Planning and Program Review Feedback Results – Spring 2014 (V2)
Prepared by Keith Wurtz

Purpose of Brief
This brief illustrates the results from the Spring 2014 PPRC survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2013 – 2014 Planning and Program Review (PPR) participants.

Sample
- 7 PPR participants responded to the survey
- The response rate was 24% in 2013-2014 and 30% (n = 11) in 2012-2013
- 86% of the respondents attended a workshop/training

Summary of Findings
- There were substantial increases in every area evaluated from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014
- 100% of the respondents felt that the PPR timelines were clear
- 100% of the respondents felt that the data provided by OIERP was easy to access
- 86% of the respondents felt that the PPR process was clear
- 83% of the respondents felt that the trainings/workshops helped the program complete their program review

Suggestion for Programs Completing their Program Reviews in 2014-2015

"Measure everything you do and report the outcomes on the PPR document. Also, follow the scoring rubrics provided by the PPR committee. The links to these scoring rubrics are provided for each question as one goes through the Web tool."

Overview

The purpose of this brief is to illustrate the results from the Spring 2014 PPRC survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2013 – 2014 Planning and Program Review (PPR) participants.

Methodology

On April 3, 2014 29 faculty, staff, and managers who had participated in program review in 2013 – 2014 were emailed a link and asked to complete a web-based survey. Participants were given until April 16, 2014 to complete the survey in order to provide enough time for the results to be analyzed and discussed to help inform changes for the 2014 – 2015 year. Seven people (24%) responded to the survey, four less than the previous year. The survey asked respondents to rate the PPR process on clarity, usefulness, collaboration, and involvement. A five point anchored scale was used. A score of 1 represented the low point on the scale (e.g.: not at all clear) and a score of 5 represented the high point on the scale (e.g.: extremely clear). In addition, respondents were asked to provide feedback to four open-ended questions that included feedback on the interview process, suggestions for programs next year, suggestions for improving the PPR Process, and any additional comments.

The effect size statistic was used to indicate the size of the difference between how PPR participants in 2012 – 2013 rated the PPR process and how 2013 – 2014 participants rated the PPR process. One method of interpreting effect size was developed by Jacob Cohen. Jacob Cohen defined "small," "medium," and "large" effect sizes. He explained that an effect size of .20 can be considered small, an effect size of .50 can be considered medium, and an effect size of .80 can be considered large. An effect size is considered to be meaningful if it is .20 or higher. Equally important, if the lower end of the effect size confidence interval (CI) is above .20 it indicates that there is a 95% probability that the program or characteristic has a meaningful impact on the outcome. It is important to mention that the number of respondents in each group does not influence Effect Size; whereas, when statistical significance is calculated, the number of respondents in each group does influence the significance level (i.e. "p" value being lower than .05).

Findings

Respondents were first asked to rate how clear the PPR process and timelines were in 2013 – 2014 (see Table 1). Eighty-six percent of the respondents felt that the PPR process was clear (3 or higher) and 100% felt that the timelines were clear.

Table 1: Respondent Ratings of the Clarity of the 2013 – 2014 PPR Process and Timelines.

Question	Not at All Clear								Extremely Clear		Total	Mean (M)
	1		2		3		4		5			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
How clear was the 13-14 PPR process?	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	14.3	5	71.4	0	0.0	7	3.43
How clear were the PPR timelines?	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	4	57.1	2	28.6	7	4.14

Note: "#" is the number of responses, "%" is the number of responses divided by the total, and the mean (M) is the scores added up and divided by the total.

Next, respondents rated the usefulness of the processes involved in program review (see Table 2). Sixty-seven percent of the respondents felt that the PPRC provided useful feedback, 86% felt that having the managers involved in the PPR process was helpful, 86% felt that the PPR process helped the programs to recognize strengths and weaknesses, and 86% felt that the process helped to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by the program.

Table 2: Respondent Ratings of the Usefulness of the 2013 – 2014 PPR Feedback, Participation of Mangers, Program Evaluation, and Improving Services.

Question	Not at All Useful								Extremely Useful		Total	Mean (M)
	1		2		3		4		5			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
How useful was the feedback that your program received from the PPR Committee?	0	0.0	2	33.3	1	16.7	2	33.3	1	16.7	6	3.33
How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process?	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	4	57.1	2	28.6	7	4.00
How useful was the PPR process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program?	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	14.3	4	57.1	7	4.00
How useful was the PPR process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program?	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	14.3	2	28.6	3	42.9	7	3.86

Note: "#" is the number of responses, "%" is the number of responses divided by the total, and the mean (M) is the scores added up and divided by the total.

Table 3 illustrates how collaborative the respondents felt that the process of completing the program review was within their program. Eighty-six percent of the respondents felt that the planning and program review process was collaborative.

Table 3: Respondent Ratings of the Degree to which the 2013 – 2014 PPR Process was Collaborative.

Question	Not at All Collaborative								Extremely Collaborative			
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	Mean (M)
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
In the process of completing your program review within your program, how collaborative was the process?	0	0.0	1	14.3	3	42.9	2	28.6	1	14.3	7	3.43

Note: "#" is the number of responses, "%" is the number of responses divided by the total, and the mean (M) is the scores added up and divided by the total.

