

E.Kormondy: Perhaps before we get started today, let's welcome back one of the most recently and currently recuperating members of the faculty. Willie, glad to have you back. He's a little bit more plastic than he was before but he might make it.

shared This seems like an appropriate time in the school year to have some thoughts ~~here~~ by the President, based on both the experience of the current year and some of the projections as we see them for the coming year, so with no further ado:

D.Evans: Thank you, Ed. I'm finally going to have to succumb. After all the years in writing remarks in bigger and bigger print, I can't do it any more and still read it, so I'll go with the glasses.

I thought this was a particularly appropriate time to meet with the faculty, to have some chance to share with you the items of importance which have been going on in the last few months, some of the areas of concern and prospect over the next few months. I think that I can report to you first that I, as of this week, feel almost fully attuned to Evergreen, having not only been President for some period of time but beginning tomorrow night, with team teaching of a seminar in management and the public interest, ^{at least} in a small sense will come to know the teaching side of Evergreen and last night began beginning pottery as a student. That was a sobering experience because my son was sitting next to me. During the evening he made two pots and all I made was a mess, so I'm duly humble.

The next few months are really important for a number of reasons important to this institution, certainly important to the faculty. The Council on Post Secondary Education is involved, as we all know, in a study of Evergreen. That study ~~will~~ is underway. They have shared with us some of their parameters of the study. Their expectations are to work during the course of this year and be prepared to present to the next session of the legislature their results. We of course have no indication yet of even their draft status. They indicated they would share it with us as they moved along in the study. I am satisfied, I think those of us who have worked with them are satisfied with the nature of the parameters and the study guide which they began with. It's clearly broader than the legislative question, which had contained within it the answer, so it's a more honest and straightforward study, designed not to elicit a certain

answer but to hopefully study Evergreen and to come up with a response which they will then share with the legislature.

The next few months are of importance also because we are now going through the kinds of decisions and we're doing the kinds of things that will ultimately reflect our enrollment for next fall, which has a very important relationship to the next legislative session and how we are viewed by the legislature, as well as the strategy we use when we go to the legislature. And of course that's the third item of real importance in the next few months, the upcoming legislative session. It will be on us all too soon. In preparation for that, of course, we will shortly be given budget instructions and be on our way in the preparation of a biennial budget. The critical feature of a biennial budget, obviously, is the enrollment which we face. I have not been here very long but I've been here long enough to already be tired of the numbers game which we seem to have to play. We have to play it because it's such an important driver of our budget, it's looked at by the legislature perhaps more frequently than any other single figure. I'm sorry in some respects that the legislature and a good many people on the outside seem to pay more attention to the numbers you teach than how well you teach the numbers who are here, or any place else, for that matter. Nonetheless, it is important and I thought the first area I would like to talk ^{with} ~~to~~/you about is where we are on enrollment. These are essentially new figures now, because as of yesterday we were into the tenth day enrollments. We do have the figures for ~~fall~~ spring quarter and in relating them to the rest of the year, we've got some problems ahead of us. I don't think they are problems which can't be overcome but spring quarter enrollment, in terms of full time equivalent students, is down to 2,114 students. That's substantially down from winter quarter, 2,378, so we're down 260 students in the spring quarter. That's a significant drop. It's a significant drop, however, from an unusual retention in winter quarter from last fall, so it's a little more in proportion when you take the typical drop in the number of students from fall to winter to spring quarter and if we had that typical drop, we wouldn't be quite so far out of line.

The important thing, however, in spring quarter enrollment, is the effect that obviously has on next fall's enrollment, because the students we are most likely to have here next fall are the students who are here now, and who have an opportunity or a reason to come back. Or if you like to look at the empty half

of the bottle, those who are here and for whatever reasons will choose not to come back, because they are either dissatisfied or cannot find a program that fits their needs. There are really a couple of areas, in doing some examination and this is still a preliminary examination, because we haven't got all of the breakout of the figures for spring quarter, there are two areas which seem to pop out, however, one of which has been reasonably deliberate. It has resulted, probably, in some decline in enrollment and that is a decision to be more strict in the time of signing and in the manner of negotiating individual contracts. As a result we are down about 170 or -80 in the number of individual contracts which we now have as compared with a year ago.

