

April 15, 1985

WHAT'S AFOOT?

CURRENT ESTIMATES OF THE BUDGETARY PICTURE. The Governor, as you are all painfully aware, requested from the college an estimate of the impact of a 10% cut on his proposed budget for the college in 1985-87. As predicted by us, the information was used to justify a tax increase. The increase and the Senate budget built upon it means that the estimates we submitted, which had no binding status to begin with, can be ignored.

Does that mean we are totally out of the woods? Unfortunately not. We are not out of the woods psychologically because the House will debate and resist the needed tax increase and may resurrect the notion of major cuts in higher education. The anxiety we have experienced in the recent past could continue for awhile, perhaps through much of the spring quarter if the legislative session is lengthened to address the state's fiscal crisis. We predict, as we predicted before, that the end result will be a tax increase and no major cuts (of the size demanded by the Governor) for higher education.

Financially as well we are not out of the woods. The proposed Gardner (and the McDermott) budgets for higher education from which the now ignorable 10% cut was to be taken, were themselves cutbacks to higher education. TESC, so far, has suffered far less than other colleges from these cutbacks. But it must be faced that even with a tax increase, we will not be given enough money to continue doing all that we are doing.

How large will the cutback be? We do not know. It will not be 10%, but we do not know what it will be. We do not know because a) we do not have a final budget for 1985-87; b) the Budget Office is in the process of reconstructing our budget request to OFM, to arrive at a leaner estimate of what it would cost for us to continue doing everything we are doing; and c) the Budget Office must arrive at an estimate of the costs of unavoidable but unfunded obligations and activities (e.g., the CPE Program Reviews or some maintenance contracts). When will we have a firm estimate of the extent of the shortfall? Surely not 'til we have a final budget. Less firm estimates, based on the assumption that the McDermott budget will prevail, might be ready by the end of the month.

CONSULTATION AND PROCEDURES ON CUTBACKS. Circumstances under which the response to the Governor's request for a 10% cut was constructed, OFM's release of our letter to the Olympian, and the Olympian's decision, despite Joe's wishes, to publish the contents of the letter, have created concerns that such decisions will be made non-consultatively and/or that Joe, Patrick and the Deans have already made up their minds as to what programs will be cut. Joe will speak at the Retreat about his commitment to consultation, about his concerns to develop an effective mechanism of consultation and governance, and about the nature of the strategic planning process he hopes to set up. In the meantime, the following paragraphs, written by Patrick, may relieve some anxieties.

Assuming, as seems prudent, that there will be cutbacks, how will they be made? Joe and Patrick and the deans will be consulting with the faculty and staff at the retreat and during the next few weeks to evolve a fair and effective process. There is currently no plan or process in place, nor will one be decided upon without consultation. We should anticipate that major decisions might have to be made during the summer.

If academic programs are involved in the cutbacks, we will need to evolve criteria of assessment. State-wide procedures, adopted to assure due process, already exist. Consistent with those procedures, Patrick offers the following unprioritized list to begin the discussion. We will be seeking refinements at the retreat:

1. Centrality to the traditional and evolving missions of the college, which themselves will need to be prioritized.
2. Quality.
3. Student demand (present and projected).
4. Costs per student.
5. Segmentability.
6. Uniqueness and comparative advantages.
7. Relevance to changing environment.

There is currently no expectation that cutbacks could be so severe or so sudden as to imperil significantly the 1985-86 or the 1986-87 curriculum.

The anticipation of cutbacks is only one reason why we need to evolve a process to assess programs. Sooner or later, higher education opportunities in southwest Washington must be expanded, presumably focused at Evergreen. We need to plan for that growth. Patrick proposes that we not engage in further across-the-board growth which perpetuates what he regards as a) inadequate levels of staffing in most every area and b) an unrealistic expectation that the problems of each unit will be solved by additional staffing; and c) a consequent failure to think creatively within the framework of existing resources. Patrick proposes that we evolve a process to assess the strengths of the college, that we designate a limited and balanced number of them for growth, that we prioritize that growth relative to the development of new areas and that we tie each element of the plan to a firm (but not rigid) schedule which enables each unit of the college to know what levels of enrollment would have to be reached before additional staffing could be anticipated. We would still be dependent upon the unpredictable actions of the legislature as to when we would grow, but at least the internal ambiguity would have been removed. (Patrick is aware of the deliberations of the Long-Range Curriculum DTF and knows that we will never evolve institutional priorities if the chief or sole mechanism of planning is the wishlists of non-communicating and self-assessing Specialty Areas.)

