Office of Research and Planning

SYNOPSIS

Research Briefs from the Office of Institutional Research
Planning and Program Review Feedback Results – Spring 2010

Purpose: The purpose of this brief is to illustrate the results from a survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2009 – 2010 Planning and Program Review (PPR) participants.

Summary of the Findings:

Clarity (see Table 1)
- 83% of the respondents felt that the PPR timelines were clear
- 77% of the respondents felt that the PPR process was clear

Usefulness (see Table 2)
- 72% of the respondents felt that having the managers involved in the process was useful
- 67% of the respondents felt that the feedback received from the PPR Committee was useful
- 67% of the respondents felt that the PPR process helped the program to recognize their strengths and opportunities
- 67% of the respondents felt that the PPR process was useful in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by the program
- 61% of the respondents felt that the PPR Handbook was useful in helping them to complete the program review

Collaborative (see Table 3)
- 72% of the respondents felt that the PPR process was collaborative within their program

Involvement of Managers (see Table 4)
- 78% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the PPR process

Respondent Suggestions for Programs that will participate in Program Review (see Table 5)
- A supportive manager "…was very helpful in this process…."
- Start early
- Set timelines
- Collaboration within the department is important to the process

Suggestions for Improving PPR (see Table 6)
- Data needs to be available, accurate, and relevant
- "The purpose of the feedback needs to be more clear…."

Additional Suggestions/Comments about the PPR Process (see Table 7)
- Five respondents commented on the positive aspects of the process and felt that it was a valuable experience: "This is a huge task and I do want to recognize the large amount of hard work the committee put into the process."

Methodology: On April 28th, 2010 39 faculty, staff, and managers who had participated in program review in 2009 – 2010 were emailed a link to a web-based survey and asked to complete the survey by May 5th, 2010. Participants were given a week to complete the survey in order to provide enough time for the results to be analyzed and discussed to help inform changes for the 2010 – 2011 year. Eighteen people (46%) responded to the survey. 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.

Findings: Respondents were first asked to rate how clear the PPR process and timelines were in 2009 – 2010 (see Table 1). Sixty-seven percent of the respondents felt that the PPR process was clear (3 or higher) and 83% felt that the timelines were clear.

Table 1: Respondent Ratings of the Clarity of the 2009 – 2010 PPR Process and Timelines.

Question	Not at All Clear								Extremely Clear			
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	Mean (M)
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
How clear was the 09-10 PPR process?	3	16.7	3	16.7	4	22.2	7	38.9	1	5.6	18	3.00
How clear were the PPR timelines?	2	11.1	1	5.6	3	16.7	7	38.9	5	27.8	18	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.

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 = 3.72) and receiving the feedback provided by the PPR Committee (M = 3.17). Conversely, the areas that respondents felt were the least useful were that the program review process did not help to improve the services offered by the program (M = 3.00) and that the handbook helped to complete the program review (M = 3.06).

Table 2: Respondent Ratings of the Usefulness of the 2009 – 2010 PPR Feedback, Participation of Mangers, Handbook, 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?	3	16.7	3	16.7	3	16.7	6	33.3	3	16.7	18	3.17
How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process?	1	5.6	4	22.2	1	5.6	5	27.8	7	38.9	18	3.72
How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review?	1	5.6	6	33.3	3	16.7	7	38.9	1	5.6	18	3.06
How useful was the PPR process in helping your program to recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program?	3	16.7	3	16.7	2	11.1	9	50.0	1	5.6	18	3.11
How useful was the PPR process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program?	3	16.7	3	16.7	4	22.2	7	38.9	1	5.6	18	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 3 illustrates how collaborative the respondents felt that process of completing the program review was within their program. Seventy-two percent of the respondents felt that the planning and program review process was collaborative. None of the respondents felt the program review was "Not at all collaborative."

Table 3: Respondent Ratings of the Degree to which the 2009 – 2010 PPR Process was Collaborative.