The other area, however, which is somewhat more disturbing, is the fact that over the last three years -- and I believe if we went back further, the trend would just be extended -- but in 1975 the retention rate from those who were here in the spring and who did not graduate and thus were eligible to come back in the fall, the spring to fall retention in 1975 was 71%, in 1976 it was 68%, in 1977 it was 62% and it's that drop in retention which is really more than responsible for the drop in enrollment. If we had retained 70 or 71% from spring to fall of 1977, we would have started fall quarter with an all time high in enrollment, both in terms of numbers and in terms of FTEs. We may wonder, of course, why that's happening. We have done some comparison of Evergreen with other ^{regional} universities and we shouldn't feel too chagrined that we are somehow doing everything wrong, because the retention rate at Evergreen is still good, compared with the other institutions. There are some conflicting trends at other institutions, depending on which school you're talking about but nonetheless, an important arena for us to be working in during the course of the remainder of spring quarter, it seems to me, is for each faculty member, each of the people on staff and faculty and in the administration, to do what we can to retain those who are already here, to provide for them the counseling, the assistance and, insofar as we can do it, in an academically legitimate way, the programs for next fall that will maximize the retention rate of those students who are already here.

Along that line, we'll have an Academic Fair on May 17th, before May 17th and in fact by May 10th we would like to have an opportunity for us to take some surveys, program by program, of students, to determine their fall preference and their intentions. We would like to have some volunteers among the faculty

to help work on that particular element, to lead up to the Academic Fair, a week before, on May 10th, with the results of the volunteer survey and the counseling help which will be necessary to insure that we do a proper job in facing up to the fall quarter and our retention rate. I think that represents one of our prime responsibilities for the next month or two, because the budget alternatives for next year are essentially these: a budget developed and money set aside for Evergreen on the basis of 2,600 students, full time equivalent students. That compares with 2,500 students for this year. As you all know, we have had to retrench and reduce some budgets in order to essentially pay back to the general fund for the fact that we did not receive or did not achieve the 2,500 full time equivalents this year.

We are now in the process of attempting to determine what level to pick in making our second year budget allocation. We could go as high as 2,600. I think it would be unwise for us to do so, at least in our initial budget allocations. That would require an increase of very substantial amount in the number of students. To have 2,600 full time equivalent students for next year would mean that the number of individual students next fall would have to be something like 2,800 or even more. So those decisions will have to be made and we could go anywhere from a low of 2,400, which is the base on which the budget has been built, and we are assured of that much money, but 2,400 is a substantial amount less than the amount we had ended up spending this year; or we could estimate on a somewhat more favorable level and sort of put ourselves on the line and of course the end result depends on how many students show up in the fall and how many are retained during the course of next year. As I say, I hate to play the numbers racket. We are forced to by the way in which legislative budgets are set. We will be governed by the ~~actual~~ number of students who actually are here during the second year of this biennium and of course that will have a very substantial effect on the legislative attitude and what actually happens during the course of the next biennium. As we face the legislative session of 1979 we will go into that session with the latest figures available to the legislature being the fall quarter enrollments of 1978. During the course of that legislative session they will probably get winter quarter enrollments and that will give them an update but it's the fall quarter enrollment which are going to be critical figures and not only in our assessment of our second year budget but perhaps much more importantly for our

longer range future in terms of the way in which we approach the legislature and I intend to approach them in the most positive way I can, at whatever levels we happen to be. It's a hell of a lot easier if we have more, rather than less. We can make some assertions and I am perfectly prepared to do it, assertions that we were tightening up on individual contracts in order to assure that we were insuring the quality of the education we were carrying out and we can say a lot of things but I can tell you from experience that nothing will speak louder to them than at least a stabilized, if not a potentially growing enrollment. That may sound like ominous news. I don't think that it has to be and certainly we'll do everything we can with it.

