



Planning and Program Review Feedback Results – Spring 2013

Prepared by Keith Wurtz

About this Brief

This brief illustrates the results from the Spring 2013 PPRC survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2012 – 2013 Planning and Program Review (PPR) participants.

Sample

- 11 PPR participants responded to the survey
- Only 3 (27%) of the respondents attended one of the PPR trainings this year

Summary of Findings

- 64% of the respondents felt that the PPR timelines were clear
- 67% of the respondents felt that the trainings/workshops were useful in helping to complete the program review
- 55% of the respondents felt that the PPR process was collaborative within their program
- 64% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the PPR process
- 67% of the respondents agreed that the data provided by the OIERP was easy to access

Suggestions for Improving PPR

- ...feedback should be based on data
- Have workshop sessions devoted to each section (or two or three sections at a time). This could serve as an editing phase to ensure that everyone has the required information in the right sections.

Overview

The purpose of this brief is to illustrate the results from the Spring 2013 PPRC survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2012 – 2013 Planning and Program Review (PPR) participants.

Methodology

On April 16th, 2013 37 faculty, staff, and managers who had participated in program review in 2012 – 2013 were emailed a link and asked to complete a web-based survey. Participants were actually given until April 26th, 2013 to complete the survey in order to provide enough time for the results to be analyzed and discussed to help inform changes for the 2013 – 2014 year. Eleven people (30%) responded to the survey, one more 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 suggestions for programs next year, suggestions for improving the PPR Process, suggestions for improving the meeting with the Committee, and any additional comments.

The effect size statistic was used to indicate the size of the difference between how PPR participants in 2011 – 2012 rated the PPR process and how 2012 – 2013 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 2012 – 2013 (see Table 1). Thirty-six percent of the respondents felt that the PPR process was clear (3 or higher) and 64% felt that the timelines were clear.

Table 1: Respondent Ratings of the Clarity of the 2011 – 2012 PPR Process and Timelines.

| Question | Not at All Clear | | | | | | | | Extremely Clear | | | | Total | Mean (M) |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----|---|------|---|------|---|------|-----------------|------|----|------|-------|----------|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | | | | |
| How clear was the 12-13 PPR process? | 1 | 9.1 | 6 | 54.5 | 1 | 9.1 | 2 | 18.2 | 1 | 9.1 | 11 | 2.64 | | |
| How clear were the PPR timelines? | 1 | 9.1 | 3 | 27.3 | 2 | 18.2 | 3 | 27.3 | 2 | 18.2 | 11 | 3.18 | | |

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). Respondents indicated that the process was useful in having the Deans and managers involved in the process (M = 3.18). On the other hand, 64% of the respondents felt that the process did not help the program to recognize strengths and opportunities for the program.

Table 2: Respondent Ratings of the Usefulness of the 2012 – 2013 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? | 2 | 18.2 | 4 | 36.4 | 3 | 27.3 | 2 | 18.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 11 | 2.45 | | |
| How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process? | 1 | 9.1 | 5 | 45.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 9.1 | 4 | 36.4 | 11 | 3.18 | | |
| How useful was the PPR process in helping your program to recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program? | 1 | 9.1 | 6 | 54.5 | 2 | 18.2 | 2 | 18.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 11 | 2.45 | | |
| How useful was the PPR process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program? | 4 | 36.4 | 3 | 27.3 | 3 | 27.3 | 1 | 9.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 11 | 2.09 | | |

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. Fifty-five percent of the respondents felt that the planning and program review process was collaborative.

Table 3: Respondent Ratings of the Degree to which the 2012 – 2013 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? | 2 | 18.2 | 3 | 27.3 | 4 | 36.4 | 2 | 18.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 11 | 2.55 |

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 64% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the process.

Table 4: Respondent Ratings of how Involved their Manager was in the 2012 – 2013 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 | 9.1 | 4 | 36.4 | 3 | 9.1 | 2 | 27.3 | 2 | 18.2 | 11 | 3.09 |

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. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that it was easy to access the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning and 56% 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 2011 – 2012 PPR Cycle

| Question | Not at All Easy | | | | | | | | | | Very Easy | |
|--|-----------------|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|-----------|----------|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | Total * | Mean (M) |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | | |
| How easy was it to use the PPR Web Tool? | 5 | 55.6 | 1 | 11.1 | 1 | 11.1 | 1 | 11.1 | 1 | 11.1 | 9 | 2.11 |
| How easy was it to access the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning? | 2 | 22.2 | 1 | 11.1 | 1 | 11.1 | 5 | 55.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 3.00 |
| How easy was it to understand the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning? | 4 | 44.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 44.4 | 1 | 11.1 | 9 | 2.78 |

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. *One respondent answered “Did Not Use” to the web tool and data questions.

