

EVALUATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING

January 29, 2009

The Evaluation Systems Committee met January 29, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. in the conference room of Building 1. Those present were Gail Ambrose, Sue Brookshire, Jolinda Cooper, Betsey Lee Hodges, Chet Jarman, Nikki Klapp, Becky Leach, Sandy McFadden, Dorie Richter, W. Romance Slade, Jay Sullivan, and Hal Swindell. Riley Mills was unable to attend.

The Evaluation Systems Committee Chair, Dorie Richter, called the meeting to order. Ms. Richter asked the Evaluation Systems Committee to review the agenda for the afternoon and to make any additions or modifications they wished. Having no suggestions, a motion was made by Chet Jarman, seconded by Nikki Klapp, and agreed by all attending to approve the agenda as presented.

The following items were discussed:

1. Current Student Evaluation of College Services (long form)

The Committee recommended the following revisions

- add sentence to the narrative under the survey title to read “**If you are dissatisfied, please tell us ‘why’ in the space for Comments.**”
- page 1, **Distance Learning – NCIH/EDL**, change #1. “Teleclassroom” to “**technology.**”
- page 2, **Facilities and Grounds**, change the section to read
 1. Classrooms are clean.
 2. Temperature ranges in buildings are maintained at a comfortable level.
 3. Buildings are well maintained.
 4. Grounds are clean and attractive.
 5. Parking spaces are sufficient.
 6. Campus is well lighted.
 7. Accommodations for the handicapped are adequate.* (place an * next to Comments.)
- page 4, **Career Development Center**, change the section as detailed below
 - Delete “for graduates” at the end of #3.
 - Delete #7.
 - Add #6. “**Job Fair was helpful, informative, and well advertised.***” (place an * next to Comments.)
 - Move “Career Development Services are...” to #7.
- page 4, **SGA**, delete #2 and #5 and add
 4. The quality of SGA activities is
 5. The number of SGA activities are

Gail Ambrose made a motion to accept the revisions. Sue Brookshire seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried.

II. Faculty/Staff Evaluation of College Services (long form)

The Committee recommended the following revisions

- add sentence to the narrative under the survey title to read “If you are dissatisfied, please tell us ‘why’ in the space for “Comments.”
- page 1, **Business Office Services**, delete #3.
- page 1, **Facilities**, change the section to read
 1. Classrooms are clean.
 2. Temperature ranges in buildings are maintained at a comfortable level.

3. Buildings are well maintained.
4. Grounds are clean and attractive.
5. Parking spaces are sufficient.
6. Campus is well lighted.
7. Accommodations for the handicapped are adequate.* (place an * next to Comments.)

-page 2, move #1 in the **Switchboard** section to the **Network Administrator** section.

-page 2, **Network Administrator**, delete #3.

-page 3, create a new section to read **Computer Support Services** and add

1. Computer and printer repairs are completed in a reasonable time.
2. Computer and printer repairs are completed in a satisfactory manner.
3. Overall, Computer Services are

-page 3, **Media/Graphics Services**, delete #5.

-page 5, **Career Development Center**, add “3. Job Fair was relative to my academic Program.” and move the previous #3 to #5.

-page 6, **Student Support Services**, delete (TRIO) reference

-page 6, Change “Comments” to “General Comments and Suggestions”.

Hal Swindell made a motion to accept the revisions. Romance Slade seconded the motion.

With no further discussion, the motion carried.

III. Employee Performance Evaluations – Review and Approval

A. First of all, the Committee reviewed the Staff Performance Evaluation by Supervisor and recommended the following

Equitable share of College Activities

Change section title “Equitable Share of College Activities” to “**Job Performance.**”

Change subsection title KNOWLEDGE OF THE JOB to **JOB KNOWLEDGE.**

Subsection JOB KNOWLEDGE – to read “Employee **understands** and performs all phases of assigned **duties and responsibilities.**”

Subsection QUALITY OF WORK – delete statement and change to read “**Employee accomplishes assigned job duties thoroughly in an accurate manner.**”

Change subsection title QUANTITY OF WORK to **PRODUCTIVITY.**

Subsection PRODUCTIVITY – to read “Employee **completes the necessary work** on a timely basis.”

Subsection PLANNING AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS – change to read “Employee **prioritizes tasks according to importance and meets scheduled deadlines in a timely manner.**”

Add a new subsection DECISION MAKING with the following statement “**Employee demonstrates appropriate judgment when making decisions.**”

Respect for the Rights of Colleagues and Students

Change subsection title COOPERATION WITH OTHERS to **INTERPERSONAL SKILLS.**

Professional and Ethical Actions

Subsection PROFESSIONALISM – delete the word “ethics.”

