

76-07

COLLEGIAL TEACHING AT EVERGREEN

Don Finkel and Bill Arney

Members of the Faculty  
The Evergreen State College

c 1991 - All rights reserved. Do not cite or quote without permission.

## Table of Contents

Prologue	page 1
Introduction: Collegial Teaching	page 4
Part I: <u>Collegial Teaching</u> at Evergreen	page 12
Part II: Collegial Teaching <u>at Evergreen</u>	page 44
Conclusion	page 85

## PROLOGUE

Over the past two summers, we have been writing a book called The Paradox of Pedagogy. This writing project grew out of our experiences teaching together in two Evergreen programs (five years apart). We had discovered, first, that we differed fundamentally in the approaches we took to teaching, second, that this difference was a key to the deep pleasure we took in working together, and third, that this "teaching across difference" had a certain connection to the pedagogical possibilities opened up by the creation of that relatively new educational institution, The Evergreen State College. We decided to write a book together to sustain the conversation we had started through teaching together and to try to articulate a report on our experience to others who might be interested.

The final third of the book is explicitly about Evergreen. In this section, we point to a wonderful teaching opportunity that the institution of Evergreen made possible; we also describe the looming threats to this possibility, threats which have been made real by the very same institution that created the wonderful opportunity.

We are presently at an unusually "open" time in the history of our college, a time between the tenures of permanent college presidents, a time after the recent hiring of a striking number of new faculty members and administrators, and a time when there is much debate about the relation between the college's founding vision and its future direction. By circulating this section of our book at this time, we hope to raise some fundamental questions that are being side-stepped or ignored by the current debates about multi-culturalism, coordinated studies, seminars, public service, and so on, questions that may help to focus our current discussions. For surely, our current discussions may shape the future of our college for years to come.

What follows is a draft of the final third of The Paradox of Pedagogy. For its present incarnation as a separate essay, we have called it "Collegial Teaching at Evergreen." You will need to know a little about what precedes it in the full manuscript, before reading it.

In the first part of the book, we examine what we take to be the item of central concern in Western pedagogy since Rousseau: the student-teacher relationship. This relationship offers a new promise for pedagogy, but only, Rousseau implies, if it can be cultivated correctly. Rousseau is the first

educational thinker to hold out this promise and to offer a map for the cultivation of this relationship, and so we begin our exploration with his book Emile. We then construct a dialectical conversation about the promise of such a pedagogy, by examining the thought of Freud, Paulo Freire, and the pair of social thinkers, Ivan Illich and Michel Foucault. We conclude, as a result of this conversation, that modern pedagogy based on the personal relationship between student and teacher is inherently paradoxical, and will always be, to some degree, self-defeating.

We then discuss two different responses to the paradox of pedagogy--which we call the "tragic" and the "progressive" response. This discussion is both a way of articulating our own differences as teachers and a way of developing a pedagogical approach which is not centered on the student-teacher relationship. We make concrete the two different responses by means of two lectures on Socrates, that first and most paradoxical pedagogue in the Western tradition. The lectures articulate two opposite interpretations of Socrates. Through our discussion of these differing responses, we are led to our central thesis: that the best response to the paradox of pedagogy is teaching that has at its heart not the relationship between teacher and student, but the relationship between two teachers--teachers who differ in fundamental ways. We label such teaching "collegial teaching," something we think is radically different from simple "collaborative instruction" or "interdisciplinary studies."

The text which follows begins shortly after the presentation of the two lectures on Socrates presented by authors "A" and "B." It begins after a brief discussion in which A's response to Socrates (who he sees as a humorous figure), is interpreted to be a "tragic" response, one which takes the solitary soul to be the central concern of education, and in which B's response to Socrates (who he sees as an ironic figure) is interpreted to be a "progressive" response, one which takes the community to be the central concern of education. It is clear from their responses to one and the same Socrates that A and B are, as educators, fundamentally different. There appears to be an unbridgeable gap between them.

A caution: That A's lecture was originally delivered by Arney and B's by Finkel (in "Classical and Modern" two years ago) and the two-part structure of this essay may invite a reader to understand this piece by identifying the parts with one or the other author. As we note in the text, collegial teaching

involves, in part, a rather remarkable identification by each colleague with the other's point of view. Hence, in our minds, A's lecture is no longer Arney's and B's is no longer Finkel's. Each of us can find ourselves in each. Likewise, we find it difficult, after working on this book together, to firmly attribute authorship to one or the other section of what follows. The work is for us of a piece, a product of collegial teaching.

One reader of this manuscript reacted with a jolt when he began reading Part II. He reported later that the two parts were each coherent and interesting but seemed to him almost completely unrelated to each other. Another reader of the manuscript commented on this reaction by telling us, "The two sections hang together by your having put them together!" She referred to them as conveying "two truths boldly told."

A paradox generally juxtaposes two views which do indeed provide a jolt. Moreover, the structure of the book as a whole is dialectical, and the final section, which you will read here, maintains that dialectical structure in which a pedagogical promise is opened up only to be deflated by a critique. The book as a whole, like each of its internal sections, ends on a note of paradox. But beyond that, this essay has been written by two people who see things differently yet have agreed to construct a common report of their experience, an experience which includes this divergent seeing. The jolt that may come from reading these two sections together is a part of the experience we are reporting on. It is integral to a form of teaching which makes present, rather than mystifies or masks, the paradox of pedagogy.

## INTRODUCTION: COLLEGIAL TEACHING

[For Rousseau] professors ... represented an unsatisfactory halfway house between the two harsh disciplines that make a man serious--community and solitude.<sup>1</sup>

Let us now summarize the paradox of pedagogy and then ask how A and B, two pedagogues who view each other across the divide of a fundamental difference, will likely respond to the paradox. We can start from either of the fundamental aims of education: education is ultimately for society or education is ultimately for the self. From either starting point, we are led down the same path.

If education is ultimately for society, it is also against society. If education is ultimately for the self, it must work also against the self. Either way, for the sake of either end, education must radically separate the pupil from society. Yet as we have seen, separation is impossible. In the new space effected by this "impossible" separation, the personal relationship between student and teacher becomes vital to education, yet it represents at the same time the biggest threat to education. In this personal relationship of teacher and student, regardless of one's aim, the teacher's job is suicidal; it is to make the student a student no longer, and thus to undo himself as a teacher. To put the paradox in one sentence, we could say that the fundamental vehicles, structures, "moves," and matrices which are the prerequisites of a liberatory education are all, simultaneously, fundamental preventative of its achieving any kind of genuine liberation.

What is a teacher to do? Specifically, how might A and B confront this paradox? A and B start from different points: education for the private self and for solitude vs. education for the public self and for the ability to contribute to social reconstruction. Yet both quickly find themselves mired in the same paradox. But they will respond to the paradox differently.

A will respond stoically. He will nourish himself from the enhancing quality of paradox itself, using his awareness of paradox to set ethical limits for himself and to incorporate into his educational aims the imperative to point out (usually indirectly) those ethical limits to his students.

B will respond progressively. He will nourish himself from his conviction that paradoxes are stimuli to further development. He will find the enhancing quality of the paradox to be the challenge to overcome it, to find his way to

higher syntheses where the paradox dissolves (and where new paradoxes may form themselves).

But A and B have something in common. Both share a sensitivity to paradox, a commitment to facing it seriously, to looking long and hard at the implications of paradox, and to summoning forth with integrity a response to it. Neither will close his eyes to the paradox; neither will deny its existence or render its implications trivial.

These commonalities suggest a response to the paradox of pedagogy that is different from choosing between the progressivism of B or the stoicism of A. Broadly speaking, it is possible to be taught by both A and B at the same time. There are two ways A and B can come together to teach.

First, one individual teacher can allow herself to be torn between these two orientations. She may feel at times like A and at times like B; or, part of her may feel like A and part of her may feel like B. Rousseau himself was torn. Though not a pedagogue himself, as a writer and thinker, and indeed as a human being, he seems to have lived with an elegant tension between a social aim and a solitary aim. Peter France claims that "the tug-of-war between solitude and society" was Rousseau's central theme.<sup>2</sup> And Bloom argues in the epigraph that Rousseau's animosity toward writers, scientists, philosophers, and scholars was based on their general unwillingness to seriously confront this tension. Ignoring the paradox of pedagogy is the least satisfactory response to it. Rousseau's work shows us a man who took the two pedagogical aims which seem so opposite equally seriously. At times, he reads like our A, and at other times like our B. Over his work as a whole, it is clear that he was both.

Having someone like Rousseau as a teacher\* would provide a most interesting means of manifesting the paradox of pedagogy to students. It would be quite difficult for Rousseau's students ever to settle clearly on a single path with a clear aim (society or solitude). Whenever one path seemed to students clearly to be the one their teacher was beckoning them down, it would not be long before

---

\* It should be clear that we would never endorse a pedagogy of play acting. One can discuss, politically or collegially, these two aims. One can play devil's advocate when one's students fall under the sway of one end or the other. These options seem weak and flawed in comparison to having the tension between opposed ends embodied in one person, even a pedagogue, who experiences the tension in all its wrenching force.

the other surfaced as the more important path. Such shifting would certainly do much to combat the impulse to completion and totality that students feel as much as anybody. But the students of such a teacher might be forced to entertain some serious questions about the wholeness or integrity of their teacher.

The second way of responding to the paradox of pedagogy without siding either with A or B is more interesting. We wish to discuss it at some length. This pedagogical arrangement is simple, yet somewhat shocking: Why not have A and B team up to teach a common group of students together? In this arrangement the points of view of A and B are bodily present to the students; they do not have to alternate or be present only partially; A and B can be fully articulated and keenly felt because each position has a personal embodiment in the classroom. Each will have full integrity. More than that, the difference between A and B will be palpable. This difference, which can be a source of pathology in a single teacher torn between orientations, now becomes explicitly a moral and educational object for students' attention.

Though putting A and B together in a classroom may be a simple, seemingly "methodological" move, we imagine it involving something more ambitious. We mean to ask A and B to plan and teach a course together, a course on a topic of common interest to them. This task still seems simple enough, and it is.

But it is also difficult, because there is a gap--a silence--that separates A and B. When they come together a certain nervousness is created. Between A and B, we may say there is a nervous silence. Each has a point of view that is stable and reasonable, that has its own integrity. Each acts in a way that is conditioned by his point of view. But when they come together, they meet at an impasse. There are two "sides" here. That much is obvious. It would seem that the only question would be which side to take. If one could only decide, then no one would have to be nervous anymore. But A and B insist on their common silence. They break their silence only when someone chooses a side, or when someone tries to put a wall between them in order to get them to play "Prisoner's Dilemma." They speak only to insure their silence.

The silence across which A and B speak to one another is analogous to Robert Frost's "Mending Wall." This fence makes good neighbors by providing a meeting place for those the fence separates. It is across Frost's fence that one neighbor calls to the other in the spring of each year. It is along the fence that the two walk the dividing line that they have in common in a



reenactment of that ancient ritual of marking one's territory. It is at the fence that they work to make repairs that importunities beyond their control have necessitated. In re-placing in spring the stones that winter has dislodged, two people work together to repair that which they have in common that separates them. It is across the fence that the call of one person is answered by another.

In this final section we want to turn away from the promise of pedagogy that we have found so paradoxical. We want to imagine a pedagogy that begins with pedagogues turning away from students. We want to imagine a pedagogy that, because of its seeming indifference toward students, leaves room for colleagues to answer one another's call to meet at the boundaries of their thoughts marked by nervous silences. In the turn away from a pedagogy based on one permutation or other of the student-teacher relationship, two colleagues may find themselves facing one another. In that place, at the boundary which they have in common that separates them, they may feel moved to act.

Team teaching or collaborative teaching as practiced most commonly has almost nothing to do with the sort of educational effort we are describing. We prefer the term "collegial teaching" to suggest we are talking about something unfamiliar to the experience of most teachers. What is crucial to collegial teaching is that the two (or more) teachers join together out of a common intellectual interest. The two words "common" and "interest" are equally important. What brings the colleagues together must be a genuine interest, not an interest invented as a pretext for creating a course. The interest must be common between them, not in the most literal sense that a written statement of each's intellectual interest would be identical. Rather there must be some common ground in their intellectual interest, or some overlap or interconnectedness, so that together they can formulate a question or project the joint pursuit of which will be genuinely interesting to each--though not necessarily for the exact same reasons.\*

---

\* For A and B to teach really well together, each has to be able to identify with and take the point of view of the other. We are not talking about having a capitalist and a socialist teach economics together. The mutually enhancing quality of collegial teaching has its source in this ability to sympathetically identify with an absolutely opposed position. In some sense, then, each teacher involved in such a project will suffer the split of the single teacher torn between A and B that we mentioned earlier. A will have a

So far collegial teaching sounds like a collaborative research project (which it is), but where do students fit in? We wish we could simply permit ourselves the luxury of saying that students enter the project of collegial teaching because the colleagues have invited them to enter. The spirit of generosity and openness that endemically informs research and intellectual inquiry sparked by curiosity and human interest should lead naturally, or so it would seem, to the proffering of this invitation. Students are with their teachers because they seek an education and what better way to get one than to witness and participate in intellectual inquiry along with those who are more knowledgeable and experienced, those who have a sufficient background to have the highly developed interest that is the precondition for both inquiry and education? The students are there because the colleagues have invited them, and they have been invited because they are willing to be a responsive audience, because they are willing to help out, and most important, because they are open to developing a serious interest in the inquiry themselves, and, subsequently, to pursuing the inquiry themselves with their own energies and their own minds.

We wish we could say that students become colleagues because they are invited to do so, but we are aware that most teaching occurs in institutions. The spirit which nourishes collegial teaching is dampened by institutions. That is why teachers must, in a sense, turn away from students. The invitation they issue is, in fact, an invitation for their students to give up being students. It is an invitation to collegueship. Whether or not this invitation can be issued and accepted in an educational institution is a difficult question, one we address in Part II below.

For now, we underline the fact that in the turn away from students as students, colleagues may find one another, even though they are teaching together. Under the arrangement of collegial teaching, the personal relationship once again becomes the central supporting, determining, and founding fact of pedagogy. But now it is the personal relationship between teachers rather than between teacher and student, teacher and students, or even, students and other students, that has become central to education and learning. At the heart of collegial teaching is a relationship between people who are equals in all important respects. In that relationship, without obvious entrees

---

subordinate B within him, and likewise B will have within him a subordinate A.

to relationships of domination, without obvious rules for forming their interactions, the colleagues must invent, from A to Z we might say, what is to happen between them before their students.

As almost all teachers know, teaching is a lonely profession. Despite all the pedagogical associations, in-service workshops, faculty development efforts that are now in vogue and which only serve to reproduce and reinforce the master-pupil relationship that gives way so easily to domination, the vast majority of teachers know that what really counts happens when they are alone with their students in the class. The institutional context of virtually all teaching in this country makes what happens when teachers are alone with their students a matter of utmost intimacy. It is, indeed, far easier to get most teachers to talk openly and candidly about their sex lives than it is to get them to talk frankly about their teaching, about what really happens when they are alone with their students. Given this common condition, we accept that most people will find it hard to entertain the idea that the most important personal relationship in the classroom could be the one between the two colleagues who are teaching the class together. Yet we have found it to be so. While ultimately there is no perfectly suitable or perfectly adequate response to the paradox of pedagogy, the best response, we wish to argue, is to have two pedagogues who differ (as A and B differ) get together out of (a) common intellectual interest, (b) mutual respect, and (c) an openness to the potential of friendship between them, and plan and teach a course together for a common group of students.

Under these conditions, the relationship they form will inevitably be erotic. This eroticism will fuel all that transpires in their course. The relationship between colleagues will be based in homophilia, that friendship that occurs between people who can perceive a likening in the other. Contrary to some treasured pedagogical principles and most social policy cant, this approach begins with the notion that education can only occur between people who perceive a likening in the other. But whether this means that education can only occur among people who are alike or who might come to be alike, or whether this suggests something about the spirit in which education and learning ought to be approached is a question that we must leave open for now. It serves us now to note merely that in the turn away from the erotic bond between teacher and student painted so vividly by Rousseau, and unmasked so dramatically by Freud,

love has entered the classroom in a form where its very presence is not dedicated to undermining the development or the liberation of pupils.

We are not describing some kind of Utopian fantasy here, but rather a kind of teaching we have both experienced in an educational institution that now exists and has existed for nearly twenty years. We intend to discuss our experiences in this institution in Part II. Let us summarize our experience in advance by saying that when A and B become colleagues and teach together, they can provide more and become more than the sum of what each could do were they teaching separately. A can become more of an A when he teaches with B, and likewise, B can become more of a B. At the same time, A can permit himself to be a B at moments, and B can try on the persona of an A. The limitations of each orientation can be temporarily transcended by working together in relationship. There is a mutual enhancement that arises from such a collaboration, an enhancement that arises not from compromise or intellectual accommodation, but from the rigorous, persistent, relentless articulation of the difference between A and B. This difference becomes the moral and intellectual object of awareness for both the students, and equally, for A and B as well.

It almost goes without saying that A and B will do all that is in their power to discourage the students from choosing sides. The point of articulating the differences between them could not be farther removed from any desire to create sides in the first place. It is rather to raise for the students, in ways ranging from the most implicit to the most explicit, all the issues that we have written about in this book. It is to let them see how paradoxical their position is as students, and to permit them to responsibly and authoritatively articulate their own responses to this paradox.

Finally, yet still summarizing what is to come, it needs to be understood that the friendship, the respect, and the love, between the two colleagues is not going to end when their course concludes. There is no way to predict what will become of it, nor any need to. It can take many forms. On most occasions, it will lead the colleagues to continue the conversation they have started in the presence of their students, the conversation that arose out of common interest and into which they invited their students to join. There are many ways they may happen on to continue carrying on this conversation, this friendship. Sometimes they may decide to write a book together. But they need not write together, nor even converse with one another. Even in the absence of

words, even in silence, friendship is possible. Indeed some forms of friendship thrive best in silence.\* Whether the continued collaboration of the colleagues aims toward social acts of conversing and writing or towards solitude and silence, friendship has the last word. This fact, it turns out, is what informs collegial teaching from the start and has the deepest impact on the students, though they may never know it.

---

\* Illich and Foucault both understand this. This is from the conclusion to Illich and Sanders' A B C: "We are children of the book. But in our sadness we are silly enough to long for the one silent space that remains open in our examined lives, and that is the silence of friendship" (Illich, Ivan and Barry Sanders, A B C: The Alphabetization of the Popular Mind, San Francisco, Calif.: North Point Press, 1988, p. 127). And this is from an interview with Foucault: "Maybe another feature of [my] appreciation of silence is related to the obligation of speaking. I lived as a child in a petit bourgeois, provincial milieu in France and the obligation of speaking, of making conversation with visitors, was for me something both very strange and very boring. I often wondered why people had to speak. Silence may be a much more interesting way of having a relationship with people." (Foucault, Michel, "The Minimalist Self," pp. 3-16 in Kritzman, Lawrence D., ed., Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984. New York, N.Y.: Routledge, p. 4.)

## PART I: COLLEGIAL TEACHING AT EVERGREEN

For a while, there, I thought that Evergreen would, like other colleges, get around to running itself. I was wrong, and I'm glad to have noticed it. Evergreen isn't going to run itself, ever. If it ever does, or if it is ever allowed to, it won't be the Evergreen that has this joyous whammy on you, no more.

