

# Integrated Planning Survey 2018-19



May 16, 2019



Program Review Steering Committee

Bri Hays

Institutional Effectiveness, Success & Equity

# IP Survey Overview and Methodology

Initially developed in 2018 to assess perceptions of the program review, resource request prioritization, and overall integrated planning process

Sent in March 2019 to program review authors across all areas (instruction, student services, and administrative services)

A total of 21 of 53 program review authors responded - 40% response rate

# Survey Respondents

- **8 in 10** were program chairs/coordinators and/or program review authors
- **3 in 4** came from instructional areas
- **62%** completed program review annual updates

# Feedback on Program Review **Templates**

**86%** indicated instructions in SurveyMonkey template were clear

**81%** said question format made it easy to understand what was needed

**76%** of respondents indicated instructions in Word template were clear

**76%** said the questions facilitated meaningful reflection

**71%** said the online template was easy to use

# Feedback on Program Review **Resources**

**95%** said the timeline for submitting program review was clear

**67%** said data provided helped them plan for program future

**62%** said they were satisfied with the level of guidance provided by the program committee

**39%** said connection between program review and resource allocation were clear

# Feedback on Program Review **Support**

**76%** said a program review committee representative was able to answer their questions

**76%** said they were satisfied with IESE Office support

**48%** said they were able to find answers to their questions on the program review website

# Most Meaningful Aspect of Program Review Process (representative verbatim comments)

- “Deeply analyzing and reflecting on our program”
- “This was an eye-opener experience. I got to appreciate the importance of coding and collecting data.”
- “We were pleased that the Annual Review was indeed a review...not a new Program Review.”
- “The most valuable part is always having the opportunity to talk with the department about our program and making plans for the future...”
- “The data was laid out in an easy to find place. The new online format has a lot of good potential which is probably mostly apparent on the back end as it was slightly clunky from the user perspective.”

# How Process Could Be Improved (representative verbatim comments)

## Template:

- “First, the SurveyMonkey format, while an improvement, is kind of clunky as a writer. Putting relevant data next to language explaining the data was not feasible, and I think that will make these harder to read. Also having to write out the whole report and then copy and paste it was awkward, especially as the SurveyMonkey form and template were slightly different...”
- “I would like to have the option of including more than one attachment”
- “Make it shorter”
- “Make it so you can more easily navigate through the online information without having to go through it each time”
- “Be able to print a copy without emailing the Institutional Effectiveness Office folks to get a print out”



# How Process Could Be Improved (representative verbatim comments)

## Process and Support:

- “It is very unclear to me what happens after my presentation to the committee...”
- “More support from staff”
- “It is not clear how non-instructional goals are meant to factor into these reports/requests...how much are community outreach or cultural events “worth” in this process?”
- “Training”
- “I think people could be better instructed on how to read/display/manage their data so it is more revealing. Giving people data they just copy and paste into a table that other people don’t understand is kind of pointless.”

# **Priorities for 2019-20**

Based on the survey results, that should PRSC priorities be for improvement next year?