

EVALUATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING
Friday, September 2, 2005

The Evaluation Systems Committee met Friday, September 2, 2005 at 10:20 a.m. in the conference room of Building 1.

MEMBERS PRESENT:		ABSENT:
Jane Alligood	Mandy Jones	Barbara Francisco
Gregg Allinson	Dorie Richter, Chair	Jim Matson
Wesley Beddard	Penny Sermons	Riley Mills
Dixon Boyles	Whiting Toler	
Kay Walker Hauser		

The Evaluation Systems Committee Chair, Dorie Richter, called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. All members were welcomed. Dorie Richter also welcomed Dr. David McLawhorn, BCCC President. The topics for discussion were as follows:

I. Brief P.A.C.E. background

Dr. David McLawhorn gave a brief overview of the P.A.C.E. background, his commitment to the College goals, and his support of the P.A.C.E. administrative decisions and process. Dr. McLawhorn then left asking the committee to continue their discussion of the P.A.C.E. and any concerns they may have about the P.A.C.E. process.

II. Concerns expressed with the administration of the P.A.C.E.

All P.A.C.E. assessments were distributed to department heads and division chairs with instructions to hand out on a certain date. The maintenance and custodial group was asked to meet in a central location on a different date at a designated time to complete the survey. They did. (All division deans had latitude to administer either in a group setting or individually.)

Mandy Jones expressed the following concerns:

- A. Several of the maintenance and custodial group felt they were treated differently.
- B. The location/room was crowded. Individuals sat at a table instead of a desk.
- C. The group's immediate supervisor was present.

Whiting Toler added item D. to read, "The length of time to complete the assessment." (Item D. was added 9-13-05 prior to the committee approval of these minutes.)

III. Concerns regarding the validity of the P.A.C.E.

Dorie Richter distributed a copy of an email sent by Mandy Jones to our P.A.C.E. contact in the NILIE leadership group at NCSU. (A copy is attached.) Ms. Richter asked committee members in the future to inform her, prior to sending, of any correspondence representing the Evaluation Systems Committee and to copy her and all other committee members.

The email stated that "We encourage our clients to administer the survey in such a way that they will get a high response rate. The highest response rates happen when the survey is administered at an all-campus meeting. If this is not feasible then the next option would be to send to everyone and set a deadline for return." The email also pointed out "if people feel that their anonymity is breached they may answer differently; however, if the number of people you are talking about is fairly small compared to the entire population, it should not invalidate the whole administration." The email concludes by saying "the intent of the survey is to assess the overall climate of the institution and not to guarantee voice to individual opinions."

IV. Recommendations

Although the Evaluation Systems Committee generally did not approve of the distribution process for the department referred to in Topic I, they determined that the way this was handled was a good faith effort to solve an internal problem dealing with evaluations. The Committee recommended, by consensus, the following:

- A. Appoint an employee of the Maintenance or Custodial Staff to serve on the Evaluation Systems Committee.
- B. Encourage individuals with a complaint about the process to follow the College "chain of command" and first discuss the problem with their supervisor. If the individual chooses not to do this then the individual is encouraged to contact their department representative who serves on the Evaluation Systems Committee. The department representative will then communicate the problem to the Evaluation Systems Committee chairperson.
- C. Email the P.A.C.E. contact person to ask if the difference in survey administration of 11% of a target population presents a significant statistical difference.

Dorie thanked the Committee for their time. The Evaluation Systems Committee unanimously agreed to adjourn. Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.



Chair: Doreen K. Richter

Date: 9-13-05