

# Faculty Meeting Minutes

May 4, 2011

SEM II D1105, 1:00-3:00pm

Faculty Chair Joe Tougas opened the meeting at 1:16. The following announcements were made:

- Dani Madrone provided a handout and announced the **Synergy Conference**, which will take place from May 9-13, 2011. She provided an overview of several free events that will occur as part of the conference. She encouraged faculty to promote the events. Dani thanked the faculty who took part in the planning of the conference and those who have let Dani announce the conference to their students.
- Sara Martin, on behalf of Bill Ransom and Elizabeth Williamson, requested that additional faculty participate in a parent seminar as part of **Freshman Advising Day** this Friday. Faculty Seminar Leaders are needed from 10:45am-12:30pm.
- Jeff Mleczo, a student studying the history of Evergreen with a focus on student involvement, invited faculty to encourage their students to participate in one of two forums to support him in his research on May 11 and 16 in Lib 3301, 1-3pm both days.

**Provost Search DTF Thank You** – DTF members received a robust round of applause for their successful work resulting in a new Provost who will soon begin. Recognition given to Laura Coghlan, Laura Grabhorn, Ruth Hayes, Heather Heying, Holly Joseph, Abby Kelso, Mesa Lindgren, David McAvity, Greg Mullins, Mindy Muzatko, Alice Nelson, Susan Preciso, Tyrus Smith, Todd Sprague, Lisa Sweet, Zoe Van Schyndel and Jeannie Chandler who supported the DTF's work.

**Evergreen Faculty Union Solidarity Scholarship Update** – Stephanie Kozick and Savvina Chowdhury provided an overview of the UFE scholarship, which was initially funded by 25 faculty. That money funded four \$850 scholarships in 2010-11. A quote from a student recipient was read. Stephanie indicated that, for next year, 16 faculty donated and funded two scholarships for next academic year. Forms were distributed to seek additional contributions for the 2012-2013 scholarship fund. An explanation of the options followed. Completed forms should be submitted to Paul McMillin.

**Fundraising Update** – Lee Hoemann and Amanda Walker provided a broader overview of fundraising efforts. Lee thanked faculty for their contributions, which include the Solidarity Scholarship, Annual Fund, Art of Living, Sustainability Scholarships, Peanut Butter and Jelly Fund, and more. Lee indicated that faculty are the best partners in fundraising for scholarships and funds to support college's work, including those that support faculty development. Lee indicated that her division is working on a 10-year business plan in recognition that "business as usual" is no longer enough. A summer fundraising institute was announced. Lee suggested that, while they are not looking for a large cadre of faculty to solicit funding, faculty are the best ones to tell the story. Lee announced that, as part of the 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration, there will be many events

including 12 travelling seminars that will include faculty. She further indicated that there are two faculty governance opportunities on the Board of Governors and a faculty presence has made a tremendous difference on how the Board thinks about faculty work.

**Faculty Governance Nominations** – Joe indicated that nominations are open for the next two weeks for the following positions (with nominations following each position):

- Faculty Chair-elect (with brief description provided by Joe Tougas) – David McAvity, Nancy Koppelman
- Agenda Committee (with description provided by Maria Bastaki) – (5 positions - 2 year position). Zoltan Grossman
- Faculty Advisory Panel on the College Budget (with description provided by Jules Unsel) – Clarissa Dirks, Stacey Davis
- Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) (with description provided by Ralph Murphy) (3 yr commitment) – Lin Nelson

**Re-Modeling Teaching and Learning at Evergreen** (RTaLE) – Joe began framing the discussion by indicating that he has been following the RTaLE work with interest because of the commitment to shared responsibility to the development and delivery of our teaching. He suggested that this work is not only about our teaching and selection of teaching partners but also in the creation of systems that help us follow through on our commitments to one another. Joe urged faculty to keep three separate questions apart from one another: 1) what's the best response to address the issues that motivated the work; 2) is that response good enough; and 3) how will the proposal be negotiated as part of our contract. He indicated that the only question we are here to discuss today is the first question.

Nancy Murray went on to indicate that the DTF received a lot of feedback at the Week 4 faculty meeting, which is not yet reflected in the proposal. She indicated that DTF members have met with several student groups to get a wide cross-section of input from students since the week 4 meeting. Four students were invited to provide their perspectives on the proposal.

Christopher Rotundo – Christopher provided a background on his education as an Evergreen alum who has worked in the Writing Center since 2009. He expressed his support for the model because it builds into the structure of Evergreen a system that helps students understand their Evergreen education. He indicated that he sought out elements of the model because none existed. He expressed regret in not writing the optional summative self-evaluation. He indicated that if he had had the benefit of this work, his education would likely have looked different.

Megan – Megan, a senior this year, described her educational experience beginning with being thrust into making academic decisions which resulted in a mandatory furlough for a year. She indicated that most students do not get the type of one-on-one support that she then sought out after her year away. She supported the draft model as a way to help students provide structure for themselves. She indicated that she is in favor of the draft

book-end model as it provides assurance of an iterative model that ultimately provides support for “the most important” document a student will write.

Trevor Van Dyke – Trevor described his education and indicated that Evergreen was his only choice. After describing his education, he indicated his frustration with the lack of support for students. He expressed appreciation for the model: 1) communication to help students go about planning their education ; 2) tools to aid student self-discovery and make it less intimidating to meet others; 3) model aides in developing more of a sense of writing for students with emphasis on critical reflection.

