The information included in this document is a summary of data taken from the entire Organizational Effectiveness Survey and is focused solely on results regarding the SPP Operations Training Work Group.
INTRODUCTION

For the second consecutive year, MarketSearch was commissioned by Southwest Power Pool (SPP) to analyze the results of its Organizational Group Survey, which was designed and fielded by SPP itself. While specific survey objectives do not exist, a report to the company's Strategic Planning Committee states, "The Organizational Effectiveness Task Force was established to develop a process for an annual assessment of SPP’s organizational groups." The report continues:

"The survey component of the process will be directed to all members of the specific organizational group. This will allow us to review feedback on each working group/committee, but still provide an overall assessment for the organization."

Because the focus of the survey seems to be the group members' assessment of their own groups, analysis focuses primarily on group assessments by group rather than aggregating all responses by attribute or item. Also, because the number of respondents in each group was small, analyzing the results by percentages or proportions of those who rated each item at a certain level (one through five) would have been misleading. The small sample sizes for each group indicate that a "directional" focus for the analysis is appropriate, which means that the focus is on real numbers and, for our purposes, an average of the ratings each sample provided on their group experience. As part of an overall analysis, averages of the group assessments are presented with discussion in the Detailed Findings section of this report.

Methodology

Southwest Power Pool sent an invitation to take an online survey to each person listed as a member, chairman, vice chairman or staff secretary of each committee or working group. There are six committees and 12 working groups. Following is a list of the committees/working groups with whose members the survey was fielded, the number of members each committee/working group has listed on Southwest Power Pool's website and the number of people who responded to the survey:
Members took the online survey and spreadsheets were compiled of the answers, which were
sent to MarketSearch for analysis. Each survey included four areas of attributes for
respondents to rate on a scale of 1 to 5. Each area allowed for comments.

An open-ended question was included in which respondents were asked to list three or more
suggestions for their group. These comments are included for SPP to consider along with the
detailed numerical findings.

This year, SPP changed the survey instrument for the overall effectiveness rating to be consistent
with the five-point rating scale of the rest of the survey. This is helpful in evaluating how the
effectiveness rating differs from other attributes, etc., but this year’s change means that
effectiveness cannot be compared to last year’s results. (Next year this will be possible.)

For each group’s results, averages of the scores were calculated to indicate how each item was
rated by the group, collectively. Then, the standard deviation was calculated from the average.
(Standard deviation is the square root of the variance of data points in a set.) Any item rated more
than one or less than one standard deviation from the average by the group members was
considered “meaningful” for that group.

For relationship analysis, correlations were run between the effectiveness ratings (averages) and
the averages for each item tested or for the attribute categories.

Again in 2007, respondents apparently didn’t understand that the question on attendance of
other groups or committees was asking about committees and working groups other than the
one they were responding as a member of. As a result, quite a few identified their own group as
an “other” group. Due to this inconsistency, MarketSearch again made no attempt to create a
chart for this item, as doing so would have been confusing at best and misleading in its
implications at worst.
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

In the “Detailed Findings” section of this report, a chart representing the averages for each group’s responses is presented along with a brief discussion of meaningful findings and representative qualitative responses to the open-ended questions asked in the survey instrument. Charts also illustrate the averages for both 2006 and 2007 in the attribute categories. In this section, significant findings of the overall report will be highlighted and evaluated.

First, it is useful to discuss the correlations that exist between data sets (these indicate that a relationship may exist between attributes tested):

- **Effectiveness**: Of particular interest is the correlation that exists between average group scores on some attributes and the overall effectiveness rating by those same group members of the committee in general. Please note:
  
  - A correlation exists indicating a very good to excellent relationship between the working group/committee effectiveness rating and the following attributes:
    
    - Meeting Preparation: Accurate agenda
    - Meeting Preparation: Useful information
    - Meeting Preparation: Accurate minutes
    - Meeting Conduct: Dissent heard
    - Meeting Conduct: Action recommended

A correlation indicates that as the effectiveness rating increases, for example, the attribute rating also increases (and vice versa). This seems to indicate that the respondents relate the group or committee’s effectiveness to these specific attributes. So while respondents may increase their score of an accurate agenda, they would simultaneously increase their assessment of the group’s effectiveness overall. This may indicate that certain meeting
preparation attributes increase the effectiveness of the group - or at least the *perception* of it by group members.

- **Negative Assessments from Specific Groups**: The Operations Data Working Group and the Transmission Working Group had the lowest overall ratings of all groups and committees tested. Comments from Operations Data members indicate that the group is nonfunctioning, doesn't meet, and members seem unsure of their responsibilities to meet, etc. The Transmission Working Group is least satisfied with "timely material" attributes, and many of the members' comments reflect this concern.

- **Positive Rating**: The Oversight Committee had the highest rating of the organizational group experience overall.

