

Minutes: March 7, 2023

College of Liberal Arts Faculty Senate

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

Prepared by Ian Lindsay, Secretary <ilindsay@purdue.edu>.

Approved by Faculty Senate, April 11, 2023.

Roll

Senate Chair Michael Johnston welcomed CLA faculty to the meeting, called meeting to order at 3:31pm.

Guests: Dorothee Bouquet, Rosalee Clawson, Elena Coda, Marlo David, Fritz Davis, Joel Ebarb, Carolina Ferreira, Andrew Flachs, Arne Flaten, Elaine Francis, Lindsay Hamm, Spencer Headworth, Wei Hong, Huai-Rhin Kim, Trenton Jones, Cherie Maestas, Sorin Matei, Lisa Mauer, Erin Moodie, Ashley Purpura, David Reingold, Melissa, Remis, Linda Renzulli, Lori Sparger, Holly Tittle-Hudson, Li Wei, William White.

Senators absent: Browning, Clair, Marsh, Parrish, Sanchez-Llama, Sypher, Thomas, Trieu, Will

1. Approval of the Minutes

Chair Johnston presented the minutes from the meeting of February 7, 2023.

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

2. Chair's Remarks – Dr. Michael Johnston

Chair Johnston opened this “all-faculty” by extending a special welcome to faculty guests, reiterating that all faculty are always welcome to attend Senate meetings. He voiced a hope that participants attending the all-faculty meetings will inspire additional engagement at regular meetings as well. He also previewed today’s agenda of guests and reports including the COACHE survey report by Dean Wei Hong and Dr. Lisa Mauer, and Town Hall Q&A by Dean Hong. He also alerted attendees about upcoming reports in April such as the ad hoc committee on hiring practices and the Faculty Affairs Committee’s recommendations regarding Paid Parental Leave policies in CLA.

Chair Johnston then turned to the important issue of shared university governance, pointing to the AAUP’s standards for upholding faculty responsibilities in shaping university curricula and methods of instruction. The University Senate and CLA Senate exercises these rights at their respective levels, and he cited our senate bylaws and our responsibility to consider, discuss, and advise on matters of intellectual life in the college and welfare of the faculty. These commitments of shared governance should be a bulwark against the kinds of recent movements in Oklahoma and Florida where state legislatures are stifling the teaching and support for DEI initiatives on college campuses, should they be raised in Indiana.

With these high stakes in mind, Chair Johnston closed by reiterating the call to seat new leaders for next year’s faculty senate to continue this important work.

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

3. Dean's Report

- a) **COACHE Survey and Town Hall**-presented by Assoc. Dean Wei Hong and Dr. Lisa Mauer (Assoc Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs)

Chair Johnston introduced Vice Provost Mauer from the Provost's Office to summarize results from the latest COACHE survey, using a [slide deck available on the CLA Senate webpage](#). Dr. Mauer reminded the faculty that the COACHE survey is a job satisfaction survey developed by Harvard University and implemented nationwide. We usually participate on a three-year cycle, but a pause during pandemic meant there was a four-year span between our 2018 and 2022 surveys. Purdue has participated four times beginning in 2012, and the overall university response rate has increased each time. The survey focused on 25 benchmarks with 156 questions addressing those benchmark themes, which we can use to compare ourselves to other universities through a report provided by Harvard that the Provost's office makes available online. Purdue also added some custom questions this year focused on department leadership, belonging, collegiality, and civility. The Provost's data team ([IDA+A](#)) has access to the raw data that they compile and release the college-level data to the colleges as well.

She walked the faculty through the data-intensive info on Slide 7, highlighting the 25 benchmark categories along on the X-axis, and each line along the bars is a university respondent. The lower red part of the bars represents the bottom 30% of responses for each category and the upper green portion represents the top 30% of responses. The black diamond represents Purdue's current place along the bars, a line symbolized our prior results, and the circles represent a visual comparison of 5 peer institutions we selected to be benchmarked against for comparative purposes (Indiana University, Rutgers, Missouri, Maryland, Virginia Polytechnic). We chose deliberately to not include comparative survey's taken during the pandemic, since we didn't participate in the survey in those years. Other slides illustrate where Purdue responded in the upper or lower 1/3 in each category, and in which of the categories improvement and decline were most pronounced since the 2018 survey.

Her office would like to see all our scores in all categories be in the top 30% signaling happiness and job satisfaction at Purdue, and they celebrate that in those categories. For example, we scored well in the categories of Nature of work: research, service, and teaching; Personal and family policies; Interdisciplinary work; Collaboration; Mentoring; Promotion to full; Department quality. And we saw strong improvements in Department leadership, Mentoring, and Tenure policies.

