

Evaluation & Assessment Committee
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
February 16, 2024
Minutes

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

1. **Approval of February 2, 2024 minutes as is at 1:07 pm**
2. **Approval of Agenda February 16, 2024 as is at 1:06 pm**
3. New student member introduction
 - a. **Recently nominated to be on committee**
4. EAC23-24.06 – Access to SEOIs discuss updates
 - a. **Heather provided the SEOI admin access with dept and job titles list and has already removed people who are no longer affiliated with CWU as of today**
 - b. **Lidia asked whether list should include a column indicating what their level of access is in watermark – Agreed this would be helpful**
 1. **This list is based on HR records of job titles**
 - c. **When non admin staff/faculty ask for access, Lidia has been getting Dean or Associate Dean approval before giving access**
 - d. **Need faculty buy-in to participate in a regular process where SEOI staff are notified by department of updates to access to SEOI list**
 - e. **Need to draft policy language giving Lidia or Heather ability to remove people from the list**
 - f. **Hope will check with EC on**
 1. **Justification running risk is people having access to data that is not relevant to their current position (if no longer admin/DPC)**
 2. **Watermark requires manual additions and removals of people**
 - g. **Another recurring issue – Should provide reasoning/transparency on why custom question timing is different during winter quarter**
 1. **Faculty and chairs don't get as long of a window to enter in custom questions during winter quarter –**

1. Uncontested withdrawal is today, the earliest they can make custom questions available is Tuesday, which shortens it to 8 days instead of 14 for other quarters
 1. The only options around this is to reduce time allowed to students to take SEOI, but the length of time available to students is set in policy, so this is not an option
- h. Overhaul of the website removed ownership of SEOI from associate provost office, but the real owner is academic affairs, so they cannot put up a calendar on the website to indicate the timing of custom questions
 1. Using emails to indicate timing of SEOI custom questions – but this is not going to all faculty
 2. The full calendar with info around timing of forms, custom questions, and student time frames
 1. Lidia will reach out to Delayna to see about adding this info to Canvas to make it accessible to faculty
5. EAC23-24.01 & 02 – Report from EC – next steps forward
 - a. Liked shortened survey questions, liked having a different survey for dean
 - b. Comment on some of the language of both Dean and Library Dean survey
 1. I do have one question though on the library survey: For #1e, what does “cultivating spaces of well-being” mean? Does this mean helping to create an overall positive working environment? Because when I read “spaces of well-being”, my initial instinct is that the dean is supposed to be creating a yoga or meditation room. The language sounds a tad too therapeutic. But maybe that’s just me.
 2. In Question 2, what does “promotes curriculum/program development” mean? (Maybe I just need an example for myself, but it seems unclear to me.)

I appreciate “demonstrates transparency in the budgeting process!”

I really appreciate the question about supporting NTT faculty needs!

I think this is a process question. In Question 4, I wonder if it might be useful to end with “Retaining a diverse faculty and staff?” It seems that all the other questions need to be considered/answered/fulfilled to retain a diverse faculty/staff.

In that same question, when it is asking about “promotes access and accommodation,” is this for disabled faculty, staff, and students? Is the group envisioning a broader understanding of these terms? How can we be clear about what this means?

- c. Library dean survey goes to everybody

1. Question 3 is not going to apply to people who do not work for library; concerned that even having a cannot judge option might reduce anonymity
 1. Library dean survey goes to everyone because that staff encompasses such a small sample size and the anonymity may be compromised – Janet mentioned this
 2. This is challenging because we want faculty to have the opportunity to give relevant feedback and allow the Library Dean to receive that, but with such a small group of faculty, it's hard to have a true anonymous survey
 3. EC has aired on the side of caution to go out to everyone
 4. Action Item: Hope will talk with Sidney and CC Janet (she likely has knowledge of how long this has been going on) and Toria about the discussion surrounding question 3
2. Other dean survey – addressing EC comments
 1. Number 5(b)(2) above comment is relevant to Dean survey
 1. Either add an example of supporting the implementation of curriculum/program development, reviewing curriculog
 2. Have a separate question about promoting this, maybe we don't need
 3. Reviews and makes decisions in Curriculog in a timely fashion – this replaces Q2(2)
 4. Added an example to Q2(3)
 2. Question 4
 1. Moved first question about retaining... to the bottom of the block because recruiting and promoting and environments would inform the retaining of staff/faculty
 2. Change the final question in that block to refer to accessibility
6. EAC23-24.03 – Review and Discuss Barriers to Student Completion of SEOI, Fact Sheet, & DEI Components
 - a. Waiting on DEI terms, but likely won't get this until the VP for DEI is selected – in the process of this now
 - b. Reviewed SEOI tip sheets from other universities
 1. Sheets giving examples of how to provide useful qualitative comments – this could be helpful – three of the docs have examples of these
 2. Handout to students that could explain what the SEOIs are used for and NOT used for – not used to fire people
 3. Handout to faculty about what they should and should not do
 1. Can't give extra credit – good reminder for faculty
 2. Language about SEOIs being relevant to merit pay/promotion is not advised but
 4. Draft two sheets – one for faculty and one for students

