

Faculty memo

REGULAR FACULTY MEETING

DEC. 6, 1978 -- 3:00 - 5:00 PM

CAB 110

A G E N D A

- 5 MIN. BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS ON OLD BUSINESS.
- 30 MIN. DISCUSSION OF C.P.E. REPORT OF THE EVERGREEN STUDY AND A PROPOSAL FOR HOW WE AS A FACULTY MIGHT TACKLE THE CURRICULAR ISSUES INVOLVED. (SUBJECT TO COMPLETION OF THE PRINTING OF THE FULL C.P.E. REPORT IN TIME FOR FACULTY DISTRIBUTION PRIOR TO THE MEETING).
- 30 MIN. DISCUSSION AND DISPOSITION OF THE REQUIREMENTS PROPOSAL: (EITHER FINAL VOTE OR SUBMISSION TO A STUDY GROUP).
- 10 MIN. DISPOSITION OF THE MILNE PROPOSALS ON MODULE EVALUATION.
- 40 MIN. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE DISPOSITION OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT REVIEW ISSUE.
- 5 MIN. PRESENTATION OF CONCERNS RE. ASSIGNMENT TO OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS BY MATTHEW SMITH.

THIS IS A VERY AMBITIOUS AGENDA AND WE MAY HAVE TO DEFER SOME OF THE ITEMS TO THE NEXT MEETING, JANUARY 3, 1979.

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting of Nov. 1, 1978

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 3:15 p.m. following a brief social period over tea, coffee and cookies.
2. The Provost gave a brief progress report on the investigation into the feasibility of Evergreen assuming responsibility for the State Interagency Training Program. Interviews are being conducted by faculty members Guy Adams and David Powell with the Training Officers and Personnel Officers of the major agencies to determine the nature of their needs and assess their attitudes about having this function provided by the College. A decision has to be made and a proposal submitted before the end of November.
3. A one hour discussion was conducted on the proposal submitted by the Provost at the previous meeting covering the definition of the Evergreen degree through the introduction of two new graduation requirements. At the end of this discussion, a motion was proposed by Robert Knapp as follows:

"It is the sense of the meeting that:

- I. The Evergreen faculty is not yet ready to require participation in Coordinated Studies as a condition for graduation;
- II. The Evergreen faculty wants to study further the possibility of requiring a final project or culminating event of some kind as a condition for graduation."

The chairman declared that the motion would be split for purposes of clarity and the following vote resulted.

Motion I. 25 Aye, 28 Naye. The faculty does wish to continue this discussion.

Motion II. Overwhelming approval. The faculty wishes to continue this discussion also.

Further discussion was set over to the next meeting.

4. Under new policy, David Milne reviewed the problems associated with module evaluations and proposed two solutions. The problems include the lateness of completion of module evaluations during and after evaluation week, their sometimes excessive length, and a confusing diversity of reporting styles employed by module faculty. Proposed solutions include a) completion of module evaluations by the first day of evaluation week and b) college-wide use of the attached standard form for reporting module evaluations. (The form would be used as follows: Module faculty members receive one blank form early in the quarter. Each faculty types the module description in the appropriate space, and has a number of forms printed with the module description on them. The Evaluation of each student is handwritten, at quarter's end, in the appropriate space, and the form is sent to the student's sponsor. If a copy is desired by the module faculty, xerox the original or put carbon paper

and a blank under it when writing the evaluation. The word limits correspond to the amount of space available on program description and student evaluation forms for describing one-quarter of a student's work.)

5. Under new policy, Bill Aldridge raised the issue as to whether the Academic Deans' review of individual contracts as currently practiced is in violation of academic freedom. He has circulated his notes directly to the faculty rather than through these minutes.

A counter position was argued by Will Humphreys which will be summarized here for purposes of future discussion.

"A. Historically, Evergreen has never been committed to a system in which faculty sponsor and student (or group of students -- as in "group contract") are absolutely free to establish terms of the contract without institutional review.

1. Such a system -- called an "open contract" system -- has been rare in experimental education. National studies (such as Individualized Education Through Contract Learning, ed. Neal R. Berte) suggests that such a system works only in schools with very strong faculty consensus on institutional norms. Berte himself urges that review mechanisms be included in all contract systems. Most schools have a review committee.

2. Evergreen has always treated ind. contracts as similar to any other curriculum proposal: Review and acceptance is required before a faculty member can begin to carry it out.

a. This is not a restraint on academic freedom; academic freedom is impaired only when there is unnecessary interference in the carrying out of an accepted proposal.

B. Are there good reasons to adopt and "open" system at Evergreen? I want to argue that there aren't and that, in fact, there are important reasons why we should not do so.

1. Why review is needed:

a. To eliminate contracts known to get students into difficulty -- e.g.

1. Contracts which violate the law -- political campaigning, use of state facilities for commercial purposes, use of controlled substances, human experimentation, illegal practice of medicine, etc.

2. Contracts which limit a student's future employment, grad. school entry or transfer capability -- for example:

- Too many vocational/technical credits
- Excessive amounts of credit for the amount of work done
- Contracts which are too vague to be understood by external readers

b. To eliminate contracts which undermine the College's credibility in general (a strong concern of alumni recently polled by CPE). e.g.

1. People holding full-time jobs and getting full credit; Contract proposals for some people in this category have involved as little as two or three hours of college work per week!
2. Interns placed in schools without notification of Coop Ed in spite of College's promises to principals: that they would be fully informed of all interns.
3. Contracts involving low academic standards -- for example:
 - Contracts in a specific discipline rejected by every faculty member with training in that field but accepted by a sponsor who has little or no background in the field.
 - Contracts in which faculty member and student will not see one another at all and student will merely evaluate himself (or provide evaluation written by another student!)
 - Contracts in which student is clearly unprepared to do the proposed work -- e.g. students with no background in chemistry who propose to study nutrition.

C. Should someone besides Deans review?

1. Committee has been proposed to DTF's several times. But each DTF has rejected the idea in favor of the deans doing it. We wouldn't mind turning it over. But we're willing to keep on doing it. We would appreciate especially having a clear mandate from the faculty to eliminate totally the kinds of occasional abuses I've been reporting on here.
6. Further discussion and decision on items 4 and 5 were set over to the next meeting, to be held on Wednesday, December 6, 1978, 3:00 - 5:00 p.m. in CAB 110. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Byron L. Youtz
Chairman of the Meeting

BLYcpg

Faculty Signature

Course Equivalencies (in quarter hours)

Evaluation of Student (100 words or less)

Description of Module (135 words or less)

CREDIT _____ ACR _____ (check one) Total credit awarded _____ (TZSC units)

(STUDENT'S NAME)

(STUDENT'S SPONSOR)

(MODULE NAME)

Proposed Standard Form for Evaluating Modules