Minutes: October 4, 2022

College of Liberal Arts Faculty Senate

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

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

Approved by Faculty Senate, November 8, 2022.

Roll

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

Guests: Matthew Allen, Dorsey Armstrong, Jamin Asay, Stacey Connaughton, Fritz Davis, Joel Ebarb, Carolina Ferreira, Jen Hoewe, Wei Hong, Brian Leung, Sorin Matei, Erin Moodie, Nush Powell, Melissa Remis, Linda Renzulli, Lori Sparger, Holly Tittle-Hudson.

Senators absent: Browning, Bulow, Harris, Marsh, Parrish, Ramirez, 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 Srivastrava present as alternates for Sen. Ann Clark and Melissa Will (Political Science).

1. Approval of the Minutes

Chair Johnston presented the minutes from the meeting of Sept 13, 2022.

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

2. Chair's Remarks – Dr. Michael Johnston

Chair Johnson took a few minutes to review some of the priorities identified for the remainder of this semester. These include concerns reported on by the DEI committee regarding variation in Paid Parental Leave across units and highlighting the vulnerabilities and power differences reported by some faculty and the challenges in making them more equitable. The next step could be to send the issue to the Faculty Affairs Committee to look at a way forward. A second issue of concern is the overall climate on campus for faculty of color, including recruitment, support, and retention, around which the Senate will be generating a more specific charge for the DEI Committee to study (discussed more in Agenda item #5 below). He also noted that the Senate will ask the FAC to look at ways forward on addressing faculty discontent with hiring practices across the College, underscoring that not all faculty share the concern. This may involve the FAC developing a statement of best practices, expressing the will of the Senate for how hiring committees ought to be populated. He emphasized the senate is a representative body, working on issues the faculty is concerned about, so please be engaged and active in discussions.

A copy of Johnston's full opening remarks is available on the CLA Senate website.

3. Dean's Report

a) Lori Sparger: Undergraduate Enrollment Report

CLA held basically steady with new beginners in fall 2022. The numbers are still settling down after the big university wide surge of incoming students in fall 2021. Degree+ and cornerstone

are both helping to keep numbers up in CLA, while we are slightly ahead of the rest of the university with respect to underrepresented minority student enrollments. Cornerstone is having an impact on students' decisions to take a CLA major as a second major thru Degree+. The College is still trying to get the university to recognize the second major as measure of impact in CLA. Covid is still impacting recruitment, so virtual recruitment sessions have been useful for students who can't get to campus. Assoc. Dean Ebarb suggests that faculty can make a difference in reaching out to admitted students and convincing them to come to Purdue. She ended this segment by introducing the new recruitment staff in the College.

The slide presentation of the full enrollment data is available on the CLA Senate website.

Questions/discussion: Sen. Webb asked who decides CLA enrollment caps. Can we accept as many as we want, or who determines the size of incoming class? Sparger says admission numbers are a university level decision, noting that our current goal is about the same as last year. The admission decisions are made centrally based on university guidelines on student qualifications informed by CLA priorities. So we ask them to look closely at artistic and creative endeavors, not unduly weighting math and science. Ebarb follows up that there is a concrete number that is set for our goal by Enrollment Management. They admit a certain number of students to achieve a certain predicted yield. We have limited control over the goal for admission, but we do have agency over the yield. We can yield as many as we possibly can up to the number admitted, so that's where we can make the difference through recruitment efforts with events and contact with faculty, etc. Though we work very hard on yield, we always seem to just hit the mark. We need to emphasize to students why someone would come to Purdue to study Liberal Arts. Commends Sparger and her team for their efforts. Sparger reiterates about 15% admitted students decide to come, but if 35% decide to come, they would certainly be able to get in.

Sen. Flachs asked about strategies that are particularly successful in recruitment and wondered if that comes out in the data. Sparger suggests the cold calls are a big challenge. Meeting with the student during an event here, follow up calls can be easier to get through call screening. For written contact, anything that is personalized, rather than generic "Dear Admitted Student" letters has better impact.

b) Lori Sparger: CLA Space Committee Report

Sparger provided an update on the progress of plans to renovate University and Stanley Coulter Halls and demolish Heavilon. She noted these plans are currently in flux. Reviewed a bit the history of planned projects, noting in the case of University Hall (the oldest building on campus) that campus tours go by University but not through it since it's not attractive inside. She reviewed goals of the project to adapt the building renovations to new modes of work across different career streams. In late August, after meeting with faculty, head, and grad student committees over the summer, things got quiet since cost projections got really high in the concept stages, and upper admin started to look more closely at the numbers. But we seem to be back on track and the architect/design team will meet with the Board of Trustees on Friday (10/7) to hopefully approve a design and construction plan, which will encompass renovation in Stanley Coulter, Beering, University, and probably still taking down Heavilon. How people are going to shuffle around is still not clear. This could be a \$40 million investment but didn't have the BOT documents in front of her for specific estimates.