-Richard Jones  
-Letter of Evaluation to  
Don Finkel, February 21, 1978

It is almost scandalous to talk about love and friendship between colleagues being the grounding for teaching and learning in a college. This is an age of accountability, of assessable student outcomes, of individualized instruction, of teaching by objectives, and so on. To say that one should turn away from students and toward one's colleagues is to invite censure for a dereliction of duty. But we have something more interesting in mind than the banal teaching of students. We have in mind the possibility of "teaching" in such a way that students might stop being students and become, instead, colleagues of their teachers. In fact, we have this project somewhere else than just "in mind." It is part of our experience. Our work at The Evergreen State College has allowed us to experience the pedagogical power of this scandalous turn away from students. From our experience we know the effects of inviting students to renounce their role as student and enter into education on different terms. Saying something about this place will give a sense of the possible in collegial teaching.\*

At Evergreen most teaching occurs in Coordinated Studies programs. One such program constitutes the entire "course load" of any student who takes it and the entire teaching load of the two- to five-person faculty team who teach it. Coordinated Studies programs are thematic. They center on a problem or question. In almost all cases faculty members from different disciplines--each of which is expected to shed some light on the program theme--constitute the teaching team. It is entirely up to the faculty team to determine how they will be a team. There are only a few expectations of every team. There must be a

---

\* We have heard it said that Kenneth Boulding once began an impromptu seminar on "peace" by saying, "I would like to argue that what exists is possible." That sentiment informs our entire essay. Collegial teaching exists. We experience it when we teach together. We never lose sight of the fact that the existence of collegial teaching makes it continue to seem possible.

weekly faculty seminar, faculty must write timely narrative evaluations of each student, and there must be a process of self-evaluation and colleague evaluation at the end of the program. Virtually all the details of student and faculty work and of their intellectual life together for the duration of the program is decided by the faculty team (perhaps in consultation with students--but that too is up to the faculty team). Team teaching is thus the norm at Evergreen. Everyone expects to teach on teams about 80% of the time they teach. Many teach on teams all the time.

But what we termed "collegial teaching" is by no means synonymous with team teaching. Indeed, many of our own colleagues at Evergreen may find the concept as strange and unfamiliar as would teachers outside the college who never teach in teams. Collegial teaching is a particular form of team teaching. In this section, we shall attempt in three ways to convey how collegial teaching is different from team teaching and why it appeals so much to us. We first suggest a set of criteria that differentiates collegial teaching from other forms of team teaching, and then we present a series of "moments" from the life of a collegial teacher to breathe some life into this notion. Finally, by answering some questions that inevitably arise when people try to picture themselves participating in this particular form of college teaching, we will, we think, suggest why a teacher might choose to turn away from students and toward a colleague.

#### Criteria

The first two criteria are inseparable.

1. The faculty colleagues must be equal. This is one way of saying they must respect each other. It is not a way of saying they must have equal rank or status, unless in their particular environment, rank and status influence respect. It means, rather, that the faculty colleagues must experience themselves as equals, and must, as a consequence, be able to act as equals before their students.

2. The faculty colleagues must be different. This is one way of saying that they must be interested in each other--in how each other sees things, thinks about things, construes problems, poses questions, responds to dilemmas. It means there must be genuine intellectual differences between the colleagues.

In her analysis of political action, Hannah Arendt specifies the human condition of plurality as the fundamental prerequisite for political action. Plurality she defines as the simultaneous presence in a group of equality and difference. "Plurality is the condition of human action because we are all the same, that is, human, in such a way that nobody is ever the same as anyone else."<sup>3</sup> The first two of our conditions correspond to what Arendt calls plurality. It is essential that people engaged in collegial teaching be able to speak with their own authority (i.e., be different) and yet be radically open to hear others (i.e., be equal).

3. The colleagues must function primarily as colleagues--intellectual colleagues--and not as members of a team whose joint responsibility it is to deliver a curriculum or administer a program. We emphasize "primarily" because, at Evergreen at any rate, the colleagues will not be able to avoid sharing the responsibilities of administering a program. This, ironically, is what we are paid for. We must "deliver the goods" and there is the inevitable burden of making sure that space is scheduled, syllabi are printed, and so on. One of the principal reasons people get fired at Evergreen is for not having student evaluations in on time. The paper must be pushed. Some team teaching at Evergreen and elsewhere consists of nothing more than administering a program. But when the colleagues envisage their work in this way, what typically results is team teaching by "division of labor." The teaching work is broken up rationally into various pieces, and different teachers take responsibility for different pieces. When the responsibilities are all added up, the entire program is responsibly accounted for. Collegial teaching is far removed from this conception of team teaching. Collegial teachers will responsibly share the work of making sure the program runs, but they will not see that dimension as the primary focus of their work.

4. Collegial teachers will not conceive of their program as a curriculum at all. They will not see the program as consisting of some domain of subjects, topics, or methods which have to be covered. They will instead view the program and all its activities (assignments, lectures, seminars, tests, etc.) as a way of carrying on a conversation among themselves--a conversation about something



(where the program theme usually supplies the something). Since they are intellectuals who respect each other (are equals) and are interested in each other (are different), the conversation they intend to have together will be a form of collaborative inquiry. By agreeing to teach collegially, two people have agreed to inquire together into a question that interests each of them (perhaps for different reasons). They expect to get further in the inquiry than each would alone because they respect the intelligence of each other and because they are interested in the differing points of view of each other.

5. Finally, the faculty colleagues must conceive of the students in a way that differs from the way most faculty view most students, whether teaching in teams or alone. The students will be viewed in a two-fold way. First they are taken to be interested auditors to the ongoing conversation among the faculty colleagues. Second, they are viewed as potential participants in the conversation, should they decide to enter it. Each of these notions is liable to misinterpretation.

To view the students as auditors does not in any way entail making them passive recipients of knowledge delivered by expert faculty. Indeed, the notion of collegial teaching threatens the concept of expertise as it has come to be understood in the academy and transforms the notion of knowledge away from anything that could be "delivered." By calling the students "auditors" we are not referring to what specific activities they are called on to do in class (or out of class); we are instead using the term to characterize the more general and underlying relationship between the students and the faculty colleagues. Students may listen to a conversation. There are no demands placed on them. An auditor occupies, some think,\* an educationally privileged position.

To view the students as potential participants in the conversation does not mean that they must be judged by the faculty as having realized some potential before they will be allowed into the conversation. It does not mean that they are required to have some prerequisite set of experiences before they are permitted into the conversation. All any one student has to do is decide to join in the conversation, and she will be welcomed to it. But this, too, is a slippery point. It will not do for the student to try to enter the conversation

---

\* B's lecture makes this point explicitly and convincingly.

as a student because the conversation by definition can only take place among equals, and a student is not the equal of a faculty member. The student who tries to enter as a student will find her entry into the conversation barred. A student can only enter the conversation by renouncing studenthood--with all the privileges of that role--and by assuming the stance of an equal and different participant. She must enter under a condition of plurality. Thus, to say that students are potential participants in a conversation is crucial. This potentiality is the possibility to cease acting like a student and to start acting like a colleague--not an easy achievement for most students.

Can collegial teaching really occur? These criteria make it clear that the task is demanding, both for faculty and for students. But we know that it can occur. Here are some often repeated scenes from teaching life at Evergreen. These are specific moments in the work of a person engaged in collegial teaching.

#### "Moments"

1. It is the first day of class. You face a sea of faces as you stand before the class. There must be one hundred young men and women--students--staring up at you, wondering what you are going to say to them. There is one thing that makes this scene fundamentally different from the way it usually occurs in almost every college or university. In addition to the hundred students who await your words are a few colleagues (maybe even only one) (one will do). These colleagues may be seated among the students; they may be seated at a table in front of the class alongside where you are standing; they may be standing around the perimeter of the room. There are faculty colleagues present, and they too will hear your words. Their presence as colleagues--and as fellow teachers--makes typical relationships to the students impossible. Their presence makes the experience of that moment before speaking to a classroom audience fundamentally different from the typical first encounter with a new class.

Everyone knows the way this scene usually plays itself out. When I teach alone, when I stand before my students as their sole teacher, my students and I exist in a pair-bond. We each occupy complementary roles in a two-role structure: student-teacher. We each define the other. They cannot be students without me, their teacher; I cannot be a teacher without them, my students. We

depend on each other for social existence, and we depend on each other for behavioral coherence. I cannot function reasonably as a teacher unless my students perform the expected student behaviors (ask questions, hand in their work, fail to hand in their work, etc.), and they certainly cannot function as students unless I do my part, and become the teacher who does what teachers are supposed to do. We are locked in a dance that the school brings into being. We may arrange to have a lovely dance together; we may have a miserable time together. But we must dance and we cannot dance without our partner.

When I stand before my own class in that brief moment of silence that precedes my speaking, I dimly feel the force of the pair-bond. I know that a great deal depends on my performance, on what I am going to say. I know that my students are hoping that I will be a good teacher, that I will do a good job. I, too, hope that I will be good, just as I hope I will have good students. The having of these hopes may put one in a thrall, just as the opening strains of a dance band put one in a kind of spell. I may, in the end, satisfy my students, or I may disappoint them. Either way I am the creature of my students. They may satisfy me or disappoint me. Either way they are the creatures of me, their teacher. Is there any way out of this spell? Is there any outcome possible other than satisfaction or disappointment? Cannot each of us be freed from the other?

In the version of the scene with my colleagues present, everything is different--at least for the teacher. I know the students are waiting for my words, but now I am not so concerned with their expectations because I am not just speaking to them. I am not even primarily speaking to them. Regardless of what pedagogical function I am filling by making this talk (giving a lecture, giving out an assignment, explaining a class activity, etc.), I am at the deepest level speaking first to my colleagues, and only second to the students. My colleagues are the ones I wish to touch with my words; they are the ones I am most keenly aware of being seen by and heard by. I am concerned with the next step in our on-going conversation, a conversation that started, maybe, ten years ago when we first met at a conference before we both were hired by this school or, maybe, only two weeks ago when the other person was assigned to this team. Regardless of how old the conversation is, it is up to me, right now, to keep it going. It is the responses and reactions of my colleagues I anticipate, their appraisal I wonder about. But this is different from the typical situation

alone with my students. My colleagues are not defined simply by their institutional roles. They are one or two or three or four specific individuals whom I respect and in whom I am interested. They are not professors; they are Kirk, Nancy, Sandie, and Bill. They are: that well educated political philosopher who for some reason became interested in Jung (I wonder why he did that?); that actress, who with a close friend, created a theatre form which combines education with entertainment (I saw them put on a terrific "performance" about 19th Century feminists about ten years ago); and so forth. They are friends and colleagues, and I care what they think about me in a way that differs from how I care about what my students think of me. I am not trying to satisfy them, I am trying to contribute to the conversation in which we are engaged together. I am trying to talk to them.

The students are there, too, of course, and I am talking to them, too, of course. But that sense of utter dependence within the pair-bond is gone. Their eager expectations or their sullen indifferences do not create the space in which I speak any longer. That space, instead, is constituted by the conversation I am engaged in with my colleagues. That space arises out of shared intellectual interests, not out of social-psychological role definitions. I am no longer the creature of my students, and they are no longer "mine." I do not have a contingent identity. To my colleagues I am who I have come to be in their eyes over a long period of time across many different venues. I do not have to treat the situation as fragile (the great fear: "What if I gave a course and no one enrolled?!"). No more dancing. I have room to breathe.

\*\*\*\*

2. Three connected moments:

A. It is Tuesday morning. As you approach the breakfast table, there is just the slightest bit of extra bounce to your step. Tuesday morning is faculty seminar morning. As you eat your cereal you wonder how the seminar will go this morning. You are eager to discuss this week's reading (Parts I and II of Leviathan) with your colleagues after pouring over this strange text during the two previous evenings. You are particularly eager to question Kirk, the political philosopher, to see how it is possible that Hobbes could ever have construed nature as he did--as a state of "war of every one against every one." Such a notion seems absurd to you. At the same time, as a psychologist, you

have been surprised to find that Hobbes articulated a rather sophisticated associationist psychology in his book. And he did this several centuries before you, with your own ahistorical training, had assumed that such a psychology could have been developed. You hope to explore with Nancy, the English historian on the team, what the roots of this psychology were in England and what effect it had on other thinkers of that time. You can only wonder what Sandie, the theatre instructor, and Bill, the sociologist, will make of this text. As you wonder, you suspect that Sandie will approach the book from her feminist perspective, and Bill from his own interest in impersonal power, derived from his study of Foucault. Cereal and wonder: a fine moment at the beginning of the day.

B. It is 1:30 P.M., Tuesday. The faculty seminar, held in Kirk's living room, was as interesting as expected, but not quite in the way you expected.

The seminar is never routine since it operates by no rules. The teaching team simply gathers to discuss the book they have all read. Each team has to invent its own way of being together, of talking together. But this does not mean they invent rules or procedures. They improvise. They discover who each other is and how each other thinks simply by talking together in a protected space. The space is protected in a double sense. It is protected from students, and it is protected from administrative planning and decision making. Business meetings are scheduled into the week for the purpose of planning so that at faculty seminar the colleagues are free to discuss the text--and to do so with no ulterior purpose other than reacting to the reading and sharing those reactions.

This week Sandie surprised you by being uncharacteristically silent. She asked some specific questions about the text, but did not offer her own views on it. Kirk had been extremely helpful in connecting Hobbes's views to the rise of science in general, and then to the specific science of constitution making that was to culminate in the American Constitution a century and a quarter later. In explaining to the others about the psychological dimension of Hobbes, you had discovered that Hobbes could be seen not only as an early associationist, but even in some ways as a progenitor of Freud. This insight pleased you, for it helped you see that there was a much greater political component to psychoanalysis than Freud had realized--a suspicion you had been harboring for

quite some time. Bill never mentioned Foucault, though the perspective was obvious in his brief "debate" with Nancy.

At noon, the five of you left Kirk's home to lunch together at a downtown restaurant as was your custom on Tuesdays. Lunch, gossip, a couple of comments on Hobbes, an equal number on next week's book, and back to campus.

Now, in your car driving back to campus you begin to think about the upcoming book seminar (20 students who will meet with you to discuss Leviathan at the same time your four colleagues will meet with their groups of 20 to do the same thing)--the normal Tuesday afternoon activity in your program. Today you feel like departing from the normal routine. You play with several ideas, debating whether to start the discussion by posing a question, whether to let the students start it with their own comments, or whether to have them write for ten minutes before talking. You do not reach a decision, deciding instead to wait 'till you walk into the room to decide. You realize that your impulse to depart from your seminar's routine is a result of the thoughts this morning's faculty seminar have stirred up in you. You want to stay with them; you want to take them somewhere. The upcoming seminar with your students seems to present a nice opportunity. You would like to take advantage of it, but you haven't quite yet figured out how. A moment of puzzled anticipation.

C. It is 2:30 P.M.--Seminar time. You walk into the room. You decide not to have students write questions and issues from the day's reading on the board as usual. Instead you pose a question about the difference between Hobbes and Plato. You all read The Republic about six months ago, early in the program. Your earlier ruminations about the latent political content of Freud's writings have led you to think about the different ways to conceive of the proper relationship between human nature and political organization or government. Hobbes and Plato, you sense, have opposite notions about how this relationship should be conceived. You intuit that Hobbes's notion might be termed "negative" and Plato's "positive," but you are not sure what these terms mean, or why you think they apply. You hope your question to the students will stimulate a discussion that will help you sort this out; at the same time, you know that prodding them to think about the present reading in terms of the earlier text is good general practice, and is likely to lead somewhere fruitful, even if it is not in the direction you are anticipating. These thoughts race through your

head in that moment you are waiting for the students to quiet down. The right words for framing these thoughts will probably come. They almost always do.

In this moment, there are no colleagues in the room. But this moment is not the same as the usual moment before the beginning of a seminar. Now, you are about to engage in conversation with your students not primarily as an expert trained in one of the academic disciplines (psychology) but rather as a person who is a member of a faculty seminar that has just discussed the text your own seminar will now discuss. Your thoughts, your questions, your orientation to the text have all been colored by the sustained discussion you had with your colleagues on Leviathan. You are coming out of one conversation and going into another on the same text, and so naturally the first will have some influence on the second. But this new seminar will be another point in your sustained conversation with your colleagues. The faculty conversation is the primary conversation; the conversation with your students is in some fundamental way secondary. Yet it is just as common to comment in faculty seminar about views and ideas that emerged in your previous student seminar as it is the other way round. The discussions shape each other. But, in the final analysis, the students' perception of you will be as a member of the collegial team because that is how you present yourself to them. They will know that your decision to begin the seminar differently is not just a whim. They will know that you have something on your mind, something that probably came from the faculty seminar they know you attended earlier.

This stance toward the students replaces the normal stance of member of a discipline. You face your students not as someone who knows something important about this text that they do not know, but as someone engaged in a serious inquiry with others about this text. Your conversation with them is in some peculiar and indirect way, a "spillover" from that primary conversation. But this new stance does not eradicate your discipline's perspective in you; it merely subordinates it. Your question about Hobbes and Plato with its emphasis on human nature is directly connected to your interest in psychology; that question emerged from an earlier focusing on a connection between Hobbes and Freud in the faculty seminar. Your question is a psychologist's natural question and the fact that you formulated this question has everything to do with the fact that you have been trained in the discipline of psychology. At the same time, however, you probably would not have made the connection or

formulated the question had you been a psychologist teaching alone. Indeed, you would never have been reading Hobbes with your students in the first place! It is only the collaborative inquiry, the collegial conversation, that has made these thoughts and questions possible.

Your students then are left with a set of possibly inchoate, possibly dawning set of questions about how they might fit into this inquiry. But the fundamental question is how they might relate themselves to this conversation among others, not how they might relate themselves to this one special person, their teacher. And you are left happy to welcome them into this conversation, if they want in, but you are not dependent on them to have the conversation in the first place. It is rather like having, along with your three children, another adult at the dinner table. The children will still get to converse, you will still speak with them and respond to their questions and stories, but the dynamics of the conversation will have altered entirely.

\*\*\*\*

3. It is the end of the academic year. You spent the previous week (Evaluation Week) writing narrative evaluations for each of your students, conferring with them individually in evaluation conferences, and finishing up all your work with them for the program. Evaluation week is the most exhausting and intensive working week of the year, and you are glad to be done with it. Having scrutinized the year's work accomplished by each of your students, having written a short, detailed, evaluative essay about this work, having read each student's own assessment of her or his work, and having discussed all of this with each student, you are happy to put your students--each one of them--out of your mind. You feel finished with them.

The better part of this final week of the year is to be spent on the program's final piece of work: a self-evaluation and colleague evaluations.

It is now Thursday, 9:00 A.M. You are alone in your office, having a cup of coffee, awaiting the program's final meeting at 9:30. This will be the faculty evaluation conference.

You spent Monday of this week writing your self-evaluation. You wrote a free-form essay reflecting on your work over the past year. Each year you try to do this piece of self-evaluation in a slightly different way. As usual, you never know what shape it will take, or indeed, even what themes you will select for discussion, until you sit down to write. By Tuesday morning, you had copies



of your self-evaluation in each of your faculty colleagues' mailboxes, and you received copies of their evaluations of themselves in your mailbox. Tuesday and Wednesday were spent writing evaluations of each of your colleagues. These were frank letters written in the second person--addressed directly to each person. You wrote about the quality of their work as colleagues and teachers in the program. There are no rules for writing such letters.\* There are only traditions, norms, and precedents to guide you in your writing. In general, one tries to be frank, specific, and honest, encouraging and gentle, yet blunt when necessary. These letters are often challenging to write. When colleagues rise to the challenge, as they often do, they are wonderful to receive.

The conference you are anticipating, as you sip your coffee, is the final event in the evaluation cycle. At the conference all the evaluations are read, and all are discussed. Once again, it is up to the team to make up the specific ordering of events--to decide just how they will make this part of the conversation happen--but the purpose is clear. The letters are to be aired and discussed. Though the written letter will be the permanent evaluation that takes its place in the faculty member's portfolio and which is used as a basis for faculty retention and contract renewal, in the life of the collegial team the spoken word is to have the final say. When the full discussion of each person's work is over, about three hours from now, the team will disband.

