

Academic Affairs Program Analysis Report Feedback

Description: feedback for Madonna on new annual report process

Date Created: 5/24/2018 5:22:06 PM

Date Range: 5/30/2018 6:00:00 AM - 6/22/2018 5:21:00 PM

Total Respondents: 36

Count	Percent	
36	100.00%	
Count	Percent	
1	2.78%	A and B to some degree.
1	2.78%	a) consider future opportunities b) identify strengths and weaknesses c) considered ways our department embodies WSU's values of Access, Learning, Community and Student Success
1	2.78%	Actually did all of these. We had given thought to all areas prior to the report so this was a good reminder of how we were accomplishing what was needed.
1	2.78%	As it happens, I had recently completed a SWOT analysis for our department so it was rather seamless to use that information for the annual report. That said, yes, I think this process is something all departments should do on a regular basis.
1	2.78%	I appreciated being able to see the data provided. It also was a good opportunity to reflect on long-term program goals.
1	2.78%	I think one thing to consider is that some departments, like mine, are actually doing quite well, which the data reflected. I think there needs to be some way to make on-going success (rather than, dang, we need to really step it up) a commendable achievement. I know that it is, intrinsically, but this report made it seem like I was going to be better off reporting all the things we were going to change rather than saying, wow, we've been doing a great job and by gosh, we're going to keep it up. Especially when funding becomes involved, it's hard not to say "we need money to make these changes" when in fact what I really wanted to say was "we need support and funding to keep doing the terrific work we have been and plan to continue doing and to retain the quality faculty and admin that doing so requires."
1	2.78%	I think reviewing the data is always useful, however, we do this also through our yearly assessment report, program review, and our national accreditation.
1	2.78%	I thought it was a little too retrospective. Specific direction to include a prospective look (i.e., goals) might be good.
1	2.78%	I was able to use data from my Annual data report (November 15) to prepare this report.
1	2.78%	I'm not a big fan of writing reports, but I believe in data-driven decisions. The report helped to summarize our efforts and look for areas to improve.
1	2.78%	It did encourage me to decide to push a little harder to get the department to get an advisory council of alumni and local political figures together. But that was about it.
1	2.78%	It did help us look at some issues of meeting demand and changes we might make. I am not sure that it was anything specific about the process, other than doing an annual report, that provided that opportunity.
1	2.78%	It did, but I already believe that my department thinks this way, we do strategic planning, we look for opportunities for change, and on doing what we can to encourage student success.
1	2.78%	It provided a chance to explain how we try to manage the department, which no one has shown any interest in since I've been chair, so it's refreshing to have a chance to explain things and it will be exciting if someone above the department level takes an interest and tries to understand who we are and why we do what we do. It was also helpful to see some of the data we haven't in the past had a chance to see. I'm not sure how much it really points the way forward immediately because this is all very new, but I think that follow-up and ongoing discussions with administration will further that possibility. And if we use this type of format and data going forward in combination with consistent feedback from administration about how they view success so that it is a long-term, approachable target (or targets) I think it could move us in that direction.
1	2.78%	No because we were already do all of these things and communicating at the program/department/college levels. The program report process

just required us to communicate to the Provost office in a way that she requested.

1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	No. I didn't learn anything new or see things differently after doing the reoport.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not anymore than our annual reports and 1,2,3 documents that we prepare for the Dean. It seemed to me we were just rehashing what the numbers said and defined themselves and not really making any amazing "findings" outside of what the numbers were saying. I believe these reports could be made by Academic Affairs and then sent to us for review, additions/changes, and/or approval. I certainly felt like I was just re-stating what the numbers meant and the process itself wasn't that too informative for the program that completed it.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not especially. I found the metrics that I was asked to report on did not provide meaningful data regarding these areas, and therefore did not prompt valuable reflection in the three areas listed above. I am constantly working on these areas anyway; the structure of the report did not allow me to reflect further (and in some respects I was constrained).
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Probably not. We are always cognizant of these issues anyway, so the process was not particularly fruitful.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sort of.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	The issue here is whether it prompted us to think in *new* ways. Our department was already considering future opportunities, areas in which we can make changes, and how we interact with WSU's mission and values. So in general I would say it did not lead to new thinking in these areas. Instead we reported what we had been doing and will be doing in the future.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	The primary one was identifying areas for changes. Indirectly from this was considering future opportunities.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	The process assisted in future planning and identifying areas to make changes.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	The process helps figuring out the issues and opportunities by re-thinking the details.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	The report format is helpful in all of these categories. It does a good job of encouraging programs to look carefully at the many ways to contribute overall to student success, and does so in way that did not feel too "one-size-fits-all."
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	There was not a lot we didn't already know. I represent a small program, and we are already aware and working on a-c, as we consider it our job.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	tie objectives to learning outcomes for the program and consider future growth
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	We engaged in a departmental Strategic Planning workshop two years ago and produced an annual updated plan since that time. This original plan included a comprehensive SWOT analysis which addressed many of the questions on the program review.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	We were already doing a yearly strategic plan and I feel this report just made it more complicated. I do feel the data helped although we had already looked at in the dashboard and discussed in faculty meetings.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	yes
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	yes this report combined with the just complete 5 year review help a lot. In my report we Identified several points in the data that were not so helpful...like trying seperate the Associate degree and Bachelors degree in Radiologic Sciences.....An undergraduate report and a graduate report would seem more appropriate in the future
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, but we have been doing this the last three years.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, I can see where involving the faculty more in reviewing the Program Analysis would benefit the University and students; it provides an opportunity to review how we do embody WSU values/how we can improve.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, it allowed us to articulate goals for the future and to demonstrate the many ways our work align's with WSU's core values/themes (Access, Learning, Community) and the many ways our work is sharply focused on Student Success.
1	2.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes. It has encouraged me to do a better job of tracking graduate success in our program.