Questions/discussion: Prof. Stacey Connaughton (COMM) thanked Sparger for her recruitment efforts reported earlier. She related stories she had just recently been hearing about

the impact of the renovations on Comm in Beering, including grads getting office space taken away, faculty moving off 2nd floor of Beering, and lots of other reshuffling, which was the first she'd heard of it. Asks what will happen to Comm lab spaces, and faculty with disabilities in Comm as they need to be considered. Lori responds that Comm will not be losing or moving any lab space. Lots of conversations about moving the Lamb Sch to the Beering first floor as a "marquee space", but at this point Comm is staying on the 2nd floor because of costs. Grad spaces are all moving toward graduate hubs across campus, which is not unique to CLA or any particular department. Sparger notes that much of this would have been covered in Town Halls that were scheduled for the beginning of the semester, but that got postponed when budget concerns came up, and they didn't want to share out concepts with the CLA community until plans were readjusted to fit the budget.

Sen. Jen William raised concerns about lack of communication from the architects since heads were not updated about the costs and its connection to cancellation of the town halls. People were left in the dark, especially in the last 6 weeks. Lori agreed that communication has not been great, even to the College. With an eye on time, Chair Johnston notes that we'll gather additional question in the chat or use the Qualtrics and we'll get those to Lori to address in more detail.

4. Committee Reports

a) Curriculum Committee Report-presented by Assoc Dean Ebarb (<u>proposed course changes</u> available on CLA Faculty Senate Website)

Ebarb presented the new courses proposed by the Curriculum Committee in place of Committee Chair, Sen Amanda Veile, who has course conflicts with Senate meetings this semester. Reminds everyone to review these before the meetings. Ebarb summarized the short list of courses, and Chair asked for amendments (none suggested) and then a motion to approve.

Motion: Sen. Denny

Second: Sen. Flachs

Vote by Zoom poll: 25 yes, 1 abstain. Course changes approved.

5. Old Business

a) DEI Committee (DEI Committee Chair and CLA Senator Andrew Flachs)—Time was dedicated to discussion of issues surrounding variation in administering Paid Parental Leave, and campus responses to sexual assault. DEI Committee Chair Andrew Flachs requested that through discussion the Senate provide some specific actions the DEI Committee should take on these matters. Both issues were investigated and reported by the DEI Committee last semester, and Sen. Flachs summarized the issues below before the floor was opened for discussion and potential solutions. [Presentation and discussions are consolidated here for clarity since the topics alternated in their order during the meeting.]

i) Sexual Assault Report

Sen. Flachs outlines a series of suggestions that came out of the Sept 22, 2022, meeting of the DEI committee. Three concrete outcomes the committee requested based on their study

are (1) a singular consolidated website with resources and procedures where students and mandatory reporters (and others as needed) could take appropriate action in response to an incident. These web resource currently exist, he noted, but are more scattered than the committee would like which can lead to confusion. (2) They also suggest the implementation of syllabus language, and coordinated training involving faculty, grads, Purdue Police, and CARE on issues of sexual assault and harassment, where faculty could incorporate their perspectives on critical violence and intersectionality. (3) And finally, a request for more intensive and targeted workshops on assault that shifts the focus more to the aggressors and perpetrators of assault, acknowledging that much of the onus falls on the victims in these situations.

Questions/Discussion: None were immediately raised. Sen Flachs reminded us that this is a difficult issue, and the DEI Comm hasn't had much luck solving it either. Chair Johnston asks Dean Ebarb if there is a mechanism for requesting language on these issues be added to the College website, or if the Senate were to vote for adding mandatory language to syllabi around assault concerns, how that might be instituted. Dean Ebarb replied that we can't have anything on the CLA site that contradicts or interferes with university policy; but if it is in alignment with existing policies, and language on the university site already exists, we can simply highlight that language from the CLA site. Adding language to syllabi, which the DEI Committee also suggested above, is tricky, since required language gets into encroaching on faculty agency on courses. Even the Provost's template for syllabi language that comes out each year is couched as recommendations that instructors can choose to use or not. Therefore, Dean Ebarb did not have a firm answer for that but suggests speaking to the Provost's office if we want to explore it further.

ii) Paid Parental Leave Report

Sen. Flachs reminded the Senate that the DEI Committee remains at an impasse with the PPL issue, since the policy of giving the heads discretion over leave does work well for most people while maintaining necessary privacy. He noted that we need to tread carefully since forcing a major policy change could make things worse for everyone. He suggests handing the issue to the FAC (if appropriate) to see if they find out a way out of the "double bind" since privacy is a concern. He acknowledged that heads understandably don't want to cede authority on this given the impact on their departments, but "handshake deals" and intense variation means that from a DEI perspective there is potential for it to impact precarious faculty across gender, race, and other lines of identity given inherent power differences. And since we were told about these issues by faculty, we can't just do nothing or these surveys and deliberative bodies will come to be seen as pointless. He concluded by pleading with the Senate to use the data reported by the DEI for actionable goals, and not shelve it. Encourage everyone again to read the reports of the committee.