Table 4 shows the results of how involved respondents felt that their manager was in the planning and program review process. The results indicated that 71% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the process.

Table 4: Respondent Ratings of how involved their Manager was in the 2013 – 2014 PPR Process.

Question	Not at All Involved								Extremely Involved			
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	Mean (M)
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
How involved was your Dean or manager in the PPR process?	1	14.3	1	14.3	0	0.0	4	57.1	1	14.3	7	3.43

Note: "#" is the number of responses, "%" is the number of responses divided by the total, and the mean (M) is the scores added up and divided by the total.

Table 5 displays the results of how easy it was to access and use data and the PPR Web Tool. Eighty percent of the respondents felt that it was easy to use the PPRC web tool, 100% felt that it was easy to access the data provided the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning, and 83% felt the data was easy to understand.

Table 5: Respondent Ratings of How Easy it was to Access and Use data and the PPR Web Tool in the 2013 – 2014 PPR Cycle.

Question	Not at All Easy								Very Easy				
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	Did not Use	Mean (M)
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
How easy was it to use the PPR Web Tool?	1	20.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	5	1	3.00
How easy was it to access the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning?	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3	6	1	4.17
How easy was it to understand the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning?	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	66.7	1	16.7	6	1	3.67

Note: "#" is the number of responses, "%" is the number of responses divided by the total, and the mean (M) is the scores added up and divided by the total.

Respondents were asked to rate how useful the PPR handbook, committee contacts, trainings/ workshops, rubrics, and the interview were in 2013 – 2014 (see Table 6). Fifty percent of the respondents felt that the handbook was useful (almost half of the respondents did not use the handbook), 67% felt the rubric was helpful, 83% felt that the trainings/workshops were useful in helping them to complete their program reviews, 60% felt that the committee contact was helpful, and 50% felt that the interview with the PPRC was useful to the program review planning process.

Table 6: Respondent Ratings of How Useful the PPR Handbook, Trainings, Committee Contacts, and Rubrics were in Completing the 2013 – 2014 PPR

Question	Not at All Useful								Extremely Useful				
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	Did not Use	Mean (M)
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review?	1	25.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	4	3	2.75
How useful was the rubric (i.e. instructional or non-instructional) in helping to complete your program review?	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	2	33.3	2	33.3	6	1	3.50
How useful were the trainings/workshops with helping you to complete your program review?	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	1	16.7	4	66.7	6	1	4.33
How useful was the committee contact in helping you to complete your program review?	2	40.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	5	2	2.80
Do you think the interview with the Planning and Program Review Committee is useful to the program review planning process?	0	0.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	6	1	3.33

Note: "#" is the number of responses, "%" is the number of responses divided by the total, and the mean (M) is the scores added up and divided by the total.

As illustrated in Table 7, almost all of the respondents attended program review training in the 2013-2014 academic year.

Table 7: Respondents Use of Scheduled Planning and Program Review Trainings in 2013-2014.

Did you attend one of the scheduled Planning and Program Review trainings this year?	#	%
Yes	6	85.7
No	1	14.3
Total	7	100.0

Program review participants were asked to respond to four open-ended questions. The first question asked the respondent to explain why or why not they found the interview with the PPRC to be worthwhile. Three respondents felt that the interview process was worthwhile and two noted that they did not feel that some of the committee members had read all the information.

Open-Ended Explanations of why the Interview Process was Worthwhile or Not in 2013 – 2014

- Committee does not give the impression they have read all information. Not good listeners.
- it was obvious that not all members read the document and one person didn't interpret it correctly
- It was stressful knowing the interview was part of the process. But going through it, the PPR made the experience comfortable understanding the needs of counseling. Thank you for guiding our department through the process. You made a process which is perceived as scary, a manageable process. Outside of that, I did not receive written feedback so I could not answer #4 of this survey.
- Not much discussion took place.
- The interview process is very worthwhile. As a past committee member I know how useful this process is to clarify any questions they might have to the unit...and as a unit member I appreciate to opportunity to clarify any questions or uncertainties the committee might have after reviewing the PR document.
- Yes because I had the opportunity to explain areas of the PR that perhaps were not as clear and received recommendations and feedback.

Respondents were asked to think about their PPR experience and provide suggestions to programs that will be going through the process next year. Respondents suggested that participants attend the trainings and follow the rubrics.

Open-Ended Suggestions to Programs Participating in Program Review in 2014 – 2015

- Go to the workshops to further clarify the process because the menu is confusing.
- Measure everything you do and report the outcomes on the PPR document. Also, follow the scoring rubrics provided by the PPR committee. The links to these scoring rubrics are provided for each question as one goes through the Web tool.
- One question I incorporated in all the answers, but the committee wanted it one statement so I was told I didn't answer the question when I had.
- Perhaps make the committee accountable for the document's clarity and use. Roll ups did not work correctly cost several people many hours waiting for the program to be corrected.
- Start early...work collaboratively with everyone who is participating in the PR process...schedule a regular weekly time to meet and go through the process of addressing PR one step at a time...become knowledgeable with the Web Tool, Handbook, and Rubrics!
- Take complete advantage of Keith Wurtz and attend the trainings.

