Planning and Program Review Feedback Results – Spring 2015
Prepared by Keith Wurtz

Purpose of Brief
This brief illustrates the results from the Spring 2015 PPRC survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2014 – 2015 Planning and Program Review (PPR) four-year and annual plan participants.

Sample
- 37 four-year and annual plan participants responded to the survey
- 41% of the respondents were the primary writer
- 22% of the respondents attended a workshop/training

Summary of Findings
- There were substantial increases in two areas evaluated from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015
  - 74% of the respondents felt that the PPR handbook was useful in helping to complete the program review/annual plan
  - 84% of the respondents felt that the Web Tool was easy to use
- 88% of the respondents felt that the data provided by OIERP was easy to access
- 80% felt that the BORG Data Mart was easy to use

Suggestion for Programs Completing their Program Reviews in 2014-2015

"Measure everything you do and report the outcomes on the PPR document. Also, follow the scoring rubrics provided by the PPR committee. The links to these scoring rubrics are provided for each question as one goes through the Web tool."

Overview

The purpose of this brief is to illustrate the results from the Spring 2015 PPRC survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2014 – 2015 Planning and Program Review (PPR) four-year and annual plan participants.

Methodology

On April 10, 2015 29 all faculty, staff, and managers were emailed a link and asked to complete a web-based survey. Participants were given until May 1, 2015 to complete the survey in order to provide enough time for the results to be analyzed and discussed to help inform changes for the 2015 – 2016 year. Thirty people responded to the survey. The survey asked respondents who participated in either annual planning or the four-year plan 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 feedback on the interview process, suggestions for programs next year, suggestions for improving the PPR Process, and any additional comments.

The effect size statistic was used to indicate the size of the difference between how PPR participants in 2013 – 2014 rated the PPR four-year planning process and how 2014 – 2015 participants rated the PPR four-year planning 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).

Sample

Of the thirty-seven respondents who completed the survey, 70% (n = 26) contributed to the preparation of the annual or four-year plan, 11% (n = 4) did not contribute, and 18% (n = 7) did not respond to the question. Fifteen (41%) of the respondents were the primary writer of the annual or four-year plan. In addition, only 22% (n = 8) participated in a scheduled program review training.

Findings

Respondents were first asked to rate how clear the PPR process and timelines were in 2014 – 2015 (see Table 1). Eighty-five percent of the respondents felt that the **PPR process** was clear (3 or higher) and 91% felt that the **timelines** were clear.

Table 1: Respondent Ratings of the Clarity of the 2014 – 2015 PPR Process and Timelines.

| Question | Not at All Clear | | | | | | Extremely Clear | | | | Total | Mean (M) |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | | |
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
How clear was the 14-14 program review/annual plan process?	2	6.3	3	9.4	10	31.3	10	31.3	7	21.9	32	3.53
How clear were the program review/annual plan timelines?	1	3.1	2	6.3	8	25.0	11	34.4	10	31.3	32	3.84

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/annual plan (see Table 2). Eighty-two percent of the respondents felt that the program review/annual plan process helped the programs to recognize strengths and opportunities and that the trainings helped to complete the program review/annual plan, 78% felt that the process helped to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by the program, 74% felt that the PPR Handbook helped to complete the program review/annual plan, and 68% of the respondents felt that having the manager/Dean involved in the program review/annual plan process was useful.

Table 2: Respondent Ratings of the Usefulness of the 2014 – 2015 Program Review/Annual Plan Participation of Mangers, Recognition of Strengths, Improvement of Services, PPR Handbook, and Trainings.

| Question | Not at All Useful | | | | | | Extremely Useful | | | | Total | Mean (M) |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | | |
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the program review/annual plan process?	5	20.0	3	12.0	3	12.0	9	36.0	5	20.0	25	3.24
How useful was the program review/annual plan process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program?	4	12.1	2	6.1	5	15.2	11	33.3	11	33.3	33	3.70
How useful was the program review/annual plan process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program?	6	18.8	1	3.1	6	18.8	11	34.4	8	25.0	32	3.44
How useful was the PPR Handbook I helping to complete your program review/annual plan?	3	15.8	2	10.5	6	31.6	5	26.3	3	15.8	19	3.16
How useful were the trainings/workshops with helping you to complete your program review/annual plan?	2	18.2	0	0.0	2	18.2	2	18.2	5	45.5	11	3.73

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 program review/annual plan process was collaborative.

Table 3: Respondent Ratings of the Degree to which the 2014 – 2015 Program Review/Annual Planning 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/annual plan within your program, how collaborative was the process?	4	12.1	6	18.2	10	30.3	7	21.2	6	18.2	33	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.

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 56% of the respondents felt that their manager was involved in the process.

