Office of
Research & Planning

Prepared by:
Keith Wurtz

CraftonHills
COLLEGE

Research Briefs from the Office of Institutional Research
Planning and Program Review Feedback Results – Spring 2011

Purpose: The purpose of this brief is to illustrate the results from a survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2010 – 2011 Planning and Program Review (PPR) participants.

Summary of the Findings:
Clarity (see Table 1)
- 81% of the respondents felt that the PPR process was clear
- 75% of the respondents felt that the PPR timelines were clear

Usefulness (see Tables 2 and 6)
- 88% of the respondents felt that having the managers involved in the process was useful
- 81% of the respondents felt that the feedback received from the PPR Committee was useful
- 81% of the respondents felt that the PPR process helped the program to recognize their strengths and opportunities
- 81% of the respondents felt that the PPR process was useful in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by the program
- 77% of the respondents felt that the instructional and/or non-instructional rubrics helped to complete the program review
- 71% of the respondents felt that PPR Handbook was useful in helping to complete the program review

Collaborative (see Table 3)
- 81% of the respondents felt that the PPR process was collaborative within their program

Involvement of Managers (see Table 4)
- 81% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the PPR process

PPR Web Tool Ease of Use (see Table 5)
- 70% of the respondents who used the PPR Web Tool felt that it was easy to use

Respondent Suggestions for Programs that will participate in Program Review (see Table 7)
- Start early
- Training
- Use the Office of Research and Planning as a resource

Suggestions for Improving PPR (see Table 8)
- Streamline the questions
- Training
- Define the purpose for doing PPR

Additional Suggestions/Comments about the PPR Process (see Table 7)
- "We are much better, but we still have room to grow regarding this process. An open meeting (maybe prof dev) to share information among groups."

Comparison of the 2009 – 2010 and 2010 – 2011 PPR Evaluation Results (See Table 10)
- 2010 – 2011 respondents (M = 3.63) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were substantially more likely to feel that the PPR process was more clear than the 2009 – 2010 respondents (M = 3.00)
- 2010 – 2011 respondents (M = 3.63) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were substantially more likely to feel that they received useful feedback from the PPR Committee than the 2009 – 2010 respondents (M = 3.13)
- 2010 – 2011 respondents (M = 3.38) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were substantially more likely to feel that the PPR process was useful in helping the recognize its strengths and opportunities than the 2009 – 2010 respondents (M = 3.11)
- 2010 – 2011 respondents (M = 3.31) to the PPR Evaluation Survey were substantially more likely to feel that the PPR process was useful in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by the program than the 2009 – 2010 respondents (M = 3.00)

Methodology: On April 18th, 2010 34 faculty, staff, and managers who had participated in program review in 2010 – 2011 were emailed a link to a web-based survey and asked to complete the survey by April 27th, 2011. Participants were actually given until May 9th, 2011 to complete the survey in order to provide enough time for the results to be analyzed and discussed to help inform changes for the 2011 – 2012 year. Sixteen people (47%) responded to the survey, two 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 three open-ended questions that included suggestions for programs next year, suggestions for improving PPR, and any additional comments.

The effect size statistic was used to indicate the size of the difference between how PPR participants in 2009 – 2010 rated the PPR process and how 2010 – 2011 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 2010 – 2011 (see Table 1). Eighty-one percent of the respondents felt that the PPR process was clear (3 or higher) and 75% felt that the timelines were clear.

Table 1: Respondent Ratings of the Clarity of the 2010 – 2011 PPR Process and Timelines.

Question	Not at All Clear								Extremely Clear			
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	Mean (M)
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
How clear was the 10-11 PPR process?	2	12.5	1	6.3	2	12.5	7	43.8	4	25.0	16	3.63
How clear were the PPR timelines?	2	12.5	2	12.5	1	6.3	6	37.5	5	31.3	16	3.63

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). The two most useful aspects of planning and program review were having the mangers involved (M = 3.81) and receiving the feedback provided by the PPR Committee (M = 3.63).