As you drink your coffee, you wonder what each of your four colleagues will have found to say about you this year. You are not worried. You know you have done good work this year, and you are well aware that your colleagues have appreciated your contributions. But this is a broad feeling, a general kind of knowledge. You are not worried, you are curious: What specific words will each of them have committed to paper to characterize your work, to convey their own very personal reactions to your presence on the team? You can only expect to be surprised, for it is always a surprise to read such letters. You savor this moment, for though you are looking forward to summer vacation as much as anyone--the vacation that starts as soon as this conference is over--you realize how rare is the occasion you are about to participate in once again, as you have for the past fourteen years. In its outward form, it resembles an annual ritual, yet in its specific content it is anything but ritualistic or predictable. You

---

\* Until recently, that is. See the first section of Part II below.

can expect civility and courtesy, but you never know what will be written in the letters or said in the discussions. The colleague evaluation conference is an event to be grateful for. Human conversations such as those that take place in these conferences are rare in professional life.

What is most rare is receiving the very concrete and careful attention to one's work from a peer that is demanded by the writing of a colleague evaluation letter. Below are some selected paragraphs, excerpted from full letters, which have been written in colleague evaluations over the years at Evergreen. We include them to suggest what receiving these letters might be like.

The first excerpt shows that you can expect to receive praise from your colleague not in the form of bland meaningless generalizations, but rather in direct concrete language which is powerful and convincing:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

...  
I have enjoyed teaching with you very much this year.... I have really learned a lot from you. Rarely have I had a colleague I have learned so much from. You are smart and well educated, and have the kind of conceptual turn of mind which I long for in colleagues. You know a lot about just the kind of material I have become thirsty to learn about (political theory) and you have been very effective in conveying what you know to me--through your lectures, through your contributions to faculty seminars, and through informal talk over lunch, walking to the [Deli] to get coffee, and on occasion, planning a workshop together.

You might also be surprised on some occasions to receive praise that is rather more personal and less professional--in words which substantiate Richard Jones' claim that colleagues letters of evaluation in the best of circumstances are "professional love letters" (also see below, p.     ):

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

...  
As you must know by now, I judge a colleague not only by his intelligence, education, initiative, etc., etc. I am old-fashioned. I look out and I see a person, and it is the person I seek to give an account of, not merely his qualities. I want to say something about who you are, and only secondarily about what you are. And so I say: You are a     . The students and we were fortunate you have had you for a year.

And sometimes the affection is expressed in a different tone:

You're a smart son of a bitch, too, a fair Frizbee flipper, and the very anti-thesis of Yossarian. If only you could sing.

Let's do this again sometime.

Sincerely,

Though praise and sometimes affection are to be expected, so too is criticism. The author of the first excerpt cited above continues in his next paragraph to criticize his colleague very pointedly about something that bothered all the members on the team all year long:

It has also been exasperating, at moments, to work with you. These moments have invariably centered around program planning.... It is the very qualities of mind and temperament that lead you to be such a good intellectual and such a strong expositor, that in the context of team planning, caused you to act in ways which frustrated me. There was nothing wrong with your ideas or proposals. The problem was that you would explain and justify them at much greater length than was necessary, thus expending precious planning time. It felt as if you had a need to fully finish a point, even when the issue had become moot. I mustered much energy in order to be patient with you at such moments, though there were times I didn't think I was going to make it.

The author continues in the next paragraph to offer a more serious criticism to his colleague on a most sensitive point:

One other aspect of your teaching I want to critically question is your way of talking to some students, some of the time. I haven't seen you interact with students in seminar or in your office, but I have heard you talk about students a great deal, and I have heard and read about (in student evaluations of you) a number of cases where students feel you have been unduly judgmental and downright unkind to them through things you have said. I know that you care very much about students and that you also work very hard at being fair and honest. But you have a psychologist's tendency to categorize and diagnose. I fear that you inadvertently trample on some students' feelings, some of the time, more than is necessary or educationally useful.

Finally, from a different letter, one colleague finds an indirect way to offer some very important criticism, even though he pretends to take it back after offering it. After suggesting that he is dismayed at having no criticisms to offer in his letter, he continues:

I thought I had one room-for-improvement observation during your Freud lecture. It was the only note I took during the lecture, and I stuck it on my spike afterward, so I wouldn't forget it (being even then worried that I might not have anything negative to say when today came). The note says: "\_\_\_ perceives lectures as exclusively for conveying information, and for getting the students to understand the information. He needs to see them, sometimes, as occasions for inviting identification, by sharing the ways he thinks as a scholar." And I was going to say to you in this letter: "\_\_\_, your Freud lecture was very informative, very instructive and the students really appreciated it; but it was all for the students;

there was nothing in it for me, and nothing in it for Freud." And then I was going to say: "Sometime, \_\_\_\_, I'd like to hear you give an imaginative, scholarly, stand-up professional lecture that is just between you and your subject, and if the students understand it, fine; and if they don't, O.K.; let 'em just admire you and look forward to someday being like you." And then you had to go and give us your Kafka lecture! All \_\_\_\_, and all for Kafka, and for all the sons of fathers! None of us could be certain we'd understood you, but we all loved the inspiration of wondering if we did. And some us re-read Kafka with a more intimate respect. So I didn't get to use my one room-for-improvement note.

Not much, he didn't.

In the previous case, specific criticism was offered as parts of letters that were overall positive and praising in tone. But how does one find a way to write a letter when one wishes the critical spirit to dominate the whole letter? The following is the opening paragraph of a letter from a person who found it distressing to teach with his colleague:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

Linda B. said it in her program evaluation: "\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ [the two faculty colleagues] didn't work as a team. There were two completely different dimensions being expressed." I don't think "dimensions" captures it, but I do know that this winter was one of the most difficult collaborative teaching experiences I've had at Evergreen. I want to try to unpack some of that here.

Sometimes a colleague finds it useful not only to refer to a comment from a student's evaluation of his colleague, as in the previous excerpt, but even to adopt a student's perspective himself in writing:

... But I think Scott C. is right in saying that you will always be more popular with your ex-students than with your present students. You saw, for instance, how much the students in our program came to appreciate your ideas after winter quarter. And I would like to suggest the reason for that: That you are dealing with such a tangle of complex ideas that the average student can't work them out well enough to understand them until some time after the time when he is supposed to be studying them. In many ways, I'm a good, average student; as I've told you with my Hilbert story, I can understand some things quickly, but I only understand important things after spending a long time working them over for myself. That's probably typical (except that most students never take the time to work them out carefully). I've enjoyed a lot of your lectures, but I often find myself confused.

In general, the most striking pleasure that comes from reading a colleague's letter of evaluation is in discovering the careful attention with which your own work has been observed and the detailed way in which it has been documented in

words. This care expresses an appreciation for your work that can find no substitute in the standard rewards that universities provide their teachers. Here are some examples:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

You deserve a major share of the credit for the success of this program. So much of what we did this year was either your direct contribution or grew out of a suggestion or idea of yours. You suggested the use of COM 110 for program meetings, which gave us additional latitude in our schedule. You identified and recruited the two writing tutors. You proposed that we keep the same seminar group through all three quarters, which has worked so well I would like to adopt it as the standard practice; and that we add a third seminar each week during spring quarter. You suggested the faculty panel discussions as a way of reducing the number of traditional lectures and as a way of providing opportunities for the faculty to be more creative with the material. You also suggested the student panel at the end of spring quarter. You argued for the inclusion of the module on critical reasoning and for a program retreat ... It was your idea to have the students take over the responsibility for writing their own critiques of their essays winter and spring quarter. You produced most of the workshops which we used throughout the year. Although, you were not the program coordinator, you paid attention to all the little details and were instrumental in seeing that everything got done on schedule.... All of these things have had a major impact on making this a successful program for students and faculty alike.

The sheer length of this list, not the significance of any particular item on it, is what gives the letter its force. The reader, who took his own work as a matter of course during the year, is suddenly forced to see its cumulative impact through the eyes of his attentive and appreciative colleague.

Whereas it is the breadth of the attention in the previous paragraph which is most impressive, in the following case, it is the discerning nature of the attention that makes the difference:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

... Of your several workshops, each of which I believe was quite useful to students (both during the workshop sessions and during the seminars afterward), I believe the one on Nietzsche turned out to be the richest and most provocative. It helped the students sort their way through, among other things, Nietzsche's key distinction between genealogy and definition, which, if only they knew, lies close to the heart of much of the recent philosophical debate in the human sciences.

In this final excerpt, written after participating in Evergreen's atypical Native American Studies program, a teacher shows through her own expressive and

distinctive style of writing that she has been watching her colleague from the very first day of the program. The quality of the attention here is sensuous and touches on aspects of teaching that are very different from the subjects of the previous two excerpts, but once again, it is the concrete and detailed quality of the writer's attention that comes across and that means the most to the reader:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

... When you came into NAS [Native American Studies], you seemed a veteran to waiting, wondering and accepting what was. You didn't struggle as I did upon entering the program. You came to Monday meetings. You prepared and delivered a terrific lecture. You waited in your office for students who needed your assistance. You took your share, you said "yes" and you seemed to love all of it. You were non-judgmental, supportive and listened carefully to everything said on Mondays. Your attention (at least it seems like attention, you may be body travelling or hypnotizing yourself to do something or other, or not do it, or memorizing lines for a play; silent attentiveness, focused eyes, a rarity) was fascinating, perhaps even curious because I lost mine easily (attention) and wondered "what in the world is \_\_\_\_\_ so busy puzzling over, nothing at all has happened for at least an hour now ..."

The letter from which these lines are quoted--written by a painter--is handwritten in thick, strong, black strokes and is accompanied by a black-and-white sketched portrait of the colleague addressed in the letter of evaluation. The portrait of \_\_\_\_\_ is an integral part of this evaluation and demonstrated to him irrefutably that he has had perspicuous attention paid to him for one entire quarter.

These excerpts suggest what our faculty colleague has to anticipate, as he sits in his office sipping coffee and waiting for the faculty evaluation conference to begin. This moment of silence does not include students as did the previous two moments of silence (prior to the lecture and prior to the seminar). The point is that in collegial teaching the most telling moments are not fundamentally driven by the presence of students.

\*\*\*\*

4. It is lunch time on campus. As usual, you go to the campus cafeteria, take salad from the salad bar, and with your tray held carefully before you, you walk around the corner from the main eating area, crowded with students, to sit at

the long table out in the corridor where many faculty traditionally gather during the lunch hour. There are some faculty colleagues you expect to see here, because, like you, they routinely take their lunch at this table. But there are always new and unexpected faces, too, as many colleagues come to this table occasionally, for what reasons you have no idea, and then are not seen again there for weeks at a time.

Conversation at this table can be about almost anything. You have privately charted the favorite topic over the past fourteen years, watching it range from pig feed in the early seventies when everyone seemed to have a farm, through personal computers when your colleagues first discovered word processing, to race track and training conditions when one of your colleagues persuaded some of her more optimistic friends to go in with her on a race-horse, to the current favorite: various early retirement schemes. But your chart indicates only statistical dominance. On any given day, anything may be up for discussion-- Evergreen politics (always a favorite), the health of one or another ailing colleague, events in the news (the cold fusion furor captured attention for weeks on end, perhaps setting the record for a single topic's ability to crowd out others), and, of course, students.

The other thing to appreciate about conversation in this setting is that, because of the shape of the table (rectangular and rather long) and the size of the group (ranging from about 6 to maybe 18), the conversation shifts easily back and forth between separate local private conversations between two and three, and one public conversation drawing in all, or most, at the table.

As you approach with your salad you sit down at the far end of the table, start to eat, and begin listening to what's going on. As you listen and eat, a colleague pulls up the chair next to you with his lunch. It is David, someone you have worked with on committees, but with whom you have never taught. He is not a regular diner at this table, but his visits are not infrequent either.

At the other end of the table, the "regulars" are discussing the recent earthquake in Mexico. Someone comments that it seems so unnatural that the villagers always return to rebuild their towns at the same sites, even though these have been sites of regular quakes throughout the centuries. Another person starts to say something about "natural selection," when David turns to you and starts talking. He says that he has always wanted to be in a program about the theme of "nature." He is a professor of American Studies, with

literature as his main interest, and has a reputation as a fine teacher (you've talked to former students of your own who have gone on to work with him and know that invariably he earns their respect). He goes on to explain that he doesn't mean a program in natural history or nature studies, but rather a historical program in the humanities which examines the shifting meanings in different eras and in different cultures of the terms "nature" and "natural."

A little bell goes off in your head, as you put together two heretofore unrelated facts about yourself: (1) for some years you have half-consciously thought you would enjoy teaching with David in a program, and (2) you too have been interested in this question, but from a very different point of view. As a psychologist, you are well aware of the old nature/nurture debate in your field, but of late you have begun to wonder whether "nature" can have any determinate meaning in intellectual analysis. "Nature" itself seems to be a socially constructed concept and hence valueless in helping one determine what does not derive from culture. Yet how can one do without the concept? Without a concept of nature, critics and theorists would seem to be at the mercy of culture in putting together any particular analysis, especially one pertaining to psychological development, your own interest. But you have always looked at the question philosophically--as one to be settled by analysis and argument. It had never occurred to you to undertake an historical inquiry into the meaning of "nature."

You realize that David was not making any kind of concrete proposal, but just talking off the top of his head in response to the conversation he was hearing. You mention to him about how interesting the question of nature strikes you, referring briefly to the nature/nurture tension in psychology. You then say, "If you ever get serious about putting together such a program, I might be interested in taking part." You think he will probably register your sentiment and continue the conversation on the abstract plane it has been on. There is no hurry in offering this program after all, and you are just trying to plant a seed.

To your surprise, David pounces on your suggestion. He begins to get excited, and starts to talk with you about what year you might do this together, who else might be good on the team, and what books would work in the program. You find his enthusiasm infectious and thirty minutes later, the two of you have sketched out a program. You have discussed student projects, thematic centers



for each of the three quarters, historical eras to focus on, and have come up with at least a half-dozen "must use" books. You even have a tentative name for the program: "States of Nature." You have also decided that you will teach this program not the year after next, for you both have teaching commitments for that year, but the year after that. It is settled. Each of you meanwhile has been given the assignment to try to recruit one more faculty member--David will talk to Tom, a physicist who also writes poetry and likes to teach math, and you will keep your eyes open not for a specific person, but rather for any historian who would be interested in this theme and in working with these people.

The enthusiastic half hour of lunchtime conversation when a year-long Coordinated Studies program is conceived is a critical moment that distinguishes collegial teaching from team teaching.

On what does this moment depend? First, it depends upon the fact that at Evergreen there really is no set curriculum. (But see Part II.) There are some programs that are always taught, and there are some clusters of faculty who feel responsible to make sure that these programs get taught, but there are no faculty assigned to teach the same programs year in and year out. "States of Nature" will come into existence (for one year only, most likely) not because it is part of any pre-designed curriculum, but because you and David discovered at a certain moment that you shared with each other an intellectual interest and the desire to work together as colleagues. The specific curricular features of this one program will arise as a consequence of this shared desire to be colleagues; the collegial arrangement is not created in order to implement a pre-set curriculum.

This moment also depends on the fact that you take your lunch at a table (or more generally, that you live your working life on campus in such a way) that mixes you up with colleagues who differ from you--colleagues from different disciplines, colleagues with different kinds of training, colleagues with different turns of mind from yours. This fact probably depends on the anterior fact that there are no departments at Evergreen and that your discipline is not the source of your primary professional identity.

Finally, this moment probably depends on the fact that both you and David have participated previously in many team-taught Coordinated Studies programs, and thus unhesitatingly trust your own and each other's ability to put together yet another one and have it work out. It is no "big thing" you are proposing,

just another year's work in an ongoing life of teaching. It is a half-hour moment that will lead to a year-long intensification of your conversation about "nature."

What the moment conveys is something intangible yet significant. This moment suggests that the decision to become a teaching colleague with someone else might be faced at any moment, in the least anticipated of times and places, and as an intimate part of everyday, mundane life. It may not happen often--years could go by with no such moments occurring--but the important point is that it could happen at any moment. It does not require a department meeting, a planning group meeting, a conference with a dean, a curriculum retreat, or any other administratively blocked-out unit of time. In fact, such moments are least likely to occur on "administrative time." They are moments that cannot be administered, that cannot be managed. They are moments that either do or do not emerge from the lived life together of a faculty of potential teaching colleagues.

This moment also conveys that collegial teaching tends to burst its own boundaries. The first three moments occur in the confines of an academic program. They occur during the time the teaching colleagues are in fact teaching together. But the fourth moment suggests that a teacher's orientation is changed as a result of the habit of collegial teaching. Wonderful teaching colleagues may be rare, but on the other hand, they may be anywhere. You never know until you actually teach with someone. You will never know unless you take a chance.

\*\*\*\*

5. I am in a lecture hall. I am one faculty member among 100 students. I am in the sixth row of seats in the middle with a good view of the lectern. One of my colleagues, A, is about to deliver a lecture on Plato's Meno. Sandie, Nancy, and Kirk, sit scattered around the room. Three days ago, I had been at the lectern, and I, also, had lectured on the Meno. A's lecture, he has told me, will be a direct response to what I said. I had presented Socrates as an ironist; he wishes to show that Socrates may be seen as something very different: a comic figure, a humorist.

One hour later he has completed his lecture. While he takes questions, there is, for me, a profound moment of silence. In this moment I am allowed to savor my immediate visceral reaction to my colleague's lecture.

Really, it is an extraordinary moment.

On the one hand, I couldn't feel more flattered. My colleague has spent a sustained period of thinking and writing for the sole purpose of responding to what I said in my lecture. None of this marvelous lecture would have come into existence had A not taken my words and thoughts seriously enough to want to respond to them in a serious and sustained way. There is no more potent way he could have found to manifest his respect for me and my work. Moreover, this respect has made itself felt publicly in the intellectual air of the program: my faculty colleagues and all the students breathe it in, whether they will or not.

On the other hand, I am startled by how different his view of Socrates is. Yes, I had quoted Guthrie's line in my talk emphasizing that everyone has his own Socrates, but it never occurred to me that anyone could see Socrates the way A does.

I am pleased by this difference. A's response to my lecture is not some assistant professor's picky academic critique, nor is it in any way an attempt at some kind of intellectual one-upmanship. It is rather an alternative vision. This different vision makes my own view sharper. It outlines my own thoughts by showing me, and anyone who listened, the limits of my thought. It helps distance my Socrates from me; I begin to hear--in my memory--my own lecture as a student might have heard it. As I think once again of A's Socrates, his view begins to become more plausible. Perhaps A is right, perhaps we should take Socrates more at his own word; perhaps he does know nothing; perhaps we should assume he means just what he says--and that he is not trying to say something much more complex to a different audience. What a radical idea!

But no. I have thought too long and worked too hard to develop my own Socrates to give him up so quickly. But there is a touch more humility now in my interpretation, just as there is more clarity in it. I have begun to consider why A would have just the Socrates he does, given what I know about his intellectual commitments, and consequently, why I would have the one I do. I see now that more than "careful reading of the text" has produced my Socrates, a

lot more. Like Frost's neighbor in the spring, I have been called to my limits and have answered the call.

Finally, I wonder what the students will make of the two incompatible Socrates that have been put before them. They will be on their own now to work out their own ideas in seminar discussions, informal talk outside of class, responses to essay assignments, and perhaps in responses to exam questions. I hope that these two sharply differentiated figures of Socrates that have been set before them will stimulate them not to choose one or the other--though there is always that danger--but rather to develop a third equally sharply different Socrates of their own. If any individual student goes so far as to do so, and also has the gumption to find a way to make his Socrates public in the program, then I stand to gain still more in my own understanding of my Socrates. But if no students do that, there is always A. He and I have a lot to talk about.