Table 4: Respondent Ratings of how involved their Manager was in the 2014 – 2015 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 program review/annual plan process?	9	28.1	5	15.6	5	15.6	9	28.1	4	12.5	32	2.81

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, use, and understand data and the PPR Web Tool. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents felt that it was easy to access data, 84% felt that it was easy to use the PPR Web Tool, 83% felt that it was easy to understand the data provided by Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning, and 80% felt that it was easy to use the BORG Data Mart.

Table 5: Respondent Ratings of How Easy it was to Access, Use, and Understand data and the PPR Web Tool in the 2014 – 2015 PPR Cycle.

Question	Not at All Easy								Very Easy				
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	Did not Use / Unknown	Mean (M)
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
How easy was it to use the program review/annual plan Web Tool?	3	12.0	1	4.0	7	28.0	9	36.0	5	20.0	25	12	3.48
How easy was it to access the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning?	2	8.0	1	4.0	3	12.0	10	40.0	9	36.0	25	12	3.92
How easy was it to use the BORG Data Mart provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning?	2	13.3	1	6.7	3	20.0	3	20.0	6	40.0	15	22	3.67
How easy was it to understand the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning?	3	12.5	1	4.2	5	20.8	8	33.3	7	29.2	24	13	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 were asked if they completed a four-year or annual plan. Fifty-five percent (n = 18) completed a four-year plan and 46% (n = 15) completed an annual plan. Respondents who completed a four-year plan were asked three additional questions specific to the four-year planning and program review process (see Table 6). Seventy-one percent of the respondents felt that the rubric helped to complete the program review, 60% felt that the feedback received by the Planning and Program Review Committee (PPRC) was useful, and 53% felt that the interview with the PPRC was useful.

Table 6: Four-Year Planning Respondent Ratings of the Usefulness of the 2014 – 2015 PPR Feedback, Rubric, and Interview.

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?	5	33.3	1	6.7	1	6.7	6	40.0	2	13.3	15	2.93
How useful was the rubric in helping you to complete your program review?	2	11.8	3	17.6	1	5.9	6	35.3	5	29.4	17	3.53
Do you think the interview with the Planning and Program Review Committee is useful to the program review planning process?	4	26.7	3	20.0	0	0.0	3	20.0	5	33.3	15	3.13

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.

Program review (i.e. four-year planning) participants were also asked to respond to three open-ended questions specific to the programs that completed a four-year plan. The first question asked the respondent to explain why or why not they found the interview with the PPRC to be worthwhile. In both Spring 2014 and Spring 2015, three respondents felt that the interview process was worthwhile and two noted that they did not feel that some of the committee members had read all the information.

Open-Ended Explanations of why the Interview Process was Worthwhile or Not in 2014 – 2015

- Committee does not give the impression they have read all information. Not good listeners.
- I found the interview worthwhile, because it provided an "outsiders" view of our program. We received input that we will be able to incorporate into our future plans to support continuous improvement.
- It helped to get a clearer sense of what the committee and larger campus body focused on or saw as important. It was also an opportunity to clarify program specific goals and the rationale behind them (external accreditation or industry advisory input).
- It was obvious that not all members read the document and one person didn't interpret it correctly
- It was stressful knowing the interview was part of the process. But going through it, the PPR made the experience comfortable understanding the needs of counseling. Thank you for guiding our department through the process. You made a process which is perceived as scary, a manageable process. Outside of that, I did not receive written feedback so I could not answer #4 of this survey.
- Never had one
- No - really had no impact on the program
- No it is redundant and a waste of time.
- Not much discussion took place.

Respondents were also 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 attend the trainings, start early, and follow the rubrics.

Open-Ended Suggestions to Programs Participating in Program Review in 2014 – 2015

- Don't expect anything that you ask for. We've been waiting ten years for equipment and safety needs that are still not fulfilled
- Don't stress over it
- Find out what's needed and supply it, that's all that matters.
- Go to Keith or Benjamin; they will help you with everything. The Dean of my division and my department chair are of no help. They say they are too busy and to do it myself.
- Go to the open meetings.
- Go to the workshops to further clarify the process because the menu is confusing.
- Have your data ready (outcomes from last year) and your new goals outlined before starting the process.
- I would suggest that they seek help and clarification early in the process. There seemed to be ample opportunity for assistance. I would say take advantage of the step-by-step process put in place by the ORP. The ability to focus on a single facet at a time made the process more manageable and less overwhelming.
- Measure everything you do and report the outcomes on the PPR document. Also, follow the scoring rubrics provided by the PPR committee. The links to these scoring rubrics are provided for each question as one goes through the Web tool.
- One question I incorporated in all the answers, but the committee wanted it one statement so I was told I didn't answer the question when I had.
- Perhaps make the committee accountable for the document's clarity and use. Roll ups did not work correctly cost several people many hours waiting for the program to be corrected.
- Refer to the rubric. The rubric helps to focus the responses to the questions. Also, when responding to the questions, simply answer the questions, and nothing more.
- Start early and make sure everybody in your area gets involved.
- Start early and stick to a schedule to complete the planning question by question.
- Start early.
- Start early. Plan to spend a huge amount of time preparing the document. Use the rubric!
- Start early...work collaboratively with everyone who is participating in the PR process...schedule a regular weekly time to meet and go through the process of addressing PR one step at a time...become knowledgeable with the Web Tool, Handbook, and Rubrics!
- Take complete advantage of Keith Wurtz and attend the trainings.
- To define an expectation that will clarify the process for a primary writer of a planning document
- Utilize the available trainings, and reference the printed materials to assist in the process.

