

## Appendix B

Program Planning Evaluation: EMAIL QUESTIONNAIRE

TO: UW-Extension DEPARTMENT HEADS

As you know, every 4 years, UW-Extension engages in a comprehensive, statewide planning process. As we begin the next process that will commence in 2003, we want to learn from the 1999 statewide planning process. Ellen Fitzsimmons, Associate Dean and Director, has charged our committee to examine the strengths and weaknesses of past planning efforts to help structure the next planning cycle. This questionnaire is part of our information collection process. Because planning goes on at the county level, your input is vital.

Please find a time to discuss this questionnaire with members of your county office who were involved in the 1999 planning process and solicit their input. 1999 planning materials were provided to each county office in a 3 ring binder, titled Program Planning 2000-04. Please locate these materials in your county office or go to the web site where they are housed (<http://www.uwex.edu.ces.pdande/planning>) to remember what they are and how they were used.

This is your chance to report what worked well and what didn't about the last planning process and have a say in what we do next time. Please use the following questionnaire to report your GROUP response. Return your completed questionnaire by email or mail your hard copy response **BY FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2002** to

Ellen Taylor-Powell at [ellen.taylor-powell@ces.uwex.edu](mailto:ellen.taylor-powell@ces.uwex.edu) or,  
432 N. Lake Street, Room 609, Madison, WI 53706

Please contact any member of the committee if you have questions: Ed Jesse, Donna Menart, Paul Ohlrogge, Peggy Olive, Tom Parslow, Denise Retzleff, Beverly Stencel, Nancy Stoutenborough, Ellen Taylor-Powell (chair).

The full evaluation proposal that describes the committee's work is available on the web at: <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/planning/>

### **PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE**

---

1. How many of your current county faculty and staff were involved in the 1999 statewide planning effort? \_\_\_\_\_ (total number excluding support staff that were involved in either this county or another county)
2. Of that number, how many are providing input into this questionnaire: \_\_\_\_\_ (total number)

SECTION 1: MATERIALS

---

3. Please answer the following questions about the planning materials that were provided in the 3 ring binder titled, Program Planning 2000-2004:

Materials:	Did your office use? (check one)	If YES, how helpful were they? (check one)	Do you continue to use ?
1. Guidelines for Program Priority Setting 2000-2004 (yellow cover) that consisted of:			
a) Planning matrix for identifying diversity	<input type="checkbox"/> Can't remember <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (	<input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Not helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES
b) Asset mapping tools	<input type="checkbox"/> Can't remember <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (	<input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Not helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES
c) Key data components	<input type="checkbox"/> Can't remember <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (	<input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Not helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES
d) Case examples	<input type="checkbox"/> Can't remember <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (	<input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Not helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES
e) Tools	<input type="checkbox"/> Can't remember <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (	<input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Not helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES
f) Sample news stories	<input type="checkbox"/> Can't remember <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (	<input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Not helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES
2. 1999 Trends Analysis (red cover)	<input type="checkbox"/> Can't remember <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (	<input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Not helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES
3. Video	<input type="checkbox"/> Can't remember <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (	<input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Not helpful	<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES

SECTION 2: LOCAL PLANNING PROCESS

---

4. What suggestions do you have for materials that would be helpful in the next planning process?

5. Were the priorities that your county identified reflected in the statewide teams/centers within each program area?

Program Area	Extent to which the county priorities were reflected in the state teams/centers (check one)
Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Not much <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know – can't answer
Family Living	<input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Not much <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know – can't answer
4-H Youth Development	<input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Not much <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know – can't answer
Community, Economic, Resource Development	<input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> Not much <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know – can't answer

6. What worked well with the planning process your county used in 1999?

7. What didn't work so well? Describe any problems your county experienced.
8. In the 1999 planning process, did your county do as well as you'd like in reaching and engaging:
- a) the diversity of your county?  
YES  
NO
  - b) users and non-users of Extension?  
YES  
NO
  - c) If you answered NO to either 8. a) or 6. b) above, please indicate what you could/would do differently to ensure that the planning process reaches and engages diversity and users/non-users.
9. What suggestions do you have so that the statewide planning process can allow variation for localized county planning, but still collect data that can be used for setting state priorities?

### SECTION 3: USE OF PLANNING DATA

---

10. Did you use the county planning data for other purposes than to send to the state level?
- a) YES
  - b) NO
11. If yes, what else did you do with the data? (check all that apply)
- a) Shared with other agencies/partners
  - b) Used to develop local programs
  - c) Used in tenure documentation
  - d) Used in grant writing
  - e) Other: please explain

12. Was there any additional information that you wished you had collected?

- a) YES
- b) NO

c) If YES, what information do you wish you'd collected?

13. How did your office deal with local needs that did not result in a state response?

#### SECTION 4: BENEFITS AND VISIBILITY

---

14. Did the 1999 planning process help you to identify new audiences?

- a) YES
- b) NO

If YES, Please list new audiences identified:

15. Did the 1999 planning process help you identify new partners?

- a) YES
- b) NO

If YES, please list new partners identified:

16. Did the 1999 planning process help you to refocus or change programming?

- a) YES
- b) NO

If YES, how? – what changed?

