

Principles Governing the Operation of the EIADAC Committee

- I. The chair of the EIADAC committee and co-chair (if one exists) are the voice of the committee. All representation of the committee comes from the chair and co-chair. Committee functions are based on the Operating Cycle (as developed in the summer of 2013; see Strategic Vision and description below).
- II. Working groups are formed based upon a collaboratively determined strategic plan formulated on a yearly cycle.
- III. A working group is formed only by consensus of members of the EIADAC committee. Each working group is led by a member of the EIADAC committee who is the convener and speaker for that working group to the committee.
- IV. All working group output is reviewed and approved by the EIADAC committee at each step in the operating cycle before it moves to the next step.

The Operating Cycle of the EIADAC Committee and Working Groups

The work of the EIADAC committee spans several stages. At each stage, the committee oversees the involvement of a working group that focuses on that particular population or issue. During each stage there will be considerable communication between the working group and the EIADAC committee. Work will advance from one stage to the next only by vote of the elected members of the EIADAC Committee.

I. The EIADAC committee reviews, monitors, and evaluates gathered university community data.

The goal is for the EIADAC committee to have mechanisms by which to become aware of issues as they are forming. Working groups serve to collect data from students, staff, faculty and others. Working groups educate themselves about a specific population at the university in hopes of discovering potentially problematic trends that may indicate a future issue. Possible sources of information include student groups or administrative structures related to the population or even initiatives at other institutions of higher education. Working groups report back to the EIADAC committee as a whole regarding any information they believe is potentially worthy of action by the committee. The committee will consider such information to determine if there is an issue of note (step 2).

II. The EIADAC committee identifies issues and/or opportunities.

Based on information from the working groups (step 1) or from individuals outside the EIADAC committee, the committee works to determine if there is an issue of sufficient gravity to warrant further action. Working groups may be charged by the EIADAC committee with finding additional pertinent information regarding potential issues and/or teasing apart overlapping issues. If information from an outside source results in the need for a new working group, that working group would also begin working on collecting information as in step 1. The EIADAC committee will then determine if action on an issue is appropriate (step 3).

III. The EIADAC committee recommends one or more interventions.

At this stage the EIADAC committee has identified an issue or opportunity of sufficient scope or gravity that an intervention is deemed necessary. Working groups may formulate one or more recommendations for interventions. The committee will review these recommendations and determine which intervention(s), if any, will be recommended. The EIADAC committee will not implement the intervention. Rather recommendations will be made to the Faculty Assembly for consideration and may then be passed along to a group within the University community for implementation.

IV. The EIADAC committee reviews interventions.

The committee will track recommended interventions, noting whether they were accepted or not, how they were implemented and by whom, and finally whether they were successful at addressing the issues identified in step 2. Working groups will liaise with groups implementing recommendations and report back to the EIADAC committee on activities relevant to the recommendations. After the interventions have been implemented, the committee will charge the relevant working group to continue to monitor the university community to see how broadly implemented interventions have affected the community and whether those effects are positive or negative (step 1).