36 Respondents

Q2. Academic Affairs consulted with department chairs to determine the most optimal time of year to require completion of the Program Analysis. Given that we'll never find a date loved by all, what is your reaction to the TIMING of this report?

Count	Percent	
36	100.00%	
Count	Percent	
1	2.78%	After Spring term seems best so that we can evaluate the just completed academic year.
1	2.78%	Early June would be fine; early May is too soon.
1	2.78%	End of May worked best for me.
1	2.78%	End of the academic year is just fine for me.
1	2.78%	Good timing
1	2.78%	Having it at the end of the year was difficult. I would prefer it to be at the beginning of Fall or Spring semesters.
1	2.78%	Having it due a few weeks after the conclusion of Spring Semester worked well.
1	2.78%	I agree that it's never a good time for everyone. That said, Summer semester would seem to be the most logical choice. It is less busy for most and it gives us an opportunity to take a retrospective look at the entire academic year to determine what was good, what was not so good, and what can be improved for next year.
1	2.78%	I have no preference on time of year. We collect information all year and will be fine with what the rest of the university would like to choose as a time line for the report.
1	2.78%	I think the timing of this was problematic this year, given that it was a new format with little guidance. I think trying to have this due May 1 is not realistic, given the end of the semester, but that having it due May 15 or June 1 (or giving an option for either) is fine.
1	2.78%	I think the timing was pretty good, but it was difficult to get feedback from some faculty.
1	2.78%	I thought the timing was good.
1	2.78%	I thought the timing was ok.
1	2.78%	I would rather have the yearly assessment report be broadened to include the elements needed for this report so there was just one report.
1	2.78%	I'm fine with the spring as long as we get the information (notice, data) in February and have it due in May ---- our program takes a Study Abroad trip at the first of May each year so getting the notice in mid-April and due in May was a bit of a time crunch for me especially with grading, end of year activities, etc,.....luckily, this year our SA trip left a bit later so I was able to the meet the deadline but couldn't next year if the notification and due dates were the same.
1	2.78%	I'm okay with the timing, however, THIS SEEMED REDUNDANT TO THE NOVEMBER 15TH DATA REPORT. Would it be possible to only have one due by May 25th?
1	2.78%	It does seem like the most ideal time of the year to do this work.
1	2.78%	It was a little weird not having this year's data because thinking back to last year seems like a long way at this point and it also caused me to wonder what this year's data would show and whether they would agree with my analysis or not. Like you say, there is no optimal time and this time seems best for planning for the next year. Doing the report in fall would be too late. So overall I think this is the best time possible.
2	5.56%	It was fine.
1	2.78%	It was fine. May is the best time to do this kind of report writing.
1	2.78%	Mid-May allows for planning during the summer but gives chairs time after the semester to get the report done.
1	2.78%	No comment.
1	2.78%	Probably the Nov 15th time with assessment data is best.
1	2.78%	The main problem this year was the short time to prepare the report, especially in COS. The other problem is that many (most?) chairs are 10 month employees, with the 10th month of work spread through the summer. So the report was work we had to do when we already had plans for our summer schedules.

