

Integrated Planning Survey 2019-2020



April 16, 2020



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 April 2020 to program review authors across all areas (instruction, student services, and administrative services)

25 of 54 program review authors responded - **46% response rate**

Survey Respondents

- **7 in 10** were program chairs/coordinators and/or program review authors
- **Over 1 in 2** came from instructional areas
- **7 in 10** attended a program review training session
- **100%** completed program review annual updates

Feedback on Program Review **Templates**

96% indicated instructions in the Word template were clear

88% said the evaluation guides clarified the information needed for program review

96% reported the online program review template was easy to use

64% said the questions facilitated meaningful reflection

76% indicated the data the IESE Office provided helped with future program planning

Feedback on Program Review **Training**

94% said the training was helpful in getting them started on their program review

71% reported the training helped them develop meaningful goals

71% indicated the training helped them use data to inform their program review

Feedback on Program Review **Support**

67% said the program review support team was able to answer their questions

* 10 participants stated the question was not applicable

73% reported the IESE Office provided assistance when needed

* 9 participants stated the question was not applicable

76% stated they were satisfied with the guidance provided by the Program Review Steering Committee (PRSC)

Feedback on Program Review **Communication**

96% said the program review timeline was clear

84% reported the requirements for submitting resource requests were clear

40% stated the connections between program review and the resource prioritization processes were clear

52% indicated that the Cuyamaca College website made it easy to find the resources needed

Feedback on **Staffing Request Process**

59% said the process for requesting new positions was clear

70% reported the instructions in the Faculty Position Request Form were clear

* 7 participants stated the question did not apply

50% stated the criteria for prioritizing faculty requests were clear

* 7 participants stated the question did not apply

50% indicated the instructions in the Classified Position Request Form were clear

* 5 participants stated the question did not apply

33% said the criteria for prioritizing classified staffing requests were clear

* 5 participants stated the question did not apply

Feedback on **Technology Request Process**

50% said the College effectively communicated the process for requesting technology resources

37% reported the instructions in the Technology Request Form were clear

13% stated the criteria for prioritizing technology resource requests were clear

38% indicated the College effectively communicated the process for requesting facilities resources

Feedback on **Facilities Request Process**

63% said the instructions in the Facilities Request Form were clear

63% stated the criteria for prioritizing facilities resource requests were clear

Most Valuable Aspect of the Program Review Process (representative verbatim comments)

- “Annual Program Reviews are helpful for maintaining accountability”
- "Analyzing data gives you a reality check. It tells you if your work is having the expected results or if you need to modify what you are doing.”
- “The workshops to help authors understand the Program Review process and requirements. Having the workshops early was very useful.”
- "Providing the word templates made things much easier to complete before going online. Looking at our goals and activities is always good as a department...”

How the Process For Preparing and Submitting Non-Staff Resource Requests Could Be Improved

- “It would be helpful to have a handbook or have a separate webpage dedicated to writing program review. The overall process was unclear and I couldn't find a checklist of needed items until I logged into the program review survey.”

How the Overall Process Could Be Improved (representative verbatim comments)

- “Improving website to be more user friendly. I had to do additional researching to find program review resources on the college's website including program review data and documents from previous years.”
- “Clearer timeline; de-clutter the Program Review Website; include a visual aid of the timeline”
- “Make both the annual and comprehensive program review shorter!”
- “The whole process for dealing with old goals vs new goals and then asking for requests needs to be tied together much better. You ask for all of these goals, and then you don't deal with requests until much later in the report. The process seems verry disjointed.”
- “Outline full process before engaging in submission.”

Priorities for 2020-21

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