



## Planning and Program Review Committee Self-Evaluation Academic Year 2017-2018

Prepared by Artour Aslanian

### **Overview**

According to Strategic Direction 6.0 of the Crafton Hills College (CHC) Educational Master Plan (EMP), CHC “uses decision making processes that are effective, efficient, transparent, and evidenced-based.” At Crafton, committee structures constitute a major component of both planning and decision-making. Therefore, an important step in pursuing this goal is to ask committee members for their own observations regarding how well their committee’s processes, interactions, and outcomes during the 2017-2018 academic year reflect these characteristics. A closely related purpose of collecting this information is to improve the functioning of committees through professional development and additional strategies.

### **Methodology**

The Crafton Council in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning developed a survey, which was distributed to the chairs and conveners of every campus shared-governance committee in paper and online formats during the end of the Spring 2018 semester. Committee members were asked to provide their opinions about the internal process, external interactions, and outcomes of each committee on which they served. The survey consisted of 5 demographic questions, 21 questions on three unique Likert scales, and 5 short-response questions; all responses were optional.

### **Findings**

The evaluation data is included with no analysis or summarization. While evaluation results for individual committees are not provided; however, the aggregated results from all committees have been analyzed and the results are available on the Office on Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning website.

Below you will find the number of the question relative to its position on the survey. As an example, “Q1” represents question one, and was the first question on the survey. The question number is followed directly by the question itself, for example “Name of committee” is what was asked for Q1. The “N” represents the number of responses received, and the “%” is the “N” divided by the number of total responses to the question. Answers with no responses have been excluded from the tables. A brief explanation is provided before each set of questions.

Questions 2-5, prompted respondents to indicate the number of years they have served on the committee they are evaluating, if they plan to serve on the committee again next year, the number of other CHC committees on which they serve, and their position at the college

Questions	Responses	N	%
Q1: Name of committee	Planning and Program Review	4	100.0%
Q2: How many years have you served on this committee?	New Member	1	25.0%
	2 years	0	0.0%
	3 years	1	25.0%
	4 or more years	2	50.0%
Q3: Will you serve on this committee next year?	Yes	4	100.0%
	No	0	0.0%
	Unknown	0	0.0%
Q4: On how many other committees do you serve?	0	0	0.0%
	1	1	25.0%
	2	0	0.0%
	3	0	0.0%
	4	2	50.0%
	5 or more	1	25.0%
Q5: What is your function at CHC?	FT Faculty	2	50.0%
	PT Faculty	0	0.0%
	Classified	0	0.0%
	Confidential	0	0.0%
	Manager	2	50.0%
	Student	0	0.0%

Question 6, directed respondents to indicate how often the committee's processes, interactions, and outcomes during the 2017-2018 academic year reflected each of the characteristics provided below. The respondents were provided with a 6-point Likert scale which included the following options: Almost Always, Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Almost Never, and No Opinion.

Questions	Responses	N	%
Collaborative: Sharing, inclusive, open to input, respectful of diverse opinions, characterized by meaningful dialogue	Almost Always	4	100.0%
Transparent: Open, easy to understand, clearly defined, characterized by effective and meaningful communication with the College community	Almost Always	3	75.0%
	Often	1	25.0%
Evidence-Based: Reliant upon relevant, accurate, complete, timely qualitative and/or quantitative information; not based solely on assertion, speculation, or anecdote	Almost Always	4	100.0%
Effective: Working properly and productively toward the committee's intended results	Almost Always	4	100.0%
Efficient: Performing well with the least waste of time and effort; characterized by serving the committee's specified purposes in the best possible manner	Almost Always	4	100.0%

Question 7, directed respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with statements related to their service on the committee overall. Respondents were provided with a 4-point Likert scale which included the following choices: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

Questions	Responses	N	%
I feel comfortable contributing ideas	Strongly Agree	4	100.0%
My ideas are treated with respect, whether or not others agree with them	Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
	Agree	1	25.0%
I have had sufficient opportunities to provide input into committee recommendations	Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
	Agree	1	25.0%
The ACCJC Standards that align with the charge of this committee helped to inform the committee's actions	Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
	Agree	1	25.0%
The Crafton Hills College Comprehensive Master Plan Goals and Objectives that align with the charge of this committee helped to inform the committees actions	Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
	Agree	1	25.0%

Question 8, prompted respondents to rate aspects of the committee’s work overall in the 2017-2018 academic year. Respondents used a 6-point Likert-scale which included the following choices: Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor, and No Opinion.

Questions	Responses	N	%
Clarity of the committee's charge	Very Good	3	75.0%
	Good	1	25.0%
Quality of communication within the committee	Very Good	4	100.0%
Quality of information flow from the committee to constituency groups	Very Good	2	50.0%
	Good	2	50.0%
Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committee	Very Good	2	50.0%
	Good	2	50.0%
Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a whole	Very Good	3	75.0%
	Good	1	25.0%
Access to data needed for deliberations	Very Good	4	100.0%
Access to meeting space	Very Good	4	100.0%
Access to other resources needed for the committee to work effectively	Very Good	4	100.0%
Training or mentoring for you as a committee member	Very Good	2	50.0%
	No Opinion	2	50.0%
Establishment of expectations or norms for committee members and convener(s)	Very Good	3	75.0%
	Good	1	25.0%
Adherence to expectations or norms for committee members and convener(s)	Very Good	2	50.0%
	Good	2	50.0%

Question 9, was an open ended question that directed respondents to provide their opinion of the committee’s most significant accomplishment in the current year. The following comments were provided:

- Prioritizing objectives with new categories
- Revising prioritization process
- Revising the process
- Revising web tool and resource allocation

Question 10, an open-ended question directed respondents to describe how the committee’s accomplishments align with the Crafton Hills College Strategic Directions, ILOs, and/or GEOs. No comments were provided in this section.

Question 11, was an open-ended question directing respondents to describe how the committee’s accomplishments align with ACCJC Standards. The following comment was provided:

- PPR questions follow ACCJC standards

Question 12, also an open-ended question directed respondents to enter the improvement most needed by the committee in its processes, interactions, outcomes, or other aspect of its work. The following comments were provided:

- Continue to work on prioritization process
- Revising objectives process (continuous improvement)

Finally, question 13 was an open-ended question that provided respondents the opportunity to provide any additional comments. No comments were provided in this section.