

**Minutes of the Faculty Meeting  
October 6, 2004  
3-5 p.m. COM Bldg Recital Hall**

**Call to order/rules**

Michael Vavrus called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. He reminded the faculty that, by rules they adopted, if some major item needs to be voted on by the faculty, there need to be two discussions prior to a vote. The faculty shouldn't conduct the vote about an issue on the same day as the discussion.

**Role of the AC and Organization of the College from *faculty handbook***

Michael encouraged the faculty to review the attachment to the ac/dc that was sent out last week. The attachments include information about the purpose of faculty meetings and the role of the agenda committee. He reminded them that the agenda committee meetings are always open. They meet every Wednesday, from 3-5, when there are no faculty meetings. If you have issues or items to bring to the committee, coming to the meeting is one way to do it. There are also several other options, including e-mailing Michael or one of the members.

**Introduction of Agenda Committee Members and AC agenda for the year**

Michael introduced the agenda committee for this : Liza Rognas, Sarah Ryan, Sally Cloninger (Fall)/Laurie Meeker (Winter/Spring), Andrew Reece, Alan Parker, Frances Rains, John Perkins, and Artee Young. He also recognized Jeannie Chandler, who provides support to the agenda committee, and Bill Bruner, the liaison to the Deans.

**Invitation for suggestions from the faculty (AC)**

Michael emphasized that this agenda committee is looking for suggestions and striving for transparency. Liza added that there is a new stress on hospitality, on what each member of the committee could bring to the table in terms of diversity interests and the history of governance work, etc. Part of that history includes the experiences of newer faculty here and the value of past work. There is a concern that the work of DTF's often gets lost, so one goal this year is to find out what's been done in the past and where we are with this kind of work now. There is a definite effort to place the faculty back in the middle of the decision-making processes along with the administration, the deans, the planning units, etc.

Michael announced that the faculty will soon be receiving reports from the two DTF's working on narrative evaluations, and will be hearing more from student affairs personnel on student mental health issues. He urged the faculty to turn in their registration forms for the faculty retreat to Debbie Waldorf. An agenda for the retreat will be sent out in the next week. The ac has incorporated feedback, including complaints, from previous faculty retreats in the planning of this one. There is also an effort to incorporate emeritus faculty in the discussions at this retreat.

**Introduction of New Faculty (Rita Pougiales)**

The following new faculty members were introduced: Marc Baldwin (MPA), Bracy Dangerfield (Tacoma), Jackie Ensign (MIT), Patricia Finnegan (MIT), Kevin Francis (Introduction to Natural Science), Steve Francis (Political Economy, Social Change and

Globalization), Mario Gadea (Introduction to Natural Science), Mark Harrison (Theater, EWS), Glenn Landram (What are Children For?), Mingxia Lee (Tacoma), Laura Michelson (Matter and Motion), Mitsuharu Mitsui (Kobe, MPA), Shoji Noma (Kobe, Resource faculty), Steve Norton (Marine Life), Martha Schmidt (Organizing for Democracy), Keith Underwood (Practice of Sustainable Agriculture) and Tony Zaragoza (Cultural Landscapes). Rita mentioned two new faculty members not present, Jeannette Garceau (Articulating Power- Text and Image in the Public Sphere) and Lydia McKinstry (Molecule to Organism.) Rita also mentioned that there is now a section of the Faculty Hiring web page specifically devoted to providing information about the new faculty.

### **Governance DTF report and motion/discussion (Cheryl King)**

Cheryl talked to the faculty about the process and history of the governance DTF and their work. The DTF was charged by Enrique during his tenure as Provost and has continued its work during Don's tenure. The remaining members of the DTF are Cheryl King, Sally Cloninger, Allen Mauney, and Laurie Meeker. The DTF was charged to "examine the current state of faculty governance and to offer suggestions for a model that may better respond to the needs of the faculty." The DTF used a faculty survey, focus groups, etc. to collect information and do their work. Last February, the DTF presented its Interim Report to the faculty in a format that was intended to be an intentional process modeling of presentation style. In the months after the presentation, the Provost Search work dominated the work of the faculty, impeding the work of the DTF. Two motions were presented at this meeting, based on conclusions drawn from the DTF's final report. The conclusions:

- A triad of supposedly equal participants governs colleges and universities: administration, faculty, and trustees.
- During the time of this study, faculty governance was perceived by the faculty as a weak link in the governing triad.
- The DTF recommends reinvigorating and re-energizing faculty governance at Evergreen by improving some of our current faculty governance systems and processes, in particular the agenda committee (the main faculty governance body), DTF's, and faculty meetings.