1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	The month of May seems to be the best time to work on a report of this type.
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	The report could be due a bit earlier in the Spring semester (March-April timeframe).
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	The time frame was not good. Later in summer or the beginning of Fall would be better working for me.
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	The timing is wrong. Most faculty are under 9 month contracts which for most of them in my Department means August - April. Asking them to then complete the report when most of them are on leave does not work for us. With multiple programs in the Department this means multiple program directors would be asked to develop this report for my initial review while outside f contract time.
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	The timing seems odd, since it was at the end of the 2017-18 academic but all of the information was from the 2016-17 year and before. Otherwise, I have no problems the timing.
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	The timing was good...late enough so as not to conflict too much with end of year activities, but not so late as to prevent a timely consideration of the program. Later in summer might encourage procrastination and a struggle to get back into the mindset needed to craft a substantive report.
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	The timing was late in the year; with more time, the individual faculty members can be more involved in the process (& review) and all of us probably need some assistance in interpreting the data we were given. Now that we've done it once, and with any feedback received, it will help us in future reviews
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	there was too much hppening at the end of the year. to complicate that timeing, my department was undergoing self-study preparation for accreditation due 6/15, additionally I perform a "report of currenrt status after graduation to our accreditor each year and taught two courses over the summer.
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	Timing is fine.
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	Timing wise, this is fine. I would have been required to complete an annual report at around this time anyway.
1	2.78%	<input type="text"/>	tough this year....data around the 15 of April and study abroad made me last minute to get it complete

36 Respondents

Q3. Were there additional data you feel would have been helpful?

Count	Percent		
15	41.67%	<input type="text"/>	No
21	58.33%	<input type="text"/>	Yes (please explain)
Count	Percent		
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	Absolutely, I need to know all data points in my department to accurately reflect work load, faculty costs, graduation rates, etc. We cannot pull apart the pieces, data for our associate degree program and institutional certificate programs must be part of this reporting process or you are only getting part of the story.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	As I mentioned in my PA, it would be very helpful to have the data on student passing rates in courses and in the course success rates broken out, so that 1000-level courses, especially for those departments that teach gen-ed-heavy loads with lots of unprepared students, don't unnecessarily skew the department's overall picture.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	Basic understanding about the department, from the data
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	Breakdown of emphasis areas
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	Comparative data as to college and university vs program was helpful, but additional data as to the "range" of data among programs would be very welcome. For example, "cost per sch" data more useful if we were provided with info as to how our program compares to others, i.e. if the cost is above average, HOW above average is it? Also, information on MINORS would be helpful as part of the initial data set.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	Comparative data for all categories. Some had program, college, and university, but others had just program.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	Greater time span, 5 years of data do not provide very meaningful information. Also add number of minors to the data sheet.
		<input type="text"/>	

1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	I dont know...I am not trained enough to "dig deeper" and find numbers and information in the systems. To be told we are going to be given all the data we will need and then also being told we will need to "dig deeper" is confusing and expecting us to figure things out when our individual specialties are not in data finding or interpretations related to what Academic Affairs sees and experiences everyday. My Ph.D. is in Academic Affairs so its also hard to even begin to not know what to look for when I dont even know what I am looking at. If this is going to be a greater responsibility on Chairs then when people become Chairs there should be some sort of training period for everything they will be asked to do, how to do it, and where to go to find things, and also what it all means in terms of bigger University and smaller program pictures. I feel like so much is just handed to us and then it is presumed we know these systems, how to "dig" into them, and then what the numbers mean when in reality, at least for me, have no clue.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	I needed SCHs (faculty efficiency) to be broken down between grad and undergrad.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	I think the data section should have been something like, "Using data describe where your department has been and where it is going. You may use the data below or anything in Tableau."
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	I used Argos to find the data I needed. Some of the data provided by Gail was useful; however, other parts were not (or it was unclear exactly what the data was actually providing.)
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	I will work with career services to identify data from their services that can be incorporated yearly.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	I'll say yes--but primarily because we need more time to review & evaluate the data we were given & to consider additional data we might need.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	In looking at the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project, it would have been useful to look at data that was solely focused on Performing Arts instead of Visual & Performing Arts
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	Numbers of students from other majors (listed by major) taking our classes.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	OIE has done an extraordinary job of building a Tableau Dashboard for the Honors Program. I did not need additional data; the process would have been more valuable to me if I'd had the opportunity within the structure of the report to examine data other than the data specifically identified by report questions, many of which were not especially meaningful to the Honors Program. My concern is not with the data as such, but with the structure of the report.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	The average number of credits registered, by semester, for department majors. This would allow us to analyze how the department is doing with respect to the "15 to Finish" goal of having more students registered for a full load each semester.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	The information that we were told we would have to drill down levels or go elsewhere to get.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	We didn't have departmental comparative data for the Library, given that we are a single department teaching one class. So the data wasn't particularly useful as a tool for university-wide comparisons. We did bring some of our own data into the report, and it would be useful to know what was compelling to the readers outside of the Library, so that we can be sure to collect data that is meaningful. It would also be helpful to know about enrollment in the LIBS 1704 by class standing (e.g. how many take it in their first year, after 30 credits, in their last semester) so that we can track progress in our goal of getting students to take the class earlier.
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	yes as stated in question 1
1	4.76%	<input type="text"/>	Yes, one of the questions asked about courses and whether we would change courses offered, etc., but as far as I could tell, no comprehensive data were available for courses. I realize this is probably a really big task, but if we are to assess how courses are doing and whether there need to be changes in offerings we would really need to be able to see several years of course-species enrollment data, ideally broken down by section and including wait list data. On a larger scale, more years worth of data are needed too (I know people are working on it). Five years is really just one cohort of students and to really see trends beyond a single cohort more years are needed.
36 Respondents			