Erin Dougherty – Erin indicated that, as a 34-year old sophomore, she chose Evergreen for the opportunity to make her own choices. She expressed a belief that the model builds thoughtfulness into the system, making students more aware of the Six Expectations. She indicated that students are currently stressed about completing self-evals whereas the model provides a more thoughtful process to complete the students’ transcript document. She indicated that this support is needed each year. She believes that the advising system will make educational planning more accessible to students who may not otherwise seek out faculty to do this work.

**Discussion** – Kathleen reminded faculty that there are some changes in the DTF’s thinking regarding the detail of the proposal: (check list) first year, credit associated with advising, advising week, faculty development, build in a mechanism to evaluate this work formally in four years to reflect on if what we are doing is what we want to be doing.

- Peter Dorman indicated that he presented the model to his students, who indicated that advising is currently not working effectively. He suggested his students were universally opposed to any academic credit being involved and that additional resources need to be put toward academic programs. They expressed concerns about the statement itself with some thinking this is out of character with Evergreen and some were offended that they did not come here to “transform their personalities”. Some indicated that there would be a differential burden associated with this requirement. Overall, there was a general feeling of animosity towards the proposal. A student indicated she will create a student forum to discuss the proposals.
- Concern was expressed that we are often talking at cross-purposes with each other. It was suggested that at the heart is for faculty to exercise an educational judgment. A talk by Nalini Nadkarni was referenced that described Evergreen through the metaphor of jelly beans (individual pieces) and bread (a chemical reaction to make a whole). It was suggested that this problem has come up time and time again yet faculty have not dealt with it. This proposal describes substantive vs. tag-on work and gets at faculty responsibility to make an important judgment to moving past disciplines to something beyond that.
- Questions were raised regarding the specifics of the model and whether they are doable with a suggestion that a review of the revised academic calendar is necessary in order to think about work load, as well as what the individual sessions with students would look like to get a sense of the additional workload.

- Favor was expressed for a lot of the elements of the model with an indication that there would likely be a problem with uneven student experience based on the interest in the work. A question was raised about whether people who want to do this could be paid more to do this work.
- A former member of the DTF indicated he struggled with the word “advising” throughout the deliberations, with a suggestion that the work is about teaching and faculty should understand how they would incorporate this into their teaching life. Faculty all have the freedom to adjust their teaching.
- A question was raised regarding what we are trying to fix. Will this improve retention? It was suggested that prior work on the Enrollment Growth DTF suggests that if students can’t get into their chosen program, this provides a retention problem.
- It was suggested that faculty are doing a pretty good job of in-program advising but out-of-program advising struggles. A challenge with faculty stepping in and out of this deliberative process was expressed.
- Concern was expressed about the proposal and whether or not it is in sync with recent changes in higher education: 1) student tuition much higher; 2) student degree attainment timeline. It was suggested that we need to offer curricular pathways that students want and that this needs to be discussed, in the framework of the diminished resources that are likely to impact faculty compensation.
- It was suggested that there are ways we can think about the proposal in terms of retention and curriculum. One of the ways we can think about this is how does this proposal help students navigate the current curriculum more effectively by carving out the time to have meta-disciplinary discussions. It was further suggested that faculty have a responsibility to support students in figuring out how to navigate their education in ways that are meaningful regardless of what classes they have access to.

(At 3:00, Joe invited those who can to stay for an additional 15 minutes of discussion)

- It was suggested that there are some students who want to overspecialize no matter how many times they are told breadth is important. Concern was expressed that faculty will be asked to do more with no additional compensation. Support was given for the proposal related to access to student transcripts on-line, which was thought to be essential. It was suggested that there are elements of the proposals that need to be done in order to better help her students but concern was expressed about doing it all with a request for more specifics.
- Legislative concerns expressed earlier were seconded with questions about how this might impact our Advising colleagues over the next few years. (Kathleen responded that while faculty will be responsible for Liberal Arts advising, the Advising staff will continue to be responsible for having an in-depth understanding of the catalog.)
- A lack of understanding for the distinction between what the Advising office does and what faculty will be expected to do was expressed, with questions about how faculty would responsibly advise students without looking at their records online.
- The need for the work outlined in the proposal was supported with a suggestion that it is disturbing that some suggest that change is not necessary. It was suggested that a review of the transcripts shows an unevenness that is appalling, with a lack of compelling evidence provided to the outside world regarding the value of an

Evergreen education that will get students into graduate school or an interview. Agreement was expressed with the notion that there are also curricular issues which RTaLE intentionally set aside. Concern was expressed regarding the faculty's ability to engage in a meaningful discussion about the curriculum given the RTaLE discussions that have transpired to date.

- It was suggested that the transcript work makes sense yet there are more questions about the advising component given the hours that faculty already give to students who share their passions.
- It was suggested that the model presented is not the best model because, at its heart, it is confusing academic pursuits with the abilities to express the Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate. It was suggested that students need more writing courses and that they should be taught by experts in writing. It was suggested that the process of discovery is better done in the oral tradition rather than ending up in the transcript and writing should be focused on academic work.
- Agreement was expressed with concerns that the proposal involves cutting into the academic content but that it might still be okay given the benefits. It was suggested that the finance and workload issues be addressed by indicating that during winter quarter, two credits will be for this work, along with 14 credit programs. It was suggested that a total of six days would be spent on this work and it would not require additional compensation.

Joe ended by indicating there will be additional time set aside next week for further discussion, with a vote intended at the Week 10 faculty meeting. He encouraged faculty to send the Agenda Committee any process considerations and the DTF any content suggestions.

The meeting ended at 3:22 p.m.