Table 2: Respondent Ratings of the Usefulness of the 2010 – 2011 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	12.5	1	6.3	3	18.8	5	31.3	5	31.3	16	3.63
How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process?	1	6.3	1	6.3	2	12.5	8	50.0	4	25.0	16	3.81
How useful was the PPR process in helping your program to recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program?	2	12.5	1	6.3	4	25.0	7	43.8	2	12.5	16	3.38
How useful was the PPR process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program?	2	12.5	1	6.3	6	37.5	4	25.0	3	18.8	16	3.31

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

Table 3: Respondent Ratings of the Degree to which the 2010 – 2011 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?	1	6.3	2	12.5	1	6.3	10	62.5	2	12.5	16	3.63

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 81% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the process. In addition, 50% of the respondents felt that their manager was "extremely involved" in the planning and program review process.

Table 4: Respondent Ratings of how Involved their Manager was in the 2010 – 2011 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	6.3	2	12.5	3	18.8	2	12.5	8	50.0	16	3.88

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 use the 2010 – 2011 PPR Web Tool. Six (38%) of the respondents had not used the tool. The results indicated that 70% of the respondents who used the PPR Web Tool felt that it was easy to use.

Table 5: Respondent Ratings of How Easy it was to Use the 2010 – 2011 PPR Web Tool.

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	20.0	1	10.0	1	10.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	10	3.50

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.
*Six respondents stated that they did not use the PPR Web Tool.

Respondents were also asked to rate how useful the PPR handbook and rubrics were in 2010 – 2011 (see Table 6). Seventy-one percent of the respondents felt that the PPR Handbook was useful in helping them to complete program review and 77% felt that the rubrics were useful.

Table 6: Respondent Ratings of How Useful the PPR Handbook and Rubrics were in Completing the 2010 – 2011 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?	2	14.3	2	14.3	7	50.0	1	7.1	2	14.3	14	2.93
How useful was the rubric (i.e. instructional or non-instructional) in helping to complete your program review?	2	15.4	1	7.7	5	38.5	3	23.1	2	15.4	13	3.15

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.
*Two respondents stated that they did not use the PPR Handbook and three respondents did not use the rubric.

Respondents were also asked to think about their PPR experience and provide suggestions to programs that will be going through the process next year (see Table 7). The most common suggestions were to start early and to talk with someone who has been through the process.

Table 7: Open-Ended Suggestions to Programs Participating in Program Review in 2010 – 2011.

Start Early (5)
Gather data every year to support evidence. **Be familiar with the expectations from the first day of school**.
Get started early!
Keep records and data throughout the semester, and **do not procrastinate**
Refer to the following link for resources that will help you complete your program review: http://www.craftonhills.edu/About_CHC/Research_and_Planning/Planning_Documents/Planning_and_Program_Review.aspx. The goals and objectives take the longest to complete so **start early**.
Start as early as possible -- especially considering data needed and collecting/requesting that.
Training (2)
Take the extra time that is needed to attend workshops and get **training** from any sources you can muster before you go through the process. Interpreting what the committee expects is difficult. If you can find someone who has successfully gone through it to assist it would help.
Talk to someone who's been through the process and get their feedback and experience on how to develop it, however, when the process is changed every year that may not be helpful.
Office of Research and Planning (ORP) (2)
[ORP] is very helpful with providing data.
Refer to the following link for resources that will help you complete your program review: http://www.craftonhills.edu/About_CHC/Research_and_Planning/Planning_Documents/Planning_and_Program_Review.aspx. The goals and objectives take the longest to complete so start early.
Miscellaneous – Time Consuming (3)
Be prepared to deal with conflicting and inconsistent instruction. Extremely **time consuming**. Is it Program or Unit?
The process is **very time- and labor-intensive**. It competes for time and labor with the multitude of other activities - CurricUNET, revised textbooks, committees, student advisory activities, department meetings, etc. The combination of all of these activities takes away from our primary responsibilities of student contact and engagement.
The process was **onerous**, didn't help me understand my program ... and put me in a position to tell the committee what it wanted to hear. I hate to sound so negative, but I wrote the review three times and each iteration got me further and further away from what might, possibly, have been most useful to me in the process. If it wasn't for [name] I'd still be mired in review. Especially galling, was the pleasant response by the committee to my first interview with them ... and then the barrage of anonymous comments about what was wrong with my document. Terrible way to be treated.

Next, respondents were asked to provide suggestions for improving the Planning and Program Review process (see Table 8). The most common suggestions were to streamline the questions, to provide more training, and to communicate the purpose of PPR.

Table 8: Open-Ended Suggestions for Improving the PPR Process in 2010 – 2011.