17. To what extent did the 1999 planning process help your county office gain media attention?

- a) A great deal
- b) Somewhat
- c) Not much
- d) Not at all

18. To what extent did the 1999 planning process help your county office gain visibility for existing programs?

- a) A great deal
- b) Somewhat
- c) Not much
- d) Not at all

19. To what extent did the 1999 planning process help identify the unique contribution that Extension can make versus other providers?

- a) A great deal
- b) Somewhat
- c) Not much
- d) Not at all

20. Were there any other benefits as a result of the 1999 planning process?

- a) YES
- b) NO

If YES, please explain

21. Were there any negative consequences as a result of the 1999 planning process?

- a) YES
- b) NO

If YES, please explain:

## SECTION 5

---

22. To what extent do you think the 1999 planning process generated credible data that was useful in program planning? Please add any comments you'd care to share.

- a) A great deal
- b) Somewhat
- c) Not much
- d) Not at all

23. To what extent do you think county stakeholders viewed the Extension planning process as generating credible program planning data? Please add any comments you'd care to share.
- a) A great deal
  - b) Somewhat
  - c) Not much
  - d) Not at all
24. What other factors, besides local planning data, affected your county program priority setting in 1999 (e.g., legislator's emphasis on land use, natural disasters/emergencies, existing programs, etc.)

We may need and want more in-depth information regarding the 1999 planning process. Please include your name if you'd be willing to discuss (via teleconference group discussion) your county planning process and/or recommendations for the upcoming process in more detail.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_

## **PROGRAM PLANNING EVALUATION: Statewide Program Teams**

As you know, every 4 years, UW-Extension engages in a comprehensive, statewide planning process. As we begin the next process that will commence in 2003, we want to learn from the 1999 statewide planning process. Ellen Fitzsimmons, Associate Dean and Director, has charged our committee to examine the strengths and weaknesses of past planning efforts to help structure the next planning cycle. This questionnaire is part of our information collection process.

Please discuss these questions with other members of your statewide program team or members of your work groups as appropriate. This is your chance to report what worked well and what didn't about the last planning process and have a say in what we do next time. Please return one completed questionnaire per team by email or mail your hard copy response **BY FRIDAY, October 25, 2002** to

Ellen Taylor-Powell at [ellen.taylor-powell@ces.uwex.edu](mailto:ellen.taylor-powell@ces.uwex.edu) or,  
432 N. Lake Street, Room 609, Madison, WI 53706

Please contact any member of the committee if you have questions: Ed Jesse, Donna Menart, Paul Ohlrogge, Peggy Olive, Tom Parslow, Denise Retzleff, Beverly Stencel, Nancy Stoutenborough, Ellen Taylor-Powell (chair).

The full evaluation proposal that describes the committee's work is available on the web at: <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/>

## **PROGRAM PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE – Statewide Teams**

25. Name of team \_\_\_\_\_

26. Program area \_\_\_\_\_

27. Number of individuals providing input into this questionnaire \_\_\_\_\_

28. Was your team/center (check one)

formed as a result of priorities set from the 1999 program planning?

an existing team at the time of 1999 program planning?

If it was an existing team, did the 1999 planning data cause any changes, redirection or refocusing of your team/center?

YES

NO

If yes, please explain briefly.



29. How did your team use the data from the county planning process in 1999?  
(check all that apply)
- we really didn't use it much
  - the data were summarized centrally and provided to the team
  - team members individually looked at the county planning data
  - we discussed the county planning data as a team
  - we really tried to build the team's work on the county data
  - other: please briefly describe
30. To what extent did the county planning data help determine your team's priorities? (check one)
- A great deal
  - Somewhat
  - Not much
  - Not at all
31. What was useful about the data? (check all that apply)
- Identified common concerns across counties
  - Stimulated discussion
  - Helped to identify priorities
  - Helped to generate media coverage/publicity for our team/center
  - Helped identify resources needed
  - Affirmed ongoing programming efforts
  - Helped identify new partners
  - Helped identify new audiences
  - Helped to refocus our team/center
  - Other:
32. What would have made the data more useful to your team?
33. Was there information that you wish you'd had in order to set team priorities and develop programs?
34. Besides the local planning data, what other information/input did (does) your team use in program development (e.g., specialist input, existing curriculum, requests of external partners)?

35. What were some other positive outcomes of the 1999 program planning process?  
(check all that apply)

- a) New people joined the team/center
- b) Workgroups formed around issues as identified by the data
- c) Team/workgroup involvement was stimulated
- d) Teams/workgroups helped streamline the data that helped counties focus on priority issues
- e) New teams/centers formed
- f) New workgroups formed
- g) Other: Please list

36. What didn't work so well? What improvements would you suggest?

37. To what extent do you think the 1999 planning process generated credible data that was useful in statewide planning? Please add any comments you'd care to share.

- a) A great deal
- b) Somewhat
- c) Not much
- d) Not at all

38. What other factors, besides local planning data, affected your team/center program priority setting in 1999 (e.g., legislator's emphasis on land use, natural disasters/emergencies, existing programs, etc.) ?

39. What suggestions do you have so that the statewide planning process can allow variation for localized county planning, but still collect credible data that can be used by teams for setting priorities and program development?

Please provide any additional comments you have.