

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

March 26, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Faculty  
FROM: Bill Arney  
RE: Enrollment Coordinating Committee Faculty Representative(s)

Earle McNeil proposed that we have a faculty representative on the Enrollment Coordinating Committee. The ECC makes recommendations concerning admissions policy. The membership of the committee and the areas they represent are as follows:

Steering Committee

Position

|                      |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| Chair: Barbara Smith | Academic Dean          |
| Chair: Sue Washburn  | College Relations      |
| Steve Hunter         | Institutional Research |
| Arnaldo Rodriguez    | Admissions             |
| Gail Martin          | Enrollment Services    |
| Stone Thomas         | Educational Support    |

Other Members

|                      |                                       |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Mark Clemens         | Information Services                  |
| Jin Darney           | Vancouver Program                     |
| Maxine Mimms         | Tacoma Program                        |
| Ellie Dornan         | Alumni Coordinator                    |
| Lovern King          | Affirmative Action                    |
| Earle McNeil         | Academic Advising                     |
| Stan Marshburn       | Assistant to the President            |
| Cher Stuewe-Portnoff | Adult Learning                        |
| Mary Tuominen        | Graduate Programs, Assistant Director |

Three students also serve on the ECC.

The Agenda Committee decided the best way to select a person (or persons) from the faculty to serve on the ECC is to call for nominations at the Faculty Meeting and then allow a period of one week following the Faculty Meeting for open nominations. All names will be submitted to Patrick Hill, and he will select our representative(s). Unless there is an objection to this process, that's how I'll proceed at the April 3 Faculty Meeting.

WRA:k1

TO: The Faculty  
FROM: Barbara Leigh Smith  
RE: Changes in Faculty Handbook

I request that you approve the following changes to Secion 4.200 of the Faculty Handbook:

(1) Stage I. Identification of Recruiting Areas.

Add at end of section:

INSERT #1 All three-year positions and one-year renewable appointments shall be open for a period of at least sixty days, and advertised in the Chronicle of Higher Education and appropriate disciplinary journals, as well as other recruiting sources to reach deeply into the pool of prospective Third World and women candidates. One-year non-renewable faculty positions must be advertised for at least 30 days. In both cases the advertisement must clearly describe the minimal qualifications for the positions.

~~A-period-of-at-least-two-weeks-shall-be....~~

INSERT #2 Sufficient time shall be provided...

- (5) willingness to work with students in tutorials and individual contracts;
- (6) willingness to act as an academic advisor;
- (7) Willingness to participate in TESC governance activities, task forces, etc.

The goal of the recruitment and appointment procedure for regular faculty is to develop a large pool of applicants which implements our affirmative action policy and reflects the characteristics above, to involve the Evergreen community as much as is possible in the planning for and selection of candidates, and to keep applicants, the Affirmative Action Officer and the campus community aware of the stages within the hiring procedure.

In order to meet institutional affirmative action goals, the Corrective Employment Policy should be utilized, including the use of selective recruitment or selective certification when appropriate.

All candidates for Regular Faculty appointments shall go through the procedure detailed below and diagrammed in Appendix I.

#### WAC 174-128-040 Recruitment of Regular Faculty

(1) Stage I. Identification of Recruiting Areas.

At least 18 months before the beginning of new faculty members' contracts in the fall, the Academic Deans, in consultation with the faculty, students, and appropriate staff will identify tentative priority needs (academic areas) in faculty recruitment. These needs will be discussed with the Council of Convenors in conjunction with the specialty areas and be made available for comment from faculty, students and staff through regular channels after which final priorities will be determined. The medium for faculty discussion of these priorities and decisions will be the Faculty Meeting. The Deans will then consult with the faculty associated with that academic area and the affirmative action office to draw up a list of recruitment sources appropriate to each area and to the affirmative action policies of the institution. These sources will be selected to reach deeply into the pool of Third World and women candidates and must be considerably broader than conventional professional journals. The advertising will include specific remarks describing the general philosophy of education at Evergreen and the areas to which an applicant needs to speak.

*Insert #1.*

(2) Stage II. Application and Completion of File.

The initial process is designed to develop complete applicant files and to help prospective candidates understand us and our hiring needs and respond appropriately. It is not the purpose to eliminate candidates at this stage.