There are several other items which I think are of importance which ought to be discussed with the faculty this morning. Two of them I think could lead to a growing interest and a growing enrollment here at Evergreen over the course of the next several years.

One of them is a current and pending application to the Council on Post Secondary Education for graduate programs here at Evergreen. When I say current and pending, it's current because the Council in their longer range plan has had for some period of time a graduate or master's level program as part of their planning here at Evergreen. It's pending because we did initiate, after some discussion internally, a proposal for a graduate program a couple of years ago. It was withdrawn when the blood bath hit ⁱⁿ ~~and~~ the Council on Post Secondary Education and graduate programs at other institutions were cut back or eliminated, it didn't seem to be too appropriate a time to come in, seeking additional graduate work. I'd like to, for a few minutes, have Ed Kormondy give you something of the history up to the present of a graduate proposal and then talk to you a little more about it. It will be, obviously, a subject open to discussion, once I finish my remarks here.

Ed, if you'd like to take over and just bring them up to date on where we are with the pending graduate program application --

E.Kormondy: I think some of the old-timers here will recall that at the outset of the college there was an integral plan that there be developed a graduate school of public affairs and in the first fall of operation, the faculty made a very strong point to the then President and Provost that in no way was the college at that point ready to embark upon a graduate studies area. Thus, back in '72

the proposal was dropped, there were no further discussions and the matter was withdrawn from the budget. There was actually a budget provided for such a school, as again, old-timers will remember. As time passed along, continuing urgings from some of our own students from the area, pressing on us for opening up graduate study opportunities, so starting about in the fall of '74 -- it's hard to realize it's that long ago -- I began some discussions informally with faculty, primarily with dean's groups, to see what the attitude of the faculty was at that time. There was a rather significant shift, some still feeling quite strongly Evergreen should never engage in graduate studies, others who, like myself, had argued strongly against the matter back in '71, having come to some new points of view. So during '75 and early '76, with the help of some of the people that are in this room, we began the process of developing some specific ideas to take a proposal to the Council for Post Secondary Education and then hence to the legislature for degree authorization.

That proposal had several very basic points about it, first, that we would ~~not~~ ~~develop~~ in effect extend our undergraduate ideas and our undergraduate modes into the graduate level. That we would try to bring some creativity to the graduate level that we have exercised and demonstrated at the undergraduate level. Thus we proposed, when all things boiled down, a non-degree-designated, interdisciplinary degree program. It would be a Mast of Arts. Like most of our undergraduates, they would then decide what they were going to call themselves when they declared that they had majored in such and such at Evergreen. The modes of instruction would be those in which we've had the most experience and the best experience at Evergreen, the interdisciplinary coordinated studies model or the group contract model, probably with the two faculty notion and individual mode. This was elaborated, as those who were on the faculty in fall, '76 remember, because, you may not remember, everybody got a copy of that proposal as it went to the Council. As the President indicated, that proposal fell on hard times for two basic reasons: One, the blood bath they referred to. This was the very time at which the Council was reviewing all graduate programs in the state, with a view to eliminating redundancies, duplications, low efficiency programs, that is, programs of high cost and few students, etc. The result of that review was completed last year and there was a good deal of agony expressed by our fellow institutions. One of the consequences of that was that this was not the time at which to advance a new program but there was a second and perhaps, from a strategy standpoint, an equally

significant negative reaction from the other institutions. We were asking, in effect, for blanket endorsement of a Master's degree at Evergreen, which would allow us, then, to range as we do at the undergraduate level, consistent without intellectual resources. In the other institutions, every degree program must gain separate approval and thus, the element of, if you will, jealousy crept in, that if Evergreen were going to get a blanket Master's degree proposal passed through, then why could we not do so and not have to go through the labor, and it is a labor, to prepare individual proposals on each degree program.

