



District Services Planning and Program Review (DSPPR) Feedback Results – Spring 2016

Prepared by Keith Wurtz

Purpose of Brief

This brief illustrates the results from the Spring 2016 DSPPRC survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2015 – 2016 DSPPR participants.

Sample

- 27 people responded to the survey
- 41% (n = 11) of the respondents participated in some aspect of the program review process
- 54% of the respondents who participated in program review were the primary writers

Summary of Findings

- 100% of the program review participants felt that the program review process helped them to recognize the strengths and opportunities for their program
- 90% of the program review participants felt that the process helped to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by the program

Suggestion to Improve the DSPPR Process

- “Need to develop question(s) that allow the service area to specifically identify how each objective is directly related to the colleges and indirectly related to student success. Also, need to develop additional budgeting categories that include more specific categories for resources that impact the colleges.”

Overview

The purpose of this brief is to illustrate the results from the Spring 2016 District Services Planning and Program Review Committee (DSPPRC) survey assessing the feedback provided by the 2015 – 2016 DSPPR participants.

Methodology

On April 15, 2016 all District Services employees were emailed a link and asked to complete a web-based survey on the District Services Planning and Program Review process. Participants were given until April 29, 2016 to complete the survey in order to provide enough time for the results to be analyzed and discussed to help inform changes for the 2016 – 2017 year. Twenty-seven people responded to the survey. The survey asked respondents to rate the DSPPR process on clarity, usefulness, collaboration, and ease of use. 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 improving the DSPPR process, aspects of the process that worked well, and any additional suggestions or comments.

Sample

Of the 117 District Services administrators and staff, 27 completed the survey for a response rate of 23%. In addition, 41% (n = 11) contributed to the preparation of the program review, and 59% (n = 16) did not contribute to the preparation of program review. Respondents who did not contribute to the preparation of program review were redirected to the last question asking for any suggestion or comments. Six (54%) of the program review participants were the primary writers of the program review and five (46%) of the program review participants were not the primary writers.

Findings

The program review participants who participated in the survey were first asked to rate how clear the DSPPR process and timelines were in 2015 – 2016 (see Table 1). Ninety-one percent of the program review participants felt that the **PPR process** was clear (3 or higher) and 100% felt that the **timelines** were clear.

Table 1: Program Review Participant Ratings of the Clarity of the 2015 – 2016 PPR Process and Timelines.

Question	Not at All Clear					Extremely Clear					Total	Mean (M)
	1		2		3		4		5			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
How clear was the 2015 - 2016 program review process?	0	0.0	1	9.1	4	36.4	3	27.3	3	27.3	11	3.73
How clear were the program review timelines?	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	18.2	3	27.3	6	54.5	11	4.36

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, program review participants who participated in the survey rated the usefulness of the processes involved in program review (see Table 2). One hundred percent of the program review participants felt that the program review process helped the programs to recognize strengths and opportunities. In addition, 90% felt that the process helped to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by the program, 82% felt that the DSPPR website was useful in helping to complete the program review, and 78% felt that the trainings were useful in helping to complete the program review.

Table 2: Program Review Participant Ratings of the Usefulness of the 2015 – 2016 Program Review Recognition of Strengths, Improvement of Services, DSPPR Website, and Trainings.

Question	Not at All Useful					Extremely Useful					Total	Did not Use / Unknown	Mean (M)
	1		2		3		4		5				
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
How useful was the program review process in helping recognize the strengths and opportunities of your program?	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	45.5	2	18.2	4	36.4	11	0	3.91
How useful was the program review process in helping to improve the effectiveness of the services offered by your program?	0	0.0	1	9.1	4	36.4	3	27.3	3	27.3	11	0	3.73
How useful was the PPR website in helping to complete your program review?	0	0.0	2	18.2	4	36.4	2	18.2	3	27.3	11	0	3.55
How useful were the trainings with helping you to complete your program review?	0	0.0	2	22.2	1	11.1	3	33.3	3	33.3	9	2	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.

Table 3 illustrates how collaborative the program review participants who responded to the survey felt that the process of completing the program review was within their program. One hundred percent of the program review participants felt that the program review process was collaborative.

Table 3: Program Review Participant Ratings of the Degree to which the 2015 – 2016 Program Review 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	0	0.0	3	27.3	2	18.2	6	54.5	11	4.27

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 displays the results of how easy it was to use the DSPPR Web Tool and how easy it was to access the data provide by the SBCCD Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning (OIERP). One hundred percent of the program review participants who participated in the survey felt that it was easy to access data, and 90% felt that it was easy to use the DSPPR Web Tool.

Table 4: Program Review Participant 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					Total	Did not Use / Unknown	Mean (M)
	1		2		3		4		5				
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
How easy was it to use the program review Web Tool?	0	0.0	1	10.0	4	40.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	10	0	3.70
How easy was it to access the data provided by the SBCCD Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning?	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	33.3	2	22.2	4	44.4	9	2	4.11

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 participants who participated in the survey were first asked to provide suggestions for improving the program review processes. The suggestions for improvement ranged from developing questions that allow the service area to specifically identify how each objective is directly related to the colleges and indirectly to student success to improving the web tool so that it is more user friendly.

Open-ended Suggestions to Improve the DSPPR Process

- I'm relatively new to this process and am still getting to understand its procedures. As I get more comfortable with it, and ideas arise, I will note them.
- Need to develop question(s) that allow the service area to specifically identify how each objective is directly related to the colleges and indirectly related to student success. Also, need to develop additional budgeting categories that include more specific categories for resources that impact the colleges.
- The ranking order was not clearly aligning
- The web need to be more user friendly

Program review participants who participated in the survey were also asked to provide any additional comments or suggestions if they ranked any of the quantitative items below average (i.e. 1 or 2). Only one respondent responded to this question.

Additional Suggestions or Comments about the DSPPR Process

- Better survey

The third open-ended question asked program review participants who participated in the survey to identify the aspects of the DSPPR process that worked well. One respondent stated that the meetings worked well and another said that the collaboration within their unit worked well.

- The meetings
- Unit collaboration in formulating our questions worked well for us.

Finally, none of the respondents provided any additional comments or suggestions.