

Chair Betty Ruth Estes convened the meeting at 3:10 and established that there was a quorum. The Chair moved Rudy Martin's report from second to fourth item on the agenda.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Minutes of the previous meeting.

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as read.

2. Proposal for emeritus status for Don Humphrey.

Patrick Hill said that two proposals concerning Don Humphrey had been made in the past month, one controversial, and the other not. The controversial one involved naming the lab building for Humphrey. Hill went on to say that the Cabinet agreed, in principle, that structures should be named after people who have contributed to the institution, and that they agreed also that Don Humphrey is one of those people. The larger issue of recognition needs to be explored by a DTF; in the process of that exploration, something will be named for Humphrey. The non-controversial proposal involved granting Humphrey emeritus status. Hill, Estes, and the assembled faculty cheerfully reminisced about Humphrey's Evergreen career.

It was moved by Cellarius and seconded by Kelly that Don Humphrey be granted emeritus status.

Unanimously approved.

3. Discussion of DTF Report on Computers at Evergreen

Ron Woodbury emphasized that the report, delivered to the faculty on May 23rd, is intended to bring out the campus's understanding and desires regarding computers at Evergreen. He introduced co-chair Steve Hunter, and DTF members Doris Loeser, Fred Tabbutt, and Judy Bayard, and then called for discussion of the report. George Dimitroff, concerned about the ease with which calculus students can solve problems using computers, asked that math students be added to the list of exceptions under Item #3. Woodbury agreed to re-word the section with Dimitroff's help. There was general concern that a disproportionate amount of attention is paid to the administrative side of computing at the expense of academics. Tom Rainey asked what provision had been made for training the faculty to use computers. Woodbury answered that Section J, K and L are intended to address the training issue. Barbara Smith said that the Fred Meyer grant proposal, if successful, will retrain fifty faculty in a three-week summer training session in the use of computers. Bayard said that with three weeks of training, faculty would only know what they wanted to do on the computer, not how to do it. Dimitroff objected to Item #8 in the Computer Bill of Rights on the grounds that it gave anyone the right to inspect private files. Hunter agreed to re-word the section so that it referred to specific and already justified needs. Nancy Allen, Sandra Simon, and Robb Knapp asked why only loans for computers were under consideration,

and suggested that cheap loans be made available for the purchase of other types of educational equipment. Simon worried about diminishing access to printed material in the face of electronic publishing. She called for the faculty to make a statement, and not to allow publishers to get away with it. Woodbury asked those assembled to put later thoughts regarding the report in writing.

4. Report on discussions with Trustees about Presidential Search

Before discussing the presidential search, Rudy Martin spoke within his capacity as advisor to English majors in the Teacher Certification Program. He asked the faculty to assign more specific course equivalencies in their evaluations of students; he gave "Research" as an example of an inadequate equivalency. He then reported the results of a series of tough discussions with the Board of Trustees regarding the search for a president. The Board will form a new search committee soon, and be very clear about their expectations of the committee and the presidential candidates. They will ask members of the last committee what improvements can be made in the search process. There had been discussion of using an executive search firm, but decisions had not yet been made. The committee will be formed during the summer and an ad will appear in late August. The Board's timetable dictates that announcement of the new president be made January 1. Martin said he fully intends to give the Board and the new search committee all his support, and exhorted the faculty to do the same.

5. Provost's Report

Patrick Hill numbered three issues concerning the faculty that would be developing over the summer: 1) John Perkins' replacement. 2) Merit raises. He explained that the policy, as it has evolved, is inconsistent with legislative intent and letter. There are two distinct allocations. CPE has been asked to monitor the allocation to be used for merit, which may mean that Evergreen can't give money from that allocation to all faculty. He will ask that CPE accept the Evergreen evaluation process as one of merit. 3) Operating budget request. Over the summer, we will develop proposals for new initiatives in the curriculum for the 1985-87 biennial budget. How, asked Hill, does the faculty want to be consulted about decisions that need to be made on these issues? After some discussion, it was agreed that the Provost and the Deans would apprise the faculty of developments through memoranda sent to faculty homes and meetings with faculty over the summer.

6. Discussion of Final Report on Intercultural Literacy and 1984-85 Faculty/Specialty Area Grants.

Betsy Diffendal introduced the draft of the Subcommittee on Intercultural Literacy. The Subcommittee incorporated all comments made at all-faculty retreat into the draft. Their strategy, in writing the report, has always been to make specialty areas and CORE programs the locus of intercultural literacy discussions and planning. It is important, she said, to consider breaking policy for intercultural literacy experiments, and to set a high standard for such experiments in 1984-85. Hill announced that the College

will be spending \$20,000 a year over the next few years on intercultural literacy initiatives; \$15,000 of that annual \$20,000 is assured. He will be appointing a DTF to make awards to individuals and specialty areas to develop intercultural literacy experiments. Details will be announced early in the fall of 1984.

It was decided that a June 6 faculty meeting was not necessary.

The meeting was adjourned.