Faculty Meeting Minutes
November 17, 2010
SEM II B1105, 1:00-3:00pm

Joe Tougas opened the meeting in harmony at 1:18.

Joe invited **Announcements:**
- Sustainability and Justice Planning Unit – it was announced that the Sustainability and Justice Planning Unit is now official. Karen Gaul and Rob Knapp will serve as co-PUCs.
- Evergreen Faculty Union Solidarity Scholarship – Ulrike Krotcheck provided information on the student scholarship and asked faculty to consider participating. Those who already contribute were asked to stand and be thanked. Applause ensued.
- CAB Building Dedication will be held today at 3:30.
- Faculty Directory – Amy Betz provided some background on the new Faculty Directory. She indicated that, until recently, it was updated by a manual process which caused a drain on staff time. This fall an automated system was debuted and the changes help advisors and students identify faculty and their subject areas. She indicated that useful feedback has been received. She showed an example page and walked the faculty through it. She indicated that the degree information, which has been on the page in the past, will be added. Another request has been made to have web links posted, which will occur once a process is identified to post only those which are current. http://www.evergreen.edu/faculty
- Kent Reister from the GSU asked faculty to solicit students to participate in governance committees and direct them to http://www.geoduckunion.info/ .

Re-Modeling Teaching and Learning at Evergreen DTF Academic Statement and Advising Proposal Discussion and Vote:
Co-chairs Kathleen Eamon and Julia Zay, along with DTF members Krishna Chowdary, Steve Niva and Steven Hendricks, guided the presentation. Two handouts were passed out (Annotated Proposal and Frequently Asked Questions). They began by reading the proposal (proposed changes from the draft presented at the week 5 meeting are underlined):

In order to better meet our institutional commitment to a culture of critical reflection, an iterative Academic Statement will be required of all degree-seeking undergraduate students. The final version of the Academic Statement will be required in the transcript as a condition of graduation. The Statement will serve as a key feature in annual college-wide advising structures, which will include sustained faculty-student work on intellectual synthesis and enhancing the breadth and depth of students' interdisciplinary liberal arts education. Implementation of the Academic Statement is contingent on the development and faculty approval of these advising structures and on institutional support of these structures and of faculty, to include workload reconfiguration and possible compensation.

The faculty were then asked to discuss the proposal line-by-line (responses in parentheses).

1. *In order to better meet our institutional commitment to a culture of critical reflection*
   - A question was raised regarding the role of the Six Expectations (this will need to be determined in the implementation phase)

2. *an iterative Academic Statement will be required of all degree-seeking undergraduate students.*
- It was noted that the word annually was removed from this sentence. (In order to place the responsibility on the college vs. dictate that students should be in full-time status)
- A question was raised as to the meaning of the word "degree-seeking" (Admitted student. Clarification: If someone is taking one class they wouldn't need to do an Academic Statement)

3. *The final version of the Academic Statement will be required in the transcript as a condition of graduation.*
- ➤ How would we make this a meaningful vs. punitive requirement on students? (Faculty will need to discuss this at length in the implementation phase during winter and spring quarters)
- ➤ If a student, five years out, wants to re-frame their academic statement, is there an opportunity to change it? (We'd need to discuss this as a part of implementation. Registration & Records totally supports the proposal as part of student learning and is ready to be part of the implementation)
- ➤ Once a transcript goes out, it can't change, correct? (Correct)
- ➤ How would the requirement part of #2 be enforced? (It would be an institutional commitment by all faculty, administrators and students to a culture of critical reflection)
- ➤ Is it the intention for the interim drafts to be part of the transcript? (Not currently intended for the transcript; but would be part of the e-portfolio. An implementation issue is that when students apply to grad school the interim drafts would not be part of the official transcript)
- ➤ What was the purpose in leaving out student responsibility? (In the annotated proposal it is discussed in addressing both student voice and student responsibility. It's both nowhere in the proposal as well as the back drop for the entire proposal)

4. *The Statement will serve as a key feature in <u>annual</u> college-wide advising structures, which will include sustained faculty-student work on intellectual synthesis and <u>enhancing the breadth and depth of students' interdisciplinary liberal arts education</u>.*
- ➤ Steve Niva described what he discovered in his year working in Academic Advising where he found a gap in the consistency of student advising.
- ➤ Sara Martin indicated that the staff in Academic Advising are interested in supporting faculty work to design structures. She indicated they are eager to see a cultural shift toward student intentionality in planning their education.