Each application, be it a response to our advertising, self-initiated, or initiated by personal request of a current Evergreen person, will be assigned a file. The Dean whose desk responsibility is faculty recruitment will review all

The cost of the candidates' visits, including transportation and accommodations, shall be paid by the College to the extent permitted by statute, current travel policy, and availability of funds.

Acceptance of the invitation and/or the provision of necessary information requested by the Faculty Screening Committee by the candidates shall mark their entry into stage four of the hiring process.

(4) Stage IV. Interviewing and Recommendation for Hiring.

The Dean's secretary or student staff, under the supervision of the Dean, shall be responsible for organizing and publicizing the campus visits of active candidates. These visits shall be publicized with the Information Center, campus media, and the Happenings at least one week prior to the visit so that all Evergreen community members who desire to meet the candidates may do so. There will be a standard time and place set aside insofar as it is possible (e.g., noon on Wednesdays) for the Evergreen community to meet the candidate. During the campus visit the Dean whose desk responsibility is recruiting will attempt to make arrangements for the candidate to meet: (1) the Faculty Screening Committee; (2) additional faculty, staff, and students interested in meeting the candidate; (3) staff representatives from Student Services, Cooperative Education, the Registrar's Office, and any other area relevant to this person's specialty; (4) the Academic Deans and the Dean of the Library; (5) the Provost; (6) the affirmative Action Officer. The dean's secretary or student staff shall arrange for additional introductions and interviews in accordance with the needs and expressed desires of the candidates, Deans, Faculty Screening Committee, and other Evergreen community members.

*Insert #2* } Following the candidate's visit to campus, members of the Evergreen community who met with the candidate will be expected to contribute written statements of their observations and opinions to the candidate's file. } A period of at least two weeks shall be provided after the campus visits during which written statements may be added to the candidate's file. Following this period, the Faculty Screening Committee will review the active candidates' files and provide a list of candidates who would be the most beneficial additions to the faculty. Normally this will be accomplished by the end of February.

The Deans will then review the active candidates' files, consider the advice of the Faculty Screening Committee and others,

## ADJUNCT FIELD FACULTY PILOT PROJECT

In August 1984, when it became clear that enrollment pressures on regular faculty resources would result in a shortage of faculty sponsors for internships, the Academic Deans decided to conduct a one-year pilot project to test an alternative way of meeting the need for competent internship sponsors. The project involved recruiting, screening, selecting, training, and providing continuing supervision and guidance for "experienced professionals for part-time faculty positions as adjunct field faculty for...work with 10-12 upper division students conducting internships...." The project was designed to accomplish the following educational practical purposes:

1. To provide students with excellent sponsors--persons who would be both as comparable as possible to the best of our regular faculty sponsors and experienced practitioners in the fields in which students' internships were being conducted.
2. To provide a way for students to find appropriate sponsors that would be easier and more effective than beating on the doors of many faculty and often settling for sponsors with only peripheral interest in the interns' particular areas of study.
3. To try to cluster interns in related fields and to have them meet in weekly or fortnightly seminars to report and to discuss their experiences, problems, and learning outcomes. We thought this not only would be beneficial educationally, but also would help counter the feelings of isolation frequently expressed by students who are doing their internships through individual contracts.

Advertisements were placed in the local newspaper. Qualifications included successful professional experience related to specified fields. The ad also stated that preference would be given to applicants with college teaching and pertinent community experience. Over 40 applicants submitted the required letters of application addressing their qualifications, resumes and two letters of recommendation. Five adjunct field faculty were selected for positions in areas of high student demand. They were Callie Wilson (health sciences and services), Karen VanDusen (health and human services), Dan Rubin (government and legislation), David Halverstadt (business/public administration) and Susan Christian (arts).

Adjunct Field Faculty Pilot Project  
Page 2

The persons hired participated in an all-day orientation and training session conducted by the Deans (Smith and Marr), Co-op Ed staff, faculty and field supervisors. Means of continuing communication with the Office of Cooperative Education were established and have been maintained.

