

Bates

Office of Human Resources

Meeting date: Tuesday, December 5, 2023
Time: 11:30 pm - 1:00 pm
Location: Commons 201 or Zoom
Attendees: Hope Burnell, Patty Rooney, Nora Molloy, Andrea Trumble, Jess Berry, Keiko Konoeda, Mark Cayer, Zach Brown-Cross, Sylvia Deschaine, Curtis Johnson, Megan Couch
Absent: Alec Morrissey, Joe Castonguay

MINUTES

1. Welcome
 - a. Hope welcomed the group, thanking them for the hours of work that brought us to this point for making a preliminary decision on vendors.
2. Icebreaker
 - a. Members were asked to share something they anticipate doing over break.
3. Vendor discussion
 - a. Hope reviewed that the following factors would help the group determine which three vendors would be forwarded to senior leadership for a final decision.
 - i. Differentiation factors
 - ii. Ability to meet our evaluation criteria
 - iii. Pros/cons
 - iv. Partnership with vendor
4. Top three
 - a. The group was asked to indicate which three vendors they would like to see move forward. Votes included those from Alec who sent information to Hope in advance. Final tally:
 - i. Culture AMP - 9
 - ii. Rankin - 10
 - iii. Korn Ferry - 6
 - iv. Gallup - 7
5. Pros and Cons
 - a. The group proceeded to list pros, cons, and differentiating factors for each of the top three vendors, which are listed in Appendix A.
 - b. In the course of the discussion, members determined that there was a preference to change votes and make Gallup one of the vendors identified to move forward, and to not make a recommendation that included Korn Ferry. Concerns around accessibility of Korn Ferry's product, and the presenter's lack of knowledge and approach to accessibility were determined to be differentiating factors that reduced their appeal.
 - c. The group discussed if they should just submit two vendors to senior leadership given what

appeared to be a clear top two vendors. The group concluded that three vendors should be put forward, given that was the original expectation set, and there was not an absolute disqualifier or “fatal flaw” preventing a third vendor from being submitted for consideration.

6. Conclusion

- a. The final vendors moving forward are Culture Amp, Rankin, and Gallup.
- b. The group did not have time to discuss the holiday party or to evaluate the meeting.

APPENDIX A

VENDOR: Rankin

PROs

Comprehensive service

Action-oriented

Post survey support

Guidance to senior leadership

The presenters were helpful and had all the answers

Personable and knowledgeable with a can-do attitude

Showed respect for our perspective

Had a keen understanding of higher education

Had emphasis on confidentiality

Transparency - communicating to the whole community

Information/metrics

Sophisticated and polished

Accessible product and presenters seemed comfortable navigating questions around accessibility and working with the College for specific needs

High touch - coming to campus for survey

Referenced larger scope identifying child care and eldercare as potential employee concerns

Clarity in their process

Raw data available – means IR can slice and dice however they wanted

Can meet the timelines we are requesting

Have significant knowledge of higher education

Showed respect for the perspectives of group members

CONs

Report not drilled down to supervisors and unclear why they identify sets of “5” as a risk to confidentiality when that is the minimum expressed by other vendors

Highest price

Raw data available to the College - this is unusual and can be seen as a risk to confidentiality

Scheduling time for their retreat day/day and a half will be a challenge

Do they have the right schools to benchmark against?

Haven't seen the user interface for taking the survey

DIFFERENTIATORS

Experience with higher ed

High touch service / sophisticated

Identifying similar schools when benchmarking

Explicit commitment to transparency and accessibility

QUESTIONS

- Additional questions for Hope to follow up on
 - How do they get data from the college to structure the survey for tracking and confidentiality?
 - How do they affirm that people only answer the survey once?
 - How is direct supervisor impact vs. higher management impact measured?
 - Can they share the number of schools / who is in the benchmark group?

VENDOR: Culture AMP

PROs

Pricing is good

Ticked all the boxes - but maybe underwhelming

Reporting and analytics - both ease of getting to it and the visual

Science-based

Being able to add comments on every question

Action plans can be made visible - good action-planning tools

Showing impact on engagement by question type

The survey can be repeated and used to measure progress year over year

Good user interface for survey takers

Simplicity - user-friendly for survey takers and reporting

Highlighted template surveys that could be deployed in the future if needed

Engaged in helping us - excited about working with us - had energy in the presentation

Provide a self-help feature on their website

Accessible - Translated surveys are available / Text to speech is available

The follow-up leading up to the demo was excellent

CONs

Name is weird

Didn't leave a lasting impression

The ability for administrator/HR to reply to comments in the survey makes confidentiality feel less secure

Hesitant for willingness to engage with paper versions of the survey if needed.

Tech-dependent (AI)

Follow up since the demo has been lacking

DIFFERENTIATING FACTORS

Pricing model

Cost

Analytics

Excellent energy

VENDOR: Gallup

PROS

Accessibility - mentioned ADA compliance without being prompted
73% response rate with higher ed
12-24 hour results after survey closes
Benchmarks to other colleges
Survey is only 12 questions (see also Cons)
Can add open-ended questions
Have question writers and analysts to help get to answers you want
Explained engagement vs. satisfaction - engagement drives satisfaction
Good user experience - easy platform to use
Reporting is good and drills down to the supervisor level
Very action-plan focused

CONS

Focused on businesses
The survey is only 12 questions
Wants to avoid paper option

DIFFERENTIATING FACTORS

None discussed

VENDOR: Korn Ferry - removed from the top three

PROs

Broke out engagement into different factors to evaluate
Broke down the project team - who does what
Regular communication built into the design

Cons

Concerns with accessibility

- Text to speech is reliant on extensions
- Said "some browsers work better than others"
- Presenters' lack of knowledge and less than thorough follow up did not provide confidence in the ability or commitment to provide an accessible experience. Focused on businesses and profit.