

Faculty Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 9, 2011

SEM II C1105, 1:00-3:00pm

Faculty Chair Joe Tougas called the meeting to order at 1:16 p.m. The following announcement was made:

- Dani Madrone provided an update on the Clean Energy Committee and the Thurston County Biomass Moratorium. She indicated she has been asked to serve on the Thurston County Moratorium on New Biomass Facilities and more student involvement is needed. She suggested that the Clean Energy Committee is concerned about how the Clean Energy Student Fee was used in that students have not been wholly engaged in the process. She indicated that a request will be made to the President to charge two DTFs - the Public Participation Student DTF (Spring quarter); and the Renewable Energy Action Plan DTF (next academic year). Further, she will request that the Thurston County Biomass moratorium be honored. Dani also indicated that the Clean Energy Committee will request that no additional student fees are used on the Biomass project.

Biomass Gasification Update – Joe introduced Ted Whitesell and encouraged all faculty to consider being involved in governance such as the Sustainability Council, which currently does not have enough faculty members participating. Ted indicated he is primarily involved with this issue due to the 8-credit program he is offering, (“Applied Research: Biomass, Energy, and Environmental Justice”), as well as his work on the Sustainability Council. Ted provided a handout which includes an article in the Olympian raising questions about Evergreen’s proposal. He indicated there has been much concern about what Evergreen is planning. He indicated the papers written by his students will be posted on the program blog, and that Evergreen has a climate action plan, including a plan for a DTF, that should be charged next year. He indicated that faculty should weigh in on the issue. The following discussion ensued:

- Urgency has been expressed to make a decision due to funding streams that are only available for a short period of time. (Ted responded that different parts of the college are taking different approaches, an indicator of a lack of coordination).
- It was suggested that the science related to carbon balance is not the most important issue here; rather, it is the community perception and communication.
- There is a lack of coordination between the Sustainability Council, Facilities and fundraisers (grants pursuers) in relation to this project.
- Joe urged faculty to think about how they can become involved and reminded the faculty that they can request specific governance assignments through the Agenda Committee.

Faculty Chair-elect for 2011-2012 Nominations – Andrew Reece indicated that the nominations taken earlier in the year did not result in anyone willing to stand. He asked for further nominations and none ensued. Joe indicated that this is the first year of having a chair-elect and it has worked well. It was suggested that the work of the faculty chair needs to be valued through compensation. It was suggested that this level of work is difficult, yet compensation will not lessen the work.

Nominations will continue to be open until the position is filled. Agenda Committee members are available after the meeting if you would like to nominate yourself or someone else.

Re-Modeling Teaching and Learning at Evergreen (RTaLE) Presentation & Discussion – Nancy Murray began by providing a quick “clicker” tutorial for use later in the discussion. Co-chairs Kathleen Eamon and Julia Zay introduced the conversation by first indicating that the votes are actually intended to take the pulse of the faculty, with the qualitative discussion being of the greatest value to the DTF. Kathleen went on to read the proposal as passed by faculty in fall, 2010 and reiterated that this work has been committed to by both the

faculty and the administration. She asked, as much as possible, for faculty to consider advising from the student perspective, from a values-based discussion versus a workload discussion, for today. This is the first discussion of the faculty as a whole regarding the advising relationship between faculty and student. Julia continued indicating that the questions in the survey are practical in nature to get at values. The format for the discussion was reviewed where a vote will be taken on an individual item, followed by discussion and then a second vote before moving on to the next question. Student DTF member Anna Wolfe-Pauley read the questions. A handout providing examples of how each of the statements could be enacted were presented and briefly discussed (see below).

	NOTE: "advising" here intended to refer to the kind of breadth and depth undergraduate advising outlined in the values statement.	Essential	Sure	Ambivalent	Not so much	Decidedly not
1.	Advising approaches should vary according to a student's class standing.	30% 13	47% 20	19% 8	2% 1	2% 1
	Second vote on #1	42% 18	35% 15	14% 6	2% 1	7% 3
2.	Advising activities should occur at the same time for all students and serve as a college-wide moment of reflection.	21% 9	21% 9	31% 13	12% 5	14% 6
	Second vote on #2	24% 10	26% 11	26% 11	7% 3	17% 6
3.	Advising should provide students across the curriculum and campuses with a set of common experiences.	16% 7	30% 13	28% 12	9% 4	16% 7
	Second vote on #3	28% 12	30% 13	23% 10	9% 4	9% 4
4.	Students should have exposure to a variety of faculty advisors.	30% 13	44% 19	12% 5	12% 5	2% 1
	Second vote on #4 (did not occur)					
5.	Students should have a long term relationship with one or two faculty advisors.	14% 6	36% 15	33% 14	12% 5	5% 2
	Second vote on #5 (did not occur)					
6.	Students should be advised by a faculty member who is evaluating them.	23% 10	14% 6	35% 15	21% 9	7% 3
	Second vote on #6 (did not occur)					
7.	Students should be advised by a faculty member other than the one evaluating them.	14% 6	23% 10	47% 20	5% 2	12% 5
	Second vote on #7 (did not occur)					

The following discussion ensued, with DTF responses in parentheses:

1. Advising approaches should vary according to a student's class standing.
 - Does Year One at the college include transfers? (Yes)
 - What is the alternative approach? (Could be same set of questions/assignments each year.)
 - Would want this to be based on the student's capacity to think through the problem, which is not necessarily based on their standing. In other words, the structure should be loose enough to allow for different levels of engagement within each class standing.
 - The movement from Year II to Year III is significant in the way it moves from breadth to depth, which reads more like a plan. (Another piece of the proposal is an academic plan, which could look different for different students. Idea is, generally, when do you declare the equivalent of a major and why might we ask students to do that?)
 - Interest expressed in seeing advising cohorts for first generation students. Idea of an intellectual memoir suggests that students would already know they are at a liberal arts college, which is a false assumption in many cases.