\*\*\*\*

#### Questions

1. What actually happens in a collegially taught program? What would I see if I observed such a program for a week?

It depends on how you looked at what you are able to see. If you looked at just what happened in and around classrooms, you would see lectures, you would see seminar discussions, you might see workshop exercises or science labs, you would see students reading books in the library or in their rooms, writing papers or doing problems and exercises. You might see students studying in preparation for an exam or writing the exam. If you looked behind the scenes, you would see a faculty seminar and a faculty planning meeting. With the exception of the last two items, what you would see is not very different from what you might see in almost any college course. In the big meetings and lectures there would be several faculty members in the room, rather than only one, but the students would be engaged in more or less the same activities they traditionally engage in at most colleges: reading, writing, problem solving, observing, discussing, experimenting, thinking, and so forth.

There is no special technique that makes collegial teaching. We are not concerned with new technologies, new methods, or new "strategies." As we noted in the Introduction [to The Paradox of Pedagogy], many schools are trying to

create "learning communities," so even seeing faculty teams having seminars and meetings together will not be a strange sight in higher education anymore. But this is essentially an administrative movement, and an administrative strategy cannot make teaching collegial. The methods that are used for instruction will not reflect what is distinctive about collegial teaching. The methods of instruction will be whatever the teachers on the team decide they will be; they will be as traditional or as experimental as are the individual teachers on the team. But they will themselves, for the most part, not reflect what is "collegial" about the teaching and about the team, nor will they turn team teaching into collegial teaching.

What is distinctive about collegial teaching is the stance taken toward one's colleagues. Collegial teaching is primarily dependent on how you relate to your colleagues, which, not incidentally, affects the stance it is possible to take toward your students. These stances result from taking the relationships with your colleagues, rather than your relationships with your students, as primary. Such a turn creates a different spirit in the classroom, a different ethos. We presented our view of collegial teaching through a series of moments in the previous section because there is nothing directive or technical to say about collegial teaching. Paraphrasing Tussman, if we could make an ethos for you, we would; as it is, we can only help you think about creating one for yourself.

If you observed a collegially taught program for a week, you would begin to feel this spirit of collegiality, but the activities you saw would, for the most part, not be very different from what you might see in any other classroom.

2. You qualified your response above twice with the phrase, "for the most part." Why?

There are a few things you might see that could directly reflect the collegial nature of the teaching, and these might be somewhat different from what you would expect to see under normal teaching conditions. For instance, at a lecture, you might hear a professor raise a question from the floor--a rather sophisticated question, perhaps--and you might hear five minutes of dialogue back and forth between the lecturer and the questioner which wouldn't resemble the normal pattern of question-and-response at normal college lectures.

Quite frankly, you might hear a lecture that was, to your ears, too sophisticated for the students. In a collegially taught program, this would not

be the result of an incorrect, one might say, overestimation of the students' abilities. It would be due to the fact that the faculty member was speaking principally to his colleagues. Auditors have the chance to listen, but they are not taken into consideration very much by the parties to the primary conversation. And there is certainly none of the "speaking down to" or pandering to students that you sometimes see in colleges. While you might be surprised by the intellectual sophistication of some material in these programs, it makes sense, if you think about the assumptions behind collegial teaching.

You might show up at the lecture hall one day to find a "faculty panel" instead of a normal lecture. The faculty panel would consist of the whole faculty team seated behind a table, each with a prepared talk of ten to twenty minutes. The way we have done them, each presenter has come with a prepared response to a text read by the whole program, or to a question posed to the team (by the team) beforehand. No one on the panel has any foreknowledge of what any of the others will say. A hurried whispered conference at the start determines the order of presentation, and then each faculty member rises in his or her own turn and speaks. After the formal presentation there is discussion among the panel members and between them and the students.

Faculty panels are often the occasion of pleasant surprises. Given the ground rule that there is no previous discussion among presenters, it is usually startling to discover how well the talks "go together" in one way or another. It often seems as if they had been planned as a whole rather than independently of each other. By saying they "go together," we don't mean that the presenters agree with one another, but rather that there is a coherence in the presented material--as if all the participants were involved in the same conversation.

And that is the point. The "surprising coherence" is not really surprising at all, because the colleagues are all involved in the same conversation. They have been reading the same books, discussing the same questions, formulating topics and exams, and listening to each other for the duration of the program. The fact they did not speak to each other about this one panel is a small fact in the face of their ongoing work together. Of course there is coherence in their talks. They are, over the long run, having a coherent conversation.

Finally, in a similar vein, if you showed up to observe a normal lecture, you should not be surprised to hear it peppered with references to ideas, insights, and questions from previous talks by the lecturer's colleagues. Such concrete

relating of one's present talk to one's colleagues' previous talks comes naturally and easily to those who teach collegially and makes the tone of even "normal" lectures somewhat different under the conditions of collegial teaching than they would otherwise be. You might also find the occasional essay assignment or exam question which explicitly references the differing points of view of specific colleagues on the team. In other words, the intellectual content of the collegial dialogue emerges as one of the texts of the program. In some cases this dialogue is the single most important text; in others, it is a subordinate yet significant text; and in still others, it is a latent, only partly conscious text.

3. You say collegial teaching requires a "turning away from students." Don't the students feel rejected? Don't the students need attention and care in order to become properly motivated?

There are several different ways to answer this question.

(i) The simple answer to the question about feeling rejected may be simply no, they don't feel rejected. The snide answer may be that rejection of students is, in the very best situations, an irrelevance in college teaching. After all, aren't colleges premised on the possibility of rejecting anyone-- through awarding an "F"? Students begin college by being rejected. They know that they have to find acceptance and make themselves appreciated. It is rarely the case that faculty members begin by accepting students. (But see the comments on Evergreen's Native American Studies Program below.) But this is only a snide answer.

An example may better answer the question. On the occasion of one collegially taught course at a college where students could shift enrollment during the early weeks of the semester, one of the colleagues introduced himself to the students on the first day with the blunt statement that he was there for the purpose of continuing an interesting conversation to be had with his colleague. He hoped, he told the students, that they might profit from this conversation, but he really didn't care all that much whether they did or not. His alarmed colleague, who had been sitting in the front row during this announcement, was quick to express his fears after class that their enrollment would surely drop precipitously as a result of this introductory statement.

"You don't keep students by rejecting them at the outset," he said. In fact, enrollment increased by 15% by the end of the first week. The fearful colleague concluded that "greed" was responsible: The students sensed that something special and vital was going on and they were greedy to be in on it. Real conversation, genuine inquiry, friendship (which often involves a certain exclusivity)--these are not the normal fare served up by modern institutions--not even colleges. Students are usually appreciative of these things when they see them; they want to be as close to them as possible for as long as possible once they come into contact with them. Collegial teaching gives them that opportunity.

(ii) But beyond psycho-social dynamics, there is something more to say about this "turning away." Turning away from students in no way implies not caring for students. It is a way of caring for students. Think about the single parent at the dinner table with her three children. As the sole adult present, her primary orientation will always be toward the children. She will attend to them and her care will be obvious. But what happens when a second adult becomes a member of the dinner table? The first adult takes a spouse and suddenly two adults who care about each other are dining with their three children. Does the fact that they attend to each other and care about each other mean they no longer care about their children? Of course not. On the contrary, their care for each other becomes one mode of manifesting care for their children. Moreover, the fact that their attention is not focused entirely on their children gives the children some breathing space, some room to grow in; it gives them the opportunity to listen to adult conversation and notice what adults are like. It lets the children appreciate the adults, not only the other way round. Turning away from students thus in no way entails ceasing to care for them. It does mean that the care will be manifested in different ways and that it will be experienced in different ways.

(iii) It is important to add that turning away from students is done by the team of colleagues. But each member of the team continues to be an individual as he or she teaches. One must distinguish the teaching done by the individuals from "the teaching" (or whatever it is) done by the collegial team. Individuals on the team will teach as they teach. Some may be nurturing and attentive of students; others may spend less time and energy on students. Some may be



supportive and warm, others may be distant and cold. All this is a matter of temperament, teaching style, and individual inclination.

The turning away we are stressing is done by the team. The students' experience in a collegially taught program has at least two facets. It is an experience of a team and also an experience of individual teachers--particularly the one individual teacher who is their seminar leader, adviser, reader of essays, and evaluator. It is thus possible for an individual student to feel supported, nurtured and attended to by a single teacher and at the same time be a witness to, be an auditor of, a team of colleagues who clearly care more about their work together than they do about the collectivity called "the students" who are outsiders to this work.

4. O.K., you sustain a vital conversation with your colleagues and you make this the center of your work. But do you actually teach your students anything? Do you care if they learn anything?

One must distinguish, once again, the "you singular" from the "you plural." The individual teachers, in their individual teaching (their lectures, the way they lead their seminars, the comments they write on student papers, what they say during individual conferences in their office) may teach a great deal. They may teach in a very traditional way in their individual teaching. It is a separate question whether the team of colleagues as a team of colleagues teaches anything. It is possible that they do. It is also possible that they will teach nothing, and yet that the students will still learn something. It depends on how you construe the word "teach."

The principal question is whether students can get something of value by becoming auditors to a collegial team. We feel they can, just as children can get something of value listening to adult conversation at the dinner table. We are not interested in trying to prove that they do, because, in part, that would require us to turn back toward the students and take an uncollegial interest in them as the bearers of "student outcomes." It is sufficient that we think they can get something; that thought alone is the basis of our actions.

The secondary question is how many students can get something of value by participating in a collegially taught program. This too is an empirical question and there is no way we can answer it. We can respond to this question

with another question: If you knew at the outset that only 10% of your students would get something of long-lasting value by participating in such a program, would you still go ahead with it? If we asked this question of ourselves, what would we find? Probably only that one of us would and one of us wouldn't. This seems, again, not a very good approach.

Another approach to this question is to return to the point of view developed by Foucault and Illich. Illich, remember, criticized schools for equating learning with teaching, that is, for making it an axiom that no one learns anything without being taught it by an institutionally certified teacher. We, who are called teachers by our institution, have been trying to find ways to continue our own learning while working within the confines of the institution called a school, and at the same time, we are trying to provide a different kind of opportunity for those the institution calls students--an opportunity in which they may learn something through means other than those the institution defines as "teaching." This seems to us worth doing regardless of how many students take up this opportunity. On the other hand, we must add that we have been encouraged, not discouraged, by our students' responses--and the more time that elapses between the experience itself and when we hear from them, the more encouraging are their responses.

5. You may feel encouraged by student responses, but don't the students feel discouraged? Don't they get confused by hearing so many different views of the same subject?

Thank you. That's it exactly! We do, in fact, teach our students something. We teach them confusion. We do not give them the opportunity to become unconfused by making themselves dependent on the authority of institutionally recognized authorities. By having colleagues speaking authoritatively to one another, but doing so in front of the students, they would--of course!--become confused. They would have to develop, in consequence, their own authority if they want to find any truthful answers for themselves. We do not deliver to them any unchallengeable thought. Everything is disputable (and disputed) in collegial teaching. If the students learn anything, they learn that if they are going to have any thought, they have to do all the thinking.

6. Let's be clear. You are teachers. As you yourself admit, you still evaluate students, you still award and deny credit, you still are a cog in the credentialing process carried on by your institution. Maybe all your fancy talk is just a way of kidding yourselves into thinking that you're not doing what, in fact, you are doing. Isn't this all an elaborate justification for your own decision to live your lives in an institution?

Maybe. Without question, we contribute to the institution's functioning as an institution. And this institution is a functional part of the larger institutional framework of modern society. We do, however, deny the implied charge of being blind to this aspect of our work. We have our eyes wide open to it. In the next section, we try to illuminate the paradoxical nature of our own institution. We argue that the very institution that has enabled and even encouraged collegial teaching also threatens it at every turn.

All we can say is that for reasons we cannot explain, we have experienced our teaching together as human interaction of the type that institutions automatically erode and eventually eradicate. We cannot justify this claim. We chose instead to write about the experience.

7. There is an unresolved tension about the number of people who can teach as colleagues. You describe teams of four and five colleagues in many of your examples, yet the experience you speak of involves two colleagues. Can more than two colleagues really act together in a way that satisfies your conception of collegial teaching?

This is a question we cannot answer. We are not in a position to answer it. Your question might just as well have been: Could more than two of you have written this book? But only the two us did write it; so how can we answer the question?

We can, however, attempt some small commentary around the question. The metaphors we have used are distinctively based on two. This is probably not a coincidence. It is certainly a reflection of our experience. But the nature of our experience says nothing about what else is possible.

Perhaps the image of Socrates in conversation is more useful a metaphor than dancing or dinner with a spouse and children. Socratic dialogues typically

start with two people in conversation, Socrates and his interlocutor. However, the conversation itself creates opportunities for others to join in. This can happen in many different ways, and does happen in different ways in different dialogues. The important point is that what starts out "naturally" as appropriate for two can become, equally naturally, appropriate for three, or four, or five, or many. The metaphor is limited in that Socrates is never set into conversation with an equal. But the image presented in the Phaedo of a group of friends gathered for a final conversation with Socrates before his death suggests with great force that what begins with two need not be limited only to two.

So perhaps it is best to think of two teaching colleagues starting a conversation. Early on, the other colleagues stand in somewhat the same position as the students. They have the opportunity to join in if they choose. Nothing forces them to, but nothing prevents them from doing so either. Of course, they have it easier than the students, because they don't have the institutionally imposed label of "student" to overcome. They are already by definition "colleagues," and the only question is whether they will really become colleagues.

#### 8. Can I learn to do collegial teaching at my institution?

The two key words in your question are "learn" and "institution"? Can one learn to be a colleague? This question is a variant on Meno's opening question to Socrates: "Can you tell me, Socrates, can virtue be taught? Or is it not teachable but the result of practice, or is it neither of these, but men possess it by nature or in some other way?" Can one learn excellence of character from a teacher? Have we been interested in teaching anything by our writing? Our A and B had different answers to what flowed from questions such as these, and so do we.

With respect to the word "institution," the question is about the possibility of working against the natural grain of modern institutions. We don't mean that all institutions would disapprove of collegial teaching. Quite the contrary. Many institutions might well approve of it and want to foster it. But in so doing, they will inevitably make a program out of it. They will issue memos promoting it, offer workshops to help faculty learn how to do it, appoint administrators to support it, appropriate funds to study it, implement it, and

above all else, evaluate its effectiveness. An Office of Collegial Teaching Support is easily imaginable. In doing all these things which institutions do so naturally, they will be making it difficult for collegial teaching to happen. But probably not impossible. We would guess that most colleges and universities are not yet so thoroughly administered that two colleagues could not get together and try to put a conversation between them at the center of their teaching.

Our experience of teaching in an institution has given us a basis for a more elaborate response to your concern. In the next section, we examine the short history of our institution, Evergreen, using it as a case study to shed light on the larger question of the relationship of collegial teaching to its inevitable institutional setting.

## PART II: COLLEGIAL TEACHING AT EVERGREEN

Earlier we suggested that there was something about our current academic life together at Evergreen that encouraged us to write about collegial teaching now. We write now because we feel collegial teaching slipping away from the college. Maybe it is already gone.

In the last several years our conversation has turned to the question of what we are losing or what we fear we will lose. The German word Schwund refers to a loss that occurs through a draining away. The draining away has the peculiar quality of not being noticeable until everything is gone. "Think of a pond," said the person who explained the word to us. "Everyday, you return to the pond and it is still there; 'it's a pond,' you say. You may be a little uneasy because it seems to be changing, but you cannot articulate your uneasiness. You reassure yourself that everything is fine; 'it's a pond.' The next day you come back and the pond is gone. As you think back, you can reconstruct the history of the loss of the pond as a gradual, incremental phenomenon, but there was no way to do so as the process was going on. And, what's more, you can't get the pond back. That is Schwund, that loss." Evergreen made possible what we joyfully experienced as collegial teaching. In all of the College's negativity, we found something profoundly positive. Evergreen is changing now and we are suffering a loss, a Schwund.

Just as we could not describe Evergreen in general, catalogue-like, managerial terms, we cannot describe our loss in general terms. Just as we had to convey something of the distinctiveness of this place and of the experience of working here by those several moments in the life of an Evergreen faculty member, we must now try to convey something of this loss by discussing specific, telling events in the evolution of the College. The events are not representative; they are not meant to "stand for" something other than themselves. They are simply topics of conversation.

What follows should be read as a concern about the regimentation and, more kindly, regularization of Evergreen. It could be read as an attack on administration or, worse, on particular administrators, but we do not want it to be. There has been a lot of concern with some administrators at the College, especially with people brought in with reputations for being effective administrators and for "making things happen." While we are concerned with the fact that our collegiate life has become documentably more administered, we do

not wish to join in an attack on administrators per se. We are concerned about a loss, a Schwund, that has come with what many perceive to be a gain. (After all, there are good reasons for doing away with some ponds.) We all have come to be participants, more or less willing participants, in a new economy of "planning." Behind the "moments" out of our lives at Evergreen painted in the previous section, there lies a sense of openness to possibility, of serendipity, of a readiness to accept one's responsibility as a member of the faculty. One had the sense that one could always be surprised by this place. Things have changed. We are now more secure in our positions, more clear about what needs to be done, more full of resources (a state we would distinguish from "being resourceful"). Life has become so regular that one generally knows what is expected and what to expect. The institution has come closer to running itself. Of course, that is another way of saying that the institution now requires good administrators to manage all the good things that we now have. What follows is an expression of concern about a new life that we have been invited to live, and that we are now living, in this institution that made possible our collegial life together, which we remember well.

Security: From Faculty Evaluation to Faculty Reappointment

At an especially difficult point (October 6, 1987) in the process of replacing a Faculty Evaluation system with a Faculty Reappointment Policy,\*\* the

---

\* "Planning" is a new concept. It is, at best, sixty years old. Uwe Poerksen calls it an "amoeba word," a "plastic word" that has no shape but that can be made to encompass anything. Ivan Illich tells about talking with Jacques Maritain "about the question which bothered me, that in his whole philosophy, I didn't find any access to the concept of planning. And he asked me if this was a different, an English word for accounting. I told him no. And was it for engineering. I said no. And then at a certain moment, he said to me, 'Ah! Je comprend, mon cher ami, maintenant je comprend.' Now I finally understand. 'C'est une nouvelle espèce du péché de presumption.' It's a new specie of the sin of presumption, planning." (From "Part Moon, Part Traveling Salesman: Conversations with Ivan Illich," CBC Transcripts, 1989, p. 4.)

\*\* In a memo to the faculty about the changes we describe here, Guy Adams, himself a member of the committee that wrote the new policy, insisted that we all recognize that the new policy was, in fact, a reappointment policy, not principally an evaluation system. He pointed out, correctly, that the new policy focused strictly on reappointment considerations and explicitly divorced "faculty development" from a question of reappointment. An evaluation system would, of course, have an individual faculty member's development as one of its

Provost, Patrick Hill, wrote a memo to the faculty. He explained that the policy proposed by the faculty committee was not acceptable to the Trustees because of "legal inconsistencies and ambiguities." We are here not concerned with the legalities of the issues involved in rewriting this cornerstone of Evergreen practice, but rather with the kinds of concerns that framed the college's response to the perceived problems with the old Faculty Evaluation policy. We are concerned with the kind of transition which is marked by the writing of this new policy. On page 13 (!) of Hill's fading, blue-dittoed memo to the faculty, there is a paragraph worth quoting at length because it signals the institutional recognition of a transition from one sort of collegial association to another.

