**Evaluation, May 1, 2015 Workshop**

1. **What did you like about the process?**
2. Meetings were well organized—there were good activities that allowed people from

different groups to interact and brainstorm; people in charge really kept the meeting moving well; the initial directions discussion was good in developing New Directions

1. Open and inclusive
2. Seeing all of the college’s initiatives listed in a single document, comprised of five sections;

It is helpful to see opportunities for my department to be involved, as well as opportunities to

improve my department. This process brings definition and structure and clarity.

1. I thought the process was brilliant, inclusive and agile. The collaboration and discussions was significant in connecting us all to institutional goals. Loved sticky wall and survey. The use of committees for input was great!
2. None—because I did not make the December and March meetings.
3. Seeing the items from the sticky wall on the Direction sheets today. You put in a lot of time synthesizing, combining responses. Thank you.
4. Wide-distributive process, wide input
5. Am new so didn’t really know what the process is/was
6. The final product provided a clearly defined tool for moving forward.
7. Makes co-chair reports more focused and meaningful.
8. Brings the focus back. What are we doing? How is it going? Lets us see the big picture and how other committees affect what we do and how we set our goals and how meet the strategic directions.
9. There was a lot of input from different people throughout the process. It feels like this is a good way to keep our work from being in silos—it’s a good way to crowdsource and see how things fit together.
10. On-line survey was beneficial. I was able to suggest an initiative. The three columns are great (initiatives, how evaluate and committee responsible). “Scoring” column was confusing.
11. I feel that I haven’t been involved.
12. I liked that you tried to reach all groups.
13. I appreciated meeting with the groups (3) throughout the year. You allowed the campus committee to have input. I am thankful that you had handouts at the meetings.
14. Good reminders about initiatives. Well organized.
15. To remind us of the initiatives, and realize how many there are—to discuss various issues with colleagues.
16. Sticky wall provides good interaction; committee visits are valuable and demonstrates good inclusion
17. Didn’t attend other two meetings. Difficult to say what I’d like to see.
18. Can we please meet more often in Delano
19. The process has been very good. Meaningful, inclusive, reflective, comprehensive, open, focused
20. I liked the broad approach (visiting groups) and the sorting of the info through cluster analyses and communication that was ongoing.
21. Closing the loop . . . some tangible (measurable) results that can be shared with campus community.
22. Committee meeting visits were helpful to begin the process; Sonya’s wrap up was excellent.
23. Collaborative discussion at meetings to brainstorm issues: very valuable.
24. I really like the process. The ability to brainstorm and throw out ideas, from all areas. I enjoyed the sticky papers.
25. **What would you suggest about improving the process?**
26. This is a really small suggestion—quick reference to the numbers at the end of some initiatives—like Direction #1 evaluate and update pre-collegiate curriculum (3.1)🡪 just a

quick verbal explanation or a document that lists these.

1. Connect staff responsible earlier in the process; required suggested timeline from each responsible entity; provide reporting times (progress reports) along a similar timeframe (3 touch points)
2. Consider size of meetings and include KEY members at step 1.
3. Have documents distributed today (5/1/15) sent out ahead of time.
4. I can’t think of anything.
5. We got input from many people but we did not close the loop with the departments before “assigning” a task—direction.
6. Better communication of process
7. One final opportunity to argue areas of responsibility (or a chance to clarify the intent).
8. Co-chairs need a chance to participate in the final decision of assigning responsibility of initiatives.
9. One minor thing—(actually in Kate’s comments while I fill this out, this is somewhat covered). Maybe on these initiatives, we shouldn’t just look at who’s responsible for “owning” or completing an initiative—but also who will actually be involved in the work (staff, for example). I see a few things that I’m not “responsible” for, but that I likely will be highly involved in. I’m here because I’m on a committee but otherwise I might not know about all of this. Sorry for the wall of text!
10. Make the process more central—online, visible. You seem to be working toward that. It’s exciting to see everything tying together.
11. Continue to work through the process.
12. I would like to know where the committee links are on the website.
13. More communication with faculty to keep awareness up about Directions. Keep FCDC up to speed.
14. Be more specific with the directions—as in the scoring and exactly what we were supposed to do. It was a bit unclear.
15. Open up the “sticky wall” to all by having a moving wall that travels around the college and gets input.
16. Will there be an outside reviewer to evaluate the evaluation?
17. Is it possible to hold online/hybrid discussions similar to Blackboard?
18. Although difficulty to do—greater student involvement.
19. I would like to see a member of senate exec. board always involved. I would like to see cleaner and simpler summaries—including graphs, charts and statements. Often the language is too vague or too detailed—have really usable and easily understood power points and presentations.
20. Involve all…the same individuals seem to participate in 90% of process. How you do this is a difficult task ….
21. Having the tables divided by group at least part of meeting, so members can work together and brainstorm; include EODAC on list of committees in more places rather than only Director of Equity and Inclusion.
22. No suggestions for improvement. Every suggestion I have, there is an equal drawback, i.e. “more time for collaboration at meetings” = longer meetings.
23. Only improvement would be getting more people to contribute. And stay on track.
24. **Any additional comments?**
25. Great job. Thx for your hours of work.
26. Like how the committee/position responsible for the direction and initiative is included on the excel spreadsheets. Good start. Documentation of process.
27. There might be more influence from those of us who are on several committees and therefore who gave input several times. Is that okay?
28. 1) Incorporate a way to get feedback from committees/departments before the point we are at today. 2) Be explicit about a department’s/committee’s ability to assess their work and prioritize. A “good” idea many not be implemented.
29. Under Community—External I think more interaction between deans, department chairs and select faculty and foundation would be helpful to identify college needs to potential donors to fund those needs.
30. I like seeing us as a whole trying to break from our silos.
31. Meeting was great! Thank you!
32. The huge problem is that when it comes to evaluating an initiative’s success we don’t have an IR dept. on campus to make it feasible for us to measure our successes or failure.
33. Some initiatives could be very beneficial, but I may not understand what the initiative actually means (i.e. student habitat).
34. Let’s get all faculty involved. It should be impossible to hide.
35. None
36. Thank you!
37. Thank you for putting it together and getting done early.
38. No.
39. Thank you.
40. What were we supposed to be doing during the group work section? Needed clearer direction.
41. I appreciate the hard work performed by committee members who have fleshed out this new strategic directions document.
42. This is really the third time doing this. It was much easier this go around.