- Agreement expressed that students entering and then students leaving have a lot of commonality but students in the middle are more individualized.
 - A question was raised regarding a move toward depth and capacities, with a sense that students in year-long programs have the ability to explore in quite some depth yet that is not necessarily reflected in the work thus far.
 - Would be happy with a more flexible model that allows for students who do not conduct their education solely at Evergreen and in four years.
2. Advising activities should occur at the same time for all students and serve as a college-wide moment of reflection.
- Makes a difference on whether the word “only” is inserted.
 - Have always thought this is a good idea as one way to make sure it will actually happen.
 - Will likely be a chaotic experience but less so by creating the space and time for it to occur vs. randomly.
 - Want to have everyone on campus at the same time so when faculty are advising students they can refer them to colleagues for planning with the assumption they will be available.
 - Based on experience at another institution where students were doing even greater independent work, when students have a large amount of autonomy, the only way advising works is to create a consistent time and place. There are drawbacks from a faculty perspective, but it is the most student-centered.
 - Res Based and Tacoma campuses should be kept on the radar as there may be a bit of difficulty within these two programs. (The DTF considers the values to be applicable to all students but the way it is carried out may be unique for these two programs).
 - This would be a way for all of the support people on campus to dedicate themselves (e.g., Academic Advising, Writing Center, Student Activities)
 - Having in one week would amplify significance. Doesn't, however, prohibit faculty from doing advising at other times, but rather adds reflection to advising they already do.
 - Does this apply to graduate programs? (Right now we're thinking about undergraduate liberal arts. This doesn't mean that we won't want to have discussions with grad programs, but because of the professional nature of the programs there are other objectives at play. The proposal the faculty passed referred to degree-seeking undergraduate students).
 - Opposed, but hard to articulate. A couple of examples: when a student is not in a program, it becomes a chance to escape. This is a new requirement and should be acknowledged as such.
 - Finding a time might be difficult and could reduce the flexibility and creativity, of when classes meet or go on retreat, which could be problematic.
 - Ambivalent because of the statement above. Should do the same thing with flexibility about when. Not the first requirement of students, yet possible to imagine a different ways for students to fulfill the requirement. (Yet the academic statement will be required; our job is to figure out how to fill it in a meaningful way).
3. Advising should provide students across the curriculum and campuses with a set of common experiences.
- Selected essential because we ought to be teaching students how to self-advise. For example, if a student comes to an arts faculty asking about environmental studies, the faculty can't competently advise about that particular field but can advise about how to conduct the research and become competent in taking the initiative to find the right resources/faculty.
 - If it indicated a common set of skills vs. experiences, I would have been less ambivalent.
 - Chose sure vs. essential because I was unsure about what type of experiences. Like it because of the possibility for intellectually rigorous experiences.
 - For students for whom college is not a known experience, they are not always confident enough. The examples provide a structure for all students to learn how to navigate the college and curriculum.
 - Some of the examples are activities that already take place.

- There are a number of opportunities for collaboration between academic advising and faculty, this is an area where there is greater impetus for collaboration between student affairs and faculty to get a greater sense of agency across the student body.
 - Understand this proposal as a common experience vs. common activities that faculty and students avail themselves of.
 - Like a lot of the ideas, which looks like it could be a 3-day symposium. Changes vote to #2 as it has to happen at a common time.
 - What we voted on was to have students do something in common that's required and we need to recognize that there will need to be something else required in order for them to do it.
4. Students should have exposure to a variety of faculty advisors; Students should have a long term relationship with one or two faculty advisors;
- Advising models not mutually exclusive. (but do need to make a choice to institutionalize)
 - Want to say both. Realize the enormous advantage of having students exposed to faculty from different fields and, at the same time, longevity of the relationship is important, making both very powerful models.
 - To a great extent, the choice should be up to the student. Very likely, faculty would be terrible advisors for some students and great for others.
 - Students should be able to choose who they'd like for their advisor. Would be a good advisor for the first two years but could imagine it would be better for advanced students to work with a faculty in the field they are most passionate about.
5. Students should be advised by a faculty member who is evaluating them; Students should be advised by a faculty member other than the one evaluating them.
- For most students the evaluation doesn't conflict with advising.
 - While, as a student, I often got advice from past faculty I think there is a tension between awarding credit and advising.
 - Think students would also benefit from a model that mixes up choices between #4 and #5, it's good for students to be able to move towards a chosen field of study and advisor.
 - See a significant number of students trying not to be seen or known. Wonder if an advisor who is not also reading their work will have enough information to do substantive advising.

Meeting adjourned at 3:02.