All respondents, both those that completed an annual and a four-year plan, were asked to provide suggestions for improving the program review/annual planning processes. The suggestions for improvement ranged from consolidating the questions while maintain the integrity of the process to improvements to make the web tool more user-friendly.

Open-ended Suggestions to Improve the PPR Process

- A drop down menu with HR positions and an automatic cost populated for each position in the resources section. Also, a link on the actual PR tool with the timeline calendar.
- A longer cycle - 6 years
- Any way to consolidate the questions while maintaining the integrity of the process and reducing the workload burden would be great!
- be honest with the actual timelines when expecting equipment
- Clearly defined roles: how does a department divided into divisions make a planning document while still preserving departmental interest as a whole? Does PPR made priorities in such a case?
- Continue to be open to suggestions made by the committee and programs that have recently gone through the PR process. I do have one, but it is difficult to state clearly in this form. I will contact Keith to discuss my suggestion as I am not sure it would be possible based on the time constraints of the committee.
- Earlier notification of deadlines. I was used to them being done in the fall, and having the dean send reminders.... but this year it was due in the spring and the dean did not send any reminders.
- Eliminate meeting, extend the time between program review, remove evaluation so it can be an authentic tool for growth
- Improve the PR menu and add clarification such as: Step 1, Step 2, Step 3, etc. There are several links that I did not know where to start or what parts I was responsible for.
- Improvements to make the web tool more user friendly would be great.
- May hire more research personal to handle the many research request that may come your way.
- No issues, no suggestions.
- Process is fine, the lack of using results is why we're on probation.
- Send the data from the campus climate surveys and student surveys which directly relate to programs writing their program review documents.
- The managers interpret the finished product much better than the committee. It would have been nice to know I hadn't done things correctly before the interview with the committee or the final written feedback.
- The planning process should be less linear, more graphical. It's difficult to see relationships among goals, objectives, and actions when they're arranged in a sequential fashion.
- The questions, in my estimation, were redundant in nature.
- Use professional organizations program evaluations and accrediting reports instead of allowing people with very little training or knowledge to make judgements on programs. Program outcomes are very easy to evaluate if the committee would take the time to read them.

Finally, respondents were asked to provide any additional comments or suggestions if they ranked any of the quantitative items below average (i.e. 1 or 2). One respondent suggested that the committee members and managers are not on the same page, one did not have any recommendations, and one suggested that the committee is too concerned with growth.

Additional Suggestions or Comments about the PPR Process

- Committee members and mangers are not all on the same page. On a positive note, the Research and Planning Department are very helpful and well informed.
- No recommendations. The PPR committee did a great job providing workshops to help with any questions this past year. Outside of workshops, the doors were always open to ask questions. Thanks for all the help!
- remove the evaluation step
- the expectations of participation in producing a planning document are not clear
- The planning committee has lost sight of the mission and vision of this college. It seems the committee is more concerned with just growth and not quality growth. Growth for the sake of growth is fraught with problems. Use more common sense.
- There is no policy that guarantees that equipment needed will be replaced or purchased. There needs to be a rotating system, which was in place years ago but now is based on a popularity contest

2013 – 2014 to 2014 – 2015 Respondent Comparisons: The responses to the 2013 – 2014 PPR Evaluation Survey were compared to the responses in 2014 – 2015 for respondents who completed a four-year plan only (see Table 7). The comparison was limited to respondents who completed a four-plan only to ensure a more valid comparison to the previous year where only four-year planning participants were surveyed. None of the differences from 2013 – 2014 to 2014 – 2015 were statistically significantly different; however, referring to the effect size (ES) there were four substantial (ES >= .20) decreases and two substantial increases. Specifically, there were substantial decreases in the following areas:

- Usefulness of having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process (decrease from 4.00 to 2.93)
- Usefulness of the trainings/workshops with helping to complete the program review (decrease from 4.33 to 3.88)
- Involvement of the Dean or manager in the PPR process (decrease from 3.43 to 2.76)
- Usefulness of the feedback program receives from the PPRC (decrease from 3.33 to 2.93)

On the other hand, there were substantial increases from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 in the following two areas:

- Usefulness of the PPR Handbook in helping to complete the program review (increase from 2.75 to 3.45)
- How easy it was to use the PPR web tool (increase from 3.00 to 3.50)

In addition, all but three of the areas rated had an average of 3 or higher except for the usefulness of having Deans or managers involved in the process, the involvement of the Deans or manager, and usefulness of the feedback received from the PPRC. The two areas with the highest ratings were how easy it was to access the data provided by the OIERP and how easy it was to use the BORG Data Mart.

