

Stilson

FACULTY MEETING AGENDA
MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1971
CONFERENCE ROOM, 213

1. Announcements
2. Provost's Report
3. Admissions and Part-time Students - Joe Shoben
4. Student Records and Evaluation DTF - Charles Teske and Perrin Smith
5. Student Newspaper - Bob Barnard
6. Evergreen and the Press - Bill Aldridge
7. New Business

WHH:ct

Sulson

FACULTY MEETING MINUTES

June 7, 1971

1. There were no announcements except that this is the last regular meeting of the planning faculty.
2. The Provost reported that some of the DTF's will not be able to reach final conclusions by their target dates. For example, the recommendations of the DTF on faculty evaluation reappointment, academic freedom and responsibility await action by the Board of Trustees. For example, the DTF on Sabbaticals has not had time to think through all relevant issues but there is obviously no rush about this. Will Humphreys raised the question of whether we would need some kind of a standing committee in relation to the interinstitutional committee working on AA degree guidelines. Barry felt that this was an area where continual negotiation would be necessary. We should play this by ear. We want to be in a position to make an autonomous response. Dean Clabaugh noted that several committees will be working through the summer on which faculty input could be crucial and asked if there would be any faculty on board this summer who could provide this input. Don Humphrey is currently making a survey of the faculty who will be available this summer on a volunteer basis.

3. Humphreys to Clabaugh:

What exactly is the role of the faculty environment committee?

Clabaugh:

This apparently has yet to be worked out in optimal detail. The business policy statements speaks of consultation with this committee whenever a decision by the facilities planning office involves form, mass and location. As regards to the decision of the temporary modular units, since they would have the same effect on these three perimeters, form, mass and location as the Turn-Key Project which they replaced it was felt that further consultation with the faculty environment committee was not necessary. That is to say, the modular units would have no different effect on the flora and fauna of the campus.

Perhaps the business policy's statement is not sufficiently specific but that the way things stand as of now.

Humphreys:

Have the Trustees ruled against the Turn-Key idea altogether?

Answer:

Yes, The Trustees have expressed an interest in more permanent housing. We are currently looking for a way to finance more permanent housing for between 400 and 450.

Martin:

What is the college's philosophy as regards on campus housing? I have heard varying ideas.

Clabaugh:

There will be a statement on that issued soon pending Joe Shoben's approval. In general, the college is only interested in providing on-campus to the extent that housing needs cannot be met by the private sector. There are now ways of facilitating the interest of the private sector that did not exist a month ago.

Eickstaedt:

I still feel the need for more clarification regarding the duties of the environment committee. For example, we don't interpret our responsibilities as pertaining only to the flora and fauna of the campus. We feel our responsibilities extend to aesthetic consideration as well.

Clabaugh:

Propose a new statement.

Sluss expressed dissatisfaction with the whole idea of a standing environment committee. He would prefer a zoning DTF charged early next year to make a thorough study based on data which would then submit its detailed report and disappear.

Clabaugh:

Propose a plan.

Martin:

Can we influence the private sector in respect to environmental considerations?

Clabaugh:

The planning commission will not approve construction near the college without college endorsement.

Humphreys noted that we also own the keys to the sewer which gives us a certain amount of leverage.

Clabaugh concluded this discussion by assuring the faculty that he did not see the Facilities Planning Office and the

faculty in an adversary relation. If there were any misunderstandings regarding the decisions on the temporary modular units these were due to the speed with which these decisions were forced upon us.

4. The student records and evaluation DTF

A detailed progress report to the faculty will be made soon regarding the following questions:

- What do we mean by the student portfolio?
- How will the opening weeks proceed?
- How will credit get registered?
- How will we deal with questions of continuations in programs that have formally ended?
- How will we deal with incompletes and negative materials?

Charles Teske gave a brief account of the DTF's thinking along these lines.

Beryl Crowe, Rudy Martin and Bob Barnard challenged the direction in which they perceived this DTF to be moving. The concern was that we not allow mechanical considerations or considerations of mere convenience to divert us from our institutional commitment to a record keeping process that will support student growth and development rather than credentialing services. Other members of the faculty could not see that an philosophical or pedagogical issues were at stake. The basic point of contention seems to center on the question whether we should plan for a multiple student portfolio each to serve a different purpose or whether there should be one portfolio kept in the registrars office in micro form from which individual students could later edit particular compositions for different readers. The DTF is thinking of three versions of the portfolio. The first to be kept in the registrars office, would include brief descriptions of programs and contracts, letters of evaluation by faculty and a student narrative plus some selected samples of the student's work. The second would be the traveling portfolio which the student was responsible for and which went from seminar leader or sponsor to seminar leader or sponsor, this would be a fuller description of the students work and would include more samples of it and would be the main advising document. The third would be the students complete including all of his papers, drafts, etc., etc.

Crowe, Martin, and Barnard favor a single all-purpose portfolio, made versatile by the microfilming technology which we will have available next year.

Question:

Do we need another faculty meeting to settle these issues?

Answer:

Maybe but leave this to the good judgement of the moderator who will decide after consulting with Charles Teske when the DTF has had time to commit its thoughts to paper. Anyone who is strongly interested in influencing these decisions should get their comments to Charles Teske, by last Tuesday.

5. Due to recent administrative organizations which will have a direct bearing on an Evergreen student newspaper of this report was postponed. Bill Aldridge expressed concern about the tone of the recent Evergreen article in the Seattle Post Intelligence. He disliked the emphasis on big names and the de-emphasis of Evergreens unique educational features. Bill was reassured by Dave Barry that this article was the sole product of the reporter that wrote it. The reporter consulted no one at Evergreen. All things considered we should probably consider ourselves fortunate that the article was on balance a favorable one.
6. Bob Barnard would like it if the faculty were routinely provided information regarding the comings and goings of the DTFs: dates, charges, membership, etc. It was generally agreed that a tally sheet routinely providing this kind of information would be a good idea.
7. Since this was the last regular meeting of the planning faculty there was no discussion of who our next moderator and recorder will be. However, according to long standing Evergreen precedent and custom it is the unshakable assumption of Humphreys and Jones that we are no longer those.

RICHARD JONES

RJ:pjf