

# **Faculty Meeting Minutes**

## **October 26, 2011**

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

Faculty Chair Andrew Reece opened the meeting at 1:20 p.m.

#### **General Announcements:**

- Ulrike Krotscheck announced the Art of Living art auction in benefit of scholarships, which will occur on November 6<sup>th</sup>. She encouraged faculty to purchase tickets to attend.
- Bret Weinstein announced his recent experience at the Occupy Olympia camp. He asked that faculty look at the Occupy movement as one that can speak to our collective interests. His impression is that there is tremendous sympathy, accompanied by a lack of action. The UFE has agreed to support the local occupation. Paul McMillin and Bret Weinstein are partnering together to set up an Evergreen tent to provide both input and a window into the conversation. He sought donations of materials, including a large tent and some chairs and invited faculty to participate.
- Mark Harrison introduced University of Hyogo exchange faculty member Gaku Mitsumata, who is an environmental economist teaching in the Citizen Science: Ecoliteracy program with Frederica Bowcutt and Jeff Antonelis-Lapp this year. He emphasized the vast cultural opportunities that an exchange such as this can offer and encouraged Evergreen colleagues to share their “world” with him as well. Gaku went on to thank Evergreen for the welcome. He thanked the American people for their support of Japan in the wake of the earthquake and tsunami.
- Larry Mosqueda announced that there will be a Peoples’ Movement Assembly this Saturday at the Olympia Center, which will cover the current wars, among other issues.
- Ruth Hayes announced her film premiere next Friday November 4<sup>th</sup>.
- Nancy Murray announced that the Women’s potluck will be Friday, November 4<sup>th</sup>.

**Collective Bargaining Update** – Rebecca Sunderman announced that bargaining is still underway, with near-weekly meetings. Issues concerning workload are the primary topic right now.

**Additional Faculty Meeting** – Andrew announced that an additional faculty meeting has been added for the curriculum and budget deans candidate interviews. It will be held Monday November 28<sup>th</sup> from 3-5 in SEM II D1105. DTF Chair Tom Womeldorff then reminded faculty that today is the last day to nominate potential candidates.

**Agenda Committee Member Nominations** – Andrew announced that Karen Gaul’s pending departure from the Agenda Committee to focus on her role as PUC, including the upcoming Faculty Hiring Priorities DTF, will create another vacancy on the Agenda Committee. The following faculty were nominated to fill the rest of Karen’s term:

Frances Raines  
Mike Paros

**Re-Modeling Teaching and Learning at Evergreen DTF** – Michael Zimmerman provided six general observations about the RTaLE DTF process:

1. A sense of how we arrived at this moment as a College;
2. Belief in a link between the RTaLE initiative and budget related to recruitment and retention;
3. Five concerns that he’s heard:
  - a. Doesn’t solve all of our problems, but an important one;
  - b. Transcripts can include the current iteration of the academic statement;

- c. Teaching writing – the goal is for a student to write the statement that’s best for them at the time they write it.
  - d. Faculty don’t feel equipped to advise students – the faculty’s job is to talk to students about where they are headed and where they come from;
  - e. When the faculty adopt a proposal, it will send a strong message to the administration and the administration will find a way to make the proposal become practice.
4. The RTaLE work is fully in keeping with the mission and principles of the college, to help students better access their education;
  5. Whatever is implemented will be evaluated regularly and is not forever;
  6. This inclusive process with such broad engagement is one to be proud of. The DTF was thanked for their amazing work thus far. The faculty were also thanked for their engagement in the process.

Eric Stein followed with an invitation to engage in the most crucial RTaLE discussion thus far in preparation for a vote on one model at the next faculty meeting. He briefly described a handout that contains the two models, as well as a page with content relating to both, on the table for today’s discussion as one in-program and one out-of-program model, yet the end-result may be a hybrid.

Donald Morisato presented Model One, which is an in-program model. He described the academic program as the most foundational meaning-making teaching at Evergreen. The strengths of the model:

- Programs are naturally the best setting for students to develop thoughtful academic statements;
- Students receive feedback from faculty in a program that they chose with faculty who best know their background;
- Avoids the administrative challenges of setting up a college-wide system.

The issue that the DTF has been wrestling with is creating a model that provides more consistency while respecting the integrity of the program. Donald went on to describe the model in more detail.

Rachel Hastings provided an overview of Model Two, which is an out-of-program model to provide a long-term mentoring relationship between faculty and advisees. In this model, the meetings occur during governance time. Students have a chance to work with a consistent group of peers. Faculty would work with 25-30 students and meet with them once per quarter (week 7). In addition, they will meet with incoming students for 2 hours during o-week. Peer review would be a big part of these meetings. Faculty will also be reading the near-final academic statements of seniors. Faculty will also have paid summer days of work time to be compensated for work as a mentor and prepare for any activities they will engage in during the academic year. Some faculty will volunteer to be compensated in addition, to work with students who are either away or are identified by their faculty mentor as needing additional support. Students will meet during o-week for an orientation to the Evergreen curriculum and the academic statement. They will then meet with their peer group and faculty member once per quarter and continue to draft their academic statements. Groups initially get formed through random assignment but students can request to work with another mentor and will be allowed to move if the faculty member has room. New faculty are paired with experienced faculty; temporary faculty with an ongoing relationship with the college could also be mentors.

Andrew then moderated the discussion, including the following observations/questions:

1. Is there additional compensation for model one? (means recommending a 5-7 day increase in compensated days)
2. For model 2, what happens to groups when faculty go into graduate program or rotate out on leave?
3. Does this iterative statement replace self-evals?
4. Does the faculty evaluation of students stay as it is?
5. It sounds like the DTF is asking faculty to do more with same amount of resources. At some level, need to cut back whether model 1 where cut back on class time or model 2 where we cut back on something

- else. Essential to keep the conversation about what we won't do (reduced governance time, scale back evals)
6. Model 1 is less specific, but how would it not reiterate some of our current challenges?
  7. Interest expressed in additional conversation about the relationship between self-evaluations and the academic statement.
  8. Evaluations and the process of reflection are the hardest writing that students do. Encourage faculty to reframe this as the nature of our work vs. simply more work.
  9. Would 50 faculty need to opt in in order for model 2 to work?
  10. Trouble with metrics in both models: size of academic statement matters time-wise, as well as the activities designed for model 2.
  11. What is it that drives students to the mentor pools?
  12. There doesn't appear to be an account for meeting individually with students that faculty are mentoring (only for seniors).
  13. View the proposal as extension of contract year where other things could get done during that time. We have not been giving enough shape to students' overall education, which should grab our attention.
  14. Why is there so much emphasis on the substantial review of the senior statements vs. a front-loading of support so they can better articulate and write their own statement.
  15. Admissions essay – if it doesn't impact their admission to the college, how would we know they take it seriously? Perhaps let it be known that their faculty advisor will receive it and learn about their new advisees through this statement. This might be quite useful as a strategy to keep people here.
  16. Did the committee consider having the new students in each mentor group be drawn from students that a particular faculty is teaching?
  17. See advantages in the first two years of there being some relatively cross-disciplinary advising. When talking about students in their last couple of years, they are not in a position to really help each other.
  18. Model one would feel more viable if the procedural aspects were more teased out.

Andrew closed the meeting by taking a straw poll to see whether faculty felt ready to vote in Week 8 or need an additional meeting (approximately two thirds of the faculty present indicated they would be ready to vote at the Week 8 Faculty Meeting).