



# Office of Institutional Effectiveness

## Annual Update 2016 Survey Results

### Summary of Scaled Response Questions:

Below is a snapshot of the scaled response questions, which ranged from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). The overall numbers were favorable, with all average responses yielding 3s and 4s out of a possible 5 (very satisfied). Questions scoring lowest pertained to understanding of the process and resource allocation. Questions scoring highest pertained to availability of support and training sessions and data provided. **Results were overall very similar to last year's evaluation, though the questions were slightly modified. The trends of low and high scores were almost identical, though the question on data increased from 3.67 to 4.13.**

Report: Survey Results Report Generated by Taskstream												
Form: Annual Update 2016 Evaluation												
Report Generated: Wednesday, March 29, 2017												
Survey Launch: 2016 Annual Update Evaluation 92 individual(s) of 299 total responded to this survey launch												
Overall Experience with the Annual Update Process												
Rate your experience below (Required Element)												
Form Element Type: Rating Scale												
Total Individual Response(s): 92 Individual Response(s)												
Participation Percentage: 30%												
Response Legend: 1 = Very Dissatisfied 2 = Dissatisfied 3 = Neutral 4 = Satisfied 5 = Very Satisfied												
Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution Count						%Positive 4 and 5	%Negative 1 and 2	Average	Median	Standard Deviation
		1	2	3	4	5	N/A					
My dean or supervisor communicated details and deadlines about the process.	92	7	6	10	29	36	4	70.65%	14.13%	3.92	4	1.23
Training sessions and Availability of Support	92	7	2	9	22	45	7	72.82%	9.78%	4.13	5	1.21
Data was provided that was relevant to my area	92	5	4	7	25	41	10	71.74%	9.78%	4.13	4.5	1.15
I am satisfied with Taskstream	92	5	3	21	29	27	7	60.87%	8.69%	3.82	4	1.1
Content and structure of the Annual Update	92	4	7	18	35	22	6	61.95%	11.96%	3.74	4	1.07
I understand how the resource allocation process relates to Annual Updates	92	12	9	16	27	25	3	56.52%	22.82%	3.49	4	1.35
Overall understanding of the Annual Update process	92	6	8	14	36	25	3	66.30%	15.22%	3.74	4	1.16
<b>Total</b>	<b>644</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>65.84%</b>	<b>13.20%</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.2</b>

### Summary of Open-ended Questions:

#### What was the most meaningful part of your participation in this process?

Main themes included: **1.** Campus-wide discussion and conversation about planning and resource allocation. **2.** The Department and Division-wide collaboration and teamwork. **3.** The level of training and support that the institution provided. **4.** The opportunity to analyze institutional data and apply it to program evaluation and planning. **(Last Year: 1. learning the process, 2. teamwork, 3. training and support, 4. interpreting data.)**

#### What was the least meaningful part of your participation in the process?

Main themes included: **1.** Timeframe and calendar challenges with respect to various reports. **2.** Skepticism whether the process was working as intended. **3.** Need for clear and timely feedback regarding whether requested items were budgeted and why. **4.** Need for continued professional development and support. **5.** Some respondents had problems with Taskstream and the technical process. **(Last Year: 1. Timeframe, 2. Purpose of process, 3. Academically focused, 4. Lack of budget information, 5. Technical/ Taskstream issues, 6. Questions about data, 7. Lack of coordination with calendars and other reports)**

#### How can we improve this process?

Main themes included: **1.** Streamline process and make less complex. **2.** Consider options for changing software to more user-friendly interface. **3.** Continue to provide support and training. **4.** Need for better understanding and meaning of the overall process and purpose. **5.** Provide feedback of the process in a timely manner. **(Last Year: 1. Streamline process, 2. Continue training/ support, 3. Provide more time, 4. Better understanding of process, 5. Clarification of data, 6. Provide Feedback)**

### Addressed Feedback by:

- 1. Created a Non-Instructional Annual Update Template**
- 2. Increased the timeline (3 additional weeks to complete + Built in flexibility to allow for more dialogue)**
- 3. Added a Fall Planning Retreat**
- 4. Provided 2 Comprehensive Handbooks**
- 5. Data Presentations to Deans and Small, Large Group and 1-on-1 training sessions throughout process**