EVALUATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING
February 8, 2000

The Evaluation Systems Committee met February 8, 2000 at 3:00 p.m. in the conference room of Building 1.

MEMBERS PRESENT:		ABSENT:
Betty Cochran	Dr. David McLawhorn	Natasha Jefferson
Sandra Edwards	Marcia Norwood	Mandy Jones
David Jones	Jimmy Page	
Art Keehnle	Dorie Richter	
Aino Jackson	Penny Sermons	
Jane McCotter		

The meeting was called to order by the Evaluation Systems Committee Chair, Dorie Richter. The newest member, Aino Jackson, was welcomed. The following items were discussed:

I. Distribution of Survey Results

The results for the *Instructor and Course Evaluation by Students* and a summary for the *Graduate Follow-up Survey* were handed out to the committee. Dorie asked the committee for suggestions on the best way to communicate the results for these surveys and for surveys to follow. After some discussion, Betty Cochran made a motion (1) to continue the distribution process as is, leaving all comments in (minus information that would identify any individual, e.g. names and titles), and (2) to make survey results available in a notebook shelved in BCCC's LRC that states "This notebook contains numerical results of the surveys. Numerical results with evaluation comments can be found in the President's Office, the Dean of Instruction's Office, and the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness." David Jones seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried.

II. Survey Instruments and Process

A. Instructor and Course Evaluation by Students

Dorie explained to the Committee that when a student selects the "NA" – Not Applicable - as an answer, the Bubble Scanning software recognizes the selection "NA" as valid and calculates percentages reflecting the "NA." This generates a misleading percentage for the other choices. (She referred to the results for question #4 on the 1999 *Instructor and Course Evaluation by Students.)* Jimmy Page made the motion to omit the "NA" from the list of choices on the survey and use a disclaimer such as "Please leave the question blank if the question does not apply." David Jones seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried.

Dr. David McLawhorn reviewed the faculty and student step-by-step guidelines for the *Instructor and Course Evaluation by Students.* Several changes were suggested. Betty Cochran made the motion to accept the changes as discussed; Jane McCotter seconded the motion. Dorie offered to incorporate the changes as discussed into the text of the Employee Evaluation Section in BCCC's Faculty/Staff Manual (Section L30) and send a copy of the changes to the Committee members for their review. With no further discussion, the motion carried.

The Committee reviewed the *Instructor and Course Evaluation by Student* questions and agreed that several of the questions were not appropriate questions for distance learning classes. Penny Sermons offered to develop a draft instrument for distance learning classes for the Committee members to review.

B. Student and F/S Evaluation of College Services

Dorie informed the Committee that the short form of the *Student and Faculty/Staff Evaluation of College Services* as approved March 29, 1999 would be administered Wednesday, March 29, 2000 at 10 a.m.

Betty Cochran shared the recommendations from a subcommittee formed at the last Evaluation Systems Committee Meeting (September 30, 1999). The subcommittee recommendations are:

1. Include on the survey form for the *Student Evaluation of College Services* a designation of whether the student is a new student or a returning student.
2. Complete two evaluations, *Student Evaluation of College Services* and *Faculty/Staff Evaluation of College Services* at the end of January. Stick with the 10 a.m. time on Wednesday.
3. On the *Faculty/Staff Evaluation of College Services* consider the inclusion of a section for General Administration. List positions by title. Rationale: there is no specific evaluation of administration by faculty/staff.
4. Add advising to *Student Evaluation of College Services*; identify advisor, developmental advisor, and curriculum. Specific questions to be determined by the Evaluation Systems Committee.
5. Implement a follow-up plan to ensure that the results of evaluation are used to improve the services of the College. The Evaluation Systems Committee might examine the SACS follow-up plan to recommendations as a model.

Dorie thanked Betty and her subcommittee for their work. Two new subcommittees were formed: one to review the *Student and Faculty/Staff Evaluation of College Services*, and the other to investigate ways/models to document that results of evaluations are used for improvement. (SACS Criteria 3.1)

C. Graduate Follow-up Survey

The return rate for the *Graduate-Follow-up Survey* for 1999 was 51% after two mailings and phone calls (NCCCS requires at least 50% return rate.) This required a great deal of time and effort from the office of planning and institutional effectiveness as well as the department of student services. To ensure a better return rate Dorie suggested to the Committee members that the office of planning and institutional effectiveness survey the graduates during their graduation rehearsal with only the questions required by NCCCS. The existing *Graduate Follow-up Survey* would continue to be administered annually. A motion was made by Jimmy Page and seconded by Dr. David McLawhorn approving a shorter survey and directing Dorie to design a shorter survey for graduation rehearsal. She will distribute it to the Committee members for their approval. No further discussion, the motion carried.

III. NCCCS System Update

Copies of the January 3, 2000 *Temporary Rule Adoption*, January 12, 2000 *Draft Report from the Performance Funding Implementation Task Force*, and January 28, 2000 *Performance Measures and Standards* were distributed.

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Doreen K. Richter, Chair   Date