THE UNSOELD SEMINAR. Significant progress has been made in raising money to establish the Unsoeld Seminar Fund. We need \$20,000 more to earn the matching grants from NEH and the Bullitt Foundation. At that point we will have a \$100,000 endowment, the interest from which will finance visits to campus of outstanding speakers who are on the cutting edge of their fields. Three or four such speakers might be invited each year. In the midst of all our financial gloom, we are on the verge of establishing a resource of great and enduring value to the campus.

The memorial is being created to be a living memorial, to bring people to the campus who will raise fundamental questions, report on exciting new research, and make us think. To assure that there is real interaction with the Evergreen community, the selection of visitors will be made with an eye to program impact. Patrick will chair a small committee of faculty and students, representing diverse areas of the college, who will select the visitors. A plan will be evolved so that Specialty Areas and other units will know when they can count on a visitor in their area.

The Unsoeld Seminar Fund could be a major shot-in-the-arm for the quality of intellectual life on this campus. Several faculty members will be donating their time to helping us raise that final \$20,000. In an effort to stimulate on-campus giving, Patrick and Byron have offered to match gifts/pledges made by April 22, up to a total of \$500. Anyone interested in contributing should speak to Patrick or Byron at the retreat.

EXXON/FLC GRANT. Patrick has written a lengthy memo regarding the Exxon/FLC grant. That memo bears on many issues (e.g., professional development and faculty workload) which will be discussed at the retreat. A place will be set aside on Thursday's soiree (5 to 7 PM) to discuss the Exxon/FLC initiative.

FACULTY SALARIES. We have managed to avoid rolling back the part of your cost-of-living raise which the legislature did not fund for this year. All of the raises which we worried might not become part of your permanent base to date have managed to survive.

Your 1985-86 salary, though significantly higher than where you began the 1984-85 year, will not, barring unanticipated action in the House, be raised at any time in the 1985-86 year; no money for raises has been appropriated for either cost-of-living or merit. It is possible that raises will be appropriated for 1986-87.

JUNE CELEBRATION. The first "Crowing Party" for the faculty will be held at Patrick's house on Friday, June 14 at 7:00 PM -- the end of Evaluation Week. All faculty are invited.

Patrick announced this idea at the Convocation in September. The party is meant to provide a communal setting to celebrate the completion of the academic year and, more specifically, the writing of the evaluations. These evaluations are central to our mission; they are terribly time-consuming; and yet to date, we have provided no institutional recognition of how important they are.

The party will say "thank you" to the faculty for doing these evaluations well. The party will say "We're glad that you got them finished." And at the party each faculty member will be invited to share with his/her colleagues -- to "crow about" -- pedagogical triumphs of the past year of which you are particularly proud.

HUMANITIES FACULTY. Patrick and David will be meeting with the Humanities faculty (both those in the Humanities Specialty Area and those interested in the Humanities) at the retreat to discuss William Bennett's To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education. The discussion, scheduled for Wednesday at 5:00 PM, is the first of many meetings that Patrick is planning to hold to deliberate on Humanities education in general and on

the role of the Humanities at TESC. One focus of those meetings will concern a problem that is shared by many, if not all, Specialty Areas -- the difficulty or near impossibility of doing advanced level work at this institution. Interested parties are welcome to join the gathering.

