

Annual Report Reviews
Public Value Self-Directed Work Group
Team Member Cynthia Crawford
July 2014

One impact of the public value self-directed work group is improved county annual reports. The group has the philosophy that we measure what we value in Extension. As a result, we also value more highly what we measure. This is certainly a truism for MU Extension annual reports.

Executive summary:

- This was the year, the data suggest, the quality of county annual reports for MU Extension took a quantum leap forward. It is the third consecutive year for consistent, annual feedback for most regions.
- For the first time, 100% of Extension regions participated in the annual report review process. It is the second year that the statewide annual report has been included in the evaluation process. One-hundred percent participation is to be celebrated.
- If annual reports are worth doing, they are worth doing well.
- We have been fortunate to identify effective external reviewers; their assessments have been consistent over time.
- While the momentum is going in a positive direction in most (but not all) counties, there is still substantial progress to be made in future years. It is important to continue the review process.
- This is a long term process. The assessments need to continue in all Missouri Extension regions in future years. We measure what we value as an organization. Faculty value more highly what the organization measures.
- The data specifically suggest:
 - It takes three consecutive years of annual report reviews, with annual feedback to faculty, to have a statistically significant difference in overall county scores.
 - The longer a region participates in consecutive years, the greater the improvements in the annual reports.
 - The region that participated in 2011, skipped 2012 and participated again in 2013 did not have statistically significant differences in annual report scores.Consistent, year to year participation appears to be important.

Analysis and specifics – 2014 review process (2013 annual reports)

- For the first time since this project started, all seven regional directors in Missouri chose to have 2013 annual reports evaluated in the spring of 2014. Each county annual report was evaluated by an in-depth reviewer who read every word of the document and a reviewer who assessed the first impression of the document by looking at the document for ten minutes.

- In 2014, we were able to better reach our goal with two positive developments. The Southeast Region participated for the first time in the annual report review and the Southwest region resumed participation after a 1 year hiatus. Only one county in the entire state did not have a report available for review. There were two reports that combined two counties (Caldwell/Daviess and Morgan/Moniteau).

Region	Number of county reports for 2013	Regional Director/Director
Northwest	18	Karma Metzgar
Northeast	20	Shelley Bush-Rowe
Urban	6	Cynthia Zluticky
West Central	16	Wayne Prewitt
East Central	17	Mark Stewart
Southwest	16	Jay Chism
Southeast	18	Janet Kline
Statewide annual report	1	Dennis Gagnon
Total reviews for 2013 reports	112 reports for 2013 reviewed	111 county reports 1 statewide report

It was gratifying to the public value self-directed team to have 100% participation for the first time.

Analysis

The grade distributions, by year for each measure, are presented in the following tables.

In-depth review:

Year	# reports/regions	Letter grade A	Letter grade B	Letter grade C	Letter grade D	Letter grade F
2009	27/2	1 (4%)	5 (18%)	20 (74%)	1 (4%)	0
2010	13/1	1 (7%)	4 (31%)	8 (62%)	0	0
2011	78/5	6 (8%)	22 (28%)	46 (59%)	4 (5%)	0
2012	78/5	5 (6%)	22 (28%)	49 (63%)	2 (3%)	0
2013	111/7	8(7%)	38(34%)	53(48%)	11(10%)	1(1%)

First impression review:

Year and # reports	# reports/regions	Letter grade A	Letter grade B	Letter grade C	Letter grade D	Letter grade F
---------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

2009	14/1	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	8 (58%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)
2010	13/1	2 (15%)	7 (54%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	0
2011	78/5	16 (21%)	7 (9%)	44 (56%)	10 (13%)	1 (1%)
2012	78/5	12 (15%)	16 (21%)	41 (53%)	9 (11%)	0
2013	111/7	29(26%)	18(16%)	46(41%)	13(12%)	5(5%)

A grade of “C” really means average in this assessment process. That value represents the mean, median and mode values in nearly each year and assessment.

The team has complete multi-year data for six of the seven regions - NW, NE, Urban, WC, EC and SW regions in Missouri.

For analysis purposes the regions will not be identified. Grades were converted to the following 12 point scale:

A+	12	B-	7	D	2
A	11	C+	6	D-	1
A-	10	C	5	F	0
B+	9	C-	4		
B	8	D+	3		

Comparing annual reports over time:

This table presents overall data for all years, all reports:

	2009 (n=27)	2010 (n=13)	2011 (n=78)	2012 (n=78)	2013 (n=111)
Mean in-depth grade	5.70	6.54	6.03	5.99	5.98
Mean first impression grade	5.00	7.15	6.10	6.18	6.57

T-tests were conducted comparing a variety of data subsets.

For each year with complete county scores, the county in-depth score and the first impressions score were added together to generate an overall score for each county. The overall score was used for t-test comparison purposes.

Comparison	T-test value
Overall scores of all counties 2011 compared to 2012	p=.83
Overall scores of all counties comparing 2012	p=.0002806*

with 2013	
Overall scores of all counties comparing 2011 with 2013	p=.0052*
Counties participating for the first time in 2013 with counties participating two consecutive years	p=.0055*
Counties participating two consecutive years with counties participating three consecutive years	p=.00096*
Counties participating for the first time in 2013 compared to counties participating three consecutive years	p=.000000013*
Match pairs t-test in region that participated in 2011, did not participate in 2012 and participated again in 2013	p=.2085

*statistically significant at the .01 level

The self-directed work group recognizes the following counties that submitting an outstanding annual report for 2013:

AA rating for 2013	A rating for 2013
Adair	Andrew
Livingston	Audrain
	Buchanan
	Callaway
	Carroll
	Cedar
	Christian
	Clinton
	Cole
	Crawford
	Daviess/Caldwell
	DeKalb
	Gentry
	Grundy
	Holt
	Howard
	Lafayette
	Lewis
	Mercer
	Nodaway
	Pettis

	Phelps
	Pike
	Pulaski
	Putnam
	Ray
	Saline
	Shannon
	St. Charles
	Taney
	Texas
	Washington
	Webster
	Statewide report

There were two counties earning an AA and 34 counties earning an A rating with 2013 annual reports.

Two counties earned AA's and 13 counties earned an A rating with 2012 annual reports.

Four counties earned AA's and 13 counties earned an A rating with 2011 reports.