

**Advisory Committee for the
Office of Accountability, Efficiency, and Effectiveness
22 October 2009
CVCC Foundation/Trustee Boardroom
3:30p.m.**

Meeting Minutes

Present: Kevin Rouse (Chair), Ron Valentini, Cindy Coulter, Keith Mackie, Marvin Elliott, John Enamait, David Streater, Linda Graham, Bill Dulin

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 3:30p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** Minutes from the previous meeting were distributed. Changes/corrections may be submitted to Kevin.
3. **Learning Outcomes and Operational Objectives Review Committee:** Kevin reviewed the procedure and purpose of this OAAE subcommittee and reported that it completed its reviews on September 10, 2009. The committee's findings will be compiled and included in a report to the President.

The actual review forms have now been disaggregated and should be ready for distribution to supervisors within the next week. The review forms contain suggestions for improvement as well as recommendations for resubmission of data and commendations for exemplary assessment practices. Rather than judge an area as noncompliant in the case of missing or incomplete data, the review committee decided to award compliance to all areas submitting data. Those groups with missing or incomplete data will be, and in many cases have already been, assisted with resubmitting data.

The review committee also recommended that certain groups receive additional assessment training. This training will be conducted by Kevin and Amy. In addition, Kevin and Amy will hold training sessions for academic and nonacademic areas to share general information gathered through the review of this year's submissions. These sessions will likely take place on November 9, 2009 and November 24, 2009. Kevin asked the membership to consider these dates and let him know as soon as possible if there are any concerns with them.

The group next discussed when the 2009-2010 data on learning outcomes and administrative operational objectives would be submitted. Kevin recommended that this data be submitted in April or early May. Many group members were concerned that department heads may not be able to complete this responsibility before they should be off duty for the summer. A variety of suggestions were made to address this issue including (1) focusing only on fall data, (2) making department heads 12-month employees, and (3) paying department heads a stipend to complete their assessment responsibilities during the summer. Kevin

will summarize the conversation and send this summary via email to Keith Mackie who will then take the issue to Dr. Hinshaw.

4. **Faculty Evaluation:** Kevin reported that he met with the Faculty Senate regarding the new evaluation procedure. During the presentation, he learned that the faculty group who developed the core competencies for faculty and who also compiled the related supervisor evaluation form never presented their work to faculty. Thus, a number of faculty members are concerned about the group's work. In particular, faculty expressed concern about peer evaluations and following related discussions, Kevin recommended that the college include peer observations vs. peer evaluations in the evaluation cycle. Observations would be cross-disciplinary and would be set up by the faculty member to be observed. Feedback would only be shared between the peer observer and the faculty member being observed. The faculty member being observed need only report that the observation took place to satisfy this portion of the 360 degree evaluation process. The committee agreed with Kevin's recommendation. The peer observations should take place for the pilot group this spring.

Faculty also expressed concern regarding the supervisor evaluation tool. In the course of discussion of this tool during the Faculty Senate meeting, members of the group who originally created the tool expressed to Senate members that they only intended the instrument to be a guideline for evaluation. Kevin concluded from this commentary that the instrument is open for significant modification by the OAEE advisory committee. Thus, he asked the committee members to look at the items and bring back suggestions for modification. Any changes to the instrument will be taken to faculty for review. Kevin reported that the faculty senate was reviewing the instrument as well, and he would check with Collette Touchette to see if there were any recommendations made by faculty.

5. **Commission on Colleges' Fifth-Year Interim Report:** Kevin distributed information to the group about the SACS/COC 5th Year Interim Report format and content. He also shared with the group areas of the report that have been cited for other colleges.
6. **Revised Committee Membership**

Kevin reported that based upon faculty recommendation and conversations with Dr. Hinshaw, the OAEE Advisory Committee membership will be revised. The Committee will now include one faculty representative from each school, one professional staff representative, one support staff representative, and one director of a non-credit area. The group decided that the faculty members would serve two-year terms with the initial group of four split between one-year terms and two-year terms. Marvin suggested that Emily Whitely be the member from the School of Academics, Education, & Fine Arts and that she be assigned a one-year term given her service this summer on the Learning Outcomes & Administrative Objectives Review Committee. The group agreed.

7. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:44pm with Kevin reminding the committee of four assignments:
 1. Plan on the **next meeting for 11-5-09 at 3:30.**
 2. Check on November 9th and 24th for the general assessment training sessions.
 3. Review the supervisor evaluation tool and make recommendations from revisions if necessary.
 4. Make recommendations for new members, keeping in mind that they should have some knowledge of assessment.