

Summary of Feedback Received on Summary Process Vice Presidents and Managers 2008-09

I. OVERALL SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK: N=14

All but one respondent thought that the Summary forms were logically organized.

The most challenging aspects of filling out the Summary forms were: Problems with ePIE, and some reports not matching up with Summary forms (accomplishment section, ePIE to Summary form and accomplishment section was difficult to navigate also accomplishments in TracDat were hard to match up to College Goals, issues with data except IT data which was helpful and matched up with Summary Reports disconnect between data reported in TracDat and reports that were generated, the trends section, matching up items such as accomplishments to Team Goals, #4 alignment of unit name, trend and source of information was problematic; matrix for Section VI confusing; need clarity for section V #1 and #2.

The majority (ten respondents) thought the reports available for their particular Summary were helpful, adequate, nice. One respondent thought the reports were mixed in usefulness and one thought the reports were inaccurate and incomplete.

The majority (12 respondents) thought the timelines were appropriate, 2 disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The majority (13) agreed that the PIE process is clearly understood by faculty and staff

The majority (12) agreed or strongly agreed that training and support were available and adequate.

Additional Feedback, Suggestions and Comments:

Cutting and pasting is a waste of time---Manager's Summary information is already available in the reports generated by TracDat.

More training was requested on how to integrate the data into the ePIE, how to work with IT to get the most out of the reports and eventually how to place the data in the Manager's Summaries.

Vice President's Summary does not include a section for AUOs and Strategic Actions which are provided to the Vice Presidents for their reports.

Future Plans report is excellent but not tied to any section in PIE. Further develop this section and it would make PIE a better planning document.

Add timeframes to each section of the Summaries. Clarify and add timeframes for ePIE.

Clarify the resources requested page to delineate which actually become budget requests. Align Resource Requests to planned outcomes from SLOs, AUOs, and SAs.

No Coversheet in Manager's Summary to identify area and contact information.

II. EVALUATION OF VICE-PRESIDENT'S SUMMARY PROCESS

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is interested in assessing the forms and processes (i.e. the PIE process, the Vice-President's Summary, etc.) that have been established as planning guides for the college. Please comment on the following components: **N=4**.

1. The components of this Vice-President's Summary are logically organized.
Strongly Agree **Agree N=3** **Disagree N=1** Strongly Disagree
2. The most challenging part in filling out this Vice-President's Summary was matching up the e-PIE formatting with the Manager's Summary formatting. **N=2**.
3. The reports available for this Vice-President's Summary were very helpful, good **N=2**; mixed—some matched and were useful, others were difficult to match up **N=1**.
4. The established timeline is appropriate for the information requested.
Strongly Agree **Agree N=3** **Disagree N=1** Strongly Disagree

5. The PIE process is clearly understood by staff/faculty in my department/division.
Strongly Agree **Agree N=4** Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. The training and SLO/AUO support available is adequate.
Strongly Agree **Agree N=3** **Disagree N=1** Strongly Disagree

Administrative Services Additional Comments: On a go-forward basis, please ask each direct report, whether they have managers reporting to them or not, to complete a Manager's Summary form. That way, formatting will match up. Right now, trying to make the Manager's Summary and the e-PIE input match up is almost impossible, when combining information.

Student Services Additional Comments:

- The orientation was clearly biased toward instructional departments only (reference : course-level SLOs)
 - The integration of SLOs/AUOs to PIE is still very much lacking. The questions asked related to progress in completing SLOs – no mention of AUOs.
 - “Strategic Action” references are missing.
 - The entire PIE misses the point on planning. There is no section which clearly delineates where each department is going in the future. The SLOs have become static rather than dynamic. Not having a planning dimension to PIE is a major oversight and omission.
 - The Future Plans Report is excellent, but is not particularly tied to a section in the PIE Summary. It is only referenced in identifying Major Themes. The Future Plans report should be more fully developed in order to ensure that the PIE Summary becomes a planning document.
 - Confusion continues as to the reference dates – by completing this in the spring semester, many staff reported on current year activities/issues rather than on the prior year's.
 - Due to the time lapse, the document is a year in arrears in providing an accurate picture of where the department is going into a new academic year.
 - The Resources Requested page is insufficient in clearly detailing what will become actual budget requests.
 - Some of the PIE Summary sections matched precisely the TracDat reports, but some did not match up, thereby creating more work. This meant that some good information was left out and some was abbreviated.
-