Many of you have heard me comment on the subtle, grating consequences of an interpersonal sort which seem to me to have flowed from a) trying to live in a community without rank, title or tenure; b) foregoing the subtle power and status associated with the traditional grading system of higher education; and c) cutting ourselves off at the same time by virtue of our commitment to interdisciplinary groupings and assignments from the status and professional recognition gained in the traditional, disciplinary based societies of higher education. Any one of these experiments might have been a sufficient challenge to the traditional sources of self esteem in a hyper-competitive society. All three together--combined with a dozen other features of the social contract--have in my judgment exacted a heavy price. We often pay that price in subtle compensations for the absent status markers of the traditional higher-education. Sometimes, those compensations take the unhealthy forms of exaggerated differentiations, near desperate personal investment in the outcomes of professional leaves deliberations or dean searches, unopenness or hostility to differences and to outsiders, uncivility to each other, and mostly through overwork which is often experienced as unsatisfying because underappreciated or officially unrecognized by the institution. I know that many have handled the insecurity creatively--we have not settled into widespread patterns of routine and repetition. But by and large it is my view that the faculty at TESC both deserve and would benefit from a clear message of institutional trust and recognition.<sup>4</sup>

Hill went on to enunciate a phrase that would quickly quash any critical consideration of the transition we experienced as a Schwund: "...the experts agree that the TESC faculty has as much or more security as exists in the tenure system."<sup>5</sup>

---

central concerns. We will, with thanks to Adams, try not to be confused into thinking that the faculty replaced its evaluation system with a new evaluation system. In creating a reappointment system we lost an evaluation system.



This concern for security, which the Provost felt compelled to assure everyone that he or she now had, was an absolutely new element on the Evergreen horizon. Indeed, we can see in the confusion over whether the faculty was writing an "evaluation policy" or a "reappointment policy" (See the footnote on page 59) the residuum of an old era coagulating to create this new concern. Think of it this way. At one time, faculty members were "evaluated." To be sure, one result of an evaluation could be dismissal from the College. But the principal focus of the system was evaluation and, in fact, improvement of teaching. The new proposal, which was approved as College policy in 1988, changed the focus from evaluation to reappointment. First, the new policy says, consider the possibility that you will not be reappointed. Evaluation, as we shall see, became a very distant, secondary matter, if it could be considered part of the new policy at all. The Provost wrote in his 1987 memo, "The distinctiveness of our institution will not be threatened by the frank recognition of a right to continuing employment on the part of our accomplished teachers." We would argue that once the practice of regularly evaluating all faculty members gave way to the promise of security for "our accomplished teachers" the distinctiveness of the place, in fact, dissolved. By gaining some security we lost an important basis of collegiality.

To get a taste of what was lost as we gained what we gained, compare the openings of the Faculty Evaluation Policy adopted in the mid-1970s and the new Faculty Reappointment Policy. The Evaluation Policy began:

Faculty evaluation at Evergreen should be a pleasure. The primary purpose of Evergreen's faculty evaluation procedures is to provide reinforcement and feedback with respect to each faculty member's commitment to the teaching arts, the basis on which all Evergreen faculty appointments are made.

Unfortunately, most institutions of higher education still make little provision for learning the art of teaching. With only the rarest of exceptions, American colleges have no real apprentice system for developing the teacher's craft.... There is no reason why this should continue. Evergreen will provide members of its faculty with opportunities to learn to teach, to experiment, to acquire intellectual breadth and depth, and to get acquainted with students free from the usual constraints of specialized discipline and department.<sup>6</sup>

The Reappointment Policy began:

Collaborative, interdisciplinary study constitutes the heart of the Evergreen curriculum. The reappointment criteria for faculty speak to

those academic qualities, skills, and attitudes of professional collegiality which make for excellence in teaching. The evaluation process, through which reappointment decisions are made, has at its heart a concern for excellence in all aspects of the academic enterprise. Adherence to this reappointment policy assures the college highly competent faculty. Excellence in the faculty depends in part on faculty development efforts, like those enumerated in the Faculty Development Recommendations, adopted by the Faculty in 1987.

Faculty appointment at Evergreen is not based on a tenure system but rather on a contract system. In the reappointment process, faculty must present evaluative material that reflects high quality teaching and collegial work at the college and warrants reappointment. In case of denial of reappointment, the burden of proof lies with the institution (as specified in this policy).<sup>7</sup>

There is a clear difference between the spirited simplicity of the first paragraph of the old policy and the forced (with its hearts within hearts), strained, legal clarity of the new policy's opening.

The old evaluation policy spelled out how the institution was obligated to help faculty members learn "the art of teaching." A faculty member met each year with an academic dean\* for an "evaluation session." All regular members of the faculty were on three-year, renewable contracts. In the first and third year of each contract, the evaluation session with one's dean was to be devoted exclusively to "aiding continued growth, the identification and discussion of areas of strength and weakness, and ways of improving upon these strengths and/or eliminating weaknesses."<sup>8</sup> The discussions at these sessions focused on the Faculty Portfolio, a usually substantial collection of documents derived from one's work over the past several years. Portfolios were to include:

- (1) Both the self-evaluation and the dean's evaluation from the previous year;
- (2) All evaluations of you by your faculty colleagues;
- (3) All evaluations you have written of your faculty colleagues;

---

\* In the original conception of the College, academic deans were to rotate from the faculty and return to teaching some two to four years later. Around 1980 the college hired two deans from outside. During the eighties, there was considerable confusion about whether these two deans were to be "Senior Deans," or "Curriculum Dean" and "Budget Dean," or just "Academic Deans." One of those two people did not return to teaching at the College. When the other person did return to teaching, the Search Committee charged with replacing him found that twenty-two current members of the faculty had been an academic dean in the past. Both of the deans-from-the-outside were replaced with current members of the faculty.

- (4) All evaluations of you by staff members;
- (5) All evaluations you have written of staff members;
- (6) All evaluations of you by your students;
- (7) All evaluations you have written of your students' work, both transcript and informal;
- (8) Copies of your coordinated studies program covenants or group contract agreements between you and your students;
- (9) Copies of individual contracts you have sponsored;
- (10) A thoughtful and critical self-evaluation of the current year's work, based largely on the documentation available in your portfolio. This essay should assess your successes and your disappointments, and it should address the areas in which you hope to make improvements during the following year in your teaching, in your other contributions to Evergreen, in your fields of expertise, and in exploring new academic interests.<sup>9</sup>

It was only a slight exaggeration to say that everyone at Evergreen evaluated everyone else all of the time and that these mutual evaluations became the substantive basis for further evaluations. It is instructive that nearly one-third of Richard Jones's Experiment at Evergreen,<sup>10</sup> the first public report on this new college, concerned evaluation. Evaluations became the basis for many of the conversations that occurred at the place.

A faculty member could be asked to leave the College as a result of this process of evaluation. The evaluation session in the second year of each contract had to end with a recommendation to the Provost on whether a person should be offered a subsequent three-year contract, a provisional one-year contract (a "one-year reappraisal extension") in which teaching deficiencies could be corrected, or should be terminated at the end of the current contract.

However, in those circumstances where a faculty member was at risk of receiving less than a full three-year renewal, the evaluation policy spelled out a set of institutional obligations that required the administration to help the person deemed to be in need of help. The Faculty Handbook said, "For those faculty receiving one-year reappraisal extensions, the Deans will provide consulting assistance ... to provide maximum opportunity for correction of the deficiencies."<sup>11</sup> At times this assistance involved the constitution of a teaching team geared to help a faculty member improve some aspect of his or her teaching. At other times, "a small, mutually agreed upon consultant team of experienced and successful faculty" together with students who might provide "information and support vital to faculty development"<sup>12</sup> worked with a faculty

member. At other times, a dean would involve himself or herself closely in a faculty member's work, attend lectures, sit in on seminars, and offer advice as he or she saw fit. This dean might even be the dean who would be responsible for writing the summary evaluation of a person's experience on a "one-year reappraisal extension" contract. There was no concern for "conflicts of interest" or other legalistic obstructions to providing help to those who might be fired. There was no effort to rigorously separate the roles of dean and faculty member. They were different, yes, but they were the same in important respects. There was the sense that everyone involved in the faculty evaluation process was a member of a community. Some members of the community had the institutional authority to recommend dismissal of others. But even they had a responsibility to help others. It almost goes without saying that, as in any community, the system of mutual obligations and responsibilities sometimes worked and sometimes did not work. But it was a system that was down on paper, and that paper could be invoked whenever someone wanted to recall for someone else that "faculty evaluation ... should be a pleasure."

Richard Jones, the one founding member of the faculty who has published material about Evergreen, summarized the spirit in which the evaluation of one's colleagues could be approached at Evergreen. He wrote in a pamphlet called "Enjoying Evaluation,"

[Colleague evaluations] I find to be the most enjoyable of all, albeit the most time consuming. With rare exceptions you are writing to a person who has by now become a respected colleague. The two of you have had the extraordinary (for college teachers) opportunity of becoming intimately familiar with each other's styles. For a significant part of a whole academic year, usually, the vitality of the same professional venture has centered your respective work lives. You've had your differences and have probably resolved most of them. You've learned some things from the other and seen the other learn some things from you. It's probably not in the cards that the two of you will soon again find yourselves on the same team. Under the circumstances, it is as likely you could stand on ceremony, or indulge false pretenses, as you could kiss your wife's (or husband's) hand. It is a time, in other words, for an exchange of professional love letters.<sup>13</sup>

The blank page is a formidable object when one sits down to write an evaluation of a colleague, perhaps a friend, perhaps someone you have concluded is a "nice person" but wished would not be employed by the College any longer, in any event, someone with whom you have spent a lot of time over the past three, six, or nine months. The task of filling that page becomes less daunting if one can

bring oneself to realize that he or she has all the richness and beauty of the written word to fill that page. Writing a "professional love letter" can be an enjoyable task and the process of faculty evaluation that "should be a pleasure" can really be one.

Our new economy of planning has changed all that. It is not surprising that one of the first things to be changed was the faculty evaluation policy. We no longer face an absolutely blank page. We face a page that has an a priori structure, not yet the structure of an evaluation that contains third-person questions like, "Did he/she project his/her voice adequately to the back of the room?" and that are completed with No. 2 lead pencils, but a structure nonetheless. And few people would ever imagine their task under the Faculty Reappointment Policy as being one of writing "professional love letters." Indeed, it is difficult to imagine that someone would even imagine he had the liberty to do that. We no longer engage in collegial evaluation; we are now participants in a peer review assessment system.

There are, around the College, many narratives that explain why the change from evaluation to reappointment/peer review took place. One says that the College was unsuccessful in trying to fire one particular member of the faculty, in part, because, to an outside authority brought in to adjudicate the matter, the Evaluation Policy was fundamentally flawed.\* In an effort to clean up the policy, this narrative has it, the College overreacted and we got the cleanly bureaucratic policy we now have. Others say that, in fact, many members of the faculty began to feel insecure in their jobs and wanted the security that the Provost assured everyone they would get. Other histories say that some faculty members were not being honest in their written evaluations of colleagues, that they were delivering their "honest" evaluations to deans orally and behind the backs of everyone involved, and that changing the timing of colleague evaluations would increase the honesty. Besides the fact that none of these historical narratives could possibly account for the tidal change marked by the

---

\* There was some humor in the outside judge's report. He noted that the policy contained several definitions of a "year." The definitions ranged in length from nine to fifteen months. The report also noted that besides having a flawed policy, people charged to administer the policy did not do their jobs well in some crucial respects and, finally, the college had not made an adequate case against the faculty member.

shift we are describing, we are not especially interested in determining the cause of the change. We prefer to see this particular change as emblematic of a change in the terms under which we conduct the affairs of the College. We wish to describe that change so that we can know a little better where we are and appreciate a little more what we have lost.

The opening of the new Faculty Reappointment Policy sets the tone for the entire document. Gone is the idealism of that first "should" [be a pleasure]; gone is the feeling of distinctiveness signaled by that "Unfortunately, most institutions of higher education..." In their place we get standard managerial rhetoric. Evergreen, like every other institution, has a concern for "competence" and "excellence." Evergreen, like every other institution, is rhetorically committed to "faculty development," but that is a matter for another policy, just like at other institutions. Evergreen, like every other institution, spells out in legally acceptable terms the conditions of employment. The tone of the new policy is one that only a lawyer could love.

The structure of the new peer review system is given by the criteria according to which a faculty member's "excellence in teaching" is to be judged. There are now four criteria, and most have sub-headings. They are:

#### A. Teaching

1. contribution to the learning environment in programs through
  - (1) subject matter expertise
  - (2) interdisciplinary approach to the material
  - (3) counseling and advising students
  - (4) facilitation of a stimulating and challenging atmosphere
  - (5) seminars, lectures, lab or field work, workshops, and individual contracts
  - (6) working collaboratively with faculty and students
2. fostering students' intellectual and cognitive development
3. fostering students' communication abilities
4. the design and execution of parts of a program's curriculum
5. innovation
6. intellectual vitality

#### B. Meeting commitments

1. Meeting Rotation and team teaching requirements [which spell out, for the first time, the number of different people with whom a faculty member must teach in each contract cycle]
2. Adherence to covenants and program syllabi and specialty area or graduate program obligations
3. Writing reappointment evaluations for each colleague ...
4. Writing timely evaluations of each student taught, assessing specifically and substantively the student's understanding of program material

5. Adherence to the Social Contract, the Affirmative Action Policy, and the Sexual Harassment Policy.

C. Planning Curriculum

1. Planning academic programs, contribution to program design as well as execution
2. Participating in the development of a coherent and innovative curriculum in a Specialty Area (or other curriculum-planning structure) including Core programs

D. Participating in College Affairs

There are five "grounds for non-reappointment." They are:

1. Failure to maintain a substantially complete portfolio, as described in this policy, and to produce that portfolio for purposes of evaluation.
2. A pattern of failure to meet the college faculty's standards of competency in Teaching.
3. A pattern of failure to meet the college faculty's standards of competency in Meeting Commitments.
4. A pattern of failure to meet the college faculty's standards of competency in Planning Curriculum.
5. A pattern of failure to meet the college faculty's standards of competency in Participating in College Affairs.

Then the policy tells everyone what should be in a faculty member's portfolio. Then it says where the portfolio goes and when. Then it says who must make decisions and write letters and when those letters must be mailed. If the appropriate decision-maker makes a decision not to renew a faculty member's contract, the policy puts that faculty member on a new track that involves due process and appeal rights and the constitution of review boards and more letters to be written and mailed and more decision points. And yes, lawyers are allowed.

People who are faced with the task of writing love letters are in the same position as were Foucault's "two men of noticeably different ages." They are both struggling to find the "code [that] would allow them to communicate. They face each other without terms or convenient words."\* They have to find a way to

---

\* The reference here is to the conclusion of the Rousseau-Freud-Freire-Foucault-Illich section. That section ends with a discussion of "friendship." The quotation is from an interview with Foucault that reads, in part,

But two men of noticeably different ages--what code would allow them to communicate? They face each other without terms or

talk to one another, in full recognition that, as with most love letters, there will be false starts, unfortunate slips, silly excesses, and much groping. The new Reappointment Policy solves this "problem." If the structure of criteria and the map of decision points is not sufficient to help one communicate properly in this new economy, the policy is quite explicit about the terms in which one's judgment is to be expressed. The new policy says that an author of a peer review of another faculty member will provide evidence in all of the four critical areas for which she or he has evidence and that "the author shall directly and explicitly evaluate the colleague's competency in each aspect for which there is evidence from their work together." In case that is not clear, the next sentence tells you what "evaluating competency" might mean. It means that you will "assess the colleague's strengths and weaknesses" and that you will "state [your] overall judgment of the colleague's competency in this aspect of his work." And if that is not clear, the policy gives you a sentence that must accompany any evidence. That sentence is, "In my opinion, overall, his lecturing [criterion A-1-e, for example] did (or did not) meet reasonable standards of competency for lecturing at this college."<sup>14</sup> This leaves little room for a "code" that only "lovers" can hope to understand, the very code that grounded some of the faculty evaluations excerpted above.

The effects of this new policy are being felt by almost everyone. One important effect was the introduction of a two-tiered system of contracts for regular members of the faculty. One's first and second contracts as a new, regular member of the faculty are now three-year contracts. After that, one advances to an eight-year contract. The intention of the policy was to reduce the reappointment decision load faced by the academic deans. The effect was to create a "good," in the economic sense, that was not shared by everyone. The existence of this good, this privilege, naturally created a sense of scarcity

---

convenient words, with nothing to assure them about the meaning of the movement that carries them towards each other. They have to invent, from A to Z, a relationship that is still formless, which is friendship; that is to say, the sum of everything through which they can give each other pleasure.

"Friendship as a Way of Life," interview first appeared in La Gai Pied, April, 1981. Reprinted in Foucault Live (Interviews, 1966-1984), New York: Semiotext(e), 1989, pp. 203-209.



around itself and became the basis for a new kind of fight. In the two years following the implementation of the policy, there have been several vicious fights over the wording of peer review letters and over the advancement to eight-year contracts. These fights did not occur under the old system since everyone shared the same privileges (or lacks); there simply was no basis for this sort of fight, the sort that is familiar to anyone who has worked under a tenure system. Evergreen, like every other school, has come to the point where the truism of the academy, viz., that the fights are so vicious because the stakes are so small, is becoming true for us.

Another crucial effect of the Reappointment Policy was, at once, to elevate and downgrade the academic deans. They always were the first decision-making point in a renewal decision. But structurally they were not especially privileged. Now they are in a privileged position and they have been turned into high-level clerks.

Most deans, as we said, rotated from the faculty for terms of two to four years. They held evaluation conferences with faculty members and, usually, during those conferences dean and faculty member would exchange written evaluations of one another. The faculty member would have read the dean's portfolio (which included the dean's evaluation of many of the faculty member's colleagues, the colleagues' evaluations of the dean, self-evaluations by the dean, and so on) just as the dean would have read the faculty member's portfolio, and both would have written letters in response to what they found there. The new policy does not require a conference except when a reappointment decision is to be made. The policy specifically does not include the mutual exchange of evaluations. Consequently, the deans are marked by this new policy as a locus of decision making with not even a bow to the reciprocity that was the definitive feature of all evaluation in the past.

Academic deans have become clerks because their job, under the new policy is to ensure the completeness of the faculty member's portfolio and to judge how well and how consistently the faculty member has in the time since this faculty member's last decanal evaluation maintained a portfolio and met the college's generally acknowledged high standards of teaching, meeting commitments, planning curriculum, and participating in college affairs.<sup>15</sup>

Even deans are sentenced by this new policy. They have a choice of three sentences. They can write at the conclusion of an evaluation, "Were it

necessary on the evidence before me to make a recommendation regarding your reappointment, I would say, 'Most certainly, reappoint' or 'Most certainly, do not reappoint' or 'Reappointment uncertain.'<sup>16</sup> Then, at the point of making a reappointment decision, they must make a decision, write their reasoning and forward everything to the Provost.

We are still at the point where some incumbents of the dean's jobs can feel the pain of the new system in relation to the old. For example, one dean wrote in a self-evaluation after the first year of working under the new policy:

[Under the new policy] the deans are restrained from becoming involved in faculty development. [The fault of the new policy is] that the evaluation process is based narrowly on the portfolio of the faculty member and in many respects does not assess the team and its teaching. The most important result is the separation of the Deans from the faculty. This separation is a function of a lower level of involvement in the actual teaching life of the faculty. While the old system might not have been great, the new one invites the deans, especially in the course of reappointment evaluations, to withdraw almost completely from the actual practice of the faculty and [to] be concerned with the paper record.... The objective of this separation--"fair judgment"--may have been laudable, but the reality is a potential and actual breakdown in the level of interaction of faculty and deans around the central activity of the institution: teaching and learning.

He commented in December, 1989:

The legalistic, bureaucratic nature of the system invites both faculty, especially new faculty, to see the deans as bosses to be manipulated and cajoled, and tempts the deans to see faculty as functionaries, as difficult political issues, but not as colleagues.

A dean cannot be collegial when he is so severely bureaucratically marked.