Q4. Were the provided data at an appropriate level of detail?											
Count	Percent										
22	61.11%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes								
14	38.89%	<input type="checkbox"/>	No (please explain)								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Count</th> <th>Percent</th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>7.14%</td> <td><input type="text"/></td> <td>Adequate Course Completion didn't make any sense.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Count	Percent			1	7.14%	<input type="text"/>	Adequate Course Completion didn't make any sense.
Count	Percent										
1	7.14%	<input type="text"/>	Adequate Course Completion didn't make any sense.								

1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Again, there were several times when the nature of the data was unclear. In those instances, I relied on my own queries in Argos.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Again...its not my specialty or area so I guess the detail was correct. The assumption I go into these data systems and find things as much as Academic Affairs probably does, I think, is a misjudgment and needs to be corrected.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	As a department that has no GenEd courses and primarily upper division courses, our efficiency rating looks pretty dismal. It would be nice to have separations for lower, upper division and grad courses
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Connecting the data to specific students would have been more helpful. I've questioned the validity of the data before. I've worked with Gail before to make changes. She does a great job helping us with the data. I just would like to see the tableau connected to Argos in such a way that when I am given the number of students in the major, I can see a list of the students in order to verify the numbers as well as contact students that haven't been making progress.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Detail was OK. Just provide a longer time span to make any sense of the data. Annual fluctuation have no meaningful explanation. In another five years we may get some idea what is happening.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	For the most part, yes, but we found ourselves referring to "long term trends" report at IR's site (for example) in order to better understand the data presented in the initial report.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I think the data section should be opened up so that departments can use whatever official data helps them tell the story of their department.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I would like to also have data on minors and on concurrent enrollment numbers, since that is significant for us--about 2000 students. These data sets would provide a more complete picture of the department's contributions.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Program directors and even many chairs not not accustomed to reviewing this type of data on a regular basis. We just responded to what we were required to justify/communicate on. It's hard to say if the level was appropriate. It felt like the process was ... here is data we are looking at, we will draw our own conclusions about this data but would like you to provide an interpretation so we know whether our interpretation is correct as we don't know all the nuances of your program. So the process is really more about what the provost office wants programs to respond to than what program director and chair would like to evaluate. Hope that makes sense.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	The data did not provide the details to prepare for the report.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	The data was sometimes confusing as it did not coincide with data we might be familiar with, or was not stated in the same way as we collect it in our area. I believe that we can look at data for future reports if we are given these specific areas in advance. This would allow a greater depth of understanding of the data and help the department look at the data throughout the year. This year was a bit of a surprise.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	We need data bout emphasis areas.
1	7.14%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes overall except for the items mentioned above. Data were insufficient to compare and contrast course enrollments, the range of years to look at trends was very small, and the most recent year was not yet available (this is understandable, but does hinder insight, especially because by this time we have just completed a year which we then have to kind of pretend hasn't yet happened; I don't know if there is a way around this, but it does create a sort of temporal disconnect).

36 Respondents

Q5. Were some of the provided data not useful or relevant to your report?

Count	Percent		
19	52.78%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
17	47.22%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes (please explain)
Count	Percent		
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate Course Completion didn't make any sense.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Data was crammed together. Reports that needed reflection in certain question/response areas were not grouped together in report data areas. So questions did not specifically say use report --- and --- to answer this question.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	enrollment was a simple variable figure reported without context (which i tried to provide) doesn't account for the way our off-campus sites are enrolled into the program (enter even or odd years and proceed 5 semester to completion before a new co-hort is enrolled).