But they also are looking closely at which categories show us in the bottom 30% (particularly relative to our 5 peers) signaling where work needs to be done. These include categories of

Health and retirement benefits; Governance sub-categories; and Departmental collegiality. The only category that showed a decline since the 2018 survey was in Health/retirement benefits.

Vice Provost Mauer also notes that Harvard provided space for open text responses that are coded across categories and shown in the data. More fine-grained details about satisfaction across career stage and demographics are provided in the slides.

Finally, she noted that IDA+A is wrapping up their analysis of the college data and we should have those soon, but she provided a snapshot of where CLA stands overall. There's a lot of variability across colleges at Purdue in the different climate, belonging, and leadership categories. CLA saw the highest level of improvement in Department leadership category, and strong improvement in tenure/promotion expectations, and several unit-level categories. The greatest declines were in categories of divisional leadership (Dean's office), Health benefits for family, Spousal accommodations, and recognition of interdisciplinary work.

She concluded by noting that Associate Deans Hong and Ebarb are on the COACHE implementation committee considering how to make the best use of the results and celebrate the improvements while working on areas of decline.

Dean Hong then took the floor to provide an overview of the CLA Programs for Faculty Success her office oversees, the [slides for which are also available on the Senate webpage](#). Below is a bulleted list of programs and investments over the past several years:

- [National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity](#) (NCFDD) aimed at fostering faculty diversity, advancement, and wellbeing: CLA has supported 69 faculty to participate in the program since 2015, committing nearly \$260,000. This summer she said they are starting the [Pathfinders](#) Program exclusively for post-tenure faculty.
- Engage Grants: provides financial support to tenure-track faculty members in CLA, especially early- and mid-career faculty, to organize two-three-day workshops focused on advancing a piece of scholarship and/or creative activity that is in final draft form. Since 2017, 23 awards of \$10,000 each have been made totaling \$230,000 (paused during pandemic). Has resulted in books published in top presses, such as Oxford, Cambridge, and Chicago.
- Tenure and Promotion Workshops: providing clarity on P/T process, in partnership with ADVANCE, Center for Faculty Success, and VP for Faculty Affairs.
- Faculty Leadership Programs participation supported through VP for Faculty Affairs. e.g., Big 10 Academic Leadership Program, Purdue Insights Forum, and other opportunities.
- Clinical Faculty Support Programs: developing promotion guidelines with FAC, networking and mentoring opportunities across CLA units, professional development programming as clinical faculty numbers increase.
- Faculty Mentoring Incentive Program: encourages mentoring networks and relationships by providing junior and mid-level faculty with a hospitality account of \$150/AY to take mentors to lunch, coffee, or other social activity.

- Partnering with FAC and ADFA to develop additional policies and programs to optimize faculty success.

The next part of this Agenda item was a town hall-style Q/A with Dean Hong. Like prior Q/A's with the Dean and the incoming Provost, questions were solicited from the faculty via Qualtrics, curated by the CLA Faculty Senate DEI Committee, and submitted to Dean Hong in advance. The [questions are provided on the Senate webpage](#), and summaries of her responses are provided below. The floor was open to follow-up questions/comments from faculty after each question.

Response to Q1 re. pay and benefits for temporary faculty and adjuncts in CLA:

Dean Hong defined the different types of non-tenure track faculty, the roles they fill, and how they are categorized by HR as either staff or faculty. Full-time instructors like Clinical Professors, lecturers and visiting faculty who are hired for a year or two get benefits, while Limited Term Lecturers do not. The latter are usually hired by semester and by the course, and so do not get benefits for the temporary teaching needs they fill. Some of these are filled by internal or external employees who decide to teach a class on top of their other duties (similar to how Dean Reingold explained this in his Q/A in January).

No faculty questions raised for this one.

Response to Q2 re. institutional transparency about decision making and data-gathering, e.g., implementation of COACHE survey:

Dean Hong invites Vice Provost Mauer to speak to this question. Dr. Mauer notes that the data is still being processed and will work its way down to the colleges as it is completed. In the meantime, membership of the implementation committees is up to each college. So faculty can be asked to participate, and she encouraged the deans and department heads in each college to look at the results through the lens of their local experiences to find the best solutions. More centrally, Dr. Mauer notes that the university is focusing on the decline in satisfaction of Health Benefits and how to address that. Dean Hong adds that she and Dean Ebarb were on the implementation team, and received comments and updates from Dr. Mauer, and they will be discussing next steps. Dean Hong is currently chair of the Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs at the campus level, and they will discuss process at that level as well.