The result of that, as President Evans indicated, is we decided to withdraw further pursuit of the proposal at that time, pending a resolution of these several issues. Those issues are not going to change, the likelihood of getting an undesignated degree program in or through the Council, because there is opportunity for the other institutions to comment on those proposals, the likelihood of that is nil. Thus that meant drawing back on what the next steps would be.

I should point out: In the interim the rate of inquiry flow, at least into the Provost's office, has not abated. In fact, it's much heavier than it was in the fall of '76 and it's not just from our own students, currently graduated, some of whom are out and would like to come back for a Master's degree, but from the local area. We have assessed this, the need is there, it is not diminished. I personally believe we still have a need to respond. The strategy that's being pursued at the moment is to develop a broad rubric called Public Affairs. By definition, according to the national organizations, this, I think, will allow us to develop the kinds of degree programs that we probably would have had, anyway, except that we will have to do it by separate and specific degree elements. Public Affairs, by definition, includes at least four major areas: Public Policy and Administration, Environmental and Energy Affairs, Human Services, Urban and Regional Planning. Those four elements include some in which we have at the present some considerable strength and experience and can begin to move ahead. Over the next few weeks, rather than take more time at this moment, as the definition of this proposal takes a little bit better shape, ~~we~~ and we have more definitive information on budget projects, etc., I'll circulate that material to get your input and advice and counsel on the matter. We are aiming for a proposal that would enable legislative authorization in the upcoming session in 1979. The notion that I am proposing and

thus far on the soundings-out, is getting some good support, is that the proposal would advance a planning stage which would allow freeing up some faculty time to do the specific planning of clientele-oriented programs, much as we have done in the past and that this planning would take place, assuming everything went according to a reasonable schedule, during the '79-'80 academic year, with the opening of the first graduate program or studies opportunities, in fall of 1980. Then moving over a period of time, again, that to be worked out at a later time, to introducing at perhaps intervals of one or two years, or one, two, or three years, additional degree programs. We would go in then for one program at first and then move ahead, as experience and growth were to allow it. Let me stop at that, Dan and we can also field questions later.

D. Evans That's where we are. The next few months will be important ones in terms of how we proceed and to what degree we proceed in terms of a graduate program. Toward the end of my remarks I would like to relate this back to what I really believe is one of our as yet not totally fulfilled charges given to Evergreen at its initiation almost ten years ago.

Secondarily of interest and concern, because I'm not sure how readily and how well we can meet the interest which has already been generated, is in the off-campus programs which we are undertaking. The Vancouver program has unquestionably been a success. We have had good students, they have almost without exception stayed in the program, we will have the first major fruits of that labor this spring with the graduation ceremony in Vancouver, when almost 60 of those students will graduate and receive their Evergreen degrees. We are prepared for the beginning of another two-year cycle in Vancouver. We have, I'm not sure yet, authorization, but very close to authorization from, if you would believe it, the Veterans Administration, who is doing something for us instead of to us, for the utilization for a dollar a year of one of the officer's row houses in Fort Vancouver, a unit that will be, really, a splendid location for a permanent headquarters and identity for Evergreen in that community. Spending some time down in Vancouver recently, I found that they still, like the South, have not forgotten the Civil War. In this case, they have not forgotten that they didn't get the location of the Southwestern four-year college. They still would like, somehow, if they could magically transform Evergreen and have it appear in Vancouver, to do so, but the second best is to have a permanent and what I think they hope will be a growing presence of a four-year institution

in Vancouver. The Vancouver program has gone a long way toward providing that permanency.

