John Caraher opened the meeting by reading a 1971 document from the Evergreen archives outlining the logic behind disappearing task forces and faculty meetings.

Kevin Francis introduced a motion to approve a Proposal for a Governance Experiment at Evergreen. The motion was seconded, followed by a review of the proposal and an accompanying document, “Proposed Modifications to Governance Experiment based on Faculty Feedback: Supplementary Reading for Faculty Meeting (Nov. 20, 2019)”. A robust discussion ensued, including about the types of policy review and decisions the Agenda Committee proposed to make on behalf of the faculty and a request for reports to the faculty-at-large when the Agenda Committee acts on their behalf.

The discussion was followed by a series of voice votes on three amendments to the Proposal:

1. The first amendment was to the Proposal’s fourth Agenda Committee function, with the amended text underlined:

   4. Determine which matters should be brought to the Faculty Meeting (possibly leading to a vote of the faculty) and which can be formally approved, or not, by the Agenda Committee without formal consultation at the Faculty Meeting. Issues that involve minor policy changes may be settled by the Agenda Committee through consultation or vote. Issues that involve major policy changes will be brought to the Faculty Meeting for consultation or deliberation except when they require an immediate decision or response in order to provide faculty input. One Agenda Committee response may be a decision that a proposed major policy change must be presented to the Faculty Meeting for deliberation and vote. Reports from committees charged or co-charged by the Agenda Committee are assumed to be major policy changes that should be presented to the faculty for consultation or deliberation. Formal approval of an item by the Agenda Committee requires 2/3 of the existing Agenda Committee membership; individual votes will not be a matter of public record. Decisions made by the Agenda Committee on behalf of the faculty will be promptly communicated to the faculty.

   The amendment passed.

2. The second amendment was to add the following language to the end of the Proposal’s paragraph on the Agenda Committee, at the top of page 3:

   *Individual Agenda Committee members can be recalled from this position by a vote of the Faculty Meeting. Any recall will be conducted under the rules for voting on a major issue, requiring two discussions prior to a vote and 66% of faculty present voting in favor of the motion to recall.*

   The amendment was rejected.

3. There was a third amendment from the floor to strike the word “not” in the second to last sentence of the first amendment (highlighted above for reference). The amendment was rejected.

The proposal as amended (included below these minutes for reference), was then voted on by ballot and passed as follows: 44 yes, 8 no, 2 abstentions.

After some comments were made regarding the informal discussion scheduled to directly follow, the faculty meeting was adjourned at 4:22p.m.
Proposal for a Governance Experiment at Evergreen

As passed at the November 20, 2019 Faculty Meeting by a vote of 44 Y, 8 N, and 2A.

Our current governance structures are not serving us well, which is an issue identified both by faculty and outside reviewers. The most recent accreditation report identified the need to improve our shared governance: “The Evaluation Committee recommends that Evergreen conduct institutional planning in a systematic and integrated manner, making use of comprehensive opportunities for input and communication among all constituents of the campus. Further, the Evaluation Committee recommends that when plans are implemented, they be made available and communicated to appropriate constituencies. (Standard 3.A.1, 3.A.2)”

Participants in a summer institute on transparent governance and members of the Agenda Committee have identified a number of issues that weaken our collective voice in college matters relevant to the academic mission and intellectual life of the College.

1. The Faculty has not had a well-articulated collective agenda on matters outside of wages, hours, and working conditions over the past three years (and arguably longer), thus other administrative entities at the College set our institutional agenda.

2. The Faculty was not adequately consulted, via the Agenda Committee or the Faculty Meeting, by the administration on major planning initiatives (Strategic Equity Plan), or major academic policy changes and institutional reorganization (College Reorganization, Paths of Study) over the past three years.

3. The Faculty Handbook section on Academic Governance has not been updated to reflect the existence of a faculty union. We lack a clear articulation within the Faculty Handbook of the scope of faculty interest, boundaries between the domains of shared governance and collective bargaining, the process of determining respective roles for specific issues that cut across these domains, or the process for collaboration.

4. The Faculty lacks a mechanism to provide formal consultation on administrative decisions on urgent matters that fall outside existing policy, creating a de facto system in which the faculty are bypassed in the decision-making process on many issues. We lack a representative group to act on behalf of the faculty on issues outside of wages, hours, and working conditions in such situations. The Agenda Committee lacks the authority to formally approve actions, decisions, or policies on behalf of the faculty except under very exceptional circumstances.

5. The Evergreen community lacks a centralized location to archive and share the work of committees and other groups that is accessible to all members of the Evergreen community, thus reducing the transparency of our collective work and decision-making.

In the Evergreen spirit of experimentation, we propose a new faculty governance structure for the current academic year. This proposal contains a requirement to accept (with or without modifications) or reject this model at the end of the current academic year. We will devote some time at our faculty meeting to share this model, gather feedback about its merits and flaws, and gauge faculty interest and support for it.
We propose that the following section replace the existing section of the Faculty Handbook on Academic Organization for the current academic year, with a sunset clause at the end of the year. In other words, we would revert back to the previous version unless we have an affirmative vote at the Faculty Meeting to keep this new language. We would also have the opportunity, at that moment, to revise the language based on our experience during the year and propose a modified model for shared governance. Extensive text was removed; new text is highlighted below.

**ACADEMIC ORGANIZATION**

NOT UNDERLINED = Existing text from current Academic Handbook. UNDERLINED = New text

**Shared Governance at Evergreen**
The art of teaching at Evergreen should be the art of arranging the conditions and moments when the student encounters problems and ideas so that important learning takes place; lives are touched, shaped and changed so that they become responsible, critical and creative life-long learners. The art of administration at Evergreen should be, must be, the art of protecting, stimulating, supporting, and rewarding good teaching.