Question in the chat asked about adding faculty representation on the Implementation Committee. Dean Hong reiterated that she'll be working with the department heads on getting faculty ideas on how to respond to the survey but did not commit to add faculty representation on the committee.

Response to Q3 re. morale and climate around faculty feelings of support and compensation:

Dean Hong reflected again on the Faculty Success programs that she presented on earlier, which represent the long-term commitments to success and wellbeing across different foci such as research, teaching, mentoring, and leadership. And each of these programs carries major financial investments by the college. She highlights that since 2016, the college has spent \$4.8

million in faculty programs such as Aspire, Create, Promise, Engage and Innovate. These programs are also important recruitment tools reflected in conversations she has had with job candidates, and likely also with search committees and department heads who mention these programs as forms of research support when recruiting top candidates.

In terms of compensation, she refers to the Dean's responses to a similar question during his Q/A in January (see February minutes), where he cited total recurring salary adjustments made last year that came to about \$750,000, with large salary adjustments in 2016 or 2017. While it's not enough in the face of 7% inflation, all institutions have been struggling. Department heads can also make individual appeals for equity adjustments.

Chair Johnston decided to move along to the final question in the interest of time.

Response to Q4 re. retention and climate specifically for Black faculty and URM faculty:

Dean Hong begins by noting that we have had success retaining URM and women faculty, and she has worked on those cases herself. This is an issue she's been working on since she came into the dean's office in 2016. She defines two types of retention efforts. The first is preemptive, which is to be proactively looking at risk and trying to retain faculty before they even get offers. And the other kind is counteroffers, and these 2 things involve large financial investments in salary, teaching and research support, which reflect the college's commitment to retention and faculty success.

In terms of Black faculty choosing to continue their career elsewhere, she comments that there are many reasons faculty choose to leave such as being closer to family or potential collaborators, or to take administrative positions, which is hard to compete with even with robust counter-offers. She notes that when colleagues take strong offers from peer institutions, it indicates to her that our faculty have established well-rounded, competitive records here, and she celebrates their career advancement.

Regarding the question about salary compensation and equity raises, the VP for Ethics conducts an annual analysis of salaries compared to our peers. And the college works with department heads when we see concerns, and those are managed by the department heads on a case-by-case basis. Factors to consider in comparisons include time in rank, publication record, grants, teaching record, and impact measurements, which are reviewed when considering individual equity raises, which is handled in her office.

Chair Johnston thanks Dean Hong and Vice Provost Mauer for their time, and the DEI Committee (especially Committee Chair Flachs) for the leading the effort of collating these questions for Dean Hong.

Questions/comments from faculty about topics discussed above:

Sen. Denny commented that he appreciates the breakdown of the LGBT information in the COACHE survey, since this is the first time he has seen the "temperature taken" on this issue in a formal way in a long time. And he looks forward to being able to dig into the data more closely

when they are available to learn more about results coming from other LGBT colleagues around campus.

Sen. Olsen offers his thanks for the informative presentations. Following up on earlier question about compensation for LTLs, he asks how we compare in our compensation with peer institutions and between departments in our college, and across colleges. Dean Hong responds that she doesn't know about that at the university level and defers to Vice Provost Mauer if she knows. They suggest asking the business office for LTL pay structures. But in CLA, Dean Hong says there is a scale for LTLs that corresponds to their degree and teaching experience but is not sure about the university level. It differs for each department and the number of courses they need to have taught. Sen. Olsen follows up asking about how LTLs fit into the larger question of livable wages among students on campus, and comparative information across colleges would help that conversation. Dean Hong says she'll consult with Vice Provost Mauer to see if there is a formal scale for LTLs but is not sure right now.

Sen William notes in the chat the policies differ by department and school. And Dean Ebarb reiterates that it really does differ across units, based on time in the classroom and other criteria. He approves the dollar amount, but the head determines what the ask is, and the CLA has a scale that can be used as a guide. Generally, the dean's office does not question or second guess the department head's requested dollar amount (x dollars for y number of LTLs), since that has been the culture. Sen William adds in person that the Business Office has a scale, and the level of LTL is determined at the department level based on qualifications, etc. Associate Dean Ebarb reminds us that very few LTLs are doing it as a full-time job; they have other full-time jobs sometimes at Purdue, and are doing LTL teaching on the side.

Link to LTL scale provided in the chat: <https://www.cla.purdue.edu/faculty-staff/business-office/documents/cla-employment-center/cla-ltl-payscale-21.22.xlsx>

Sen Benedicto asked in the chat (before having to leave) about whether faculty are asked to pay for the NCFDD programs they participate in. Dean Hong says that NCFDD Faculty Success Program is fully funded by the College, and the Pathfinder Program will be cost-shared between the departments and the College. But faculty participants, if chosen, do not pay for the programs.

