

Faculty Meeting Minutes

November 18, 2009

SEM II B1105, 1:00-3:00pm

Faculty Chair Rita Pougiales opened the meeting at 1:15 and thanked everyone for attending.

Announcements:

- Faculty members Joe Tougas and Anita Lenges announced a scholarship fund for faculty to provide assistance to students impacted by the tuition increases called **Evergreen Faculty Union Solidarity Scholarship**. They described several different options for faculty to donate to the fund including salary deductions of ½ % to 1%. Their goal is to get 20 people to make pledges and indicated Laurie Meeker will collect pledge forms at the end of the meeting.

Re-Modeling Teaching and Learning at Evergreen (RTaLE) DTF -- The Presentation was begun with introductions of the DTF. A handout outlining the background of the charge was distributed. Co-chair Kathleen Eamon then provided an agenda and goals for the day. Co-chair Julia Zay presented the DTF's website: <http://blogs.evergreen.edu/rtaledtf>. with a particular highlight of this as an opportunity to provide input on the issues and proposals, as well as an opportunity to submit new proposals.

Team Quantitative Data was then presented issues detailed in the charge relating to: improvements needing to be made to provide support for students to navigate the increasingly fragmented curriculum; lack of students engaging in team-taught programs; need for clearer curricular opportunities for students to attain interdisciplinary breadth; need for more evidence of student synthesis and integration in transcript documents; need for more thoughtful student curricular navigation and reflection

The proposals A – H in the handout were read in sections, and then the meeting was opened for questions and comments. Discussion ensued on the following topics:

- What would the portfolio look like?
- What does standardized suggested credit equivalencies mean (with a request for examples)?
- If students know their self-eval won't go in their transcript, concern that they won't be very thoughtful.
- It helps to think about this as not only a self-evaluation, but as a self-evaluation as well as a reflection to guide the path forward.
- Suggestion that we don't try to force the process to be "neat" for students when the path they take might not be.
- Should provide students some latitude in editing their transcript in the end.
- Encourage faculty to talk to students about proposals; some have indicated they are already doing this.

- Frame so self-evaluations stay at the center of student learning.
- Critical tension: who is the audience? Many evaluations are now written for the student vs. the external audience.
- Problem that students only have 30 days to edit an evaluation and a sense that they should have up until they graduate to do this work.
- Proposal demonstrates appreciation for difference between private (in-house) and public record. A transcript is evidence of college graduate-level understanding of work. To some degree, there is a heavy burden on a transcript that is different than that placed on grades. Need a comprehensive vision of what evaluations mean to faculty.
- Currently the student and faculty often talk to each other about the evaluation. If the replacement evals are disconnected from work with faculty, think there could be more of a disconnect.
- Students are engaged in a messy process from quarter to quarter, which should be internal with opportunities for time to create the public documents as well.

Discussion on Advising Proposals:

- Would like to see the senior statement be at the beginning of the transcript, similar to where summative evaluations are currently placed.
- Concern that we are looking at proposals without data, which seems difficult to move forward without data to define and measure breadth. For instance, math and art are not specifically mentioned when we know this is an issue. Question raised if there are groups of students who do not achieve breadth (e.g., transfer students, math/art students; BS); also - do students from other institutions get breadth?
- Is this a route to solve problems raised through transcript reviews and address re-accreditation?
- Questions about the academic plan and why it is not on the list – is it embedded in the academic portfolio? Seems like there should be a relationship between the academic plan and the portfolio
- Thought the genesis of our current work comes with an acceptance of the six expectations as a framework for our work.
- This cluster of proposals is the most critical and useful. The way we operate insists that students take responsibility for their own work in a way beyond that which happens at other colleges. Students have to do reflective work outside of programs in order to do reflective work to guide their next steps.
- Supports idea of curricular structures to support integrative essays and yearly evaluations/assessments, but unclear whether that could happen in current structure. Perhaps a semester system with an interim session, or carve out time during orientation or evaluation weeks.
- Believes self-evaluation in relation to program is critical and should not be lost, and there should be a re-commitment.
- Writing self-evaluations at the end of each program is useful. Also sees this as connected to the advising process which is key; the touchstone for really good advising between students and teachers is beyond the realm of the individual academic program. If structured into a week-long advising week (Carnivale), it could be very important.

- Believe it's a good idea to make a distinction between in-house and transcript evaluation. It's possible to require that credit not be posted until a self-evaluation is received (whether or not it's submitted to transcript); then synthetic evaluations depend on interim ones
- Having the self-evaluation buried within the transcript is not useful for students applying to medical or graduate school. Reducing the transcript size is useful.
- Why/when did the change occur to a timeline regarding when a student could alter/edit their transcript?

Discussion on Proposals Related to Individual study, project work, team-taught graduation requirement

- Suggestion to beef up H to include multi-content programs as part of a minimum requirement
- Explore upper division requirements to do independent work.
- Should consider group writing contracts, where group work/peer review is good pedagogically. If we're going to complicate the level students need to be at to do independent work, we need to create more group opportunities.
- Are ILC's really worthy of the credit they are being granted? There's a high number of ILC's because students can't get into programs. This needs to be addressed, there needs to be more faculty collaboration and more team teaching.
- Programs and an advising plan are needed to meet breadth requirements.
- 16% of students in 2 or more team-taught programs is a red flag given the college we are. Would also like to understand how many students are in programs sequentially and what % of students' academic careers are in team-taught programs.
- Needs to be faculty requirement to structure programs to include quantitative, qualitative and creative modes of inquiry.

Rita closed by thanking the DTF for the work they have presented.

The next Faculty Meeting, and last meeting for fall quarter, will be on December 9th.