Question	Not at All Collaborative								Extremely Collaborative		Total	Mean (M)
	1		2		3		4		5			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
In the process of completing your program review within your program, how collaborative was the process?	0	0.0	3	16.7	6	33.3	3	16.7	4	22.2	16	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.

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 78% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the process. In addition, 44% of the respondents felt that their manager was "extremely involved" in the planning and program process.

Table 4: Respondent Ratings of how Involved their Manager was in the 2009 – 2010 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	5.6	3	16.7	3	16.7	3	16.7	8	44.4	18	3.78

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.

4

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 5). The most common suggestions were for programs to seek help from their managers, start early, establish timelines, and to collaborate with other members of the department. One respondent also recommended starting from the program mission.

Table 5: Open-Ended Suggestions to Programs Participating in Program Review in 2010 – 2011.

Supportive Manager (5)
Do not be afraid to get help from your dean. [Our Dean] … was very helpful in this process for me.
Have a helpful Dean for one.
I appreciated the timelines established by our dean, and the review and feedback from the dean in this process.
Make sure that you start early. We were fortunate to have a Dean which had us follow deadlines for each portion of the document. This helped tremendously as we were able to spend enough time on each area and reflect upon what it meant and what we wanted to say and did not feel rushed.
Work closely with someone who seems to know what is really going on (e.g., [manager]).
Start Early (4)
Make sure that you **start early**. We were fortunate to have a Dean which had us follow deadlines for each portion of the document. This helped tremendously as we were able to spend enough time on each area and reflect upon what it meant and what we wanted to say and did not feel rushed.
Start early and do not get into too much detail. If there are several people on the department be sure everyone is reading the same manual. If the Dean is providing guidance be sure to read over the whole process and possibly approach things in a different order than the Dean may recommend.
Start early and talk a lot among yourselves.
Start early and use this opportunity to take a comprehensive look at your program
Timelines (3)
I appreciated the **timelines** established by our dean, and the review and feedback from the dean in this process.
I would suggest setting in progress **timelines** that set completion and review dates for each question prior to submission. I would also *suggest starting by thinking about the program/unit mission statement* and working back from there. I think this really helps in connecting the other points back to the mission as well as aids in viewing the reflection and analysis from a holistic standpoint.
Make sure that you start early. We were fortunate to have a Dean which had us **follow deadlines** for each portion of the document. This helped tremendously as we were able to spend enough time on each area and reflect upon what it meant and what we wanted to say and did not feel rushed.
Collaboration (2)
Start early and do not get into too much detail. If there are several people on the department **be sure everyone is reading the same manual**. If the Dean is providing guidance be sure to read over the whole process and possibly approach things in a different order than the Dean may recommend.
Start early and **talk a lot among yourselves**.
Miscellaneous (3)
Attend any meeting where the information is going to be shared.   Data sharing, document sharing etc.   **Ask to see samples** so the comfort level/understanding level is improved. Ask for meetings with other disciplines writing documents within your division.   The "ask someone in the faculty bridge hallway method does not seem to be working" as well as one might hope.
Good luck!
Here are some of the things that I have overheard in passing on campus: Hope you have ESP. Have a thick skin going in. Good luck. I'm so sorry.   You know all that time you spent on it? Doesn't mean a thing. They will just tear your report apart. I don't think they even read the whole thing. If they did, then they wouldn't have asked certain questions because some of their questions were addressed in the report. I don't think they know how to interpret the data that was given to them.   You'll probably have to rewrite it and submit it again.

Next, respondents were asked to provide suggestions for improving the Planning and Program Review process (see Table 6). The most common suggestions were to improve the accuracy of data and to revise the feedback report. Other less common suggestions included clarification of goals, group training, and to only require a program review every five years.

Table 6: Open-Ended Suggestions for Improving the PPR Process in 2010 – 2011.

