

**Faculty Meeting Minutes**  
**November 16, 2011**  
**SEM II D1105, 1:00-3:00pm**

Faculty Chair Andrew Reece opened the meeting at 1:14.

**New Agenda Committee Member Vote** – There was one nomination put forth to fulfill Karen Gaul's term (through the end of this year). Frances Rains accepted the nomination after the last Agenda Committee meeting. A voice vote was held

**Announcements**

- Sarah Pedersen announced that the Friends of the Library annual meeting will be this Sunday. Stokley Towles will perform his Stormwater piece.
- Richard Weiss announced that Occupy Olympia is looking for writers to work on publicity.

**Re-Modeling Teaching and Learning at Evergreen Proposal Discussion and Possible Vote** – Andrew began the discussion with a few points about process, making the following points:

- The A/C deemed this a major issue requiring two discussions. They further deemed that at least two discussions on the issue have already occurred. If the body decides that there need to be two discussions on the proposal, there will be. Andrew expressed hope that, should the vote not occur until week 10, all of the faculty assembled today would also attend the week 10 faculty meeting.
- There has been a request for a ballot vote, which can occur if the faculty assembled it vote it so.
- The faculty can vote in the affirmative, negative or they may abstain. If you wish to abstain, it is akin to a no vote regarding the final tally.
- Regarding amendments, the assembly of faculty determines whether or not there are objections to a proposed amendment. Should there be one or more objections, there would be discussion and then a vote. If there is no objection, the amendment is accepted.

A question was raised about whether or not the RTaLE DTF members should vote given that they have a vested interest in the proposal. It was clarified that the concern was raised because DTF members were paid to work during the summer. The point was made that this would only be so if the DTF was only paid if the vote passed.

The RTaLE proposal motion was moved and seconded and the floor was opened for discussion. The following points/questions were made:

- The proposal does not take into account the additional workload of temporary faculty who teach only or primarily upper division students.

- Faculty workload was brought up as a major issue, particularly given recent reductions in support. The idea of compensating faculty for additional work is not workable for some. If there is money to pay for this proposal, why can't the money be used to reduce FTE? How much money is available?
- Any time we have put advising into a program, it hasn't happened. If we're really going to make a change, we need to do something outside of the program in order for all students to have an opportunity.
- The proposals don't assume any particular forms of shifting. There are recommendations attached to the proposal that do address some of the workload concerns. The Orientation week and all campus days are ways in which the DTF tried to address concerns about the main proposal possibly disappearing within proposals.
- Discussion ensued regarding an earlier comment about a "hybrid" approach to workload.
- The proposal language related to the timing of the academic statement, particularly in relation to a planning tool to assist students to determine where they are going vs. where they have been, was discussed.
- There are many valuable potential outcomes both for students and faculty, particularly related to students' ability to articulate what they have accomplished. For faculty, there is a tension between faculty-determined content time and community-determined activity. In the future, this is likely to be different vs. additional workload once the work has been in place for years. "Content" vs. "coverage" is an issue.
- The Tacoma campus has discussed the proposal on several occasions. It was first noted that Tacoma would like to see a change to the Handbook that allows voting in Tacoma. Tacoma faculty have concerns about the O-week workload.
- A question was raised regarding the lack of credit for the Orientation week work, as well as the disappearance of the cornerstone and capstone courses.
- Appreciation was expressed about some elements of the proposal. Concern was expressed that the vote needs to occur when there is no guarantee of compensation attached. Regarding workload, there is both intensity of workload as well as quantity throughout the quarter. Concern was expressed that this would create another moment, like evaluation week, that holds intensity of workload without the recovery time built in after evaluation week.
- Faculty were reminded that there is an option to propose amendments. Attention was directed to the endnotes, particularly related to the academic statement. Regarding comments about cornerstone and capstone, it was not assumed that these would disappear. Regarding compensation, it was suggested that this will be bargained between the UFE and the Administration.
- This work should not be thought of as work that is added to our current workload, but hope was expressed that colleagues support the proposal as a redirection of the way that faculty spend time with students.
- The best was assumed regarding the "wobble room" that is indicated in the proposal with regard to things that still need to be worked out. A question was raised regarding what happens for students that begin at the College during winter or spring quarters. If most of the attention to statements happens in the fall yet the registration hold occurs in the spring, what occurs in between?