Respondents were asked to rate how useful the PPR handbook, committee contacts, trainings/ workshops, and rubrics were in 2012 – 2013 (see Table 6). Sixty-seven percent of the respondents felt that the trainings/workshops were useful in helping them to complete program review.

Table 6: Respondent Ratings of How Useful the PPR Handbook, Trainings, Committee Contacts, and Rubrics were in Completing the 2012 – 2013 PPR

| Question | Not at All Useful | | | | Extremely Useful | | | | Total* | Mean (M) | | |
|---|-------------------|------|---|------|------------------|------|---|------|--------|----------|---|------|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | | | 5 | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | | | # | % |
| How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review? | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 2.33 |
| How useful was the rubric (i.e. instructional or non-instructional) in helping to complete your program review? | 3 | 33.3 | 3 | 33.3 | 2 | 22.2 | 1 | 11.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 2.11 |
| How useful were the trainings/workshops with helping you to complete your program review? | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 6 | 2.83 |
| How useful was the committee contact in helping you to complete your program review? | 1 | 16.7 | 4 | 66.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 2.00 |

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. *One respondent did not use the rubric, three respondents stated that they did not use the PPR Handbook or the trainings/workshops, and four respondents did not use the committee contact.

As illustrated in Table 7, 8 respondents indicated that they had not attend a scheduled Planning and Program Review training this year and three indicated that they had attended training this year. Accordingly, most of the respondents who completed the survey this year had not used any of the support services provided by the PPRC.

Table 7: Respondents Use of Scheduled Planning and Program Review Trainings in 2011-2012

| Did you attend one of the scheduled Planning and Program Review trainings this year? | | |
|--|----|-------|
| | # | % |
| Yes | 3 | 27.3 |
| No | 8 | 72.7 |
| Total | 11 | 100.0 |

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 learn how to use the web tool prior to starting the process and to explain why their numbers from one year to the next had changed.

Open-Ended Suggestions to Programs Participating in Program Review in 2012 – 2013

- Be aware of the problems with the process and try to help the committee find a more inclusive way to develop a meaningful program review.
- Find out who is on the committee and determine who you want to help you; do NOT let the committee appoint someone (or have someone appoint him/herself); start immediately in August
- Learn how to use the web tool before you start the process
- Look at all your numbers and be ready to explain why? Why they went up? Why they went down?... or better yet, make sure that it is in your report!
- Meet to collaborate on one question at a time. It makes it much less overwhelming to deal with.

- Too complicated and long.

Next, respondents were asked to comment on their meeting with the PPR Committee and include any recommendations for improvement. One suggestion was that feedback provided by the committee should be based on data.

Open-ended Suggestions to Improve Committee Meetings with Units

- Feedback is not useful nor is it necessarily accurate; feedback should be based on data.
- I think it went well.
- Perhaps the committee could have more meaningful feedback that can be immediately implemented for program review.
- Sometimes certain committee members who are management use opportunity to ask question as a forum to make statements about what they think the program should or should not do, which is not their role on the committee.

Respondents were asked to provide suggestions for improving the Planning and Program Review process. Two suggestions indicated that the process needs to be shortened. In addition, one respondent also suggested that the training sessions be devoted to two or three sections at a time.

Open-Ended Suggestions for Improving the PPR Process in 2012 – 2013

- Have workshop sessions devoted to each section (or two or three sections at a time). This could serve as an editing phase to ensure that everyone has the required information in the right sections.
- Much shorter.
- The negative feedback and cycles. The committee should be more aware of the image it projects to the faculty, students, administrators and the public.
- This process is too labor intensive for EVERYONE. The workload for the committee alone is absurd. The process is too redundant as well.

Finally, respondents were asked to provide any additional comments or suggestions for the PPR Committee. One respondent suggested the resource requests in the web tool needs to be streamlined and made more simple.