1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Faculty commitments are spread across various programs in the department, therefore the Student/Faculty ratio for a given program will be difficult to measure and assess.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Faculty efficiency due to undergrad SCH used but faculty teaches both grad and undergrad.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I did not find #7, the adequate course completion data to be all that useful.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I didn't realize this ahead of time, but I wasn't sure how to interpret the cost per SCH data. It seems that mostly reflects salaries and other things that aren't really part of day-to-day or even semester-to-semester management. This may be my own lack of understanding, but it might help to have more guidance on how to interpret and use those data.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I think all of the data were attempted to be used in the report but overall I just compiled averages to then make justifications for past, present, and future tendencies. I also felt like I was just making it up for the most part as I went along because I truly don't understand the data, its importance, why the data is being given to us to interpret when we don't have enough understanding of the data from an Academic Affairs perspective, and also feel like the report could be better devised from Academic Affairs who understand the data, where and how to dig for more information, and then report to us if a program is doing well or not in the directions Academic Affairs vision, understanding, and "big picture" views are. I think a report from Academic Affairs with their insight and understanding would be more beneficial, then if there are areas of concern or possible improvement we could then meet as programs and with Academic Affairs people to develop the plans to improve.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I would like a greater explanation of E&G line items. What is CE-IW funding and why is it a metric I should think about as a department chair? What is self-support?
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	See above.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	See above. Much of the data on cost per SCH and faculty/student ratios just don't make much sense for the Library.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stated in Question 4
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	The data was not clear, particularly to connect with the questions in the report.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	the number of credit hours to graduation the last chart....our number are always high with transfer students and profession education required for certification.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	There is overlap in our programs so it is difficult to make any particular conclusions about our programs based on the data. Also, some departments serve a significant purpose beyond the number or SCHs and graduates. For instance, our department has sole courses that contribute an important role to our healthcare community, but don't necessarily result in graduates. Given the nature of healthcare education, we also rely much greater on higher instructor to student ratios. So long as these considerations are taken into account, the data is useful. If our data is compared to that of the Math department, it is not useful at all.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is a difficult question to answer. As noted above, the data provided mostly allowed me to provide responses to the report prompts. However, I did not find many of the report prompts, where they connected directly to data, to be especially meaningful to my program. This is very likely because the Honors Program is unlike an ordinary academic department, and questions relevant to those departments will be much less relevant to Honors.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, but it felt so random when there were only five years of data. Anything can happen in five years. "Analyzing" such a snapshot without any context felt arbitrary, like you had to make up explanations. But this is a good baseline for the future. I think what the problem is that there is an implicit assumption that a department/program can have such impact on the numbers in a five-year time span.

36 Respondents

Q6. Would you have liked additional assistance with understanding or interpreting the data?			
Count	Percent		
19	52.78%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
17	47.22%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes (please specify needed assistance)
Count	Percent		
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	A few sample reports with data included demonstrating how the data is interpreted and justified would be welcome and advised for the future.
1	5.88%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate Course Completion didn't make any sense.

1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	As above, it would be useful to know from outside readers what they would like to know about the Library Instruction Program, and LIBS 1704/LIBS 1504 specifically.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	Given the timeframe and situation, additional assistance will likely be needed. Gail (& other staff) did a remarkable job trying to get the data to each Dept and I don't know that she could have done more this year.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	I say "no" actually, but in order to fill in this box, I have to mark "yes," only because there is Gail. Gail was wonderful when I called (on several occasions) and helped walk me through with helpful explanations. In particular, I appreciated her suggestion to do a "deep-dive" into the data when looking at my graduation completion rates to see how many of the students who had not completed their degrees after 90 hours were actually enrolled in Weber classes. That would be worth putting on the form itself (eg: of the X students who remain ungraduated after 4 years, how many are currently enrolled?).
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	I wasn't always sure how to interpret the reports.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	It would be helpful to have more clearly defined goals in how the data is to be woven into the narrative.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	More definitions on a few items would have been nice. See answer to number 5.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	not clear about student demand and responsiveness
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	programs are clearly different in goals, outcomes, and way to achieve our objectives although evaluated seemingly on a similar rubric, not sure that's efficient or equitable by comparison.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	See above. In particular, I would like more information on the nature of the queries that were used to produce the data.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	See comments above...I think mandatory training is necessary.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	Some of the data was hard to interpret, even with the guide provided. I just want to make sure I'm reading it correctly and not skewing it one way or the other.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	The understanding the data documents from Gail helped however, it has been a bit of a mystery
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	Yes in the case described above. Overall, I thought guidance was good, but that being said, additional guidance can be helpful if it reveals the priorities and values of the administration, so I would not say no to additional guidance either.
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	Yes, it would have been helpful, especially since the data sheet was given to us to explain and interpret when it had very little context and framework within which to interpret it (only a-c above).
1	5.88%	<input type="text"/>	Yes, there was a bit of a blind side when departments first received the data that was being used. A better orientation to chairs would be a huge benefit in completing a more comprehensive report, and also provide more opportunity for quality comparison and feedback.