PACIFIC RIM STUDIES. Joe and Patrick met with about 20 faculty who have expressed interest in Pacific Rim studies. Discussion focused on creating some mechanisms which would assist faculty in developing and sharing their interests. "International Economy" or "International Political Economy" were mentioned as possible rubrics under which to work. The inclusion of cultures native to the Pacific Northwest was stressed.

The meeting was intended to assess interests and resources. No commitment, beyond what was made in the Spring of '84, viz., that this was among several "decision packages" which the college might undertake were funding provided, has been made. Without outside funds and/or further consultation, no commitment will be made.

MODEL EDUCATION PLANNING TO BEGIN. On April 10 faculty from Western Washington University came and talked with a group of Evergreen faculty interested in the education program about the Western program and the process of planning a new education program at Evergreen. Western is in the process of changing their curriculum in ways which those of us at the meeting found very interesting. Evergreen faculty interested in teaching in the new program (which will be team taught by Western and Evergreen faculty) will begin planning the new program with Western. Planning will take place over the next twelve months, with the new program to begin in Fall 1986. A description of Western's initial thinking about their own new program will be distributed to the Evergreen faculty next week.

FACULTY EXCHANGE UPDATE. It now appears that we will have two faculty at Evergreen from Seattle University next year: Bob Harmon (History) will probably join the WAR program and Lou Christiansen (Music and Fine Arts) will also be at Evergreen. Seattle Central will send two or three faculty; names of these faculty will be circulated as soon as arrangements are finalized. There's even word that one of Evergreen's faculty may be journeying to Western New Mexico State University to teach next year if arrangements can be worked out. Western New Mexico is where Mervyn Cadwallader is now Chancellor.

LWOP. Four faculty were awarded leaves without pay but with benefits for 1985-86: Al Wiedemann, Fred Tabbutt, Jean Mandeborg and Ginny Ingersoll.

INTERCULTURAL LITERACY AWARDS. The Committee made most of its decisions on April 3, but is negotiating a bit with some of the applicants. Final decisions will be available before the retreat.

FULBRIGHT SCHOLAR. Our request for a Fulbright scholar has been recommended for funding. If it is funded -- as appears likely -- we will have with us next year a scholar from a Latin American country. We expect to hear about this by May 1.

POLICY INSTITUTE. The Washington State Institute for Public Policy is conducting a search for the permanent director. Duke Kuehn has been acting director since February of 1984 and will be a candidate for the permanent position. The selection of the director will be made by the Board of

Directors of the Institute, a group of high-level policymakers of the State of Washington. Patrick and Ken Dolbeare are the only Evergreen people on that ten-person Board. A screening committee of 5 persons, with only Patrick and Stan Marshburn from Evergreen, will make recommendations to the Board. Full descriptions of the position and the procedures for application are available in Rita Cooper's office. The deadline is April 26.

Changes in the constitution of the Institute are underway, including additions of provosts or their designees from other institutions of higher education in the state. The changes are intended to clarify the fact that the Institute, while located at Evergreen, is not an Evergreen institute. The fundamental purpose of the Institute is to marshal the academic resources of the whole state in the service of policymakers.

FOCUS ON RETENTION. In September, Patrick Hill charged a Retention Committee to design and implement intervention strategies to increase the retention rates of Evergreen students. The committee's efforts are specifically focused on high school directs and new incoming students. Coordinated by Ernest "Stone" Thomas, the committee members are: Gail Martin, Dean of Enrollment Services; Earle McNeil, Director of Counseling; Ellie Dornan, Director of Alumni Affairs; David Marr, Academic Dean; Jan Lambertz and Corey Meador, Recreation and Athletics; Ken Jacob, Director of Housing; and Steve Hunter, Director of Institutional Research.

During Fall and Winter Quarter committee members developed strategies to increase orientation activities and peer support, refine the academic advising system, integrate alumni into retention efforts, involve students in recreational activities on Wednesday, and develop a data-driven retention model. Concerns pertinent to the academic component of the college include: academic advising, program support to ongoing orientation activities, feedback on student academic performance, and students' participation in activities outside of academic programs to increase opportunities for students to meet each other and develop their social life.