The first motion applies specifically to the agenda committee (AC). The DTF recommends that:

To stabilize the agenda committee, make it a more representative body of the faculty, link it more deeply to the planning units and to assist in assuring that AC members can exercise formal and informal power, the DTF proposes formalizing the membership of the AC as follows:

- 1) Membership to include representatives from the planning units, the Tacoma program, Evening and Weekend Studies and NAWIPS (all on continuing contracts), along with four at-large positions.
- 2) The agenda committee selects its own chair.
- 3) The ability for the AC to formally charge DTF's is written into the faculty handbook.

- 4) To improve communications amongst the faculty and the AC, clarify reporting structures and strategies.

These measures would prevent a continuing trend of the newest faculty being nominated and serving, promote accountability (the AC would publish minutes so faculty could see the processes and decisions being made, would get updates from the DTF chairs, etc.)

The following responses to these recommendations came from the faculty:

- The report does not appear to directly address the low rate of faculty participation.
- The planning units were not supposed to be a substitute for departments. (Cheryl – although the PU’s may not have been intended to be so, they have, in fact, become the governance body of the college.)
- Question for clarification: Is the DTF recommending that the planning units select their own representatives on the AC? Yes, they would select their own.
- The recommendation does raise concerns about departmentalization. The barriers to faculty hiring were used as an example of when the PU’s play a critical role in a process but also create many barriers.
- Concern was expressed about adding any more stress to the work of the planning units.
- Concern was expressed that trying to represent the planning unit may be too restraining for the representatives from the planning units as they try to represent the faculty as a whole. It would be hard to wear both hats.
- It was suggested that perhaps limiting the number of committee members from a particular unit would be better than having each unit select a representative.
- It was also suggested that there could be one from each unit, but not selected by the unit.
- The DTF was asked if there would be any further changes to the membership. There could be a liaison from the deans added to the membership.
- Concern was expressed that the faculty chair would be selected by the committee rather than the faculty as a whole. This seems to reduce the influence of the faculty as a whole on the committee.

At this point, Michael informed the faculty that amendments could be considered in two weeks. There will be a full discussion at the next meeting.

The second motion would add language to the faculty handbook about DTF’s. It would further define the terms “consultative” and “collaborative.” DTF’s should educate, facilitate, follow through, etc., and the additions to the handbook would make this process clear. The perception is that DTF’s work very hard and then, in three minutes, all their work is gone. There is also a problem with faculty having to vote on a dime about issues which DTF’s have been studying for a year or more.

The last page of the report addresses recommendations that do not require motions. The DTF is asking the agenda committee to think about the faculty meetings – large group processes, dates and times, resource allocation, developing and socializing the new faculty, etc. They recommend that the Provost allocate additional support to the agenda committee, including a .25 FTE position who will assist with the documentation efforts

(minutes and quarterly report) and additional research as needed. This person would not be from the Provost or Deans' area and shouldn't be part of the administration. They also recommended that the AC members receive compensation for their work in a manner similar to what the PUC's get.

- It was suggested that the DTF bring summaries of the narrative responses to the next meeting for discussion.
- The question was asked, "Why does the AC deserve compensation that other folks don't get?" Cheryl responded that members of Faculty Senates, etc. at other schools are given compensation. It's a huge job.
- Question: How was the decision made to compensate the PUC's? How did we slide into "other schools do this"? If at one time this was part of the work of the faculty, why are we now saying that we require additional compensation? (Alan Parker responded that this is not a question of sliding into what other schools do, but of being realistic. If changes need to be made, then they should be made.)
- Question: What problem are you trying to solve with that compensation? It should be clear what problem is being solved.

The discussion on these motions will be conducted at the next faculty meeting. The governance DTF Report is on the web and will be sent out on e-mail.

### **Presentation on Campus Diversity Initiatives**

Paul Gallegos and Simona Sharoni spoke to the faculty about the 2004-2005 Diversity Series. This project had its origins a few years ago when students of color raised concerns about a variety of issues on campus. There is also recognition of the challenges that faculty face when dealing with controversial subjects in the classroom. This Diversity series will examine race, power and privilege from a number of different positions and perspectives. Academic programs can incorporate this work into their syllabi and have seminar discussions, etc., on the three different cultural campuses. Events will take place at the Tacoma Campus, at one of our Reservation-Based sites, and the Olympia campus. Programs are invited to all of the events. All will be televised on closed circuit TV and screened on the web. Paul and Simona asked the faculty to incorporate this work into the curriculum, and invited them to announce the talks to their students and inform them about the web page. There are additional resources available on the web page, films, etc. and resources we have used in classrooms. At this point 20 programs are integrating one or more of the speakers into their work. Paul mentioned that he would like to record the conversation in the classroom, if possible. David Marshall and Sandy Yannone have helped to develop a way of documenting what is happening in the classroom and having records of the discussions would be helpful in this effort.

Michael adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.