Prof. Renzulli (head, Sociology) suggested on p.2, paragraph 2 of the document, which focuses on the relative importance of learning and engagement in clinical faculty promotion, that we remove the phrase “as opposed to traditional research activities”. She felt this places emphasis on the differences between faculty by potentially characterizing the work of clinical faculty as somehow less valuable. The FAC co-chairs agreed to alter the wording there.

Prof. Briller (Anth) notes that these are important hires in the latest hiring wave so it is a good time for this document. She echos the call to remove any wording that alludes to “traditional” roles of faculty. She hopes the document language can help advance the notion that clinical faculty should be given the space to take ownership of these positions and the diverse roles they play in the college, rather than feel they are being compared to tenure track faculty. She appreciated the work that went into the document and thinks this will ultimately put us ahead of other universities by adopting a broader vision of clinical/professional faculty roles.

Chair Johnston asks for clarification about who Senators should continue to seek input from in their departments. Prof. Powell and Prof. Connaughton replied that anyone in the units who will be preparing a promotion case or is evaluating promotion cases should have the opportunity to look this over and provide input. Some of the less eloquent boilerplate language in the document comes from higher up at the Provost level. There was some discussion about next steps after

comments are incorporated, and Prof. Powell noted we can have as many additional discussions in the Senate as we need to until everyone is satisfied because it's important to get his document right. She suggests Senators collect input from their individual units and report amendments back to her to incorporate. It is important that departments review this carefully since they will each have their own procedures that should not conflict with this College-level document, so departments should feel that they can live with these guidelines.

(Initial discussions in the meeting were to incorporate comments by January 4 in time to circulate a revised draft in time for the January 10 senate meeting. But later discussions by the senate officers noted that this may be too short notice for departments to discuss this, since December department meetings may already have occurred. We decided to push revisions and further discussion to the February meeting to allow input to come in.)

Chair Johnston thanked the FAC for its hard work on this document.

## **6. New Business**

---

Chair Johnston calls for new business Senators want to raise for this or future meetings, since we were about 30 minutes ahead of schedule. Sen. Klein-Pejsova thanked the College and CLA Senate leadership for coordinating the visit by President-elect Chiang.

No further business suggested.

## **8. Adjourn**

---

Chair Johnston entertained a motion to adjourn at 4:30pm.

(Prof. Powell reminded us we can conclude the meeting without a motion if we have completed all business on the agenda.)