In June, the committee will be submitting a report to Hill outlining the result of its effort and recommendations to further improve the college's retention rate of new incoming students.

PROFESSIONAL LEAVES. The professional leaves policy has been a concern to the campus for a number of years, especially with reference to the weight assigned in DTF decisions to institutional service. Patrick has discussed the issues with the current Professional Leaves DTF and with many interested individuals. A session is scheduled at the Retreat on Wednesday afternoon to explore alternatives. Llyn de Danaan, Pris Bowerman, Steve Hunter, Sig Kutter, and Sandra Simon will be offering proposals for an alternative policy at that session.

Patrick believes that decisions of the Professional Leaves DTF are the focus of unrealistic and unfulfillable expectations. In the eyes of many, professional leaves are one of the few and perhaps the only ways in which the institution expresses appreciation for years of selfless service. In the eyes of some, it is the only hope for respite from a workload that is cumulatively enervating. In the eyes of others, it is the only way that the institution celebrates scholarly values.

Patrick is concerned to relieve the DTF from overly-freighted expectations. He is not committed, one way or another, to the role which the leaves should play in a complex of institutional opportunities (which include exchanges, internal sabbaticals through reduced workloads, FLC, externally-financed research opportunities, etc.) to foster continued intellectual vitality in the faculty. We encourage you to attend the session on Wednesday and express your views.

THE THIRD-YEAR EVALUATION EXPERIMENT. Patrick and David Marr initiated the third-year evaluation experiment in response to the perception on the part of many faculty that the deans' evaluations of faculty a) have become mechanical and b) that even when not so, fail to provide the kind of feedback, challenge and support which some of the faculty are seeking. The motivation for focusing on the third-year faculty was complex: they currently have no scheduled evaluation, and given the fact that they already have their next three-year contract in hand, there is a degree of safety or non-threaten-
ingness in which something different might be absorbable.

David and Patrick have spoken with many of the third-year faculty, elicited positive responses from many, and even had three volunteers (David Hitchens, Rob Knapp and David Marr himself) for the more time-consuming part of the experiment.

Like many things which Patrick initiates, this experiment addresses more than one of the institution's problems. In addition to addressing perceived shortcomings of the evaluation system, the experiment addresses a) the isolation of faculty members from colleagues with whom they are not currently teaching; b) the absence of a public forum in which faculty may present their work to their colleagues; c) (consequent on a and b) a generalized ignorance on the part of the Evergreen faculty as to what their colleagues are working on; and d) a virtual absence for many people of mature feedback on the quality of one's work -- some people are doing terribly good work and don't know it and others are doing ordinary work which would benefit greatly from collegial criticism.

The proposal would involve the following activities:

- a. Faculty member in third year writes a 5-10 page intellectual autobiography that lays out the major shifts in his or her thought over the last three (or more) years: emphasis on one's questions, themes, projects, resources, etc. The autobiography may contain a section on pedagogy, but it need not.

A comparison of two autobiographical portraits -- one drawn from, say, 1978 or 1980, the other from 1985 -- might be a useful way of presenting a story of one's intellectual life. What captured your imagination and engaged your intellectual energies then? What about now? How did you get from that earlier time in your scholarly or artistic life to the present? Tell this story.

- b. Faculty member selects a piece (or two) of background reading and circulates it along with the autobiography. The reading selection -- an article, chapter from a book, etc., of up to fifty pages -- should provide an intellectual context within which the readers of your autobiography may situate major themes, questions, debates, and intellectual shifts to which it draws attention.

- c. If the plan were adopted, persons in the third year would form a critical audience/support group for each other. The 5-10 page autobiographies of all would be circulated and (for the sake of reducing the workload), each third-year faculty member would choose a third of the sessions to which he/she would commit to attending. The President and/or the Provost would be willing to host the sessions. The sessions would be open to other interested faculty.