The most profound tragedy of the situation, which this dean's comments suggest, is that people will quickly adapt to the new system because it is such a common-sensical system. We all know how to manipulate and cajole the boss. All bosses know how to deal with functionaries, even when they become "difficult political issues." Even though the job of the deans may have become a little more difficult, they no longer face the task of finding "the code [that] would allow them to communicate." They don't have to find the code; it's in their handbooks. Only two weeks after the comment above, another dean wrote a commentary on the new policy that argued, in part, that everyone must now work to solve the problems created by the new policy:

I hope that we will review and revamp what deans do so that the door between the deanery and the teaching faculty will be a wider and more inviting passage in both directions. The deans must not be isolated from the faculty. A significant number of faculty must find the prospect of serving as dean an inviting one. But revising the deanery isn't the whole solution. The faculty has got to figure out how to welcome deans into their teaching lives. Probably this means fixing, or trashing, the new reappointment policy.<sup>17</sup>

While he did admit the possibility of "trashing" the new policy, this dean had already accepted the terms of the new structure in which deans and faculty are no longer "equal but different," as faculty and deans were when rotation between the two statuses was an accepted fact of institutional life, but in which deans are just different.\* A kind of institutional plurality, to recall Arendt's term, has given way to a standard bureaucracy.

#### Stability: The Development of a Curriculum

Just as faculty evaluation at Evergreen has moved faculty members away from a confrontation with a blank page toward becoming a participant in a process that begins with a structured format for one's thinking, so the academic offerings of the college changed from an anarchic collection of "programs" to a more structured curriculum. The College, again, gained something in this transformation. It gained stability, predictability, some consistency and coherence. It also lost something in that transition. We can try to remember\*\* that loss even though we might appreciate what we have gained.

As we said in the Introduction [to The Paradox of Pedagogy], Evergreen was founded in negativity. No grades, no departments, no ranks, no tenure. And no curriculum in any traditional sense of that term. Richard Jones wrote to a friend in February, 1971,

my main reservation at the top is the probably unreasonable one that McCann is not a Meiklejohn. He has shaped a quite modest legislative

---

\* The new policy also gave greater legitimacy to a growing number of "directors" on campus. For example, the directors of graduate programs came to have review authority over any faculty who worked, however briefly, in their programs.

\*\* This with thanks to Bob Romanyshyn of the University of Dallas. He speaks of the neurotic as the dis-membered body, of the symptom as a cutting off of one's past, and of therapy as the re-remembering of one's past, of the re-calling of one's repressed past into one's present.

mandate of purely local reference (to build a new State College which is not a carbon copy of others existing in the State of Washington) into a sweepingly innovative effort of national significance. But in this McCann is more negatively than positively inspired.<sup>18</sup>

Out of this negativity, the planning faculty had to make something positive because 1,000 students would be arriving in the fall following the luxurious "planning year" enjoyed by the founders of the college.

One of the first academic deans of the college, Mervyn Cadwallader, a disciple of Alexander Meiklejohn (the founder of the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin in 1927), had the planning faculty read Joseph Tussman's Experiment at Berkeley. Tussman had tried to reproduce the Meiklejohn Experimental College at Berkeley in the mid-1960s. His book recounts the difficulties and the joys of teaching in teams in a most traditional university. But for the small group of educational reformers assembled at the southern end of Puget Sound in the post-Kent State era, the book became a nucleus around which the diverse ideas and agendas of that group could coalesce. Jones notes, "The experience [of reading Tussman] was to have a decisive influence on one of the most revealing experiments in the history of American higher education."<sup>19</sup> Into the void of the new academy that was shaped by the negative thinking of its first president, Charles McCann, the planning faculty placed a curricular structure of team-taught, interdisciplinary, year-long, theme-centered, so-called Coordinated Studies programs. When the first group of students arrived on the unfinished campus in the fall of 1971, instead of being met with a catalogue of departmentally organized courses that could be permuted in many different ways through the free choice of every student (constrained only by the requirements of departmental majors and minors), they were met by a choice from among only ten programs of study to which they, along with a faculty team of between three and seven people, would devote a year of study.

Cadwallader had had a positive agenda in mind when he recommended the Tussman book to the planning faculty. He wanted the college to develop a "moral curriculum" modeled on the content of Tussman's experiment at Berkeley. It is crucial to note that the planning faculty rejected this idea and seized only upon the structural aspects of the Experimental College: team teaching, thematically organized, long-term programs with seminars at center-stage.

Evergreen would have a generally agreed upon way of teaching and learning. There was no agreement on what was to be taught.

The early College catalogues are charming in their arrogance. The early catalogues tell the student nothing about what he or she might expect to learn; they focus instead on how hard the student will have to work. "The faculty of Evergreen believes that all students should plan to do a great deal of work and learning in both Coordinated Studies and Contracted Studies." "A Coordinated Studies program has a comprehensive design and a required set of activities.... The program has a logical structure. And it is demanding." In seminar, "There will be pressure. It will come from the other members of your seminar who need your help and from the urgency of the problems at hand. If you aren't willing to take responsibility for this kind of hard academic work, then you should seriously question whether Evergreen is the college for you." The catalogue promises help to those who find the going rough, but it also says, "If a student fails to meet his responsibilities to the program, he will be required to leave."<sup>20</sup> The college enjoyed its no-nonsense attitude. But it also ran the risk of being accused of having no content.

This accusation was met with bold, self-confident rhetoric. The 1973-74 catalogue, for example, listed the "Programs in Progress" for academic year 1972-73 with the notation that,

At Evergreen, we seek to offer a variety of new Coordinated Studies programs and new opportunities for Contracted Studies each year. A Coordinated Studies program will be repeated only with a modified design and with changes in the faculty team leading it.

You should not expect, therefore, to find the 1972 programs in operation next year. Even if some of the program titles appear again and even if some of the same faculty team members are involved, the programs will have been largely altered by the experience of the first years. We shall continue to value growth and change over mechanical repetition within hardened categories.

The summaries which follow describe work in progress; they are presented here for the sole reason of giving you some idea of how we go about the enterprise of higher learning. For if you choose to join us, you will be enrolling in the College, entering our particular climate, rather than signing up to take one specific program or prearranged sequence of programs.<sup>21</sup>

A student did not come to "be a pre-med" or to "do sociology." A student could only "choose to join" the College that was "in progress."

A student who wanted to know what was available in this "particular climate," this "enterprise of higher learning," had to wait for the publication of the Catalogue Supplement late in the summer just before the opening of school. The 1972-73 Supplement listed eight basic coordinated studies programs and nine advanced programs. Each program had a one-page or two-page description in the Supplement. The descriptions sometimes listed books that would be read, sometimes not. All the descriptions gave the themes or the questions that were at the heart of the program. For example, the year-long basic (entry-level) program "Learning About Learning" was introduced this way:

This is a basic program for all students. Its purpose is to explore the nature of the learning process. Since intentional learning forms but a small part of all learning in one's life, the scope will be much broader than classroom settings. Some questions to be considered might be: What are the different learning theories? How does learning take place a) in structured/unstructured settings? b) in institutional/non-institutional settings? c) among different age groups? d) in different organisms, particularly primates, e) in different cultures/ethnic groups in the United States? Are learning and education the same? What is the purpose of schools? How do I learn best? How can I help others learn? What kinds of environments, both human and physical, seem conducive to different kinds of learning? How do different people and setting affect what and how I learn?

The description carried on for another page and a half. It gave a student not only an indication of what would be taught; it gave the student a taste of the teacher who had, after all, written the program description. In the place in the Supplement where one might expect to find a guide to departments, there was a concordance that thematically related courses from the previous year to the courses being offered in the current year. One column was headed "Were you interested in one of these [1971-72 programs]?"; the other column was headed "Then read the descriptions of these:". Under the first column, for example, was "Human Development." Opposite it was "' Roles in Society,' 'Human Development II,' and 'Learning About Learning.'"

The attitude of the catalogue was colored by that phrase, "if you choose to join us." The faculty seemed to think of itself as engaged in something into which the students might be invited.

The blank page of the catalogue of courses that got filled at the last minute was, in the very first years of the college, mirrored in a blank page given to each faculty member to fill out and insert into a document called, "The Class of

[for example] '72." The faculty filled these blank pages not with reflections about students or with commentaries on the classes they had finished teaching; they filled these blank pages with words and images about themselves. There were pictures of the faculty member, sometimes pictures of the faculty member's family. There were standard biographies. There were line drawings and handwritten commentaries. One faculty member scrawled her name in broad-tip marker, wrote the word "Adequate," and added her social security number. The faculty thought of itself, not the students, as the "Class of ..." at Evergreen!

The beginning of regularization of the academic structure was marked by the inability to sustain this irreverent academic guide. "The Class of '72" was the last document of its kind even though there was a desultory effort to revive something of its sort in the late 1980s. By 1976, the College was publishing "An Academic Advising Resource Guide," soon dubbed the AAARG!, that contained sober commentaries on how to proceed through Evergreen, complete with a delineation of the "advising roles" played by the various offices and officers of the college and grievance policies for those who felt wronged. The AAARG! concluded with standardized biographies of each faculty member and each person's current "teaching assignment." In a bow to the College's origins in serious humor, the AAARG! did have a glossary called "Evergreen as a Second Language," showing that this College would rather invent a new word than suggest it was part of the higher education establishment by drawing on the vernacular. For example, "module" became Evergreen's term for "course." But the trend toward absorption was clear.

Actually, the appearance of "modules" (courses) and a dramatic rise in independent study provoked the first major debate about curriculum, such as it was, among the faculty in 1977. Some people, Richard Jones among them, felt that the curriculum proposed for 1978-79 had gotten too far away from Coordinated Studies programs. Jones said in a faculty meeting and then wrote to all who had written to him in support and in opposition (and eventually to the whole faculty) that Evergreen would become a second rate institution if it persisted on the course indicated by the new curriculum. He said,

A college which has no grades, no majors, no courses, no requirements, no departments, no rank, no tenure, and no rules as to faculty scholarship must have an identifiable center which holds. That commitment has so far been provided by our commitment to teaching one interdisciplinary set of things at a time, full time and doing it collaboratively.<sup>22</sup>

Jones was concerned that the "set of things" that got done by each group of faculty that got together was taking on more and more structure. He was concerned that less and less attention was being given to the central fact of educating at Evergreen: that teaching provides the arena where one encounters one's colleagues. Like those concerned with declining enrollments, he too wanted to debate numbers, he said, but he would only debate the question of what number of faculty members made a coordinated studies teaching team an intellectually vital arena in which to work. He felt particularly anxious, he wrote, when he had "to dream up those damned 'equivalencies,'" "course equivalencies," now another commonplace at the college, that let future transcript readers know how the education that transpired in a program could be translated into the courses of the standard college catalogue. Jones echoed the old arrogance of the faculty as he concluded his letter with this barb:

My guess is that we haven't [given proper attention to the issue of the size of an effective teaching team for Coordinated Studies and, therefore, have allowed "downsizing" of programs] because we've been scared into trying to give the students what they think they want, instead of giving what we know they need--which is hard to say without feeling either arrogant or confused, because that's what the universities used to do, isn't it?<sup>23</sup>

The structureless curriculum of the early Evergreen permitted the appearance of many different teaching structures. Jones's objection was that these new structures were appearing in response to student demands, not faculty wisdom. For him, the wisdom of the planning faculty was reflected in its decision not to have a curricular structure to which everyone would be beholden but to have, instead, a center to the work of the faculty.

Structure came to the curriculum as the 1970s became the 1980s. The College invented "Specialty Areas" that would offer clusters of programs. The 1989-90 "Evergreen Student Handbook" said,

Evergreen's unusual curriculum is organized into specialty areas. These are themes around which study is organized. Faculty within the specialty areas plan curriculum and often teach together. You are free to work in any specialty area as long as you meet the prerequisites for the program in which you are interested.<sup>24</sup>

An Evergreen "Specialty Area" is not quite a "department." They have names like "Health and Human Services," "Political Economy and Social Change," "Native American Studies," "Environmental Studies." The faculty in each area often come



from a number of different disciplines, but the structure brings with it certain obligations and expectations. Faculty are expected to teach a certain number of years in one specialty area. Each specialty area has a "convener" (not exactly a department chair since these people have no budgetary authority) who is responsible for ensuring that the area offers an appropriate introductory program, a fair sampling of advanced programs, and can handle students in need of opportunities for individual study. Increasingly over the past several years, the specialty area conveners have been responsible for making a case to the academic deans for hiring new faculty members so that the area is adequately staffed. They have also been faced with pressures from the ranks of their own specialty area faculty to ensure some regularity in the introductory programs so that those teaching advanced material could be assured of some base of knowledge in their students.

In the early 1980s all the specialty areas were asked to prepare brochures on "Career Pathways" toward which study in each area led. So, for example, the "Health and Human Services" area published a two-page document that listed three "Career Pathways" for those studying in this area. People could get on a "Health Sciences" track by taking inorganic and organic chemistry, "Foundations of Natural Science," "Matter and Motion," and "The Aesthetics of Healing." "Students in [the Human Services] pathway take the program 'Human Health and Behavior'" and then select from other programs in this area or other areas. There are also instructions on how to prepare for a career in "Psychological Counseling." "Health and Human Services studies prepares you for graduate work in psychology, health services, social work, counseling, management, educations and community services. Careers can include counseling, community advocacy, program development and administration," says the brochure, illustrated with a couple of clichéd, open (read "helping") hands. The fact that a brochure could list programs that could be taken as a "track" eliminated much of the spontaneity that the earlier approach to the "curriculum" encouraged.

Not all of the specialty areas gave into such standardized ways of thinking about themselves. The "Native American Studies" Career Pathway brochure, for example, lists no careers. This specialty area, about which more below, published a two page piece that begins,

The Native American Studies area is concerned that students develop a sense of:

Identity  
 Group Identity  
 Personal Authority

All programs are presented from this viewpoint and examine our relationship to:

The Land  
 Others  
 Work  
 The unknown

The Native American Studies area operates from a philosophy that the educational needs of people are best conceived as reciprocal relationships involving communities, educational institutions and individuals. Native American communities are at the center of the Native American Specialty area.

And then the Career Pathway went on, in the spirit if not the expansiveness of the old "Class of ..." documents to name each faculty member and give a brief biography. It is this kind of resistance to the trend toward standardization and regularization of the curriculum that puts the changes in the rest of the college in such high relief.

In retrospect, the step from a college with no set curriculum to a college with an orderly, relatively predictable curriculum was a short one. The first dean hired from outside the ranks the College's faculty was hired to oversee the curriculum. She remained in office for twelve years, the longest term served by any dean at the College. When she left office, the call for nominations to replace her took it as a commonplace that this dean "has primary responsibility for organizing and implementing the curriculum." The nature of the change is clear. The original faculty of the college had, in effect, rejected the very idea of a curriculum. They had accepted a few structures within which teaching and, they hoped, learning would occur. Now the College has a regular curricular structure that is different from but not wholly unlike the structures at other institutions.

Certainly, teaching and learning at Evergreen is different from teaching and learning at many universities and colleges. But just as certainly the arena in which teaching and learning occurs at Evergreen has changed. As an indication of that change, compare these two excerpts, the first from the College Bulletin of 1973-74, the second from the 1989-90 Student Handbook:

1973-74:

...In order to keep abreast of the changing world and to capitalize quickly on our experience, ... our academic programs include their own self-destruct mechanisms. Although we certainly retain our concern for the immense and significant problems implied by our programs now being studied, we have committed ourselves to critically modifying each year the ways in which we attack these issues. Thus, as the current academic year unfolds, we're busy planning for the new programs we will offer in 1973-74.<sup>25</sup>

Plans for Coordinated Studies programs are formulated by faculty members. The next series of proposals for year-long programs will be formulated and submitted during the winter quarter, 1972-73. After a proposal has been approved, each team designs its own program, makes its own experiments in curriculum design and teaching, arrives at its own agreements for governance, and evaluates its own effectiveness. The team asks for a mandate and gets it. It is up to the team to use its resources, its energy, and its mandate to do something memorable and something significant.<sup>26</sup>

1989-90:

Planning the curriculum begins nearly two years in advance of the academic year in which it is offered. Several months before the planning retreat, faculty within specialty areas begin to assess curriculum needs and who will be available to teach. Informal discussion begin about teaching teams, and ideas for program themes are born. Then, in the spring, faculty go on a short retreat at which they formalize the curriculum plans for the year after the upcoming academic year. The curriculum planning process is long and complex. Not all proposals are accepted. In making overall curriculum decisions the deans must consider faculty resources, balance and other factors.<sup>27</sup>

On the one hand, the faculty is concerned with being responsive to the world and to its own experience. On the other, the faculty is concerned about being two-years ahead in planning. On the one hand, the aim is to use a mandate from the college to present something memorable and significant. On the other, the process is long and complex and the considerations go to concerns about resources and balance. On the one hand, it is a collective "we" who are busy planning, critically modifying and presenting material. On the other, it is the deans who are making overall curriculum decisions. There is no question that Evergreen now has the stability that a well-managed curriculum can provide. There is a question of whether something in the nature of collegiality is lost in that gain.

Sanctity: "Multiculturalism" and "Diversity" as Planning Concepts

The coming of a curriculum to Evergreen may have undermined the basis for collegiality. But there remained cracks in the structures, cracks in which collegiality between or among people who were different but equal could become the driving force of teaching and learning. In the late 1980s a new and, in our view, more substantial threat to collegiality appeared. Instead of viewing the various kinds of differences (in knowledge, in experience, in training, in background) on a faculty team as an essential resource that might prove useful as a program pursued its thematically organized questions, something called "diversity" appeared on the curricular scene as a scarce resource. "Diversity" in a teaching team became one of those "other factors" the academic managers called deans took into consideration in formulating and balancing the curriculum. "Multiculturalism" became a "planning concept" around which programs for the promotion and protection of the scarce resource called "diversity" would be organized. Evergreen, like other schools of its time, boarded the multiculturalism bandwagon and made "multiculturalism" into the principal agenda item of the whole college and the organizing axis for structuring the curriculum. Concerns about social justice and about differential suffering across race, gender and class divides that had informed (via the life-long commitments of faculty to these concerns) teaching and learning at Evergreen since its founding gave way to a concern for developing a new liturgy called "multiculturalism" that would legitimate the use of scarce resources and that would sanctify the actions of those recognized as the elect.

That the College had, from its inception, a commitment to studying social justice and to including issues of race, class and gender in its programs is undeniable. The excerpt from the program description for "Learning about Learning" made it clear that students would be expected to think about cultural factors in learning. Many of the autobiographical profiles written by faculty members for "The Class of '72" included statements of concern about cultural and economic differences. One person, a member of the Colville tribe, wrote about the "things that move me profoundly":

Attending medicine dances; hearing the graveside Indian death chants; listening to tribal elders--from all tribes--speak; they are our historians, our orators, our story tellers, our philosophers and our educators; they truly know what life is all about; among them I am humble, although I am arrogantly proud of being an Indian.

A man wrote, "My living taught me more, infinitely more, than my 'education' ever did. My blackness was and is a fundamental aspect of my experience." He concluded his statement with something about the nature of his commitments and concerns about human survival generally, about his concern that "unless man fundamentally altered his institutions, any kind of survival that mattered was impossible," and about his ambivalence "about the likelihood of his doing that." Another person introduced herself by saying, "Part of my role these days is to do a lot of thinking about women, necessarily about myself as a woman."

While many of the faculty shared common concerns about social justice, differential privilege and world peace, there was no standardized idiom in which they expressed those concerns. There seemed to be an implicit notion that once these people of obvious differences got together, something might happen that would lead each to a better understanding of the problems he or she faced. As the faculty member who was ambivalent about the prospects for "a kind of survival that matters" put it,

the great stone has to be pushed back up the hill yet again. So I had to come to Evergreen.

I came here to teach and to learn in hopes that I'd find others, regardless of rank or title, who were like-minded. So far, I've managed to find some of them, and I expect to find more. If they and I stop finding each other, if the lightning goes, so will I.