During the course of the last month or so I have purposely sought out and met with the presidents of our community colleges, feeling that we have for a number of reasons a good relationship and ought to maintain and expand that relationship with the community colleges of our state. Most of our students come as transfers from community colleges. Evergreen has traditionally offered a better and closer relationship in terms of transfer of credits to students from community colleges. The presidents of the community colleges of Southwest Washington, in response to an invitation, appeared on campus and spent a day here about a month ago. Nine out of the ten colleges were represented by their presidents, the tenth one represented by their dean of students, or instruction. Two more community colleges from Southern King County, Highline and Green River, asked if they could come, because they had some additional interest. We felt we were moving a little out of our territory, but invited them and they did come. The end result of that day, I think unquestionably, is an interest which has been added to by the day they spent here, an interest in a number of those communities represented by the community colleges in having a Vancouver-style program in their own community. I think it would be pretty safe to say that Grays Harbor and Longview, Port Angeles and perhaps one of the community colleges in the Tacoma area, have all expressed real interest in a Vancouver-type program being taught by Evergreen in their communities.

I think I realize, perhaps not to the extent that I need to, the burden that is now placed on you, particularly, and Evergreen as an institution. We reached out and excited some interest, they lobbed the ball back in our court and now we have the challenge as to whether and to what extent and where we believe we can offer serious degree granting off-campus programs, particularly for those students, and a growing number of students, who are not mobile, who are in their home communities with families and jobs and who range in age from mid-twenties to mid-fifties or beyond. The question is, how can higher education serve them and more particularly, how can Evergreen serve them? The interest is unquestionably there and, as I say, the ball is back in our court, to determine how willing and how able we are to respond to that need.

Let me turn to a third area and share with you our current status in the search for a new Provost to replace Ed. We received about 100 or a little more than

team of
100 applications. We have, I think, a good and a hard-working/faculty, staff and some students involved in sifting through those applications. We are now at the point where we are down to 30, approximately, which have been read, all of the applications have been read by teams. We are down to 30, where all of those will be read by and analyzed by each of the members of the committee, 15 people, and of course our current plans are to move toward a mid-April meeting which would further reduce the numbers to a manageable group, subject then to personal interview and to ultimate choice, which at current plans would be some time in the early part of May. I recognize, and did, right from the beginning, some of the difficulties we are facing in terms of a Provost search. I think I recognize better now than even a few months ago, the difficulty of a new president coming in and getting fully acquainted with Evergreen and all of its elements. We have a new dean from outside Evergreen and of course the potential, at least, of a new Provost, who might come from inside but also might come from outside Evergreen. Concerns have been raised by a number of you, personally to me, about that problem and the potential of having a significant amount of the administration and particularly the academic administration, coming from people who might not have a very clear idea, or at least would not have much in the way of personal experience, with The Evergreen State College. I know there has been some concern about the enormous burdens which are placed on those who are involved in academic administration. That is particularly true of the Provost, who has not only internal responsibilities of major proportions but an increasing demand, most of which comes from outside the institution, to be involved in an external sense. Now I believe that many of those external contacts can be and, certainly in the current case, will be handled by the president. Legislative contacts, a number of others of similar nature, but there is an increasing amount of external, academically-oriented contact which is important for Evergreen to retain. Our ultimate success legislatively, our relationships with the other four-year institutions, our relationships with the community colleges and the two-year institutions of this state, a whole host of external affairs are very important to our internal success and they really do demand the chief academic officer or someone speaking for the academic side of Evergreen to the outside world. Before we embarked on the search for a Provost, I even looked at alternative ways of organization. Unfortunately there are none which appear to be clearly better or easier. The suggestion that we divide the job into an external and

an internal job has some merit in terms of assigning someone then clearly to academic direction internally of the faculty but it has the obvious disadvantages of splitting up something which we hardly can split up and that's the academic continuity inside and its relationship to what happens externally. It also may add another person to the administrative side of academics, which we probably couldn't afford, anyhow. Suggestions have been made that we may need to add to the deanship a fifth dean, to enable us to share the burdens which are frankly growing to a pretty impressive proportion on the deans we have now and in doing that, to have someone really act as a senior dean of faculty or carry on that internal relationship which I think many of you have expressed as being quite important. There are some benefits in that, there are also the obvious disadvantages, again, of a dean of faculty and a provost and a president, just adding one more level in the line of responsibility from faculty to administration and president. It also adds another person and takes another person out of the teaching faculty but in each of these cases there are some merits, there are some demerits. Ultimately it seemed that the best direction was to proceed in the search for a provost and to attempt to get the best person we could, whether internally or externally, and then with the new deans and the new provost, attempt to reassemble, if it were necessary, some of the responsibilities to make sure that the major problems which seem to have arisen were handled in the way we organized. That's the current status of the provost search, I would guess and I guess I would be disappointed if there weren't some questions or concerns expressed after my remarks.