Table 7: Average Responses, Effect Sizes and Statistical Significance for the 2013 – 2014 and 2014 – 2015 PPR *Four-Year Plan* Participants only who responded to the PPR Evaluation Survey.

Question	2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015*		Effect Size & 95% CI			Statistically Significant?
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	ES	Lower	Upper	
How clear was the PPR process?	11	2.64	7	3.43	17	3.59	0.12	-0.76	1.00	No
How clear were the PPR timelines?	11	3.18	7	4.14	17	4.06	-0.08	-0.96	0.80	No
How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the PPR process?	11	3.18	7	4.00	15	2.93	-0.83	-1.73	0.13	No
How useful was the PPR process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program?	11	2.45	7	4.00	18	3.72	-0.18	-1.05	0.70	No
How useful was the PPR process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program?	11	2.09	7	3.86	17	3.59	-0.18	-1.06	0.71	No
How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review?	6	2.33	4	2.75	11	3.45	0.52	-0.66	1.65	No
How useful were the trainings/workshops with helping you to complete your program review?	6	2.83	6	4.33	8	3.88	-0.34	-1.38	0.75	No
In the process of completing your program review within your program, how collaborative was the process?	11	2.55	7	3.43	18	3.44	0.01	-0.86	0.89	No
How involved was your Dean or manager in the PPR process?	11	3.09	7	3.43	17	2.76	-0.47	-1.34	0.44	No
How easy was it to use the PPR Web Tool?	9	2.11	5	3.00	16	3.50	0.39	-0.64	1.38	No
How easy was it to access the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning?	9	3.00	6	4.17	16	4.13	-0.04	-0.98	0.90	No
How easy was it to use the BORG Data Mart provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning?					9	4.11				No
How easy was it to understand the data provided by the Office of Research and Planning?	9	2.78	6	3.67	16	3.81	0.11	-0.83	1.04	No
How useful was the feedback that your program received from the PPR Committee?	11	2.45	6	3.33	15	2.93	-0.27	-1.21	0.69	No
How useful was the rubric (i.e. instructional or non-instructional) in helping to complete your program review?	9	2.11	6	3.50	17	3.53	0.02	-0.91	0.95	No
Do you think the interview with the Planning and Program Review Committee is useful to the program review planning process?			6	3.33	15	3.13	-0.12	-1.06	0.83	No

*2014-2015 results only include respondents who completed a four-year plan to ensure a more valid comparison to prior-year data.

Table 8 illustrates the averages for 2014-2015 PPR annual plan participants only. All but three of the areas rated had an average of 3 or higher except for the usefulness of the PPR Handbook in helping to complete the annual plan, the usefulness of the trainings/workshops in helping to complete the annual plan, and the involvement of the Deans or manager. The two areas with the highest ratings were the usefulness of having the Deans or managers involved in the process, and the usefulness of the process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of the program.

Table 8: Average Responses for the 2014 – 2015 PPR *Annual Plan Participants* only who responded to the PPR Evaluation Survey.

Question	2014-2015*	
	N	Mean
How clear was the 2014 - 2015 program review/annual plan process?	15	3.47
How clear were the program review/annual plan timelines?	15	3.60
How useful was having the Deans or managers involved in the program review/annual plan process?	10	3.70
How useful was the program review/annual plan process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program?	15	3.67
How useful was the program review/annual plan process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program?	15	3.27
How useful was the PPR Handbook in helping to complete your program review/annual plan?	8	2.75
How useful were the trainings/workshops with helping you to complete your program review/annual plan?	3	3.33
In the process of completing your program review/annual plan within your program, how collaborative was the process?	15	2.80
How involved was your Dean, or manager in the program review/annual plan process?	15	2.87
How easy was it to use the program review/annual plan Web Tool?	9	3.44
How easy was it to access the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning?	9	3.56
How easy was it to use the BORG Data Mart provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning	6	3.00
How easy was it to understand the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning?	8	3.25

*2014-2015 results only include respondents who completed an annual plan to ensure a more valid comparison to prior-year data.