In January, the Deans asked Barbara Cooley to evaluate the pilot project and to make recommendations about the continuation, modification, or elimination of the program. These recommendations are now being referred to the faculty for consideration. Part of the evaluation of the program included visitations by the Deans to seminars conducted by the adjunct field faculty.

It is our judgment that this pilot project has been an overwhelming success in achieving both its educational and its practical purposes. We believe the program should be continued, but with appropriate revisions in hiring and evaluation procedures. These adjunct field faculty teach on a more continuing basis than other adjunct faculty do, and they are responsible for making determinations about larger amounts of credit. Therefore, they should be hired through our usual faculty hiring channels (the Faculty Hiring DTF), and they should be evaluated by the Academic Deans.

(3/21/85)

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE  
March 27, 1985

TO: The Faculty

FROM: Sue Washburn and Steve Hunter  
for the Enrollment Strategies Retreat Group

SUBJECT: Strategies to Reduce Fall 1985 Enrollment

We may be funded for fewer FTE students next year than were enrolled this year. It appears that Evergreen will be funded for 2380 annual average FTE in 1985-86. After taking action to reduce enrollment this year, our 1984-85 annual average enrollment will be slightly more than 2400 FTE. Applications for next fall are currently 32% above the comparable figure for 1984. If we do nothing to reduce Fall 1985 enrollment, it is likely that the College will overenroll by at least 200 FTE during the 1985-86 academic year. The Legislature will not tolerate overenrollment and it is unlikely that the College will receive the additional funding necessary to accommodate the number of students it appears we could enroll during the next year. We must take action to reduce Fall 1985 enrollment.

This is a working draft of the recommendations that will be submitted to the President. These recommendations are designed to reduce 1985-86 enrollment and will need to be adopted in the near future to affect next fall's FTE. We have more time to discuss long-range strategies for enrollment management in the year ahead. We invite additional faculty comments on the short-range proposals at the April 3rd faculty meeting. We also want to begin a continuing discussion with the faculty regarding long-range strategies. Time will be set aside at this year's faculty retreat for this subject. While it is frustrating to be forced to reduce enrollment after years of work by faculty and staff to do the opposite, the College has an opportunity to structure the composition of its student body. We need to decide what configuration is most desirable.

The numbers for Fall 1985 look like this:

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Target Fall 1985 FTE to average 2380 FTE for the academic year:                              | 2475 |
| Estimated FTE of the Continuing Undergraduate Degree-seeking Student Body:                   | 1440 |
| Estimated Graduate Student FTE:<br>(assumes full second-year entering class for MES Program) | 110  |
| <u>Subtotal</u>  | 1550 |
| Balance available for New Undergraduates (2475 - 1550):                                      | 925  |
| Estimated New Degree-seeking Undergraduate FTE if no action were taken to reduce admissions: | 1075 |
| Estimated FTE of Special Students (nonmatriculant part-time)                                 | 100  |

Total New FTE anticipated if admissions are not restricted: 1175  
Estimated Fall 1985 FTE overenrollment (1175 - 925): 250

The estimate for new degree-seeking undergraduates is conservative. It assumes that future admissions activity will be equivalent to that of 1984 and carries forward only the increased number of applications already received for next fall.

#### RESULTS OF THE ENROLLMENT STRATEGIES RETREAT

On March 18, members of the Enrollment Coordinating Committee, Graduate and Outreach program directors, the Academic Deans, four other faculty representatives, and the student S & A Coordinator met to discuss methods of reducing enrollment. Strategies were separated under two headings: Short-range and Long-range. Because decisions about strategies affecting Fall 1985 enrollment must be made quite soon, discussion at the March 18 meeting focused upon short-range actions. The result of our brainstorming on long- and short-range strategies is attached.

After lengthy discussion the following short-range strategies were proposed to reduce Fall 1985 enrollment:

| <u>Action</u>   | <u>Estimated FTE Reduction</u> |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Eliminate Special Student Enrollment                                | 100                            |
| Reduce Number of Conditional Admissions                             | 50                             |
| Eliminate Provisional Admissions                                    | 10                             |
| Earlier Application Deadline/<br>Student Cohort Targets Combination | 60                             |
| Total Estimated Reduction   | 220 FTE                        |

The Enrollment Strategies group also recommended that the Academic Standing Policy be tightened. It seems reasonable that students who have been given the opportunity to make academic progress and have failed to do so should be disenrolled so that qualified new students may have access to an Evergreen education. It is estimated that a tightened Academic Standing Policy would reduce 1985-86 enrollment by 10 annual average FTE.