I've had an opportunity and a very pleasant one, during the course of the last month or so, to have small groups of faculty meet with me so I could get better acquainted with some I had not yet had an opportunity to meet with, to hear from them about some of their concerns and ideas and what they were doing. It's a good opportunity toward the end of the day to relax over a sherry. I found that there are many more sherry drinkers than coffee drinkers on the faculty, particularly at four o'clock in the afternoon, which didn't surprise me a bit. I hope to continue that until we have had a chance, both for those I have had an opportunity to meet and work with over the past few months, as well as some I have ~~not~~ not, will continue those until I have had a chance to meet with everyone. One of the items which has come up repeatedly during the course of those meetings has been the concern over curriculum

planning. We have (many of you haven't detected it yet, I suspect) in the academic calendar a retreat scheduled for the end of the school year. I understand we have not had a retreat of that nature in the last couple of years, although they were common in years previous to that.

A number of suggestions have been made, and I throw this open to your comment either now or at some later time, as to whether a spring retreat devoted to at least the beginning and the sorting out of curriculum planning for the 1979-80 school year would give us a head start we have not had in the last year or two. In doing that, do we have an opportunity, for instance, to avoid some of the crunch which occurs at the beginning of fall quarter, when the demands are on each of you to finalize curriculum planning for the next year at the same time you are beginning to get into full gear for fall quarter. If that can work and if there appears to be on a broad basis among the faculty the same enthusiasm there has been among those I have talked to so far, then we will embark on the planning and get a faculty team to work on the planning of such a retreat, which hopefully will give us some new direction and a head start on our curriculum planning.

Finally, legislative issues which are current and of real concern:

Enrollment limitations, interestingly enough, are a concern of the legislature. The particular emphasis is on the two universities. A draft bill has been presented by the House Higher Education Committee, particularly by its chairman and vice-chairman, to try to establish by law over a four- or five-year period enrollment targets, particularly for the two universities and rather than the budget being the arena in which those enrollment limitations are set, it would be done by separate statute. There is understandable minimum of enthusiasm for that from the two universities but a modification of it might end up being a pretty good thing, if there were an opportunity specified each two years to review what had happened, to modify if it appeared necessary the next two years and then to add the two years subsequent to that and have a rolling four-year expectation of enrollment and coupled with it, then, some kind of range, so that we, nor any other institution, would get unduly hurt by the fact that we simply cannot predict enrollment down to the last student and that's precisely what we're being asked to do today, with no kind of range, no kind of gap between our enrollment limitations or our contract enrollment and what actually occurs. I think there may be some real benefit in that

legislation. We're trying to do something to turn it around and make it a positive rather than a negative force.

You may have read and some of you may be more acquainted with the current concern expressed by some legislators and by the governor about governance in higher education. We had an all-day seminar a short time ago at Seattle University, with representatives of the House and Senate Higher Education Committees, the governor and virtually every president of colleges, community colleges, universities and their trustees and regents. The seminar was devoted to an examination of governance, of whether we had a system today with a Council on Post Secondary Education, essentially coordinative in nature, which could do the job, or whether we had to embark on something more rigid and more bureaucratized. It is the direction a number of other states have taken and is the direction some, at least, in this state would like to see us take. It's a critical issue, one which will be of major debate during the next legislative session and we ought to be prepared for it.