Add a new subsection ETHICS with the following statement “**Employee maintains adherence to safety, security, confidentiality, and other departmental objectives applicable to his/her position.**”

B. Secondly, the Committee reviewed the Administrator Evaluation by Supervisor and recommended the following

Add text to #2 in the LEADERSHIP section to read “Stimulates **creativity** and innovation... administrator.” and #5 to read “Demonstrates commitment... **core values, vision, mission, and goals.**”

C. Next, the Committee reviewed the Supervisor Evaluation by Employee and recommended the following

Change #2 in the MANAGEMENT section to read “Involves individuals... (e.g. scheduling, physical **facility**, class size, etc.)
Add text to #2 in the LEADERSHIP section to read “Stimulates **creativity** and innovation... administrator.” and #5 to read “Demonstrates commitment... **core values, vision, mission, and goals.**”

D. Finally, the Committee reviewed the Instructor Evaluation by Supervisor. There were no other changes recommended other than those listed in the next paragraph.

~~*The Committee recommended the addition of “Exceeds Expectations” to the rating scale for all employee performance evaluation forms. The Committee also recommended adding “Evaluation Time Period _____” to the top of the evaluation forms.~~

The Evaluation Systems Committee did not recommend a suggestion to add a place on page two for another signature, for example requiring a dean or department head to sign in addition to the employee and the employee’s supervisor. Moreover, the Committee did not recommend adding “Follows and supports college policy.” The Committee felt that the statement was too broad and was covered adequately by all evaluation sections and subsections.

Betsey Lee Hodges made the motion to accept the Employee Performance Evaluation forms as amended; JoLinda Cooper seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried.

IV. Performance Standards Update

Dorie Richter gave a brief update on the performance standards. The surveys for “completer” goal attainment and for “completer and non-returning student” student satisfaction are in progress. Data is due to NCCCS, Planning and Research Department, by February 6, 2009. Employer Satisfaction Survey results are also due at that time.

V. Other

Ms. Richter also briefly reviewed the SACS on-site committee report findings noting that many of the SACS on-site committee recommendations required only additional documentation from BCCC.

Dorie thanked the Committee for all their time and work. Romance Slade made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Sandy McFadden seconded the motion. Having no further discussion or business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

NOTE:

Several editing and wording changes to the employee performance evaluation guidelines, performance evaluation instruments, and surveys of college services were sent via email by members of the College

Administrative Council (AC) prior to the February 25, 2009 AC meeting. The suggestions are as follows:

Employee Performance Evaluation - guidelines

page 1 – I. Employee evaluation is designed and developed to ~~(deleted a colon)~~

II. To increase employee effectiveness by ~~(deleted a colon)~~

page 2 - III. A. Guidelines are as follows:

#2 - Prior to the annual evaluation conference, each employee will update and submit his/her Individual Professional Development Plan for completed activities from the past year. The Plan will be kept by the employee's supervisor and will become an integral part of the employee's annual evaluation. At the time of the annual evaluation conference, each employee and his/her supervisor may also agree upon an Individual Professional Development Plan for planned activities for the upcoming year.

#4 – delete the word “annual”

B. Guidelines are as follows:

#2 - The **individual's** supervisor will develop a summary of the ratings.

For example, during the first week of February, the Dean of Instruction would distribute the “Supervisor Evaluation by Employee” instrument to full-time instructors and staff who report to each of the division chairpersons and the director of **learning resources center** ~~library services~~.

page 3 - The summary will not become part of the personnel file; however, general findings of the evaluations **will be kept by the supervisor and** may be included in the annual evaluation report of the supervisor.

page 1 - Staff Evaluation by Supervisor - correct the spelling of the word “judgment.”

page 4 - Current Student Evaluation of College Services – SGA section – move #3 to end of list and renumber.

All Employee Performance Evaluation forms

~~*Add “Exceeds Expectations” to the narrative under the survey title to read: *~~**Comment/s following each section are required if “Exceeds Expectations” or “Does Not Meet Expectations” is checked.**

During the February 25, 2009 meeting of the BCCC Administrative Council, the editing and wording changes to the Faculty/Staff Evaluation of College Services and the Current Student Evaluation of College Services were approved as presented. Also approved as presented were the editing and wording changes to the Employee Performance Evaluation instruments and guidelines. *The recommended addition of “Exceeds Expectations” to the rating scale of the Employee Performance Evaluations was not approved. (Refer to the ‘strike thru’ text on page 3 and page 4 of these minutes.)