Additional Suggestions or Comments about the PPR Process

- #8 and #9 should be written, not put in some special format. Hard copies should be accepted. Sections should be much more specific, more clearly presented, and much more limited in scope. Reviews perhaps should be done by departments and the reviews only presented to the PR committee with the entire document entered somewhere "for the record".
- I don't know how often people utilize the handbook...and the web tool needs to be streamlined and made more simple, especially for resource requests.
- N/A
- Program review process needs significant changes.
- The process is too long, too complicated, the data is hard to follow and mostly quantitative, and we are doing PPR too often on too short of a cycle.

2010 – 2011 to 2011 – 2012 Respondent Comparisons: The responses to the 2012 – 2013 PPR Evaluation Survey were compared to the responses in 2011 – 2012. Overall, the participants felt that the clarity and usefulness of program review were not as clear or as useful as the respondents in the 2011 – 2012 academic year. Specifically, the 2012 – 2013 respondents (M = 2.45) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were statistically significantly and substantially less likely to feel that the PPR process was useful in helping to recognize strengths and opportunities than the 2011 – 2012 respondents (M = 3.80). In addition, the 2012 – 2013 respondents (M = 2.09) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were also statistically significantly and substantially less likely to feel that the PPR process helped to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by the program than the 2011 – 2012 respondents (M = 3.30).

Table 8: Average Responses, Effect Sizes and Statistical Significance for the 2011 – 2012 and 2012 – 2013 PPR Participants who responded to the PPR Evaluation Survey.

| Question | 2010-2011 | | 2011-2012 | | 2012-2013 | | Effect Size & 95% CI | | | Statistically Significant?* |
|---|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|----------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------------|
| | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean | ES | Lower | Upper | |
| How clear was the PPR process? | 16 | 3.63 | 10 | 2.90 | 11 | 2.64 | -.20 | -1.05 | 0.66 | No |
| How clear were the PPR timelines? | 16 | 3.63 | 10 | 4.10 | 11 | 3.18 | -.68 | -1.53 | 0.22 | No |
| How useful was the feedback that your program received from the PPR Committee? | 15 | 3.53 | 10 | 3.60 | 11 | 2.45 | -.90 | -1.76 | 0.03 | No |
| How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process? | 15 | 3.80 | 10 | 3.60 | 11 | 3.18 | -.26 | -1.11 | 0.61 | No |
| How useful was the PPR process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program? | 16 | 3.44 | 10 | 3.80 | 11 | 2.45 | -1.07 | -1.94 | -0.12 | Yes |
| How useful was the PPR process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program? | 16 | 3.31 | 10 | 3.30 | 11 | 2.09 | -1.02 | -1.88 | -0.07 | Yes |
| In the process of completing your program review within your program, how collaborative was the process? | 16 | 3.81 | 10 | 3.00 | 11 | 2.55 | -0.38 | -1.23 | 0.50 | No |
| How involved was your Dean, or manager in the PPR process? | 16 | 3.45 | 10 | 3.30 | 11 | 3.09 | -0.15 | -1.00 | 0.72 | No |
| How easy was it to use the PPR Web Tool? | 16 | 3.69 | 9 | 2.67 | 9 | 2.11 | -0.40 | -1.32 | 0.55 | No |
| How easy was it to access the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning? | | | 9 | 3.78 | 9 | 3.00 | -0.64 | -1.56 | 0.33 | No |
| How easy was it to understand the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning? | | | 9 | 3.44 | 9 | 2.78 | -0.45 | -1.37 | 0.50 | No |
| How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review? | 14 | 2.92 | 7 | 2.86 | 6 | 2.33 | -0.55 | -1.62 | 0.60 | No |
| How useful was the rubric (i.e. instructional or non-instructional) in helping to complete your program review? | 15 | 3.27 | 9 | 3.11 | 9 | 2.11 | -0.90 | -1.82 | 0.11 | No |
| How useful were the trainings/workshops with helping you to complete your program review? | | | 7 | 3.29 | 6 | 2.83 | -0.36 | -1.43 | 0.77 | No |
| How useful was the committee contact in helping you to complete your program review? | | | 6 | 3.67 | 6 | 2.00 | -1.57 | -2.72 | -0.18 | Yes |

*Statistical significance was not found for any of the differences. This is most likely due to the number of survey respondents in each year being below 30.