36 Respondents

Q7. Consider the prompts provided in the Program Analysis direction sheet. Were they helpful in getting you thinking?			
Count	Percent		
32	88.89%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
4	11.11%	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
36 Respondents			

Q8. Were there questions that you found to be irrelevant? unhelpful?			
Count	Percent		
17	47.22%	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
19	52.78%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes (please specify)
Count	Percent		

1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	demand and responsiveness might be managed in one section
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I don't recall the specific questions now but each area had several questions to respond to (menu selection style). We attempted to respond to nearly each one. The entire process was not as straight forward as we were trained to think.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I found myself repeating in different sections. For example, E and F could have been put in one category.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I think there were too many questions. Again, as one of those A-students from long ago, I can't read a question and leave it unanswered, even if you say "no need to answer all the questions." Well then, I think, why are they there? And since these reports have a certain competitiveness to them (and I am very competitive), I ended up with a long (probably too long) report.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I thought the prompts constrained the scope of the report. I know this is a balancing act of giving enough structure but not too much. In general, I thought there was too much structure.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	In a large department with 7 programs it's a huge amount of work to answer all these questions across all programs.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Liberal arts programs do not train people for specific jobs. The questions did not show appreciation of the liberal arts tradition of a BA/BS degree.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Many of them felt irrelevant. Numbers do not explain the experience students are getting. The numbers were the only thing that seemed to matter and, if they were in decline, somehow the program was responsible. It felt somewhat punitive to have to come up with an explanation when there are many reasons for any change in enrollment/graduation rate. But, having the data as information was a good thing.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Most of Section E. Responsiveness to Student Demand was not helpful. I think it is essential for programs/departments to consider how responsive they are to student demand, ways to improve that responsiveness, and in general ways in which they/we might better serve students. However, I found the metrics used to measure responsiveness to student demand, as specified in the report, to be non-intuitive. Several of those metrics simply do not apply to the Honors Program.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not overall because the questions included a series of prompts and did not require a response to each one. I was able to select the ones that seemed most relevant and/or that I thought I had some relevant information for.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure how to respond to this as the report was done 6 weeks ago. I do encourage a better communication and orientation from the university to the individual chairs. This would help with the quality and consistency of the information.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overall I felt like most of the questions could have been answered without needing to then report the data. After all if Academic Affairs sees the data and understands their interpretations better why dont you make those interpretations for us. I dont feel like any new things were discovered, just trying to use the data to prove our existence and demonstrate how efficient and effective we are compared to other programs and departments, that where the data was helpful. But most of the narratives could have been accomplished without the data, at least how we completed the report.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some seemed a bit repetitive, or were interpreted that way--but the process can be streamlined & improved as needed.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	some seemed repetative
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	There was something at the end... "where are you going?"... or something vague like that. That could have used some clarification.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	There were some questions that felt like they were asking for the same information
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Well, if I felt a prompt was irrelevant, I didn't respond to it. The instructions were clear that each prompt did not have to be addressed.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, but I don't remember which.
1	5.26%	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, but only because the Library is different.

36 Respondents

Q9. What additional questions might we have asked to help you understand and represent a future for your department?

Count	Percent
-------	---------

28	100.00%	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: red;"></div>
----	---------	---