If these actions did not reduce enrollment sufficiently, action could be taken to restrict admissions for winter and spring quarter to further reduce 1985-86 FTE. (Note: Completely closing admission for those quarters would result in an annual average FTE reduction of approximately 130. This may be advisable because there are very few mid-year entry points in the 1985-86 curriculum.)



Strategies to Reduce Fall 1985 Enrollment

March 27, 1985

Page 3

The group was very concerned about the effect of eliminating Special Student enrollment. In general, these students tend to be community residents. The College has provided an important service to the community by allowing non-matriculant enrollment. Special student enrollment has also served as a very successful public relations tool. It is recommended that the College explore an expanded referral to South Puget Sound Community College, the addition of some self-supporting programs, and an expanded Leisure Education program to provide as much service as possible to this group of students. It is also recommended that we consider the establishment of a formal Continuing Education Program (either on our own or with SPSCC). Such a program will require a new full-time director. It cannot be overseen by an already overwhelmed dean.

The group was also extremely concerned that any action to reduce enrollment have as little effect on reducing cultural diversity as possible. Further study is required to determine how best to accomplish that objective. We have some preliminary information that indicates that, although we can't set aside a percentage (quota, goal, etc.) for Third World enrollment, we may be able to set a "cultural diversity" target.

The Fall 1984 composition of our undergraduate entering class and the targeted composition recommended by the Enrollment Strategies group is presented below.

|   | Fall 1984 <u>Entering</u> Class | Proposed Composition |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Freshmen  | 25%                             | 30%                  |
| Transfers (including former Evergreen students) | 75%                             | 70%                  |

Because applications from Transfer students tend to come later in the admission process than freshmen applications, moving the application deadline back to August 15 (from September 1) is likely to result in the "cohorts" target proposed by the enrollment strategies group.

Continued enrollment pressure will provide us with an opportunity to focus on the "ideal" composition of the student body. We have never had this opportunity before because we have been so focused on external pressures to grow. For the first time ever we must "prioritize" our student cohorts. This paper is a preliminary discussion piece for a continuing discussion about strategic planning issues for Evergreen during the next year.

Several background/position papers were prepared prior to our March 18 meeting. Please contact us if you would like that additional information.

## I. Short-range Options

### A. Student cohorts

1. no specials
2. overenroll fall; adjust winter/spring
  - a) reduce admission of non-residents
  - b) no admits with B. A. degree
  - c) no part-time students
  - d) eliminate winter/spring admissions
  - e) no specials

### B. Curricular

1. expand leisure ed
2. expand SPSCC consortium
3. self-supporting part-time/evening/etc.
4. academic standing
5. Eliminate part-time/weekend programs
6. Off-campus self-supporting

### C. Admissions

1. move up application deadline
2. implement invisible controls (movable deadlines)
3. eliminate provisionals
4. reduce/eliminate conditionals
5. eliminate recruitment efforts

### D. Other

Disenroll emotionally dysfunctional students

## II. Long-Range Options

### A. Curricular

1. Graduation requirement
2. Force students to graduate at 200 credits
3. Earlier deadlines for contracts and internships
4. Add Educational Opportunities Program (EOP)
5. Go to semester
6. External credit evaluation
7. Prioritize curricular emphasis
8. Require upper division work
9. Enforce residency requirements
10. Identify "best students models"

### B. Admissions

1. Admissions deadlines
2. Registration deposit
3. Eliminate rolling admissions
4. Increase application fee
5. Redefine recruiting postures
6. Supplemental application
7. Invisible controls
8. Admit by cohorts
9. Reduce/eliminate conditionals
10. Raise admissions standards

### C. All Others

1. Housing
2. Increase cooperative arrangements with local community colleges
3. Eliminate curricular options
  - a) teacher's certification
  - b) graduate programs
  - c) off campus
4. Reciprocal tuition
5. Re-examine upside down/external credit
6. Clarify college mission