- The proposal was supported due in large part to the serious problems in the transcript, particularly that the student voice in the transcript is uneven with undue emphasis on the student's first year. The concerns regarding consistency and visibility were addressed, with an indication that the DTF spent a large amount of time considering how to grapple with unevenness across programs (online access to evals, suggested minimum hours, materials to support the writing of the academic statement, and an O-week component which creates the anticipation among students that this work will occur in-program.). Regarding workload: one way to think about this is that faculty are voting for more or different work but not giving up the option of how much is re-allocated vs. how much is newly compensated.
- The proposal will improve our teaching and help students to think more about what it means to be a student at a liberal arts college. Regarding workload, it seems that we are reacting to a proposal as opposed to addressing workload more generally (e.g., re-think governance).
- Clarification was sought regarding workload and compensation. Page 3 suggests an addition of 37 hours with some ideas, including total re-allocation of work, to address the added hours. (it was responded that there is a spectrum of options to consider to address this as new vs. re-allocated work. It was suggested that the UFE might benefit from seeking clarity about which the faculty would prefer.)
- Understanding was expressed regarding re-allocation of work, yet concern was also shared for an earlier statement regarding loss of support for our work that make it difficult to take on something that takes even more time. It was suggested that, on the directives page, an addition should be made to address this kind of support (e.g., travel, sabbatical, etc.).
- Regarding the state of the economy, there are likely to be more students needed to make our budget. An addition to the proposal could be a contingency related to compensation and/or time. Additionally, the assessment should include assessment regarding faculty as well (page 8).
- Regarding earlier questions raised, the DTF did consider mid-year admitted students, who would wait until the next fall to do the Orientation work and the academic statement could be submitted earlier than spring. This was to provide some additional time for the students to complete the current iteration of the statement. Regarding the number of hours allocated to governance, there are 180 hours, which is more than 4 times what is being allocated for this work.
- Andrew paused at 2:20 to ask faculty to consider whether or not they will be ready to vote today.
- Chuck asked whether or not, if the vote is delayed until week 10, the Administration and UFE could address the faculty regarding compensation.
- Michael responded that it made more sense for the faculty to adopt what it thought was best and that the administration and UFE would work together to implement their plan.
- Laurie Meeker added that as work is conducted, faculty can be consulted throughout the process.
- The proposal appears to be of benefit for students yet not necessarily for faculty without some guarantee about compensation.

- Compensation includes healthcare, sabbatical, retirement and wages which are all subject to change by the state. As a faculty member who has been here for a while, it is clear that faculty will not give up time in the classroom with students. Possible amendments could include guaranteeing the 1:25 faculty student ratio. The formal amendment: Add a provision to the proposal that indicates the faculty are approving the proposal under the assumption of the continuation of a 1:25 or lower faculty FTE load. Should the institution raise FTE, the proposal must be reconsidered.
- An objection to the amendment was stated in that it needs to be negotiated.
- Disagreement was expressed in that anything written in the document is a recommendation that would need to be negotiated.
- It was suggested this may undercut the proposal unintentionally.
- The proposal is important for the students to be able to have a voice in the transcript to do the kind of thinking that is required to have that voice. Workload concern was expressed. This is one of the most important proposals for change in what we do at the college that is meaningful for students. It was suggested that there are ways to deal with the workload. Hope was expressed that a vote would occur today.
- It was suggested that Evergreen offers students freedom that is unique and that it provides an opportunity for students to establish in writing what their trajectory is.
- Is there a way to take what is currently in the recommendation and make it speak to some of the issues around workload that need to be considered, which might be more nuanced than just FTE?
- The question was called on the amendment. The amendment was voted down.
- A new amendment, to add #10 was added: Proposal #10: The College will work to restore or expand support for the full development of the faculty including staff support, faculty institutes, sabbaticals and travel.
- An objection was stated to the amendment in that it is symbolic. The vote was called and the amendment was voted affirmatively.
- A vote was called on whether or not to close discussion on the proposal. The vote was affirmative to close the discussion.
- It was proposed that there be a paper ballot. The proposal was voted down.
- A vote took place on the entire proposal. The proposal passed by a vote of 72, 13, 5.
- The Agenda Committee was asked to consider an amendment to the rules to allow Tacoma campus to participate in future votes.