Parenthetically, we should note that he had to do his searching and finding among a diverse group of faculty. Of the 96 faculty members in "The Class of '72," 21 were women, 16 were what we would call today People of Color (and five were in both categories). For the time, the faculty of the college was remarkably diversified across the categories that now matter.

We do not know if the "lightning" of the place has gone, but the orientation to faculty finding one another has been superseded by another concern. This is how a memo titled "Strategic Planning Statement: Multicultural Diversity" issued by the College's Planning Council put one of the "Issues/Concerns" that informed the new debate about "diversity":

Cultural studies need to be organized into identifiable segments of the curriculum in order for prospective students to find them, and in order to provide the support that a separate community of learning can provide. On the other hand, cultural issues should be critical to the whole curriculum. These appear to be conflicting needs.<sup>28</sup>

Now the task is to establish structures that will enable students to find courses of study and "support," not to allow faculty to find one another. The only question is what kind of structure is best suited to that simpler, managerial task. The only conflict is with the wish that cultural studies would become a global good, not something "located" somewhere in particular. The problem is how to plan for structures that will permit the proper people to find the proper resources at the proper time.

The principal resource to be managed in the new economy of planning is "diversity." Another concern heard by the Planning Council was that

Individuals need to be able to find support from others who share similar experiences, issues and problems. Sometimes that support is hard to find because there is no organized location for it, because there is not yet enough cultural diversity in the community, because the time of people of color is spread too thin over a wide range of campus activities where their representation is needed and because there is some resistance to activities which can be interpreted as "separatist."<sup>29</sup>

That is a packed statement. Now people of color are "representatives" whose representation "is needed" in many arenas of the campus. It is not a question of whether we would like to have people on the campus who are different from those already here; the question is whether there is enough "diversity," a statistical concept that detracts one's attention from the people who constitute the faculty as a whole. In 1990 there was no precise analog to "The Class of '72," but there was a listing of faculty in "The Evergreen Student Handbook." Of the 180 faculty members named there, 51 are women, 32 are People of Color (and 12 people are in both categories).<sup>\*</sup> There has not been a dramatic change in the statistical "diversity" of the faculty over the past eighteen years. But there has been a dramatic change in the rhetoric with which the issue is addressed. The Planning Council worried about the fact that there is little agreement on the campus about the definition of this new notion, "diversity." "The danger," the Council editorialized, "is that 'diversity' becomes whatever

---

<sup>\*</sup> This is not a scientific accounting of the situation at the College. Many people listed in the "Handbook" are visitors or people on leave. Neither of these categories were heavily represented in "The Class of '72." But we do not wish to pretend to scientific accuracy. That would only invite scientific rebuttal and debate about "the facts." Such debates are a symptom of the new economy of planning in which we are called to exist as faculty members at Evergreen. This, we remind the reader, is a report on a conversation and we offer this impressionistic "data" as something we talk to one another about.

the speaker wishes it to be, or whatever is least threatening, and that it becomes, therefore, meaningless as a planning concept."<sup>30</sup>

This "planning concept" has broad implications for the organization of the college. The Planning Council said that, as a College, "we are attempting to establish a new world view. Such an undertaking is a long and arduous process demanding an expenditure of significant mental, physical, emotional and financial resources."<sup>31</sup> The Provost, in 1990, charged the faculty

to act--not just talk but act--on its own declaration of last spring that inter-culturalism is its own agenda.... The faculty needs to bring into existence immediately a planning process, the membership and charge of which is such that all faculty and students and staff at Evergreen are convinced that this is a serious intellectual and pedagogical and communal commitment. Faculty of color in particular need to be convinced that this is a serious commitment.<sup>32</sup>

The life commitments expressed on blank pages filled with faculty members' autobiographical sketches are, apparently, not sufficient evidence of "commitment" anymore; commitment must be marked through the establishment of a "planning process." And the whole process must be subject to public approval; especially must the process receive the approval of those who are the raw material behind the new scarce resource in the planning arena.

Two proposals that surfaced as the 1980s became the 1990s indicate the extensiveness of the financial commitment that this new notion of "diversity" commands. A report on International Studies at Evergreen calls for a commitment of 20%-30% of the entire faculty to an "International Studies Project." A new initiative of the Board of Trustees calls for spending \$1.5 million on a "Center for Multicultural Studies." These are not proposals for trivial "commitments" in a College with an annual budget of less than \$35 million. This is the kind of money that provokes fights in the academy; these stakes are not low.

Administrators seek to see new administrative initiatives that come under the rubric of "multi-culturalism" as continuous with past values of the College. Thus, a dean preparing a memo to justify the \$1.5 million expenditure for the "Center" wrote, "Evergreen's increasingly 'multi-cultural' curriculum can be seen as a development that has grown from a long-standing determination to make the curriculum more inclusive." He writes that "multiculturalism" is, in some important ways, just a new way of doing old business. He writes, "Where disciplinary difference was once the essential ingredient in the most inventive

programs, cultural difference has now become critical. Collaboration was, and is, modeled for students by cross-disciplinary conversation, but now collaboration is being modeled by cross-cultural conversation.<sup>33</sup> This reconstruction of the immediate past as smoothly continuous with the College's history ignores the fact that most faculty members came to the college, in part, out of a rejection of disciplines, out of a desire merely to find "like-minded" people willing to push big stones up steep hills yet again, but to do so together. The image one has of the early Evergreen is of a social place where different faculty members would meet with students to work on problems they felt they had in common. It is only from the vantage point of the present that the conversation that occurred then can be understood as being intended to model for students any sort of collaboration. People talked because they had to.

"Multiculturalism" seeks to structure a conversation. People might talk, but they are compelled to talk about the correct topic. In deciding how to spend some surplus summer money one year, the academic deans decided they would fund three kinds of activities: (1) "a series of two-week on-campus institutes on topics related to multicultural studies," (2) sending "teams of faculty to some conferences on multicultural issues," and (3) projects proposed by individual faculty members or groups of faculty members "to promote their professional development in the area of multicultural studies." Again, the dean justifying the "Multicultural Center" using the idiom of the modern manager:

Of course "multi-culturalism" isn't an event; it's a process, a way of extending the vision of what being well-educated encompasses. The term itself might someday be defined, and the definition might turn out to be useful. What we need, however, is less the definition than the conversation that the development of a definition could inspire.<sup>34</sup>

And, of course, to engage in this proper conversation, "Faculty need support to converse with one another outside the classroom.... Faculty need a period of intensive research and development on how better to take advantage of the intra-national and inter-national differences that already have been found to have such great potential in a radically inclusive curriculum and institution of higher education."<sup>35</sup> Hence, the \$1.5 million that will (probably) be spent on this major re-tooling of human resources.

It is difficult to find fault with such high-mindedness and bureaucratic good will. But we do not wish to find fault; we wish to try to suggest that multiculturalism, the planning concept, and diversity, the scarce resource,



structure the College in a way that undermines collegiality. In introducing his thoughts on multiculturalism, the Provost wrote in 1990,

We are as a faculty in a strained and fragile state. Many feel marginalized, confused, anxious, fearful about their jobs, and unwilling to take the risks which so rich an environment might under other circumstances invite. No group of faculty seems pleased with where we are.<sup>36</sup>

One faculty member said that she has heard faculty who are People of Color say that they are not able to work with her anymore because they have to "save themselves" for the students. "Some faculty of color have to spend so much time educating whites that they have little time left to teach and support students of color who need their mentoring."<sup>37</sup> But these symptoms seem to us to be the traces left by the effort, successful so far, of creating a curriculum that has its own demands (which now go principally under the name of multiculturalism) to which everyone must submit. People who must serve the needs of a curriculum--as opposed to engaging in a search for people who might help them in their quests--will be fragile, strained, confused, anxious. There is in a "curriculum"--as opposed to "like-minded colleagues"--nothing to grasp.

Bureaucratic structures turn people into resources that will serve the needs of the structure. People who are viewed as "human resources" can be (and will feel) used up by that which needs them. And they will not have the kinds of unstructured conversations that can occur when two people are pushing the same stone up the same hill; they will spend all of their time and energy (other scarce resources under this kind of economy) making sure they have found the right words for talking about the right things. They spend this time speaking and inculcating in others these ritualized words that make the College, if not the world, a more pure place, even if this means not being able to listen any more to others. One member of the faculty wrote in response to the report on international studies:

In our rush to adopt inter-culturalism as a program we will run the risk of no longer being able to hear the pain of those who suffer in the linguistic limbo created by being in classes and on a campus where only one culture is present, spoken, embodied. Think of it this way: Without a program, a curriculum, a Director, a staff, a budget, a . . . , I must listen to the student who says to me, "You talk differently than my grandmother. She once said . . . and I cannot understand you," and I am compelled by these words of suffering to struggle together with this student to find a common idiom that will link me with her with her grandmother so that education can proceed.

When we have a curriculum, a budget, a program, and a Director, I have an out. I can say (and the very existence of the program tempts me to say), (Bureaucratically:) "Grandmothers' Discourses is being offered next quarter; come back then," or (Therapeutically:) "Yes, of course, I speak only my culture; others speak the cultures of their grandmothers; perhaps you would be more comfortable in their classes," or (Negotiatingly:) "We should go see the Director; he can be the intermediary/therapist/negotiator between us; after all, neither of us wants conflict, and perhaps we will find a way to better communicate with one another; and wouldn't that be education!" In our rush to embrace good ideas for solving difficult problems we may lose our capacity to appreciate our common lot of suffering which enables us to listen to everyone, not just those who speak like us, and which enables us to imagine good education.

Once the open space of the social encounter that can develop around "our common lot of suffering" is filled up by curricular structures, once the conversations with no aim (but with the purpose of hearing an other) give way to conversations aimed at formulating definitions, once enduring and difficult problems admit bureaucratic "solutions," the very basis for an education through collegial teaching is undermined, if not lost.

One member of the faculty finally became tired of the casual but deadly serious way in which "multiculturalism" was being invoked with all the ritual that can come to surround any mystery like "culture" and with all the threats that can accompany ritualized behavior. After a withering attack on the way racially based or imperially imposed terms ("African-American," "Arab") were being invoked in the name of purifying our discussions of contamination from racially loaded terms, he wrote (in the campus newspaper),

It has always been an essential and conspicuous part of Evergreen's predominant political culture that a relatively small but disproportionately vocal and influential group of moral/political guardians has roamed the College seeking the ruin of the Incorrect. And their standards of Correctitude have in recent years become increasingly stringent and more finely calibrated. I have tried to show in the foregoing [analysis of the use of "multiculturalism"] that one of the results of this hyperinflation of the discourse of Correctitude is that the resulting rococo terminology lapses, under the weight of its own convolution, into self-defeating incoherence. It is as if your home thermostat were calibrated to a hundredth of a degree. This kind of exactitude is vicious, as it would make of our furnace an impossible object: it would turn off as soon as it turned on, and it would turn on as soon as it turned off. Similarly, the increasing refinements in the prevailing discourse of Righteousness is incoherent and racist in the name of ... anti-racism!

This criticism is on target if the "discourse" is taken to be an essentially rational one. But this writer knew very well that criticizing the rhetoric that developed around "multiculturalism, the planning concept" for being convoluted is like criticizing any religious ritual for being convoluted. This "discourse" was developing in the way a religious language develops. "Multiculturalism" is a liturgy that has its own altars (at which a tribute of 20-30% of the faculty, or \$1.5 million is to be paid) with their own guardians who know the right ritualistic words to invoke to protect the mysteries. And, indeed, the writer was taken to task for missing the point entirely, as, it seems, the non-elect always must. A rebuttal in the College newspaper argued, essentially, that racism is the result of the invention, in the nineteenth century, of the concept of "race" as a way of talking about color differences. Racism is not the result of the existence, in truth, of races. So People of Color say there can be racism without, in fact, there being any such thing as race. In a college, both arguments could be correct and the disputants could become discussants and, maybe, colleagues. In a religious world, this kind of argument demands sacrifices. It is no wonder faculty members are anxious.

The Provost of Evergreen concluded his overview of the College's administrative efforts to improve "diversity" by saying, "Some have observed that the issue is like that of perceiving the glass of water as half-empty or half-full. I do not see it that way."<sup>38</sup> Like any good administrator, he wanted to think about what the state of affairs ought to look like in the future (as the Planning Council put it, "What do we want the College community to 'look like' in the year 2010?"<sup>39</sup>), and then he wanted to think about the resources that would have to be mustered and the programs that would have to be implemented to get from here to there. He wanted to protect the water in the glass and, if possible, add more, because you never know how much you are going to "need" when you start down this future-oriented path. Nowhere in this kind of thinking is there room for using what you have to respond to humanly felt problems in the present, for using the stuff in the glass to slake a thirst. Holy water has its rules for use and can only be used in the context of a properly sanctified structure.

Assurance: Giving in to Assessment

Those who are sanctified nevertheless sometimes need assurance. During the late 1980s Evergreen jumped on board another bandwagon that was rolling through institutions of higher education, the assessment bandwagon. Again, there are reasons for the College having embarked on a large assessment project (many of which have to do with pressure from outside the College, most notably from the recently constituted Higher Education Coordinating Board), but, again, we are not interested in why the College has changed. We are interested in noting that it has changed.

When word came from administration that the College would have to engage in some formal assessment of its "product," there was a ripple of the old arrogance. "What we do is not suited to 'assessment,'" some people said with their noses ever so slightly upturned. When word came that all the institutions in the state would have to subject some of their students to standardized tests (and when the suggestion was made that it would not be unreasonable to link future funding of each institution to test results), there was a ripple of panic. Then there was communication among the schools in the state, organization among the administrations, and some months later Evergreen's administration came back to the faculty to announce, proudly, that they had saved the school from mindless, standardized evaluations and that they had struck a deal with the state's Coordinating Board that would allow each school to devise its own assessment scheme. This was greeted with more than a ripple of enthusiasm. Especially after the administration was able to secure from the state legislature a non-trivial sum of money dedicated specifically to assessment projects, many faculty members became committed to telling the "Evergreen story" to anyone or any institutional authority that expressed any kind of interest.

Assessment of students at Evergreen had been structured very much like evaluation of faculty. Faculty members placed themselves before a blank piece of paper and filled that paper with their thoughts about a student's achievements. In some programs, faculty members wrote "letters of reflection" to their students mid-way through a program or at quarter breaks. These letters of reflection were informal evaluations in which faculty members tried to encourage those who needed it, tweak the better students to superior work and, in general, to find the words that would make the program "memorable" and

"significant" for each student. End-of-program evaluations were formal evaluations. They became, along with program descriptions, parts of each student's formal, college transcript. Some faculty wrote evaluations that had a "boiler-plate" quality to them. Others wrote letters to the student that were not unlike the informal letters of reflection. Others wrote individualized, third-person accounts of what the student had done in the program. Richard Jones, worried that he was writing something for an audience he did not know, wrote letters to a student's next instructor and told that instructor what to expect from this student based on his or her work in the previous year. The blank page could be filled however the faculty member chose to fill it.\* The only constraint placed on the faculty member was that failures could not be formally noted. The faculty adopted the practice of including in the transcript only assessments of the work actually completed. In addition to the faculty member's evaluation of a student, each student had the opportunity to include a "self evaluation" in his or her college transcript. The student also faced a blank page and filled it however he or she chose.

Under this system, there was no concern for what is called in an economy of planning "summative evaluation." There were no grade-point averages to calculate, since there were no grades. There were no class ranks to be awarded, since there was no dimension for ranking. There was not even an academic major recorded on a student's diploma that would confer the kind of rank that is culturally associated with the various disciplines. Once students accumulated 180 credits (the total of those "damned equivalencies" at the bottom of each evaluation), they were awarded degrees and excused from the college at the next commencement.

Assessment, as that term has come to be understood in higher education, requires summative evaluation. Evergreen committed itself to assessment, first, in its "Strategic Plan," a planning document adopted by the College on August 7, 1986. The plan called for the development of "an evaluation system which provides us with systematic evidence about the effects of an Evergreen education

---

\* Legend, and perhaps fact, has it that one faculty member included in each evaluation an appropriately chosen, instructive toy. He broke even the bounds imposed by the blank page. He subsequently normalized his behavior.

and which challenges us to remain committed to student outcomes which are consistently excellent." The rationale for this said,

we need to subject our impressions [of students' development of skills] to documentation because such documentation will assist us in refining our programs, as well as informing others of their effectiveness. Documented knowledge of the effectiveness of our teaching strategies will help the State Legislature and the Higher Education Coordinating Board, both of which are increasingly concerned about educational outcomes, to understand the sources of effectiveness in our style of education. For ourselves, we need continually to sort out those practices that are most effective and those new directions that we should develop.<sup>40</sup>

This kind of rhetoric--brutally planning-oriented rhetoric--takes us a long way from a college in which teaching teams requested and received from the College a mandate to do something memorable and significant. This kind of rhetoric says that the only thing worth remembering is that which will help one refine the future, and the only thing that is significant is that which can be documented in a way that responds to agencies that are "increasingly concerned about educational outcomes." This is the first time that the College had been concerned about the "excellence" of "student outcomes." In the past it had been concerned about teaching and learning, and when a student left the College with a thick transcript full of pages filled by faculty members and by the students themselves, that was that. The student was gone and the faculty was left behind to teach and learn again.

The scheme proposed by the Strategic Plan was rigorously concerned about the future effects of present actions. To the extent that it was implemented, this scheme would create a situation in which everyone would have to think carefully about the future in every choice of teaching scheme or teaching material he or she made. Faculty members would not be free to "keep abreast of the changing world and ... capitalize quickly on our own experience." The assessment scheme cast a long shadow of future "student outcomes" over present teaching efforts and faculty were left to titrate ("continually to sort out those practices that are most effective ...") their teaching methods in response to the demands of "documented knowledge."

To assess "student outcomes," the Strategic Plan called on the officers of the College to

Seek planning funds to develop an evaluation system that will:

1. Determine the effects of our programs on our alumni (our outcome measure).

2. Generate information that compares them with alumni from similar colleges and universities.
3. Develop a component to the system that will examine our processes for their effects on our current students as well as alumni.
4. Continue to cooperate with the Outcome Assessment project of the Washington State Center for the Improvement of the Quality of Undergraduate Education.
5. Continue high quality program reviews involving the institutional Curriculum Review Team, external visitors and cooperation with the Higher Education Coordinating Board.
6. Develop a faculty and administrative exchange program with Alverno College, the institution which has developed the most expertise in the evaluation of liberal education.<sup>41</sup>

The old arrogance of the College was gone. While the College had participated in external reviews and prepared internal documents for accreditation teams, this scheme institutionalized external comparison, the acceptance of external standards for assessment and cooperation with external institutions in the formulation of internal practices. The wall that Evergreen had erected around itself was breached by the assessment scheme.

The scheme that eventually developed, with the help of many faculty at the institution was handsomely funded and had many facets. The administration secured \$140,000 to do assessment. This was about the same amount available for all other "sponsored research" projects proposed by the faculty and was by far the largest pot of money available to faculty for designated work. One group of people seized on the cognitive development model of William Perry, began doing overall assessments of student development, and made comparisons between Evergreen students and students at other colleges and universities collecting similar data. Others began planning the administration of various psychological measures to selected groups of students. The Office of Educational Research hired an ethnographer to write about the College with an anthropologist's eye to provide a context for other assessments. Another group of faculty began a video project that included not only filming of classrooms and the compiling of Alverno-inspired video logs of student achievements, but also filming of a critical discussion of the overall assessment project held at an all-faculty retreat. It is a sure sign that you are participating in an economy of planning when criticism of a project becomes part and parcel of the project itself.