III. EVALUATION OF MANAGER'S SUMMARY PROCESS

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is interested in assessing the forms and processes (i.e. the PIE process, the Manager's Summary, etc.) that have been established as planning guides for the college. Please comment on the following components:

N=10

1. The components of this Manager's Summary are logically organized.
Strongly Agree N=3 Agree N=7 Disagree Strongly Disagree
2. The most challenging part in filling out this Manager's Summary was: Connecting the items to our Team Goals; N=2 summarizing/synthesizing the data; Division Scan—we use informal data not college-generated data; interpreting the data, finding data, getting accurate data; accomplishments table difficult to navigate; time to review, N=2 trends need development are redundant to future themes; filling out the correct form (confusion with e-PIE). helpful as far as organization of report sections by questions managers need to respond to; however the printout for data analysis report for Question #4 separated the Unit Name and Trend from Source/Impact making alignment of information a challenge. The Resources Requested Report for Question #6 makes sense because the SLO/AUO/SA were visually presented with resources requested and department/team/college goals; however, that logic is lost in the matrix in Section VI when the first column asks for "Request" followed by "Types of Request." What is the difference between the two categories? It would make far more sense to align resource requests to planned outcomes expressed via SLO, AUO, and SA.
3. The reports available for this Manager's Summary were:; N=4 Very adequate, helpful; N=2 helpful overall; very nice; big improvement over last year going in right direction; incomplete and incorrect.; Accomplishments Report, Future Plans Report, and Common Conditions Report.
4. The established timeline is appropriate for the information requested.
Strongly Agree N=2 Agree N=7 Disagree Strongly Disagree N=1

The units should be working all year with their ePIEs, so the unit deadline should not create undue pressure if people are using ePIE as intended. If we managers had more time after receiving the compiled reports, we probably still wouldn't get started until a week before our deadline. Spreading it out won't help.

5. The PIE process is clearly understood by staff/faculty in my department/division.
Strongly Agree Agree N=9 Disagree Strongly Disagree N=1

Faculty not involved except in SLO development, staff still getting concepts down

6. The training and SLO/AUO support available is adequate.

Strongly Agree N=3

Agree N=7

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Kate was great!

1. The IT reports were most helpful in separating out the data entered into TracDat and saved the Department Chairs a lot of time putting the data into a "report format."
2. We did not feel that the SLO report, however, was very helpful.
3. I think the Division and the Department Chairs need additional training to really know and understand where data should go in TracDat in order to have the information show up in the right place(s) in the IT reports and eventually in the Manager's Summary.
4. The accomplishment report requires a related college and Team goal for each accomplishment and yet there is no real clear cut way in TracDat of achieving that... relating each accomplishment to a college / team goal.

We need to fix Tracdat program to enable sorting of specific accomplishments by college goal. It would also be nice to enable us to input the related team goal at the same time, using a pull-down menu. Lots of time was spent looking up team and college goal numbers from a printed list during the preparation of the manager's summary report because this feature wasn't working in the unit "general" tab

Since there is no coversheet, how would the manager identify his/her division? Is it helpful to have the name and contact information of that manager handy for the next level of review/approval?

This has been a very busy and productive year within each of the instructional department as well as the Natural Sciences. The results and directions included in this report are significant and representative but not entirely complete. Dynamic processes by dedicated members of the NSD are continuing.

- There seems to be a disconnect between the data as input into the TracDat system and the data generated on the reports.
- There is no tracking for the schedule-entry that is input with the course-level SLOs.
- Clarification on data sought in section V, # 1, 2.
- This document is an efficient reflection of PIE. Lacking is the correlation to this summary within the TracDat software, which tends to be convoluted, cumbersome and confusing.

We believe that the e-PIE process has been refined to the point that **it is not necessary for Depts. /Units to fill out the Unit /Dept e-PIE:**

1. Department Chairs who have worked hard filling in all required fields in Trac Dat should not have to copy and paste into another document.
2. Essentially everything that is needed in the Manager's Summary is available to now in reports.
3. Our Dept Chairs' time would be better utilized in SLOs/GEOs activities.