At the meeting which Patrick and David held with the third-year faculty, several concerns were addressed which might fruitfully be shared with all the faculty:

1. Yes, some faculty are using the current evaluation system in a manner which forces extensive self-reflection and serious growth plans. Some are also managing by their own devices to get collegial feedback. Many (most?) are not and few feel that they are getting adequate collegial feedback.
2. No, there is no changing of priorities involved in focusing this evaluation away from pedagogy. The faculty is not suddenly being asked to produce research or scholarship. The focus, however, is on what one has been learning or seeking to learn rather than on the pedagogical mechanics.
3. The focus on intellectual autobiography is not meant in a literal sense. The concerns are to encourage a long-range perspective on one's work and the clarification/celebration of the individual's intellectual project which must be the primary source of energy and sustenance for persons in our profession; A narrower focus, e.g., on a book review that one has just completed, would not address those concerns; nor would it nurture the kind of collegial re-connection which the broader, more intelligible focus might make possible.
4. Yes, this adds still one more thing to the workload of the faculty. Before dismissing the idea for that reason alone, let us hear what the participants in the experiment say about its benefits. The work involved to do this may yield more valuable results than some other work we are doing.
5. If one's next three-year contract is already in hand, in what sense is this an evaluation? Is it possible to fail? Does anything go into one's portfolio?

You could not under any circumstances lose your three-year contract due to poor performance in this activity. In that sense it is not an evaluation. But you could "fail" in the sense that your colleagues might tell you that your resources were ten years out of date, or that the questions you were asking had already been answered, or that you were excluding the disciplines most useful to answering those questions, or that you had made no progress in answering the questions over the past three years. The "failure," however, would be easily remedied; for in the next two-three years, one could begin to address those recently discovered problems. If there were an extreme case, namely one in which one's colleagues agreed about serious deficiencies and there was no progress made in remedying those deficiencies, then we would have a serious problem.

The third-year faculty will have the statements and readings from Marr, Knapp and Hitchens by Wednesday, and are asked to read them. The sessions will be scheduled separately. Please let Patrick know by Thursday which of the three sessions you will be attending. Persons other than third-year faculty are encouraged to attend.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE. In its first year of operation, the Affirmative Action Committee has made major strides forward. The Affirmative Action Committee is composed of members of the President's Council, two classified staff members elected by the staff, and five students selected by the President, including two women students and two Third World students, at least one of whom shall be a representative of the Third World Coalition. The committee has the responsibility to plan and sponsor an affirmative action education program on campus. Two subcommittees work to attain the goal, education and training.

The Education Subcommittee, headed by Michael Hall, has developed the master calendar of intercultural events to enable faculty, staff and students to become aware of opportunities to increase cultural awareness. It is hoped that by coordinating efforts, faculty will be able to incorporate cultural events into their program planning, utilizing resources and speakers they might be unable to finance through slim program budgets.

The Training Subcommittee, chaired by Gail Martin, has developed a list of tentative affirmative action training needs. Building on the two questions, "Which area(s) are a priority for this year?" and "Can we fund this training priority from existing resources?", the Training Subcommittee is this year emphasizing the development of a survey instrument to determine the intercultural literacy levels on campus. From this survey, scheduled for Fall 1985, affirmative action training needs on campus can be more accurately determined. Claudia Beyer and Lovern King are working with student intern Wendy Byers on this project. Different faculty, staff and students will be consulted initially to evaluate the survey instrument before it is distributed next fall.

Another subcommittee that worked very effectively earlier in the year was the South African Investment Policy Subcommittee. This group worked very hard to inform the Board of Trustees on background materials on divestiture of college funds in South Africa. The work of the group was a significant factor in the strong divestiture policy that the Board passed.

The Affirmative Action Committee has also recently completed a unit-by-unit work force analysis that will assist in determining priorities in affirmative action hiring. The committee is currently working on four-year affirmative action goals for their units and a reflection of those affirmative action needs in their budget requests for the coming year(s).

Significant progress has been made this year through the efforts of the Affirmative Action Committee, in coordination with the Affirmative Action Office. The goal of campus-wide incorporation of intercultural literacy has moved closer to implementation.