One of the most curious projects proposed under the assessment umbrella sought to bring the old blank-page approach to assessment into the new economy

of planning. In a memo to the Assessment Study Group (November 1, 1989) two administrators proposed collecting "student portfolios" for assessment purposes. A "student portfolio" used to consist of all evaluations written by and of a student, all letters of reflection, and significant pieces of the student's work. In the early days of Evergreen, students carried this material in red vinyl brief cases. Faculty members would often ask to see a student's portfolio before admitting the student to a program. The cost of keeping a "portfolio" was \$2.50 for the vinyl brief case and a little effort from the student to make sure that all the right papers got put into it. Now, for the assessment project, two administrators were proposing the expenditure of just under \$40,000 to collect portfolios on 50 students, to store those portfolios in the Office of Institutional Research, and to analyze them. Part of the justification for this undertaking was this: "National and regional assessment meetings increasingly reflect a growing disillusionment with standardized tests. Among the major criticisms of standardized tests is the absence of a clear connection with the curriculum."<sup>42</sup> In one stroke, this proposal makes a commonplace out of something that was, for so many years at Evergreen, disputed territory, the "curriculum." But it did so in terms that are completely acceptable under an economy of planning. Collect data under the assertion that the collection effort has a "clear connection" to something, the curriculum in this instance, that was rejected at the outset of the endeavor. Then, of course, the thing to which the collection effort is connected must exist, or must be made to exist. In the name of doing one good thing (collecting "documented knowledge"), we get another good thing (the stability of a curriculum). The pieces of the new economy are neatly sewn together. The whole begins to make sense on its own terms and the past becomes very hard to re-member.

There is one sector of the College that stands in contrast to this rush to assess in summative terms. The Native American Studies Program is a part of the College that, as one faculty member put it, "called Evergreen's bluff." Assessment, like teaching and learning in this Program, remains student-centered, student-driven, and difficult to aggregate. Learning is cumulative, while evaluation is holistic but non-summative. In the major program in this specialty area, students are asked to give their answers to four questions:

What do I want to learn?

How do I plan to learn it?



How will I know that I have learned it?

What difference will it make?

There are no right answers for these questions. Students are asked, simply, to answer them authoritatively. They become a matter of discussion between student and faculty, but faculty are obliged to accept a student's answers to these questions as the student's answers. These questions and the student's answers then become the basis for assessment throughout the program. Institutional assessment that has an external orientation always has implicit in it a "No" that it speaks to students. "No, you don't know that." "No, you have not progressed up the cognitive development scale, despite what you might think." "No, you have not achieved good student outcomes." "You are not the authority you think you are." No matter how nice and unpunishing an institutional assessment scheme is, it always holds a "No" in reserve. The Native American Studies Program begins by saying "Yes" to students and it persists in its "Yes." It accepts students' various definitions of what might constitute learning for each of them in the circumstances they find themselves. It accepts their answers to those four questions. When teaching and learning begins with a "Yes" and concludes with an evaluation of a student's achievements, the students will never hear a "No" and their learning will never be brought into an economy of planning.

Of course there are administrative efforts to bring this part of the college under the planning umbrella. The College's self-study report, prepared for its second ten-year accreditation, said of the area,

...the program has been very successful in providing a vehicle for independent work that allows for self determination by students. It has not been as successful in recent years in providing a vehicle for helping Native American students move into the on-campus curriculum, nor has it been the locus for a great deal of teaching about Native American cultures.... There has been a significant resurgence of interest in the area in the past three years and it is being seen as an important locus for the college's efforts to become more meaningfully multicultural. To take full advantage of this interest the area will need to emphasize its value to the campus as a cultural center, not simply as an alternative pedagogy.<sup>43</sup>

So far, the area has resisted the demand that it "emphasize its value..." that it contribute directly to some college-wide agenda of multiculturalism, that it teach about Native cultures (one of the founders of the area emphasized that this was a place for Native people to study, not a place for them to be

studied), that it get on the bandwagon that will allow it to assess the quality of its products alongside everyone else.

Is this kind of resistance useful? We think it is important. In another context, Wolfgang Sachs has written about the way in which the Planning Discourse sooner or later sounds "the wailing sirens" of a "kind of lifeboat ethics." In the name of survival (in the face of the State Legislature or the Higher Education Coordinating Board, or in the face of our own lack of assurance about the value of our educational endeavor), we have embraced an economy of planning that aims to penetrate every crevasse of the College in order to refine it, improve it, to make it aim for excellence. Writing of the ecology and development movements, Sachs said, "An ecocracy which acts in the name of 'one earth' and aims to get the world out of its criminal rut and make it fighting fit can soon become a threat to local communities and their lifestyles." In a similar way, an economy of planning in higher education that is driven by an obsession with assessment of the excellence of student outcomes, and with an eye toward making students fighting fit for the world they live in, threatens to root out any truly educational alternative that might otherwise find its way into an institution of higher education. Sachs asks, "How is it possible to reinvent economic institutions that allow people to live gracefully without making them prisoners of the pernicious drive to accumulate?" He concludes that, perhaps, among the peoples of the Third World there is some creativity that will be useful to this end because, "in spite of everything, many people there still remember a way of life in which economic performance was not paramount."<sup>44</sup> We would ask if it is possible to reinvent educational institutions that would allow people to teach and learn gracefully without making them prisoners of the pernicious drive to be "excellent" according to today's standard? And we would conclude that perhaps it is in little pockets like the Native American Studies Program that there remains some hope, simply because some people there remember a way of educating in which learning was paramount and assessable performance was not.

#### Summary: Characterizing the Change

In all these aspects of the college there has been a similar movement. In faculty evaluation, in the curriculum, in the assessment of students, there has been a move away from the blank page toward the well-structured, even the

ritualistically structured, page. Taking our cue from this movement, we are ready to essay a characterization of the overall change of The Evergreen State College that, we think, has resulted in a Schwund.

In its early years Evergreen had many of the characteristics of a ghetto. It was well bounded, poor, often under siege; it sheltered those who were in a distinct minority with regard to the dominant "culture" of higher education; it had its own internal language and practices; and it had a kind of arrogant vitality. The College had its own ethos, a term that classically referred to a dwelling or a specific place that called on its inhabitants to practice a certain stewardship with regard to it. Now the College is a fairly well structured, bureaucratically managed space. It is manifestly part of the higher education system of the state and, as such, it is concerned about its public image, with managing communications across its interfaces with the rest of the system. It is an ethical space, if we may use that word "ethical" in its most modern sense that involves the proper drawing of proper lines that keeps everyone in their places within a well-managed space.

"Ghetto" is an apt term to characterize the early years of Evergreen. The first college-wide assembly one of us ever attended (in 1981) had the College's president, later U.S. Senator Dan Evans, telling the convocation that there was yet another bill in the state legislature proposing to close the college. "But," he said, "unlike previous bills, this one has the backing of some Democrats, so it is more serious." The College had gotten so used to being attacked that the president had to remind people to take an attack seriously. Because of its image as an "alternative college" and because of low enrollment in the early years, there was constant speculation in the nearby state capitol about turning the place into a State Patrol training academy or, simply, about using the buildings to house the expanding state bureaucracy. The place was always under siege. Aiding the development of a siege mentality was the near-starvation budget allocated to the College. There was no separate budget for "sponsored research" or "faculty development." Program secretaries were shared among 20 or so faculty members. There were very few material resources to cause conflicts. All of the conflicts of the College were with "the outside." There was the legislature, of course, but there was the rest of higher education as a convenient "enemy" as well. One of the most common forms of discussion at Evergreen until very recently was about the way Evergreen differed from "Brand X

University." This language that cast all other institutions of higher education into a melting pot was very useful for building a sense of internal unity, as long as it was heard only internally. Evergreen is the only place where either author has been interviewed by a college-wide hiring committee. One author commented to the group that it was clear that this group thought of themselves as a hiring filter and that they gave the impression that their primary task was to allow only the right sort of people to come over the wall to join them.

As with any ghetto, Evergreen had its own ethos. Even though many of the teaching practices of the College were similar to what you might encounter elsewhere, you could taste the place. There was an audacity, a spirited, playful seriousness, a respect-full impertinence that we became part of when we came to this place.

Now, like the space of the blank page of evaluations, the place has become structured. Small managerial details that left major marks on faculty members' psyches started to appear in the 1980s. Faculty members were sent computerized records of their long-distance phone calls. Scheduling of programs had to be forced into a block scheduling scheme.\* A "Faculty/Staff Lounge" was installed (after a debate about whether it should be just a "Faculty Lounge") so that one could lunch with one's own kind. "Security" became a fashionable concern\*\* and the College seems to take a perverse pleasure in fighting with other state agencies over whether we should have a Security Force or a Police Force. There is a curriculum. There are schemes for accountability. The deans make sure that everything is balanced. And the College pretty much seems to run itself.

---

\* With the one dramatic effect that no longer would everyone at the College have the same lunch hour.

\*\* There are still some humorous aspects about Evergreen, but not everyone gets the jokes. The President commissioned a study of "security" on campus. A long questionnaire about what makes people "insecure" was formulated, distributed, analyzed and written up. What makes people feel most insecure? Not lack of security lighting. Not the "indecent exposure" incidents on the path to the beach that get regularly reported to the campus community. Not drugs or drink in the dorms. The cause of the greatest sense of insecurity was the red brick square that gets powerfully slippery in the incessant winter rains. As with any datum collected in a serious way in a planning economy this one had immediate effects. Some of the red bricks were ton up. Non-slip concrete pathways were installed across the square on the statistically most frequently traveled courses. Even walking on campus is becoming more structured. But we are more secure.

The new Evergreen is now a resource-full place. Every member of the faculty was issued a personal computer and printer. The third President established a large pot of money for "sponsored research." (This at a college whose rules, even still, prohibit consideration of research and publications in a reappointment decision.) Enrollment soared in the late 1980s to the point that the Admissions Office closed its doors to applicants who did not submit their applications earlier than seven months before the beginning of the next academic year. New pots of money to sponsor conferences and institutes (on, for example, "multi-culturalism" and "gender issues") appeared and faculty found that they did not have to teach summer school to keep their bankers happy. Faculty who were, by the new situation in which they found themselves, invited to spend more time writing proposals to get more money from the academic money managers necessarily had less time to spend finding "like-minded folks" to talk to. "Talking to" turned into "talking about." And people found they could get paid for "talking about."

Evergreen was founded as an unethical institution. We use that term in the strictly modern sense where "ethics" means the placing of boundaries of propriety. We use that term descriptively, somewhat pejoratively, but not normatively. We mean only that at Evergreen's founding there were very few boundaries that told people the proper, ethical limits of their actions. There were none of the usual institutional categories to tell people who they were. This is just another way to say that people had to face the problem of inventing ways of talking to one another, of "finding the code." We suggest that Evergreen has gradually become an ethical institution. That is, the College has erected many of the usual university boundaries and structures by which people come to know who they are and who everyone else is. This ethicality takes all the ambiguity out of our "relationships" with one another and lets us learn to "communicate effectively." And when we fail to communicate effectively, there are, on the one side, communication therapists and, on the other, masters of Correctitude ready to tell people how to communicate and what should be communicated about.

We think that it would be useful to remember that this modern trace from the "unethical" as a cleared place to the "ethical" as a properly delimited space is almost exactly the opposite of the trace from the ethical to the unethical as those terms were understood until roughly the middle of this century. Ethics

used to entail the clearing of a place into which human meaning could be projected. It involved the creation of an ethos. In our move toward becoming "ethical," we may have lost our ethos. The possibility for people to engage in collegial teaching may have evaporated like a lovely pond, unappreciated until the day when it is there no more.

The Admissions Office closed its doors to applicants who did not submit their applications earlier than seven months before the beginning of the next academic year. New pots of money to sponsor conferences and institutes (or, for example, "multi-culturalism" and "gender issues") appeared and faculty found that they did not have to teach summer school to keep their bankers happy. Faculty who were, by the new situation in which they found themselves, invited to spend more time writing proposals to get more money from the academic money managers necessarily had less time to spend finding "like-minded folks" to talk to. "Talking to" turned into "talking about." And people found they could get paid for "talking about."

Evergreen was founded as an unethical institution. We use that term in the strictly modern sense where "ethics" means the placing of boundaries of propriety. We use that term descriptively, somewhat pejoratively, but not normatively. We mean only that at Evergreen's founding there were very few boundaries that told people the proper, ethical limits of their actions. There were none of the usual institutional categories to tell people who they were. This is just another way to say that people had to face the problem of inventing ways of talking to one another, of "finding the code." We suggest that Evergreen has gradually become an ethical institution. That is, the College has erected many of the usual university boundaries and structures by which people come to know who they are and who everyone else is. This ethicality takes all the ambiguity out of our "relationships" with one another and lets us learn to "communicate effectively." And when we fail to communicate effectively, there are, on the one side, communication therapists and, on the other, masters of Correctitude ready to tell people how to communicate and what should be communicated about.

We think that it would be useful to remember that this modern trace from the "unethical" as a cleared place to the "ethical" as a properly delineated space is almost exactly the opposite of the trace from the ethical to the unethical as those terms were understood until roughly the middle of this century. Ethics

## CONCLUSION

Part II sounds a sustained note which is bleak, and may, to some, be an invitation to despair. Moreover, it invites the critique that the very collegiality of this writing project refutes the claim that collegiality is no longer possible at Evergreen (a claim we would never make). Part I, on the other hand, sounds an enthusiastic note, and may, to some be motivating and exciting. It would be easy to read these two sections as voicing opposing sides to a debate about the nature of our college.

We urge you not to read them this way. We each wrote them both, and we each find our experiences mirrored in both sections. Both sections describe one and the same institution.

One of us recently wrote a public letter in response to a memo about the presidential search process in which he invoked the spirit and language of John Dewey to argue that

we need to be thinking about our future in the language of aims, not as 'things to be accomplished'; moreover, our aims are not things we sit around and choose--they are already inherent in our practice and our history. It is crucial that we become aware of them and that we act intelligently by means of them--but we do ourselves damage if we imagine that we sit around in a vacuum at any moment and 'choose' them.<sup>45</sup>

We would like this essay to be read as an attempt to articulate some of the aims of our historical practice at Evergreen, and, at the same time, some of the impersonal "aims" of that historical drift which seems inevitably to move modern bureaucratic institutions. The question that faces us is whether we can direct our own practice intelligently enough by means of our own aims so that we continue to resist the currents as defined by modern institutions of education (including our own). To say "continue" implies that Evergreen began by resisting such currents, a claim which is both debatable and optimistic. But let it stand. That debate is not worth having. What is worth doing now is self-consciously recovering the aims which have guided us in our best moments and vigorously resisting the institution's tendency to smother them. To do this, we must recognize that each of us carries the institutions' tendencies within us; at least half the struggle will take place within ourselves. We will need to separate within our own thinking and feeling what is "rational," what is "fair," and what is "inevitable" from what we know to be important and worth preserving. In our own struggles to effect this separation, we have discovered that our most important experiences, those most worth preserving, have arisen

out of what we here have called "collegial teaching."

Part II sounds a sustained note which is bleak, and may, to some, be an invitation to despair. Moreover, it invites the critique that the very collegiality of this writing project refutes the claim that collegiality is no longer possible at Evergreen (a claim we would never make). Part I, on the other hand, sounds an enthusiastic note, and may, to some be motivating and exciting. It would be easy to read these two sections as voicing opposing sides to a debate about the nature of our college.

We urge you not to read them this way. We each wrote them both, and we each find our experiences mirrored in both sections. Both sections describe one and the same institution.

One of us recently wrote a public letter in response to a memo about the presidential search process in which he invoked the spirit and language of John Dewey to argue that

we need to be thinking about our future in the language of aims, not as 'things to be accomplished'; moreover, our aims are not things we sit around and choose--they are already inherent in our practice and our history. It is crucial that we become aware of them and that we act intelligently by means of them--but we do ourselves damage if we imagine that we sit around in a vacuum at any moment and 'choose' them.<sup>25</sup>

We would like this essay to be read as an attempt to articulate some of the aims of our historical practice at Evergreen, and, at the same time, some of the imperious "aims" of that historical drift which seems inevitably to move modern bureaucratic institutions. The question that faces us is whether we can direct our own practice intelligently enough by means of our own aims so that we continue to resist the currents as defined by modern institutions of education (including our own). To say "continue" implies that Evergreen began by resisting such currents, a claim which is both debatable and optimistic. But let it stand. That debate is not worth having. What is worth doing now is self-consciously recovering the aim which have guided us in our past moments and vigorously resisting the institution's tendency to another aim. To do this, we must recognize that each of us carries the institution's tendencies within us; at least half the struggle will take place within ourselves. We will need to separate within our own thinking and feeling what is "rational," what is "fair," and what is "inevitable" from what we know to be important and worth preserving. In our own struggles to effect this separation, we have discovered that our most important experiences, those most worth preserving, have arisen



## NOTES

1. Allan Bloom, The Closing of the American Mind, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987, p. 299.
2. France, Peter, "Introduction," Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Reveries of The Solitary Walker, New York, N.Y.: Penguin, 1979, p. 15.
3. Arendt, Hannah, The Human Condition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958, p. 8.
4. Hill, Patrick, Memorandum on Faculty Evaluation, The Evergreen State College, Olympia, Washington, October 6, 1987, p. 13.
5. Ibid., p. 14.
6. The Evergreen State College 1984 Faculty Handbook, sec. 4.3000, pp. 1-2, WAC 174-128-050, since repealed.
7. The Evergreen State College 1988 Faculty Handbook, sec. 4.3000, p. 1.
8. 1984 Faculty Handbook, sec. 4.3000, p. 2.
9. Ibid., p. 5.
10. Jones, Richard M., Experiment at Evergreen, Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1981.
11. 1984 Faculty Handbook, sec. 4.3000, p. 3.
12. Ibid., pp. 2-3.
13. Jones, Richard M., "Enjoying Evaluation," The Evergreen State College, n.d., p. 46.
14. 1988 Faculty Handbook, sec. 4.3000, p. 5.
15. Ibid., p. 8.
16. Ibid.
17. Memo from Chuck Pailthorp, December, 1989.
18. Jones, Richard, Experiment at Evergreen, op cit., p. 26.
19. Ibid., p. 21.
20. The Evergreen State College Bulletin, 1973-74, Olympia, Washington, pp. 29, 39, 42, 46.
21. Ibid., p. 100.

22. Jones, Richard, letter to Richard Alexander, November 28, 1977.
23. Ibid.
24. The Evergreen Student Handbook, 1989-1990, p. 13.
25. The Evergreen State College Bulletin 1973-74, p. 4.
26. Ibid. p. 120.
27. The Evergreen Student Handbook 1989-1990, p. 20.
28. "Draft--Strategic Planning Statement: Multicultural Diversity," The Evergreen State College, April 17, 1990, p. 4, emphasis added.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid., p. 2, emphasis added.
31. Ibid., p. 1.
32. Hill, Patrick, Memorandum to the Faculty on Multiculturalism, May 25, 1990., p. 11.
33. Pailthorp, Chuck, "Draft--Evergreen's Model of 'Multi-Culturalism,'" July 24, 1990, p. 3.
34. Ibid., p. 5.
35. Ibid., p. 6.
36. Hill, op. cit., p. 2.
37. Planning Council, op. cit., p. 3.
38. Hill, op. cit., p. 6.
39. Planning Council, op. cit., p. 5.
40. "Final Report of the Strategic Planning Council," The Evergreen State College, August 7, 1986, pp. 20-21.
41. Ibid., p. 21.
42. Memorandum to the Assessment Study Group, "Portfolio Project Proposal," November 1, 1989.
43. Memorandum from "Matt Smith for the Deans" to the faculty, "The Accreditation Report," January 5, 1990, p. 39.

44. Sachs, Wolfgang, "On the Archeology of the Development Idea: Six Essays," State College, PA: STS Program, Penn State University, November, 1989, pp. VI-7, IV-9.

45. Don Finkel, Memo to the Presidential Search Process DTF, February 8, 1991.