

FACULTY MEETING AGENDA

April 24, 1985  
3:00 - 5:00  
CAB 110

1. Minutes of the previous meeting (attached; Arney) - 5 minutes.
2. Report on Deans' Groups (B. Smith) - 10 minutes.
3. Scheduling for Fall 1985 (Perkins) - 5 minutes.
4. Discussion of Barbara Smith's proposal to add a new faculty status (B. Smith) - 20 minutes.

(The Agenda Committee will propose that we discuss Barbara's proposal and that a Study Group be appointed to prepare a formal proposal for consideration at the May 22 Faculty Meeting.)

5. Appointment of a Study Group to assess current policy and procedure regarding professional leave and to recommend changes, if necessary (Arney) - 5 minutes.

(The Agenda Committee will propose that it be responsible for appointing this group which will report its recommendations at the first Fall 1985 Faculty Meeting.)

6. Proposal to change Faculty Handbook regarding Professional Travel (P. Henderson) - 10 minutes.
7. Faculty resolution regarding next search for a Senior Academic Dean (attached; Arney) - 60 minutes.
8. Announcements - 5 minutes.

Chair Bill Arney, with assistance from Dean Smith, Provost Hill and President Olander, convened the meeting at 3:10 and established that there was a quorum.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Minutes of the previous meeting.

Minutes of the February 27, 1985 meeting were approved.

2. Reports on state/Evergreen budget status and Senior Academic Dean search.

Patrick Hill informed the faculty of the two cuts presently facing the college. The first is, in effect, a give-back of \$192,000 to be absorbed between now and June 30, 1985. It will come primarily from three sources: (a) \$80,000 of recently discovered equipment money, (b) \$59,000 reserved for purchase of equipment for lab computers, and (c) "every single penny" left in the institution's reserve account.

Hill stressed that Fred Tabbutt and Walter Niemiec have received an unbreakable written promise that that \$59,000 sum can be spent on July 1, 1985. The only alternative to the use of this money would have been to roll back this year's faculty and staff salary increases.

Regarding the 85-86 budget: Hill reported on the Governor's directive for all institutions to estimate the kinds of things that might happen if a 10% (effective 12%) cut were to be imposed. The Governor's directive, a political exercise designed to increase pressure for a tax increase, forbade across-the-board cuts and asked that programs be eliminated. Evergreen's total cuts in the exercise would come to \$3.85 million. A memo from Joe to the campus will explain the nature of the exercise, the non-binding character of the response to the Governor, and the administration's commitment to start from scratch in already established procedures in the unlikely event that cuts of this magnitude were to come to pass.

Patrick then reported on the search to replace John Perkins. Finding a Senior Dean with budgetary expertise of the finest quality was the Search DTF's foremost charge, and in the past two months that charge has become even more critical as the state's financial picture worsens and as the responsibilities of particular people in Evergreen's administration are re-defined by the new president.

The provost announced that in light of those developments, he was not able to name either finalist--Rob Knapp or Tulsi Saral--as Senior Academic Dean, because both lacked the substantial experience with budgets which had been listed in the DTF's charge as an absolute prerequisite. John Perkins has, therefore, responded positively to Patrick's request that he remain in the position until a satisfactory solution to the problem can be found.

Relatedly, Hill reported that Joe Olander has acquired through OFM funding for a management study of the college. The conclusions and recommendations of that study are expected to be made public in June. This study could conceivably recommend a reconfiguration of Evergreen's administration.

3. Proposal to change policy on Academic Standing.

David Marr brought to the faculty a modification of the proposal which was discussed at the last Faculty Meeting (refer to minutes of 2/27/85). The major change between this version and the existing Academic Standing policy is that this one would result in a student earning fewer than three-fourths the number of credits for which he/she is registered in two successive quarters (rather than three) being placed on Academic Warning. The class lists issued by the Registrar will be used to indicate each student's academic status. Credit determination by faculty will be binding, quarter by quarter.

Kirk Thompson questioned why the criterion for "success" was 75% and not 100%. Ken Dolbeare reminded the group that we are now turning students away while unsuccessful students stay on. Lovern King voiced her concern over being asked to vote on a new policy today, having had just a few minutes to study and consider the proposal.

The motion to so change the Academic Standing policy passed.

Note: A copy of the revised policy and information about when it can legally be implemented will be distributed to the Evergreen community in the near future.

4. Proposal to elect faculty representative(s) to Enrollment Coordinating Committee.

Earle McNeil has expressed a desire for a member of the faculty to serve on the ECC. Kirk was concerned that several faculty should serve on the Committee, but pointed out that its present Monday afternoon meeting schedule blocks widespread faculty participation. Sue Washburn assured that the meeting schedule could be altered.

Betty Ruth Estes was nominated from the floor, and other faculty can be nominated between 4/3/85 and 4/10/85. All names will be submitted to the provost, and he will select the representative(s) and determine appointment duration.

5. Proposal to change Faculty Handbook to add a new category of faculty member.

Barbara Smith brought back an amended proposal after a motion to reword the proposal passed at the last Faculty Meeting. She asked for action on Inserts #1 and #3 (refer to salmon-colored attachment in 4/3/85 agenda package). The proposal would help distinguish between two types of faculty appointments: one which is truly non-renewable and one which is

for one-year, but offers good opportunity for continual renewal. Considerable time and money would be saved by not having to re-open hiring each year for the latter category.

A motion to approve Inserts #1 and #3 was made and passed.

Note: This is the first approved change in the Faculty Handbook since its recent re-printing. The provost's secretary will record this and subsequent changes in the Handbook and will distribute an update during the summer.

6. Proposal to change Faculty Handbook to clarify posting of faculty openings.

Barbara offered two changes which will (a) further clarify hiring procedures and (b) eliminate the two-week lag between a prospective faculty's interview and decision-date (refer to blue attachment in 4/3/85 agenda package). A motion to make these changes in the Handbook passed unanimously.

7. Report on pilot program using adjunct field faculty as internship sponsors.

Barbara Smith referred the faculty to the white attachment in the 4/3/85 agenda package which explains the history and purposes of the adjunct field faculty project. Very briefly, the experiment began last fall when practitioners were hired to sponsor internships in areas in which student demand was high and outweighed the availability of appropriate faculty sponsorship.

Barbara Cooley introduced two students, Anne Whiting and Jean Westerlund, each of whom shared their perspectives of the "pros and cons" of the pilot program. Both women praised the experiment, mentioning the regular seminars, accessibility of supervisors, and the supervisors' inside knowledge of off-campus opportunities in the field.

Barbara Smith then asked for endorsement of Insert #2 on the salmon attachment. Adjunct field faculty appointed to work with the internship program for more than one quarter would go through the regular faculty hiring procedures and would be evaluated by the academic deans. Kirk Thompson opposed the form of the motion presentation, but Bill Arney stated that the Agenda Committee had earlier agreed to bring it to the floor in this manner.

Kirk then moved to have a DTF charged to study the adjunct field faculty issue. The motion failed.

Barbara Cooley next moved to charge a provostially-appointed Faculty Study Group to consider the issue. The motion passed.

8. Announcements.