Report of the Independent Exploration DTF
(formerly Independent Study DTF)
(formerly Downtime DTF)

At our final meeting, Wednesday, May 30, we agreed to present the following suggested options to the Provost:

1. Continue as at present with faculty members handling these students sub rosa.

Discussion: A reason for doing this would be to see if improved planning and communications along with some growth in traditions might not focus and isolate the problem more clearly by next spring. For example, if faculty learn to free up more time for unstructured one-to-one advising and counseling, and if at the same time, students become more comfortable with themselves and Evergreen, i.e., Evergreen really exists as something more than an insubstantial fantasy, hence students become more trusting of faculty, then some of these problems might abate. This DTF wishes to applaud those faculty who have responded to these students and to express the fact that we know how troubling that responsibility can be. We understand why a faculty member might finally refuse to again accept students who are in this period of creative ferment and hope that others will move in behind them and take the same risks.

2. Encourage students to remain at Evergreen for a quarter of exploration without credit.

Discussion: The problem with this is that many students are making a living by going to school. We felt that those students on the G.I. Bill and those on Social Security are out of luck, but we could perhaps allow loans during this quarter (and work/study as well).

3. Encourage a faculty member to take a number of students on group contract to try out the original proposal, called Evergreen Experiment, the faculty member and team to present a report and, hopefully, a proposal to the Provost.

Discussion: Earle McNeil was identified as a good man to do this because he has a module in the fall and could take this on in the winter. He also has the interest, has been diligent in exploring Evergreen's resources, and has the organizational abilities required. The faculty member would have to be freed from the responsibility for evaluating his students individually for the experiment to be honest.

4. The idea of designing a program to meet this need is attractive.

Discussion: We feel that we have the faculty and student talent here, some relevant experiences, and a perceived need. What we don't see is an availability of time and energy at present. This one might be placed on the back burner to be brought forth at program planning time next year.

For the DTF,

PETE SINCLAIR