

CAAAC Member Review
of
Gallup Survey Results

Survey General Information

- Second year of Survey
 - intended to provide a standardized method for collecting performance measurement data related to committee engagement and satisfaction
- 20 CAAAC members responded out of 57 members (last year 37 members responded)

Areas where CAAAC scored highest

(2004/2003 scale of 1 – 5)

- Committee Staff is well prepared for meetings (4.58/4.48)
- Access to Senior Managers and Agency Technical experts (4.55/4.27)
- Desire to work with this committee again (4.35/4.15)

Areas where CAAAC scored lowest

(2004/2003 scale of 1 – 5)

- Our committees recommendations or other contributions are used effectively (3.35/3.33)
- Our committee is made up of the right mix of individuals ((3.55/3.64)
- Our committee members are well prepared for meetings (3.58/3.97)

5 areas where CAAAC scores reflected growth (2004/2003 scale of 1 – 5)

- Access to senior leadership (4.55/4.27)
- Desire to work with this committee again (4.35/4.15)
- Committee communicates effectively with Senior Managers ((4.15/3.79)
- The mission and goals of this committee are clearly defined (3.79/3.52)
- Committee receives sufficient feedback from the agency on recommendations (3.65/3.18)

4 Areas where CAAAC scores reflected

decline (2004/2003 scale of 1 – 5)

- Committee members are well prepared for meeting (3.58/3.97)
- Our committee has access to adequate resources (3.65/4.03)
- Our committee meets the right amount to accomplish its work (3.80/4.06)
- Committee operating procedures and guidelines are fair (4.05/4.44)

Question to Committee for discussion

- Do these results accurately reflect areas where the committee as a whole believe we need to improve (ie membership makeup, member preparedness)?
- Are there other issues we should focus on? If so what are they?

Drivers to reexamine CAAAC

- Gallup Survey Results
- NAS AQM Report (is a new subcommittee or subcommittee structure needed to address issues raised?)
- EPA policy finalized October last year limiting individuals to serve no more than 6 years on a FACA (drives more rapid membership changes)

Next Steps

- **Members**

- review survey results and send suggestions on improving the CAAAC to DFO

childers.pat@epa.gov

- **Subcommittee Chairs**

- Work with AQM workgroup and DFO on how to structure NAS recommendations to fit within current structure or to create a new structure

DFO assignments

Work with members on improving following areas:

- Member preparation (better use of electronic communication – email/website)
- Committee makeup (membership turn over in next 2 years likely to increase)
- Other areas raised today
- Report progress back to CAAAC in February for continued discussion at April meeting