Count	Percent
-------	---------

1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	Can't think of any.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	expectations for the college and or University ...for example is our goal to increase enrollement by 5% or___ then we should know that to asisst us with planning....such as time space money and so on
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	Faculty/staff related question -- contribution and issues
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	funding budgets analysis compared to the size and graduates produced by programs
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I am not sure....the one program which did the report is not a 100% representation of my entire Department. So to base its "findings" to the whole Department would be a misrepresentation of the Department, its needs, its goals, and where and how we are headed to achieve them.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I can not think of any
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I can't think of any at this point.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I can't think of anything at this time.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I like to think in terms of S.W.O.T. - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats. Focusing on these categories helps me clarify paths forward.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I think it's less about asking additional questions, and more about freeing up the ways in which the questions can be answered, especially regarding data and metrics. Admittedly, from a university-wide assessment perspective, I'm sure you don't want a patchwork quilt of data, with every department reporting the metrics that make them look good-- I would want some level of uniformity, so you know you're comparing apples with apples. Furthermore, most programs are not in the luxurious situation regarding data that the Honors Program is in. We had the undivided attention of OIE data specialists in the construction of an amazing and powerful Tableau Dashboard, and I have plentiful, nuanced data at my fingertips; most departments/programs do not. However, a little more flexibility regarding High Impact Program areas might allow me in future to take advantage of the rich data stream to which I have access. (I understand that I could have, in effect, written 1.5 or two reports, and still provided those data; but realistically, I do not need to go finding more work.)
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I think the big thing that was missing is what the heart-and-soul of every department is: faculty. I spent waaaayyy too much time doing business accounting (SCH, graduation rates, etc), and not enough time talking about what my faculty are doing to keep themselves current and relevant as both professors and scholars. We made two hires this year - stunningly competitive out there - and I can assure you that we did not ask any candidate for either position about their SCH-production potential nor their thoughts on graduation rates. Give me a clear spot to show you what my faculty are doing as scholars and innovators - they are amazing and I want to tell you all about it. "Other" seems like a pretty crummy place to have to put that.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I think the key is consistency. I have reported data several different ways—5 year report, annual data report, and this annual report. Let's articulate all of these for consistency.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I think this may be an easier question to answer when we learn how the reports will impact the departments and the institution. I'm still not clear as to whether the focus of the report is to show that our departments are producing quantity or quality. I am hoping that this new kind of reporting is allowing us to show both (data & narratives).
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I thought it was comprehensive.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	I would start with "How do you see the department changing over the next five years" Then use every prompt to get the author to build on their response. For example, does student demand fit your five year picture? Explain. Do you have a strategic plan to fit your five year plan? Explain. How does your five year plan relate to the mission, vision and values of WSU? Etc...
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	In some ways it would be simpler to ask three questions: What are your goals for the future? What are the challenges in reaching them? What resources do you need and why do you deserve them?
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	It would be useful to be able to organize the report around our strategic goals from year to year. Where did we make progress? What do we need to change?
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	n/a
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	N/A
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	No additional questions required
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	none

3	10.71%	<input type="text"/>	None
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	The entire report only focused n 1 of the 3 areas that faculty members are required to be engaged it - teaching. There was little to no interest in knowing what program faculty, staff, students are doing in scholarship and service.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	There was nothing about scholarship in the report. There should be. The focus is on efficiency rather than excellence.
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	What scholarship was produced by your department in the past year?
1	3.57%	<input type="text"/>	You might consider a question that addresses the obstacles/limitations some Departments encounter. For example, many of the Depts in our College are required to meet accreditation guidelines that impact teacher/student ratios in professional programs. Of course, this may require us to address these limitations and be creative in solving associated problems.
28 Respondents			

Q10. Please provide other comments, observations, suggestions.

Count	Percent		
18	100.00%	<input type="text"/>	
Count	Percent		
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	A valuable process overall, that should become more so in future. Please make sure it is understood that identifying issues and planning solutions is as (or more) important as reporting on successes.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	Because so much of the same information was already painstakingly gathered and included in a five-year self-study, it seemed redundant to be writing yet another report on the same data and accomplishments. Some parts could be copied and pasted, but it seemed busywork since the whole five-year report is available to read online. I understand that not all programs are on the same five-year review cycle and therefore would suggest that those programs that have recently (in the past 2 years) been evaluated by outside reviewers need not provide another five year report. In the past few years, as a department chair, I have submitted multiple reports that simply disappear into the void, and that the process has lost somewhat meaning. I am sincerely hoping there will be meaningful and thorough feedback on this one. I am afraid chairs are becoming tired on the continuous reporting.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	I am wondering where intellectual development (i.e., research) fits in.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	I don't think the data always tells the best story. Thus, I appreciated the format of the report and being given the opportunity to tell our story beyond data. I think data serves its purpose, but again, I think it should be looked at holistically. Simply comparing data between two departments can be short sighted.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	I have stated concerns above. I believe this is an important process for the university and we are happy to participate.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	I think the process should be reversed. Have the provost office review all the data and reflect on what the perception/interpretation is then ask the program whether the Provost office perception is accurate and if not why. So the program level responds to provost concerns, comments, support etc.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	I think there are some fine tuning issues to undertake, but this could be a nice format for an annual report. I don't think it should be related to the program review other than in the broadest sense that knowing about your program every year will help you write about it every five years. In my experience writing the program review is different than this report. Also, moving forward, how is the report going to be different next year? The new items I could add to this report in one year's time will be minimal.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	I was very concerned that this new annual report had no specific items devoted to faculty scholarship. It left me with the impression that faculty scholarship is not valued, only SCHs and how fast our students graduate. Plus, the almost sole emphasis on these latter items gives me pause about the future of this institution. Are we (as departments) to be measured simply in terms of how many students we attract to our major and our courses, and how quickly we can get them through to graduation? This seemed to be the message of the data provided for this annual report.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	If we could more precisely identify the purpose of the report we could tighten the reporting, provide more targeted reports and reduce the workload of deans in reading the report by identifying: Is it to help chairs & deans identify future goals? Is it to provide a platform to allocate financial resources? Both? Etc. Right now I feel the purpose of the report is a little muddly, which makes reporting challenging--not sure exactly what to emphasize for what purpose.
		<input type="text"/>	