4. Space Planning Update – Lori Sparger

Postponed due to time constraints. Lori Sparger will send a written update from the college.

5. Committee Reports

a) *Curriculum Committee Report*-presented by Associate Dean Ebarb

Dean Ebarb presented the new courses and changes reviewed by the Curriculum Committee in January (see [link to document](#)). Chair asked for amendments (none suggested) and then a motion to approve.

Motion to approve: Sen. Gray. Seconded by Sen Olsen. Chair Johnston opens the floor for questions.

Sen. Peterson notes regarding the new Religious Studies courses, that a Bible as Literature course is currently offered as ENGL 264 that has been on the books for many years, so will it be cross listed with English? Dean Ebarb says that Holly Tittle-Hudson texted him that “yes” that they will be cross-listed.

No other questions from the floor.

Chair Johnston takes a voice vote. All ayes, no nays or abstentions. Report is approved.

b) *Grade Appeals Committee* – presented by Associate Dean Ebarb

Dean Ebarb remarks that it is very rare that we have a grade appeal that cannot be resolved informally through discussions. But there was a case this year in a Sociology course from an international student who raised a case about a course taken over the summer before coming to Purdue. The student prepared a statement. It was reviewed by the committee, and if one person on the Committee believes that it wants a hearing, then you have a hearing, but we had two members who believed a hearing was warranted. There was a hearing, with representatives from Sociology, the committee, and the student represented themselves. But the hearing resulted in not changing the grade, so the case was dismissed. The results were reported to the Provost’s office as required.

Chair Johnston express appreciate to Dean Ebarb for the conscientiousness of the Grade Appeals Committee in listening to the concerns of students, and it is nice to know all that is running smoothly in the background.

c) *Educational Policy Committee*—presented by Sen. Will Gray

Sen. Gray began by asking Associate Dean Ebarb to provide background information to the CLA on the University Senate’s deliberations about embedded learning outcomes (ELO) and foundational learning outcomes (FLO) relating to DEI.

Dean Ebarb noted that the University Senate had initially considered adding a ninth FLO category to the Core Curriculum pertaining to DEI. Dean Ebarb had pushed back, observing that responsibility for delivering such content would have fallen heavily on the CLA; and that current CLA courses did not appear to cover all four of the attributes that the draft FLO called for. The University Senate had then adjusted its approach and elected to introduce a DEI requirement as an ELO instead.

Dean Ebarb reviewed the difference between ELOs and FLOs. We may well be meeting the ELOs for DEI in the core through a wide variety of our courses already. Whereas FLOs are reviewed for each course in the UCC to demonstrate that we are still meeting those requirements for purpose of accreditation, ELOs are not reviewed by the UCC.

Sen. Gray then shared his screen to show the wording of the ELO approved by the University Senate in their Feb 20 meeting. He suggested that we consider how and whether to determine whether CLA courses already meet these criteria. The document highlighted the four “key outcomes” for DEI mentioned by Associate Dean Ebarb; however, as Dean Ebarb noted, individual courses would not have to fulfill all four of the “embedded” outcomes identified.

Sen. Gray observed that EPC review of the CLA’s existing “Social Diversity” course requirement had been on hold while awaiting the decision at the University Senate level, since the introduction of a university-wide FLO would have had significant repercussions for the CLA curriculum. The ELO option chosen by the University Senate ensures that the CLA can maintain its “Social Diversity” category as is. But the question remains whether the EPC should *also* attempt to determine how well the DEI ELOs are being fulfilled by CLA coursework. He closed by asking the Senate to confirm whether this issue should reside in the EPC, as opposed to DEI or Curriculum committees, since the EPC is already dealing with the “Social Diversity” category at the college level. Solicited feedback on this over email since the meeting time was almost over.

Sen. Klein-Pejšová asked if there is a timeline by which we need to decide how to move forward. Sen. Gray said he is not aware of a deadline since the new ELOs are not yet listed on the UCC website. Dean Ebarb noted again the University encourages the college to confirm students are getting exposed to the many ELOs in the UCC, but only the FLOs come with the carrot and stick since there is a formal review process for those.

Sen. Johnston thanked Sen. Gray and Dean Ebarb for their report and noted this is an issue that will likely carry over into next year when we will have better sense of the urgency of actions needed.

6. New Business

Sen. Johnston opened the floor for new items of concern. None were raised.

7. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:58pm.