- **Further Note on Effectiveness**: All of the groups assessed their effectiveness at a lower rating than the overall attribute averages, and no group gave effectiveness a score of 4 or higher (one group, Operations Data, gave effectiveness a 2.67 rating). This is an issue of concern because it indicates that while members may indeed be pleased with various attributes of the group experience, they feel that the effectiveness of what they do - their reason for spending time on these efforts - is low. This may lead to further problems in the future.
DETAILED FINDINGS

The following discussion provides the basis for this report's major findings and executive summary. An explanation of terms is warranted:

• **Correlation**: The correlation is the relationship between two sets of variables. In this analysis, correlation is used to establish a link between sets of ratings by group members. An inverse correlation means that there is an inverse relationship between variables. For example, a fair to good correlation means that there is .25 to .50 result of a correlation formula; it also means that it is more likely that as one set of variables increases, so does the second set of variables. An inverse correlation means that as one set of variables increases, the other decreases.

• **Directional Findings**: This refers to numbers that are "real" rather than "proportional." As this survey asks small groups to rate various attributes of their experience, it is wise to use those real numbers rather than percentages to indicate results. In the group findings, results are averaged and respondents totaled in each chart.

• **Standard Deviation**: Standard deviation is the square root of the variance. In this analysis, standard deviation is calculated so that average ratings that lie outside of one standard deviation from the average can be pointed out and examined. Statistically, 75 percent of all values in a "population," or set of data points, lie within two standard deviations of the average. For this report, the group findings are analyzed for data points equal to or greater than one standard deviation from the average.

• **Meaningful ratings**: In the group findings, "meaningful" ratings indicate that rating averages for that item for the group were equal to or greater than one standard deviation from the group's average. This terminology is used so that attention can be drawn to specific attributes significantly beyond the average; however, this should not be confused with "statistically significant" figures. (Given the small data sets of respondents, such terminology would imply greater numbers and a higher confidence rating than is warranted in a "directional" survey.)
## Chart 15: Operations Training Working Group

### Operations Training Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate agenda</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely material</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful information</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate minutes</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents diversity</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary expertise/skills</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members prepared</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members motivated</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members focused</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action recommended</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient facilitation</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissent heard</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of accomplishment</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks input</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive and respectful</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps group on task</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures follow-through</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*# of responses = 6*
Operations Training Working Group members gave meaningfully high scores for "accurate agenda," "timely material," and "useful information." Meaningfully low scores were given for "members prepared," "members motivated," and "useful information."

Operations Training Working Group members were most satisfied with meeting preparation attributes (4.79) and least satisfied with membership attributes (4.17).

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- "Good, efficient meetings."
- "This is a good working group as far as its organization."
- "There is a core group of members that carry the ball."
- "Good group, some are there just to put something on their resume however."
- "Chair has not attended meeting for several months."
- "Allen does a great job!!"
- "Need more active members on the OTWG."
- "More follow-through with initiatives by WG members. More interest in understanding the pedagogy and mechanics of training."
- "The present group has brought the SPP training program from below average to an industry leader. The SPP personnel and the OTWG members should be very proud of their accomplishments."
- "The chair is level-headed and patient. The members are engaged during our meetings, but lack follow-through. The group is honest and open about concerns and recommendations."
Overall

This analysis presents average scores for the attribute groups by committee/working group along with comparison data from the 2006 survey.

Chart 19a: Average Scores for Meeting Preparation (2006 and 2007)
Because the 2006 survey asked participants to rate effectiveness on a 3-point scale, a comparison is not provided with the results of the 5-point scale in 2007. This change was recommended by MARKETSEARCH to keep effectiveness ratings comparable to other ratings in the study, but prohibits any direct comparisons with last year’s data for 2007.

Again, the Operations Data Working Group gave the lowest score for this attribute (2.67). The System Protection and Control Working Group gave the highest score (3.80). Overall, ratings for effectiveness were lower than other attribute categories.

In 2006, the Operations Data Working Group gave the lowest score; the Operating Reliability Working Group rated its effectiveness the most favorably.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is clear to this researcher that members of the Operations Data and Transmission working groups have the lowest satisfaction with their experiences with the SPP organization, while members of the Oversight Committee has the highest satisfaction with their experiences.

In terms of future recommendations, again, **MarketSearch** stresses that the most important recommendation is that objectives specific to the study - not merely to the overall initiative - should be developed so that the survey instrument suits the organization’s information needs and so that analysis is pointed toward highlighting the information most necessary to Southwest Power Pool about the Organizational Group experience with SPP. Without clearly stated objectives, it is difficult to assess the data by the means most valued and necessary to SPP.

**MarketSearch** also recommends again that an added dimension to the study should ask respondents to assess the importance of the various attributes and attribute groups. For example, for each attribute participants are asked to rate on a 1-to-5 Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree with a neutral middle), the instrument may also ask respondents to rate that item on a 1-to-5 scale of importance to their positive experiences with SPP. Without this kind of data, there is no way to assess whether a low rating on a specific item is particularly meaningful to respondents overall. With importance ratings, value grids could be added to the analysis to indicate when and where the organization should focus its efforts at improvement and when the organization can maintain the current results. The current survey instrument provides no data to assess the relevance of the findings.

Finally, more questions should be developed to understand why the effectiveness rating for each group is always lower than the average attribute rating for that group. It is a matter of some concern that members are more pleased with attributes of their chair, for example, than have a strong feeling that their work on the group is having the desired impact.