1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	none
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	None
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	Overall, I can see the utility in this exercise. What I would most like to see is an annual PA report format that mimics, as closely as possible, the categories and detail analysis expected in my five year program review, so that the big program review is less onerous. Ultimately, if it could be more like the post-tenure review, where I assemble my last five years of annual reports and attach a cover sheet, that would be both efficient and effective. I think it would be helpful if we all were given a couple of sample PAs from this year that were the most effective at compiling and analyzing data, that would be really great. I felt like I was just putting everything I could into this report (in part because it's the baseline - hopefully they won't all be this detailed) and analyzing 5 years worth of materials without a real sense of purpose, other than filling out the report. I know it's supposed to get us "thinking forward," but this report, in particular, felt like it took a lot of retro-analysis because most annual reports in the past haven't had to analyze five years' worth of data. I'd like to think that my next one can simply point to the changes since this one and then there will be the ability to be more prescriptive about the future.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	See above answer to Q. 9.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	Since this is a University wide activity; I'd like to see good exemplars, activities, strategies, etc. from the reports that are used in other Departments.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	Student success, teaching, and service (to a small degree) are well covered by report prompts, but faculty scholarship is largely unreported or undocumented. I would expect a closer alignment between what the University values for tenure and promotion and what it values in terms of program review.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	Thank you for asking for our input ...Gail and her were great support and help
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	The report took less time to prepare than previous versions (and I suspected those were too long for many people to read them anyway). In that sense, it was an improvement. However, I'm very concerned that focus on efficiency (cost per SCH, number of graduates, years to graduation) to the near exclusion of questions about excellence (scholarly accomplishments, faculty/staff/student awards, notable alumni accomplishments...) can lead to a race to the bottom in terms of priorities.
1	5.56%	<input type="text"/>	Without having a clear picture of how to use the data, were to find it, how to interpret it, and what the real goal of the reports are (as this was coming down the pipeline to be achieved from January to May I feel like the reason for doing it were changing) and the changing timelines, number of reports to develop, and everything else with pushing this down in such a short time frame I believe the desire, understanding, and awareness to complete the report also got soured. I think question 9 also demonstrates one of my frustrations...not all Departments are a single program so even the language is confusing when told to do a Department report but I have 4 programs in my Department and then being told to do one for each program, then one for the whole Department, then just do one. If people in Academic Affairs are viewing each report as a Department this is not accurate and I also have concerns about since only one report was developed to "represent" my entire Department. I think the language needs to be more accurate...as this is a Program Analysis not a Departmental analysis...correct? Departments with multiple programs in it should be given more time and assistance in completing these reports than Departments whihc are a single program. Having one month for one report is not the same as having one month for 4 reports. Overall, I think what is trying to be achieved could be handled better and more efficiently at the Academic Affairs level and their reports can be sent to Departments and Programs for review, meet with Academic Affairs personnel as needed to review the reports (i.e. get your kudos or begin creating a plan of improvement). If not, then I strongly believe Program Directors should be compensated (e.g. release time, stipends) to then attend training's, be taught how to dig for more data, interpret the data correctly and effectively, submit their individual reports to the Department Chair who then can review, provide suggestions, etc. As mentioned previously I think the timelines for these being due need to be adjusted if each program will complete them based on how many programs are actually in a Department. Also will each Department be viewed o each Department...if each Department then I believe a Departmental report for those Departments with multiple programs is necessary so all those reviewing these reports do not get confused or make incorrect judgement thinking a program is a department when it is not.