



Planning and Program Review Feedback Results – Spring 2012

Purpose: The purpose of this brief is to illustrate the results from a survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2011 – 2012 Planning and Program Review (PPR) participants.

Summary of the Findings:

Response Rate

- Ten participants responded to the survey

Clarity (see Table 1)

- 90% of the respondents felt that the PPR timelines were clear

Usefulness (see Tables 2 and 6)

- 83% of the respondents felt that the committee contact helped the program complete their program review
- 80% of the respondents felt that the PPR process helped the program to recognize their strengths and opportunities

Collaborative (see Table 3)

- 70% of the respondents felt that the PPR process was collaborative within their program

Involvement of Managers (see Table 4)

- 70% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the PPR process

Access to data (see Table 5)

- 89% of the respondents agreed that the data provided by the ORP was easy to access

Respondent Suggestions for Programs that will participate in Program Review in the 2012-2013 Cycle

- Allow time
- Use the resources available, such as exemplary program review documents as examples, committee contacts, the Office of Research and Planning, and managers

Suggestions for Improving PPR for the 2012-2013 Cycle

- Be consistent
- Streamline SAO process
- Clarify the questions
- Provide trainings at discipline meetings
- Combine like units for a more collaborative PPR process

Comparison of the 2010 – 2011 and 2011 – 2012 PPR Evaluation Results (See Table 8)

- 2011 – 2012 respondents (M = 3.80) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were substantially more likely to feel that the PPR process was useful in helping to recognize strengths and opportunities than the 2010 – 2011 respondents (M = 3.44)
- 2011 – 2012 respondents (M = 4.10) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were substantially more likely to feel that the PPR timelines were clear than the 2010 – 2011 respondents (M = 3.63)
- 2011 – 2012 respondents (M = 2.90) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were substantially less likely to feel that the PPR process was clear than the 2010 – 2011 respondents (M = 3.63)
- 2011 – 2012 respondents (M = 3.00) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were substantially less likely to feel that the process was collaborative than the 2010 – 2011 respondents (M = 3.81)
- 2011-2012 respondents (M = 3.30) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were substantially less likely to feel that the PPR Web tool was easy to use than the 2010-2011 respondents (M = 3.45)

Methodology: On April 10th, 2012 21 faculty, staff, and managers who had participated in program review in 2011 – 2012 were emailed a link and asked to complete a web-based survey. Participants were actually given until May 4th, 2012 to complete the survey in order to provide enough time for the results to be analyzed and discussed to help inform changes for the 2012 – 2013 year. Ten people (48%) responded to the survey, six less than last 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 2010 – 2011 rated the PPR process and how 2011 – 2012 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 students in each group does not influence Effect Size; whereas, when statistical significance is calculated, the number of students 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 2011 – 2012 (see Table 1). Sixty percent of the respondents felt that the PPR process was clear (3 or higher) and 90% 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 11-12 PPR process? | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 10 | 2.90 |
| How clear were the PPR timelines? | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 6 | 60.0 | 10 | 4.10 |

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 helping the program recognize their strengths and opportunities (M = 3.80). In addition, having the Deans and managers involved as well as the feedback provided by the PPR Committee were useful (M = 3.60).

Table 2: Respondent Ratings of the Usefulness of the 2011 – 2012 PPR Feedback, Participation of Mangers, Program Evaluation, and Improving Services

| Question | Not at All Useful | | | | | | | | | | Extremely Useful | |
|--|-------------------|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|------------------|----------|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | Total | Mean (M) |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | | |
| How useful was the feedback that your program received from the PPR Committee? | 2 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 10 | 3.60 |
| How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process? | 2 | 20.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 10 | 3.60 |
| How useful was the PPR process in helping your program to recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program? | 2 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 10 | 3.80 |
| How useful was the PPR process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program? | 2 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 5 | 50.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 10 | 3.30 |

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. Seventy percent of the respondents felt that the planning and program review process was collaborative.

Table 3: Respondent Ratings of the Degree to which the 2011 – 2012 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 | 20.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 10 | 3.00 |

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.

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 70% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the process.

Table 4: Respondent Ratings of how Involved their Manager was in the 2011 – 2012 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? | 2 | 20.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 10 | 3.30 |

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-nine percent of the respondents indicated that it was easy to access the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning and 78% 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? | 2 | 22.2 | 2 | 22.2 | 2 | 22.2 | 3 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 2.67 |
| How easy was it to access the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning? | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 11.1 | 3 | 33.3 | 2 | 22.2 | 3 | 33.3 | 9 | 3.78 |
| How easy was it to understand the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning? | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 22.2 | 3 | 33.3 | 2 | 22.2 | 2 | 22.2 | 9 | 3.44 |

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 2011 – 2012 (see Table 6). Eighty-six percent of the respondents felt that the trainings/workshops were useful in helping them to complete program review and 83% percent of the respondents felt that the committee contact was useful.

Table 6: Respondent Ratings of How Useful the PPR Handbook, Trainings, Committee Contacts, and Rubrics were in Completing the 2011 – 2012 PPR

| Question | Not at All Useful | | | | | | | | | | Extremely Useful | |
|---|-------------------|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|------------------|----------|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | Total* | Mean (M) |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | | |
| How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review? | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 42.9 | 2 | 28.6 | 2 | 28.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 2.86 |
| How useful was the rubric (i.e. instructional or non-instructional) in helping to complete your program review? | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 44.4 | 1 | 11.1 | 3 | 33.3 | 1 | 11.1 | 9 | 3.11 |
| How useful were the trainings/workshops with helping you to complete your program review? | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 42.9 | 2 | 28.6 | 1 | 14.3 | 7 | 3.29 |
| How useful was the committee contact in helping you to complete your program review? | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 66.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 6 | 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. *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, there were four respondents who indicated that they did not attend a scheduled Planning and Program Review training this year, two respondents who indicated that they had, while four respondents did not answer the question.

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 | 2 | 33.3 |
| No | 4 | 66.7 |
| Total | 6 | 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 set aside a lot of time and use the resources available, such as example documents, committee contacts, the Office of Research and Planning, and their managers.

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

- A lot of the questions were the same just asked in a different way and that made it confusing for me. I think it would help if someone could be called to go over the PPR to see if it has met all rubric’s instructions. Just another pair of eyes to take a look at it before I turn it into my manager for review. I had a hard time placing the answers in the right order and under the right question. I work in the custodial department and I’m use to trades and labor work it was very difficult for me to fill out the PPR. It was the hardest report I have ever had to fill out in the 32 years I have been working. The only thing that helped me was that [Name] was helpful and guided me in the right direction when I had questions. There were too many a. b. c. or 1. 2. 3. in each question. In number 1 there were 5 letters to answer, in number 2 there were 8, in number 3 there were only 3 which was not bad. But in number 5 there were 10 numbers to answer in a. or 8 in b. In number 11 I had to add 7 attachments to explain answers given throughout the PPR. **It took me almost a month** to complete the PPR and I worked on it every day. Maybe it was just me I’m not a teacher or professor who might have found this easy I found the form extremely hard. I asked [Name] in [Department] if he was having a hard time with it and he said the same thing as I did it is the hardest form he ever had to fill out in his career. I asked [Name] in [Department] and she said she had a hard time with it also. The only one that was able to help me was [Name] and he is **my manager** I would have like it to look good before he got it. I work at night so I was not able to make it to any of the meetings during the day. [Name] from **Research and Planning** was helpful with explaining how to answer the questions online and how to attach the attachment. I did not get any handbook on how to fill the PPR out maybe that might have helped me.
- I’ve heard that the **committee reps and the statistics people were very helpful**, but I found it impossible to schedule attendance at workshops or arrange appointments for individual meetings.
- It will suck up your every waking moment
- Make sure you can access all the stuff you are supposed to fill out. **Simplify your goals and objectives** (don’t get too long winded or too detailed).
- Meet with the **committee liaison**
- People trying to plan cannot rely on those on the committee; they say one thing and do another. just **plug away following the forms**
- The format was developed for educational area. SAO's had to stretch the described boundaries to fit into the given format
- To **use other exemplary programs** to guide their own process...each offers some similar experiences.

Next, respondents were asked to comment on their meeting with the PPR Committee and include any recommendations for improvement. Overall, respondents were pleased with the meetings. One suggestion was to make sure units are aware of the meeting times early so they can arrange their schedules accordingly and fully participate.

Open-ended Suggestions to Improve Committee Meetings with Units

- Disjointed
- I was not invited to this meeting until the day of the meeting so I was late and they were almost finished when I got there. I would recommend that the meeting time and date be given **one or two days** before the meeting so I can make arrangements to be there on time.
- No, the meeting was fine
- No, they were very courteous and patient.
- The meeting was great.
- Yes don't duplicate the needed sections. Ask what you, why you do, how you do, when you do, can you do better, nothing more or less.

Respondents were asked to provide suggestions for improving the Planning and Program Review process. Suggestions were to be consistent, streamline, and clarify the questions and the process, provide trainings at discipline meetings, and combine like units to collaborate in the PPR process.

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

- **Develop a streamlined review for SAO's.**
- Don't change the target every time we do this.
- Everything at CHC is so fragmented. At other institutions, I've worked together with sister disciplines to collegially consider what it takes to move a student through a degree program. I don't consider a cluster of two or three classes to constitute a program, but that's how it gets done at CHC. Here it seems typical that one faculty member is ALONE in the process, and we have several faculty members separately duplicating work instead of **working together** to create a shared vision and single report. It is great for keeping us isolated and in the "my little kingdom" frame of mind.
- Have **trainings in discipline meetings.**
- My guess is that our department possibly did more than they needed to...it would help to know if there was any specific information that didn't need to be done and included. It was an enormous amount of time and work.
- Yes, cut it into two reports so it is not so long I was very existed when I was finished filling out the PPR. If you know when you need it; three months before have half of the questions asked in one report such as; 1 through 5. Then in a month and a half have the other 6 to 11 questions asked. And try and make each question shorter not number 1 with a. b. c. d. e. and f. And don't ask the same question over and over again in different ways.
- Your job is our program and not your process, you seem to have the importance backwards

Finally, respondents were asked to provide any additional comments or suggestions for the PPR Committee. One respondent suggested the questions for the next cycle be sent out in the previous year to remind units the process is ongoing.

Additional Suggestions or Comments about the PPR Process

- Have **trainings in discipline meetings**.
- I'm very pleased with the entire support system for completing this paramount task. [Name] and [Name] were over-the-top helpful and patient. Thanks to [Name] as well for making the time to explain the rubrics and process. She also helped me make sure I was on target.
- Yes, I think you should give out the next set of questions for 2012 - 2013 now so everyone can see what the questions are going to be so they can work on them throughout the year. Adding in attachment as needed or created, knowing what when I have started on a new project and that is should be in the next PPR I can set myself up to succeed. Not having to look and think at the last minute what did I do in the past year. It should be an ongoing project for the year. It would remind me to make sure and comply with my goals and improve on work on them throughout the year. So at the end when the report is due all I have to go is go back and read it to see if I left something out. I could go over it with my manager throughout the year to insure I'm going in the right direction or work on what I need to so I will be able to complete the PPR properly. I would have time to review the rubric on each project I complete so I can answer all questions properly. It would also give me time to schedule to attend the PPR training meetings throughout the year.

2010 – 2011 to 2011 – 2012 Respondent Comparisons: The responses to the 2011 – 2012 PPR Evaluation Survey were compared to the responses in 2010 – 2011. Overall, the participants felt that the timelines were clearer and the process was helpful in recognizing strengths and opportunities for the programs in 2011 – 2012 than in 2010 – 2011. On the other hand, units were less likely to feel the PPR process was clear, the process was collaborative, or the Web tool was easy to use this year when compared to participants in the 2010-2011 cycle.

Table 8: Average Responses, Effect Sizes and Statistical Significance for the 2010 – 2011 and 2011 – 2012 PPR Participants who Responded to the PPR Evaluation Survey

| Question | 2010-2011 | | 2011-2012 | | Effect Size & 95% CI | | | Statistically Significant?* |
|---|-----------|------|-----------|------|----------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------------|
| | N | Mean | N | Mean | ES | Lower | Upper | |
| How clear was the PPR process? | 16 | 3.63 | 10 | 2.90 | -0.55 | -1.33 | 0.27 | No |
| How clear were the Planning and Program Review (PPR) timelines? | 16 | 3.63 | 10 | 4.10 | 0.34 | -0.47 | 1.12 | No |
| How useful was the feedback that your program received from the PPR Committee? | 15 | 3.53 | 10 | 3.60 | 0.05 | -0.75 | 0.85 | No |
| How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process? | 15 | 3.80 | 10 | 3.60 | -0.15 | -0.94 | 0.66 | No |
| How useful was the PPR process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program? | 16 | 3.44 | 10 | 3.80 | 0.26 | -0.54 | 1.05 | No |
| 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 | -0.01 | -0.80 | 0.78 | No |
| In the process of completing your program review within your program, how collaborative was the process? | 16 | 3.81 | 10 | 3.00 | -0.74 | -1.53 | 0.09 | No |
| How easy was it to use the PPR Web Tool? | 16 | 3.69 | 9 | 2.67 | -0.73 | -1.54 | 0.14 | No |
| How involved was your Dean, or manager in the PPR process? | 16 | 3.45 | 10 | 3.30 | -0.10 | -0.95 | 0.76 | No |
| How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review? | 14 | 2.92 | 7 | 2.86 | -0.05 | -0.97 | 0.87 | 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 | 0.13 | -0.70 | 0.95 | No |

*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.