Next, respondents were asked to provide suggestions for improving the PPR processes. The suggestions for improvement ranged from the PPRC continuing to be open, to improving the web tool menu, to hiring more research personnel, and to using professional organization program evaluations.

Open-ended Suggestions to Improve the PPR Process

- Continue to be open to suggestions made by the committee and programs that have recently gone through the PR process. I do have one, but it is difficult to state clearly in this form. I will contact Keith to discuss my suggestion as I am not sure it would be possible based on the time constraints of the committee.
- Improve the PR menu and add clarification such as: Step 1, Step 2, Step 3, etc. There are several links that I did not know where to start or what parts I was responsible for.
- May hire more research personal to handle the many research requests that may come your way.
- The managers interpret the finished product much better than the committee. It would have been nice to know I hadn't done things correctly before the interview with the committee or the final written feedback.
- The questions, in my estimation, were redundant in nature.
- Use professional organizations program evaluations and accrediting reports instead of allowing people with very little training or knowledge to make judgments on programs. Program outcomes are very easy to evaluate if the committee would take the time to read them.

Finally, respondents were asked to provide any additional comments or suggestions if they ranked any of the quantitative items below average (i.e. 1 or 2). One respondent suggested that the committee members and managers are not on the same page, one did not have any recommendations, and one suggested that the committee is too concerned with growth.

Additional Suggestions or Comments about the PPR Process

- Committee members and mangers are not all on the same page. On a positive note, the Research and Planning Department are very helpful and well informed.
- No recommendations. The PPR committee did a great job providing workshops to help with any questions this past year. Outside of workshops, the doors were always open to ask questions. Thanks for all the help!
- The planning committee has lost sight of the mission and vision of this college. It seems the committee is more concerned with just growth and not quality growth. Growth for the sake of growth is fraught with problems. Use more common sense.

2012 – 2013 to 2013 – 2014 Respondent Comparisons: The responses to the 2012 – 2013 PPR Evaluation Survey were compared to the responses in 2013 – 2014 (see Table 8). There were substantial increases in every area evaluated from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014. Specifically, 8 of the areas had large (ES >= .80) increases, 5 of the areas had medium increases (ES >= .50), and 2 areas had small (ES >= .20) increases as defined by Cohen. All of the increases were substantial and two were both substantial (ES >= .20) and statistically significant ($p < .05$). Specifically, the 2013 – 2014 respondents (M = 4.14) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were statistically significantly and substantially <u>more likely</u> to feel that the PPR timelines were clear than the 2012 – 2013 respondents (M = 3.18). In addition, all of the areas rated had an average of 3 or higher except for the usefulness of the PPR Handbook and the committee contact. The two areas with the highest ratings were the usefulness of the trainings/workshops and the easy access to the data provided by the OIERP.

Table 8: Average Responses, Effect Sizes and Statistical Significance for the 2012 – 2013 and 2014 – 2015 PPR Participants who responded to the PPR Evaluation Survey.

Question	2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		Effect Size & 95% CI			Statistically Significant?
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	ES	Lower	Upper	
How clear was the PPR process?	10	2.90	11	2.64	7	3.43	0.67	-0.33	1.61	No
How clear were the PPR timelines?	10	4.10	11	3.18	7	4.14	0.85	-0.18	1.79	Yes
How useful was the feedback that your program received from the PPR Committee?	10	3.60	11	2.45	6	3.33	0.80	-0.27	1.79	No
How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process?	10	3.60	11	3.18	7	4.00	0.58	-0.41	1.52	No
How useful was the PPR process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program?	10	3.80	11	2.45	7	4.00	1.30	0.21	2.27	No
How useful was the PPR process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program?	10	3.30	11	2.09	7	3.86	1.45	0.33	2.43	No
In the process of completing your program review within your program, how collaborative was the process?	10	3.00	11	2.55	7	3.43	0.87	-0.16	1.81	No
How involved was your Dean or manager in the PPR process?	10	3.30	11	3.09	7	3.43	0.25	-0.72	1.18	No
How easy was it to use the PPR Web Tool?	9	2.67	9	2.11	5	3.00	0.62	-0.54	1.69	No
How easy was it to access the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning?	9	3.78	9	3.00	6	4.17	1.03	-0.12	2.06	No
How easy was it to understand the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning?	9	3.44	9	2.78	6	3.67	0.56	-0.52	1.58	No
How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review?	7	2.86	6	2.33	4	2.75	0.34	-0.96	1.58	No
How useful was the rubric (i.e. instructional or non-instructional) in helping to complete your program review?	9	3.11	9	2.11	6	3.50	1.06	-0.10	2.09	No
How useful were the trainings/workshops with helping you to complete your program review?	7	3.29	6	2.83	6	4.33	1.18	-0.12	2.30	No
How useful was the committee contact in helping you to complete your program review?	6	3.67	6	2.00	5	2.80	0.62	-0.64	1.78	Yes
Do you think the interview with the Planning and Program Review Committee is useful to the program review planning process?					6	3.33				