Streamline Questions (3)
I'd like **fewer questions**, perhaps even some designed by the reviewer (myself) and far, far fewer goals, targets, data, etc.   The more data I had to evaluate, which was a ton, the less I understood the usefulness to me of the data.
Simplify the input process and the instructions. I started preparing a Word document, and then learned of the web-based document. The conversion was not user-friendly. In the end, I did not have access to all parts of input system for the program review document. Those areas could not be completed.   The document seems to have a great deal of redundancy. It needs to be streamlined and to the point. In the end, what was the point? The document was prepared, reviewed, approved and filed away. Where is the direction? Where is the accountability? Do we go through this process simply for compliance or is it intended to drive positive change in our programs?
Streamline the questions as best as possible to make them more efficient.
Mentoring/Training (2)
Get more **mentoring and feedback** from the committee during the process not at the end when you find out that you did it wrong with no way to correct it. It feels like a test rather than a process to LEARN and make changes that will improve the program.
Have **discipline specific training** at the discipline meeting or department meeting, in a computer lab.
PPR Purpose (2)
I still believe that it is **not clear what the purpose of the PPR process** is and how it helps programs. (other than to meet accreditation standards.)   If everyone clearly understands why the hours and hours are needed to complete the process a better product might be produced.
Simplify the input process and the instructions. I started preparing a Word document, and then learned of the web-based document. The conversion was not user-friendly. In the end, I did not have access to all parts of input system for the program review document. Those areas could not be completed.   The document seems to have a great deal of redundancy. It needs to be streamlined and to the point. In the end, **what was the point?** The document was prepared, reviewed, approved and filed away. Where is the direction? Where is the accountability? Do we go through this process simply for compliance or is it intended to drive positive change in our programs?
More Time (1)
Allow **more time** for the disciplines to describe their programs to the committee. It should be a two way street...the discipline should have the opportunity to share as much as the committee to share at the joint meeting after the plan has been completed.

Respondents were also asked to provide any additional comments or suggestions for the PPR Committee (see Table 9). One respondent stated that the PPR process is "much better." One suggestion for improvement included additional training for managers.

Table 9: Additional Suggestions or Comments about the PPR Process in 2010 – 2011.

Positive Comments about the PPR Process (2)
[Name] is phenomenal with his support and knowledge
We are much better, but we still have room to grow regarding this process. An open meeting (maybe prof dev) to share information among groups.
Suggestions (2)
More training and mentoring. Managers have little ability to guide and help during the process.
Strip the whole process down to about five key questions that can be answered in a few pages. Or, allow me to opt out of the process and resign as head of [department].

2009 – 2010 to 2010 – 2011 Respondent Comparisons: The responses to the 2010 – 2011 PPR Evaluation Survey were compared to the responses in 2009 – 2010. Overall, the participants felt that the PPR processes were more clear, useful, and collaborative in 2010 – 2011 than in 2009 – 2010. Specifically, respondents felt that the 2010 – 2011 PPR processes were substantially more clear, that the feedback provided by the PPR Committee was more useful, that the PPR process was useful in helping the program to recognize strengths, and that the PPR process was useful at helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by the program than the 2009 – 2010 respondents.

Table 10: Average Responses, Effect Sizes and Statistical Significance for the 2009 – 2010 and 2010 – 2011 PPR Participants who Responded to the PPR Evaluation Survey.

Question	2009-2010		2010-2011		Effect Size & 95% CI			Statistically Significant?*
	N	Mean	N	Mean	ES	Lower	Upper	
How clear was the 2010 - 2011 PPR process?	18	3.00	16	3.63	**0.50**	-0.20	1.17	No
How clear were the Planning and Program Review (PPR) timelines?	18	3.67	16	3.63	-0.03	-0.70	0.64	No
How useful was the feedback that your program received from the PPR Committee?	18	3.17	16	3.63	**0.34**	-0.35	1.01	No
How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process?	18	3.72	16	3.81	0.07	-0.60	0.74	No
How useful was the PPR process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program?	18	3.11	16	3.38	**0.22**	-0.46	0.89	No
How useful was the PPR process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program?	18	3.00	16	3.31	**0.25**	-0.43	0.92	No
In the process of completing your program review within your program, how collaborative was the process?	16	3.50	16	3.63	0.12	-0.58	0.81	No
How involved was your Dean, or manager in the PPR process?	18	3.78	16	3.88	0.07	-0.60	0.75	No
How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review?	18	3.06	14	2.93	-0.11	-0.81	0.59	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.