5. *Implementation of the Academic Statement is contingent on the development and <u>faculty approval of these</u> advising structures and on institutional support of these structures and of faculty, to include workload reconfiguration and possible compensation.*
- ➤ In deliberations, was it your goal to address workload? (Minimally this could be workload neutral, with a hope that it will ultimately reduce workload by building structures into compensated work)
- ➤ It was suggested that advising will happen casually no matter what structures we put in place which might impact workload. (Creating a culture of critical reflection within an academic program is a lot of work. As an academic institution, it would be positive to have this instituted college-wide).
- ➤ It seems very important to be clear about the fact that we have ways to support this. There will be start-up costs and it's important that we only do this if we have the start-up costs in place. It was suggested that we need a semester system.
- ➤ This proposal addresses the work and values that we have both for students and each other. It is useful for all faculty, and particularly new faculty, to have a structure that can be pointed to.

The discussion then shifted to general questions and comments:
- ➤ It would be helpful to have this work embedded into what students are already doing. As a senior student, I wonder what it would have been like to have had support in critical reflection from the beginning.
- ➤ Regarding workload -- there are ways to think about it in a workload neutral ways (students in my program) vs. non-neutral (25 students I haven't worked with before). If in-program, re-configuration matters a lot to shift what we do within our programs, such as not covering quite as much content and focusing some on skills to write a good self-evaluation. Having a structure that involves communal work by students with each other can reduce workload, such as having students read each others' self-evaluations which is not a one hour task for faculty; communal work amongst students could have the greatest positive impact.
- ➤ Some models of minimally adequate academic statements would be useful.
- ➤ Concern was raised about the equity of our current reliance on a casual advising structure.

- The proposal is intended to address, in part, student retention both in programs and at the college. When students are retained in programs, it causes less work for faculty. It also has positive impacts on students' ability to engage in upper level work
- Some of us have taught at other institutions where advising is required. It is not just about writing a statement but about proactive work with students about their pathway, which takes sustained faculty/student work. It also requires the ability to understand the curriculum, which takes time. (The proposal includes language specific to work reconfiguration and possible faculty compensation if we come up with a proposal that requires more work of faculty vs. credit-bearing work).
- Understand the vote today is regarding the proposal and that there will be further conversation about the actual structures. Question about the level of agreement needed for structures to be enacted.
- Concern expressed about separating this vote from the implementation vote.
- In response, another faculty member spoke in support of the separation between the two as we are now voting for the possibility of a culture shift that still needs to be worked out.
- The idea of a culture shift is important. Marlboro and Prescott's advising structures create a certain energy amongst students that we should work toward. They place more effort in their incoming students, which suggests a work differential for different stages of the work.
- Don't want to conflate Gen Ed with this. Gen Ed was top down vs. this which comes organically from the faculty.
- If we implement this, what is the problem we're solving, and our measurement to tell us that we've solved the problem? (The Academic Statement is out front because this is one of the places where we can look for evidence that what we're doing is working, such as through the transcript review and a qualitative analysis.)
- Another measurement is the presence of the student voice in the transcript overall. A distinct measurement would be all students having their voice in the transcript. This discussion is modeling a re-iteration of the culture of reflection that we're hoping to institute campus-wide. Sandy Yannone indicated that the Writing Center is fully behind supporting the models that get implemented if this proposal is passed.
- We are missing a step in not embedding a model testing phase. (Piloting will not create the desired culture shift and does not put into place the institutional structures.)
- If the goal is an academic statement from each student at the end of their career, it's easy to measure. The goal seems to be towards the retention of students. If we don't have a means of determining and measuring the goal, we don't have a means to stop if we haven't met it.
- Through interactions with students, we will have the best sense. As a result, students will be more engaged in their learning and involved in the college. This is a way of bringing the college together and getting to know students better.

The question was called and seconded.

> Faculty in favor: 69
> Faculty opposed: 6
> Faculty abstaining: 11

The proposal passed.
Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm