

Evaluation & Assessment Committee
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
January 5, 2024
Minutes

Attendees	College	Present (Y/N)
Warren Plugge, (Chair)	CEPS	Y
Sara Toto	COTS	Y
Nancy Pigeon	CB	Y
Lidia Anderson		N
Hope Amason	EC	Y
Toria Messinger	LIB	Y
Heather MacDonald Carchidi	CS	N
Junyuan Chen	CAH	Y

1. **Approval of December 1, 2023 minutes approved at**
2. **Approval of Agenda January 5, 2024 approved at 1:05 pm**
3. **Review/Update Status on Charges**
 - a. **EAC23-24.01 – primary charge we’ve been working on**
 - b. **EAC23-24.02 – still need to have code and bylaws to put into policy before creating survey**
 - c. **EAC23-24.03 – have discussed this and have asked EC to help us clarify terminology around diversity**
 - d. **EAC23-24.04 – Try to work on this during winter quarter – last year we talked about peer review process; the reports in 2010 and 2014 have been the primary documents on this; this is an important one to shield against issues related to SEOIs and bias**
 - e. **EAC23-24.05 – update RCM question to VBB language in survey – this should be a quick item**
 - f. **EAC23-24.06 – SEOI administrator still needs guidance on who can and should stay on the list of those who can view SEOIs**
 - g. **EAC23-24.07 – We need to work with DEI committee**
 - h. **EAC23-24.08 – Updating the President survey in the spring for next year; will use job description to help with this**
 - i. **EAC23-24.09 – conduct FS and EC assessment in the spring**
 - j. **EAC23-24.10 – Dean surveys in the spring**
 - k. **EAC23-24.11 – Review procedures manual for equity**
 - l. **EAC23-24.12 – Review procedures manual**
4. **EAC23-24.01 & 02 – Dean Meeting Results**
 - a. **Still need CAH dean**
 - b. **Library dean feedback**

1. Concern about the usability of the information that would be received when those assessing may not have information/understanding about the library dean role
 1. Missing out on library faculty – too few to evaluate in an anonymous manner
 2. Concern about asking faculty to comment on staff-specific questions
2. Looking for other ways to evaluate, like 360 (supervisors, peers, subordinates, and self evaluation)
 1. This might be a good option given the setup of the library system
 2. Might consider splitting up a survey to capture non-library faculty/staff perspectives and library faculty/staff
 3. Keep in mind requiring a 360 review would go outside the committee's purview (e.g., includes admin and potentially students)
3. Revise questions where language asks about faculty, staff, and students to just faculty since faculty are the only ones taking the survey
- c. CB dean feedback
 1. Very new to position and concern that being assessed so soon might be premature
- d. COTS dean feedback
 1. Overall, the survey is too long – especially when considering the number of surveys faculty will be taking in the spring
 2. Mentioned 360 reviews as helpful
 3. Liked the new mission/vision questions
 4. Suggested removing the question about the relationship between colleges because it's not something faculty/staff would know about
- e. CEPS dean feedback
 1. Provided some suggested revisions to several questions
 2. The relationship question should be removed
 3. Using the word inclusive with diversity or in place of diversity
- f. Need to ask EC about whether Yoshiko (Dean of UG studies) is assessed with a specific survey, but might encounter issues like with the library if focusing on faculty/staff working under Yoshiko
- g. Could run with a general survey for all deans this spring, but could pay particular attention to the feedback across those questions and seek to revise between the next two years
 1. 360 review would be a good way to supplement the surveys
- h. Remove the multiple-comment open-ended questions and place one in the back saying that the respondent has the option to provide any other thoughts/comments
- i. Need to consider that people may have indirectly learned/heard about their dean and that could influence how they respond and might lead to additional comments that are not necessarily accurate

1. Provide guidance within the instructions that consider your direct experiences with the dean – talking, observing them
2. Some of the questions have the word perceive in them and others do not, we may want to consider including the word perceive throughout or in certain areas
 1. Consider providing instructions that this should be considered from the respondent’s perceptions – particular interactions with the dean: Please answer the following questions based on your perspectives, interactions, and observations of your dean and their work.
- j. Moved questions in to several larger blocks
- k. **Action Item: Toria will provide a draft with suggested revisions for library dean next meeting**
- l. **Action item: Warren will place the new draft into Qualtrics so we can view it next meeting to see if the blocks need to be reduced**
- m. **Action item: CAH dean feedback**
- n. **Action item: Warren and Hope will talk with EC about whether Yoshiko’s position needs the same dean survey**
5. EAC23-24.03 – Barriers to Student Completion of SEOI & Fact Sheet
 - a. Moved to next meeting
6. Other
7. EC Updates (5 min)
 - a. Providing feedback on VP equity/belonging search, Provost, and getting ready for FS meeting on 1/10
8. Adjourn at 2:48pm