

**Victor Valley College
Facilities Committee
Notes on Observable Outcomes Questionnaire Results**
Matthew C. Lee, Ph.D.
March 30, 2012

1) Methodology and Subsequent Evaluation Cycles

- a) Consider this a pilot, based on an initial set of important indicators and issues, with a small sample of respondents who have unusual knowledge of facilities issues.
- b) The first three sections did not constitute a formal facilities evaluation by campus experts. If they had:
 - i) Items would have been refined, ambiguities eliminated, terms defined.
 - ii) The scale would have been refined, anchored more definitively, and perhaps separated into different scales for different item sets.
 - iii) You would have received training in rating the items, and we would have worked on interrater reliability ahead of time.
- c) Nor did they constitute a formal survey of a representative sample of the campus community. If they had, the items and scales would still have required refinement and clarification for a broad audience, and the sampling and administration procedures would have been quite different.
- d) Part of the Committee's task in discussing the results is to decide (by the end of Spring if possible) how best to evaluate physical resources planning next year. You should consult OIE in reviewing the issues before making that decision. For example, I suspect that you found that rating areas you know is easier, and likely produces more detailed and accurate information, than rating areas with which you are unfamiliar. So in subsequent cycles, you might wish to survey the denizens of each area separately, perhaps on a rotating schedule. In any case, including the respondent's familiarity with the building, grounds, and equipment as an item in whatever survey or questionnaire you use is a good idea.
- e) In the *People, Committees, and Processes* section, accurate factual responses to some of the questions require knowledge of internal Facilities Committee operations that many folks on campus are unlikely to know. But campuswide perceptions are also important for a successful committee, and some of these same questions can be applied in modified form to a general survey in order to find out about those perceptions.

2) Reading the Results

- a) The copy of the Questionnaire shows the item IDs.
- b) The first spreadsheet, in color, shows a preliminary descriptive analysis of the physical resources results. It simply highlights relatively extreme ratings, either higher or lower than the mean of all your ratings on all areas and items. OIE can do a much more sophisticated analysis of the data; this is just a starting point for discussion.
 - i) Note that some areas fare quite well in the ratings: The two parts of the Regional Public Safety Training Center (coded RP1 and RP2), and Buildings 31, 21, 41, and 30 in particular. Others fared poorly: Vocational Education-Welding-Auto-66AB (coded VWA-66), Excelsior (coded Exc), and Buildings 75 and 50 in particular. What conclusions, if any, can you draw about physical resources planning from such area extremes? Is it just that the "bad" areas are old and the "good" areas are new, for example? How do you distinguish planning issues from maintenance or sheer

- condition issues? What improvements would you suggest for next year's physical resources planning?
- ii) Building systems (SB3), technology/automation/mechanics (LB2, SE2, and LE2), flexible configuration (LB3), energy efficiency (LB4), and safety and accessibility (LB5) overall show the lowest ratings, though of course not by much. On the other hand, grounds surfaces and features in good repair (SG2) show the highest rating. Again, what conclusions, if any, can you draw about physical resources planning from these differences? And what improvements would you suggest for next year's physical resources planning?
- c) The second spreadsheet, in black-and-white, shows means and standard deviations for your ratings in the *People, Committees, and Processes* section. All these items reflect characteristics of effective physical resources planning and related work that you as Committee members identified. So in my view they represent the standards to which the Committee and the College should adhere.
- i) The highlighted ratings fell below the mean of all your ratings on all items. That means that in just over half the characteristics, your ratings on average fell between "Meets moderately" and halfway up the scale to "Meets mostly." What can the Committee do to meet all the standards mostly or completely next year, in those cases where it has control over its performance? What can it do to help move the College toward "Meets completely" next year, in those cases where the standard is beyond Committee control?
 - ii) Note the extremely large range of mean rating across the 12 respondents. Members appear to differ considerably about how well the Committee is meeting its standards (though it could be that members simply vary in their interpretation of the scale). I suggest that the members devote a meeting to reviewing these standards, and discussing what they could do collectively next year, both to perform better in meeting each of them and to come to greater consensus about the level of expectations that each of them represents.
- d) The final handout shows all the comments received, transcribed as accurately as I could manage. Many just call out specific problems that perhaps the group could refer to the proper department for investigation and resolution, or place on your agenda for further discussion. Others might help guide the Committee's discussion of improvements in physical resources planning next year.