Because the art of really effective teaching is something we all learn together, and because the art of developing and teaching interdisciplinary programs is something that we will work at for years to come, the more experimental, creative, critical and self-corrective we are, the more successful we will all be.

To ensure this, the faculty has been organized into many temporary, small, autonomous teams and each given a great deal of freedom and a great deal of responsibility, power and authority. The faculty, so organized, will always have access to the deans, the provost and the president. The deans, provost and president will always have immediate access to the faculty.

The academic structure of Evergreen enables faculty members to know and feel their stake in the success of their program—and their stake in the success of the Evergreen idea. When the structure did not support our goals, it was changed, and it will be changed again as need arises.

**Domain of Faculty Interest**
The faculty’s interest is divided between domains covered by collective bargaining and domains covered by shared governance. The United Faculty of Evergreen (UFE) is responsible for representing the faculty’s interests with respect to wages, hours and working conditions. Beyond wages, hours, and working conditions, faculty play a central role in all decisions related to curriculum, academic and admission standards, and faculty hiring. In addition, the scope of faculty interest includes matters relating to institutional mission, structures and processes within the Student and Academic Life division, academic support for students, structures and strategies to promote inclusive excellence, resource allocation within the Student and Academic Life division, and decisions about college-wide resource allocation and planning. Should the roles of UFE and the shared governance structures overlap, the Agenda Committee will endeavor to work collegially with UFE to address particular issues.
The faculty expects meaningful consultation and participation on all matters within the scope of the faculty's interest. The faculty also expects its collective recommendations to be heard, considered, and taken with great seriousness by the deans, the provost, the president, and the trustees.

The formal power of the faculty extends to a vote of no confidence in a policy, administrator, or administering body. Votes of confidence are reserved for extraordinary situations in which regular procedures do not suffice. We warmly invite, indeed we urge, the president, provost and deans to attend faculty meetings regularly in order to be aware of faculty opinion.

**Key Roles and Responsibilities of Shared Governance**

The **PROVOST** is expected to bring matters that fall within the scope of the faculty interest before us by bringing them to the attention of the Agenda Committee on a regular basis.

The **DEANS** are faculty members charged with academic administration (Section 2.300).

The **FACULTY MEETING** is a forum for discussions about academic policies and other matters related to the faculty interest.

The **AGENDA COMMITTEE** will determine the appropriate use of the Faculty Meeting on each matter, which might include consultation with the decision-maker, consultation with Agenda Committee members who will make a decision on behalf of the Faculty, deliberation leading to an advisory vote by the Faculty, or some other mechanism.

The Chair of the Faculty will also be chair of the Agenda Committee. The Agenda Committee is a representative body elected from the faculty at-large basis. The Agenda Committee will consist of eight elected members, plus the Chair of the Faculty and the faculty representative to the Board of Trustees. Terms of the elected members will be two years, and at least four new members will be nominated and elected annually in the late spring. The chair will also be elected annually in late spring. The previous year’s chair typically serves as the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees.

In addition, the Agenda Committee will recruit two non-voting members to foster collaboration within the faculty and across the College: 1) an academic dean or provost, 2) a representative from the United Faculty of Evergreen leadership team.

The Agenda Committee has the following functions:

1. Facilitate the development of a collective faculty agenda for the year and strategies for implementing this agenda.
2. Create an agenda for the Faculty Meeting and determine the best structure for the Faculty Meeting.
3. Provide consultation on academic policy and college decisions within the broader faculty interest as defined above. Issues that the Agenda Committee agrees are only extensions of existing tradition and policy may be settled by the Committee in consultation with the provost and deans and reported to the faculty.
4. Determine which matters should be brought to the Faculty Meeting (possibly leading to a vote of the faculty) and which can be formally approved, or not, by the Agenda Committee without formal consultation at the Faculty Meeting. Issues that involve minor policy changes may be settled by the Agenda Committee through consultation or vote. Issues that involve major policy changes will be brought to the Faculty Meeting for consultation or deliberation except when they require an immediate decision or response in order to provide faculty input. One Agenda Committee response may be a decision that a proposed major policy change must be presented at the Faculty Meeting for deliberation and vote. Reports from committees charged or co-charged by the Agenda Committee are assumed to be major policy changes that should be presented to the faculty for consultation or deliberation. Formal approval of an item by the Agenda Committee requires 2/3 of the existing Agenda Committee membership; individual votes will not
be a matter of public record. Decisions made by the Agenda Committee on behalf of the faculty will be promptly communicated to the faculty.

5. Charge or co-charge committees to address issues within the faculty’s interest. Review with the provost and deans the charges, constitution, and membership of all committees and governance bodies working in areas within the faculty interest.

6. Review committee reports within the faculty interest and determine whether they should be brought to the Faculty Meeting for consultation or deliberation leading to an advisory vote.

7. Improve communication at the College by developing and maintaining a central website for campus governance and provide a quarterly report on major governance work within the faculty interest. Post timely minutes of Agenda Committee and Faculty Meeting proceedings on the governance website, including all votes made by the Agenda Committee.

8. Collaborate with the academic deans to plan the academic retreat.

We do not propose changes to the existing handbook section on the Faculty Meeting.

**Governance Groups**

To promote faculty discussions in groups smaller than that of the whole faculty yet larger than that of teaching teams and planning units, each member of the faculty will be assigned on an annual basis to one of several governance groups. The groups will always be interdisciplinary and composed of a cross section of the faculty (full-time and part-time faculty; graduate, undergraduate, and library faculty; regular and temporary faculty, etc.).

From year to year, the membership of the governance groups will be reorganized with the goal of avoiding the creation of permanent and potentially self-perpetuating units within the faculty. Governance groups are based largely on each year’s deans groups, with some modification to ensure an adequate representation across areas of the curriculum.