Yesterday I had the opportunity in Bremerton to meet with Senator Wallgren and the two House members from that district. That makes about 75 legislators now I've had an opportunity to meet with in the course of the last several months. I have found that their attitudes toward Evergreen, by and large, are either not knowing very much but being quite interested, or, from those who do know quite a bit, a very substantial, positive reaction toward Evergreen. I haven't tried to meet with Senator Henry or Senator Rasmussen or a few others yet, so it may not be as uniformly good when we finish the process, but there is a significant amount of goodwill toward Evergreen among the members of the legislature. More goodwill than I think some of us realize. We hear from the noisy ones, we hear from the local newspaper and their concerns about Evergreen and fail to realize sometimes that the members of the legislature, the bulk of them, have those positive feelings and the newspapers, and we have met with virtually every one of the daily newspapers in Southwest Washington, plus the ones from Seattle and Tacoma, either have a curiosity and not very much knowledge or where they do have knowledge it's usually positive and I hope by the time we have left those Editorial Board meetings it's more positive than when we went in.

In conclusion, after ten months as president, I am far more convinced and

more knowledgeable than when I came

modes of study we have developed as an adjunct to that are important and give us flexibility which few, if any, other institutions have. I've talked to enough students and enough faculty members and have heard enough of the striking successes to realize that we have a story as yet not very well understood and perhaps not completely told to the people of this community or of this state and that's our job. I've discovered in ten months a unique devotion to teaching among this faculty, it's perhaps one of Evergreen's strongest assets. I've discovered the importance of evaluation and have repeatedly challenged those who would say that Evergreen has no grading system but rather insist that we have developed a more sophisticated grading system than the typical A, B, Cs which are common elsewhere and that no other typical institution could accomplish honestly the kind of evaluation system which has been developed here at Evergreen. But it is our responsibility to make sure that that evaluation system is carried out effectively, candidly, honestly and completely for each student under our guidance and that it be done promptly enough so that students can utilize it as they leave Evergreen for jobs and for graduate work. I've said in a couple of newspaper interviews that after ten years I consider Evergreen no longer experimental and I am thoroughly convinced of that. We know it works and we know it works well and anything that works well can no longer be considered experimental. We ought not to let that, however, deter us from continuing to be innovative, continuing to examine what we have done and what we might do better in future years and I think our future really does depend pretty much on how well we understand the needs for higher education in this state over the next decade. We have a changing population, with a changing age mix. We still have three fundamental concepts which the legislature had in mind when they created Evergreen, as I think you all know. The charge to be innovative, which I think we have clearly and in an outstanding sense responded to. The charge to be a particular asset to state government, which I think we are not yet totally fulfilling but perhaps could, with the possibility of a graduate program with its major emphasis on public policy and the relationships which would then grow between state government and this institution. And we have a third responsibility, of course, to serve Southwest Washington. Unfortunately, we are not doing that job well in terms

of high school graduates who are willing to come directly from their high schools to Evergreen. We are doing it better, in terms of community college students in Southwest Washington, the percentage of our total student body coming from Southwest Washington has increased, but here, again, our opportunity to really fulfill that charge may well come in the expansion and successful utilization of programs like the Vancouver program. To do things which other institutions cannot do as well in providing a coordinated, responsible degree-granting, cohesive program in the home communities of many students or potential students who simply can't pick up and come from those communities to the Evergreen campus.

I'm more proud than ever of Evergreen and every place I go, particularly out of the state, find the responses, the attitudes, the knowledge about Evergreen something which I wish I could share repeatedly with each of you, because they are rewarding kinds of comments that indicate that somebody, somewhere for the last decade has done something right and they've done it right enough that in the minds of those who have had contact with this school, or those who have some responsibilities and some awareness in higher education nationally recognize it and our task is somehow and in some way to translate that understanding among those who know higher education to the many citizens who don't know very much about higher education, who know even less about Evergreen and who are subject to the many stories locally which turn some of them away. That's a great challenge and it's an important one and I think we have every opportunity to respond to it and to successfully mount that challenge in the course of these next few years.

I'd like to open up now to whatever questions or comments you'd like to talk about on any of these elements, or others.

Questions and answers - - -