

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

February 21, 1975

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Evergreen Students, Faculty, Deans, Directors, and Staff
FROM: Student Intern DTF
SUBJECT: Recommendations regarding Individual Contracts and Internships

On February 5th a group of interns and concerned students (see below) met in the 2100 Lounge of the Library building to discuss proposed changes in the individual contract mode. This was prompted by a January 2nd memo of Dean Rudy Martin in which he indicated that he was thinking about limiting the number of individual contracts to 15% of the student enrollment or approximately 400 students and the establishment of a faculty board to determine whether a particular individual contract was of sufficient quality to merit acceptance. We also reviewed two other proposals which have been suggested to solve this "problem". The proposal of Ken Donohue would modify that of Martin's in that the faculty board would determine whether a particular student was "advanced," and thus limit the number of individual contracts indirectly. Will Humphreys would prefer to see the posting of all possible contracts on a wall and faculty who would be eligible to accept contracts could initial the ones that they would interested in.

We see serious flaws in these proposals and preface our questions and suggestions with the following assumptions. The demand for individual contracts is dependent upon the quality of coordinated studies and group contracts. The individual contract mode is the last refuge for students to plan their education given the present surriculum generation structure. TO LOOK AT INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTS AS A PROBLEM AND TO TRY TO CREATE A SOLUTION TO THIS "PROBLEM" IS ONLY DEALING WITH A SYMPTOM AND NOT A CAUSE.

Therefore, we ask the following questions and make these suggestions:

1. It is the responsibility of the faculty to determine the quality of academic work on a one-to-one basis. Those persons most directly dealing with students should be the judges of the students, rather than boards and bureaucracies. The Deans should divest themselves of the power to determine the worthiness of a particular contract and the Director of Cooperative Education should determine the academic quality of an internship.
2. To help alleviate the demand for faculty in popularly demanded fields, more emphasis should be placed on a faculty candidate's field than on whether he or she is a friend of a current faculty or dean or whether the candidate is seen as a "hot" prospect by the Dean at the hiring desk.
3. Will the implementation of faculty boards or contract walls deal with the hustling aspects of trying to get an individual contract? Will the elite of aggressive students who are now on contract be replaced by a "new" elite as defined by the faculty boards? What effects does the system we use now have on our affirmative action policy with regards to non-whites and women? How would the proposals of

Martin, Donohue, and Humphreys address this?

4. Are we trying to set up a system of pre-requisites? Do we hold firm to the policy that students should attend Evergreen for one quarter before they go into the contract mode? If not, what policy can we adhere to?
5. There must be some discussion on the differences between individual contracts and internships. Should internships be as academically oriented as other contracts, or are they an inherently different mode of education? If there are differences, how would the above mentioned proposals handle these?
6. If these proposals are implemented, what considerations will be given to those students who have come to Evergreen thinking that they could do independent work? If we are to begin a new system in the fall, will we be able to inform those students who are thinking of coming here this fall as to what the new policy will be?
7. Finally, we recommend that before any new procedure is put into action that the Deans finance the polling of all students on individual contracts and a random selection of those in other modes to determine whether the new policy is 1) known by the students, 2) approved of, and 3) whether there are other suggestions. We also recommend that this poll not be conducted by the Deans, but by a group like the Input Resource Center or an academic program.

In conclusion, we hope that these suggestions and questions will be as seriously considered as the seriousness of our intentions and the situation.

DTF members:

Tom Arneson, Intern	521 East 16th, Olympia	943-6196
Neil Bennett, Intern	126 N. Milroy, Olympia	943-4959
Dara Bray, Intern	1315 West 7th, Olympia	352-1247
Cori Christiansen	Bldg. C, Room 115, TESC	866-5129
Carl Coapstick, Intern	3603 East 176th St., Tacoma	LE1-7994
Joy Davis, Intern	1500 S. Water, Olympia	352-3038
Kitty Aslin Ensley, Intern	2005 Ascension, Olympia	943-1330
Elizabeth Fortson	515 Farallone Ave., Tacoma	564-7495
Leslie Owen	404 N. Milroy, Olympia	352-8692
Geoff Rothwell	Rt. 15, Box 243, Olympia	866-0806

- cc.: All student centers and communications
 All Faculty
 All Deans
 All academically oriented Directors and Administration
 All Program Secretaries