Data (3)
Hopefully more accurate **data** now that the ORP has a better handle on what we need to review.
I saw opportunity regarding the clarification of goals/resources as well as **data** availability. Both points have been addressed and are slated to be improved moving forward.
The committee should write the first draft of each unit's plan, incorporating the **data** which are relevant. Then the individual faculty would have an opportunity to comment on and modify the plan. Expecting individual faculty to have access to data that the committee does not have is ridiculous.
Feedback Report (2)
The **feedback** report from the committee needs to be less condescending and more professional.   There needs to be directions from the committee as to what to do with the report once the department receives it. (E.g. Now that I have this, what do I do with it?) Do we file it with all the other PPR reports? Do we need to act on the negative suggestions and submit a new PPR report to correct any deficiencies? Are these deficiencies acted on and/or corrected/addressed in the Annual Report?   One person should be in charge of scheduling when the departments should arrive. Too many people were involved and it got confusing.
The purpose of the **feedback** needs to be more clear and the feedback needs to be useful or purposeful. A question was raised about what to regarding the feedback and there was no clear answer or useful purpose other than to receive the committees "grade" of the report.
Miscellaneous (4)
Dean should be much more involved
Do it only every five years!
My only issue with the whole process is will something come out of it. I have been writing the same thing in different ways off/on for the last five years, and I still have not seen anything come my way with respect to updates of technology or any of the items that I have requested.
Offer group meeting to assist in understanding. Brainstorming sessions, as well as clarity sessions. While some people may not attend, those that do find this very helpful.

Respondents were also asked to provide any additional comments or suggestions for the PPR Committee (see Table 7). Five respondents commented about the positive aspects of the process and felt that it was a valuable process. Suggestions for improvement included creating a formal template and improving the handbook.

Table 7: Additional Suggestions or Comments about the PPR Process in 2009 – 2010.

Positive Comments about the PPR Process (5)
I **liked the feedback** that was given at the end of this year and the overall review for all programs.
The group put in many hours and are to be **highly commended for their work**.   Having attended several sessions with the planning group (not as a member, but as a representative of different disciplines) they application of the review process was consistent and fair.   I would encourage the group to continue to follow a rubric for review of all documents.   It was no doubt very difficult to indicate to faculty the issues of deficit on the Program Review. Including when submitted documents needed more information or missed the mark. The team this year tried diligently to share information for correction of the document. Sometimes faculty still did not make needed corrections or simply ignored the request.   To the dedicated colleagues who spent many hours of time working with this committee - keep up the good work. Thank-you for asking for feedback. It once again defines the mindset of the people working on this committee.
The process of self-analysis is clearly challenging due to the intense dissection that has to occur in order to get a true picture of the program/unit. Despite the challenge, I saw this as necessary and helpful. The fact that a clear, specific and organized document that reflects the strengths and opportunities within my program now exists as a result of the process serves to help me to understand my program and **make informed decisions in line with the overall mission**.
This is a huge task and I do want to recognize the large amount of **hard work** the committee put into the process. I assume the committee has looked at other exemplary process from other campuses. It would be helpful to share these with faculty going through program review.
Frankly, I could not have done it without [**our manager**]. He was so helpful in instructing me on some unclear questions (not really unclear, it was more my ignorance). I also do not think it a bad idea to have a more formal template we could all use.
Suggestions (3)
Frankly, I could not have done it without Rick Hogrefe. He was so helpful in instructing me on some unclear questions (not really unclear, it was more my ignorance). I also do not think it a bad idea to **have a more formal template** we could all use.
If the committee is going to make criticisms of items not addressed on the PPR report, then those **items need to be on the PPR handout/outline** which is given to the departments. We cannot address items which we were never told to address or analyze and then be criticized for not addressing them.
It is an **enormous amount of work** on top of a full-time teaching load.

Any questions regarding this report can be requested from the Office of Institutional Research at: (909) 389-3206 or you may send an e-mail request to kwurtz@craftonhills.edu: PPR_SP10_Survey-Results.doc, DataPPRSP10.sav.

7