Questions/Discussion: Sen. Denny asks if College or University HR folks have been asked about what possibilities there are for modifying the policy if we wanted to change something. Sen. Flachs says that's a sticky issue with the heads since implementation would require an HR representative and likely lawyers getting involved with these conversations.

Prof. Linda Renzulli (Dept Head, SOC) says that the PPL issue not just about power and authority of the heads, since heads advocate for their faculty the best they can; but she understands there needs to be some kind of binding policy since heads rotate out of the position, and there needs to be continuity in leave practices. Picking up on Sen Denny's

point, she feels this is more an HR issue and outside the scope of the Senate, and that the Senate should bring it up to HR if they want; maybe HR can help us navigate what in the policy we are even allowed to change and how to negotiate that. Her second point is that we want to parse what is possible at different levels of the university, from the department to the college, all the way up to the federal government. So rather than telling the College what it should be doing, she suggests that maybe it's first a University Senate issue as the best place to start since the university is where the policies are shaped that inform CLA's. She recommends we all talk to our University Senators to engage this at that level. But even before that, it first should be brought before HR reps. If there is inequality, have senators talk to the HR faculty rep (Tera Bivins, Senior Human Resources Business Partner) if there is someone who is not getting their needs met.

Sen. Flachs agreed that it's a good idea to pass it on to HR and the University level. Reminds us that the reason it came to the DEI committee is because individual heads can be great advocates, but policies need to protect everyone. People have reported they are uncomfortable in asking for the aid that they are entitled to to begin with; and that asking for these rights would make them vulnerable in some way. His committee, by its charge, is concerned with the percent of faculty who don't feel protected, and the wild variation in execution of the policy, even if the policy does exist. There may be a reason for variation, but reiterates the desire to find a way to protect those feeling vulnerable about asking for accommodation (e.g., marginalized or untenured faculty), while avoiding the implementation of a rigid, uniform policy that ends up being bad for everyone. But moving it up the chain may be the best way forward.

Chair Johnston agrees that at our level, the FAC could be the next step for this issue. He thanked Prof. Renzulli for offering a head's perspective on this issue.

Sen. Flachs noted that this is exactly the kind of conversation the DEI Committee wanted to see happening around this issue in the Senate.

Sen Clair contributed that as a Full Professor, she's aware that junior faculty may not know of all the resources available to them. And even as a senior faculty, she was in a situation a few years ago where she did not get the support and accommodations she needed from her department head after a serious accident. She suggests as a potential solution that we develop a double reporting method where a request for leave goes both to the head and to HR immediately, then nobody feels exposed for going to HR it automatically is forwarded to them.

b) Cornerstone

Chair Johnston provided a brief update that the Agenda Committee is collating a list of questions and concerns around Cornerstone raised by faculty on the Qualtrics survey and in the Zoom chat during the September Senate meeting and will send them to Dean Ebarb via email so that he can address them at the November meeting. Those issues include the teaching load of new hires in Cornerstone, the percentage of students that are getting taught by tenure track, non-tenure track faculty, postdocs, etc., and how these fit into the university policies capping the percentage of instruction that can be delivered by non-tenure track faculty. Also, how these obligations affect core cost coverage by the home departments, how Cornerstone is managed in cooperation with departments and P&T evaluations, and the degree of academic freedom

afforded faculty in Cornerstone classes. And finally, how can we better protect/prepare instructors teaching politically charged topics to Cornerstone students who haven't been exposed to challenging topics in their major disciplines.

Questions/Discussion: Sen. Denny suggests it would be helpful to have more context about policies of academic freedom and how those issues are taken up, especially in large multi-section classes like COMM 104 and ENGL 106. He proposes in the November meeting to have that broader discussion where faculty can add some context from their experiences. Chair Johnston thanked Sen Denny for his comment and suggestion, and notes that the Agenda Committee can be sure to invite members of the Cornerstone steering committee to help clarify these issues, along with Dean Ebarb's responses that he will be preparing. He also reminded the Senate that any other recommendations for the next meeting should be sent to Vice-Chair Kauffman-Bueller who is also Chair of the Agenda Committee or submit questions through the Qualtrics.

6. New Business

Chair Johnston opened the floor for new business, but nothing was raised.

7. Adjourn

Chair Johnston entertained a motion to adjourn at 4:54pm.

Motion to adjourn by Sen Wood, seconded by Sen Flachs.