

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

The IDEA Center
www.idea.ksu.edu



Name: SAMPLE, ADMINISTRATOR
Institution: IDEA UNIVERSITY
Term: Fall 2001

Number Asked to Provide Ratings: 71
Number Responding: 62
% Responding: 87

Sections and Purposes of the Report

<u>Page</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
2	I. Overall Effectiveness	Provides two summary ratings: 1) quality of job and 2) confidence in administrator. Results are reported for all raters and for subgroups (by position, relationship, frequency of contact, or years at institution) if there were at least 5 respondents.
3	II. Strengths and Weaknesses in Performing Administrative Roles	The strengths and weaknesses can be used to suggest reasons for results in Section I (both for the total group and for individual subgroups).
4-5	III. Administrative Style and Personal Attributes	Results in this section should be used to help understand those in Sections I and II. Results will also help identify specific types of changes that may lead to improved administrative functioning.

A Few Words of Caution

Several limitations are inherent in a survey approach to evaluation. Interpretations should be made within this framework.

Limitations of Survey Methodology. No rating scale can include all relevant questions, and what is relevant varies from campus to campus. Therefore, the results cannot be considered totally comprehensive. Furthermore, there are some weaknesses in all rating processes that reduce the validity of ratings. Among the most important of these are *leniency* (a tendency to give the benefit of the doubt to those being rated), the *halo effect* (the tendency to allow one's general impression of the administrator to systematically influence responses to all items), and the *error of central tendency* (a reluctance to make extreme ratings, high or low).

Excluded Information. Some important evaluative information is accessible to only a few people and only on rare occasions. Respondents to this survey cannot judge effectiveness in activities like contributing to meetings of the Board of Trustees, obtaining gifts from major donors, or suggesting creative solutions to a unique institutional problem. Some administrative practices can best be evaluated by interviewing the immediate office staff or specific individuals who have sought the administrator's assistance on a particular concern. In brief, the survey did not ask all the important questions and did not collect views from all who could provide relevant observations. A comprehensive assessment of administrative effectiveness would require a broader, more diverse inquiry.

Qualifications of the Raters. Credible ratings require that respondents have ample opportunity to observe and the ability to interpret observations accurately. Because most administrators have multiple responsibilities involving various constituencies, it is unlikely that any single rater can make a meaningful report on all the questions. Those who have most frequent contact with the administrator are in the best position to provide credible ratings. But be wary of overgeneralization, since some raters may see only a narrow facet of your work. If you are in a position to choose those with whom you interact regularly, this may introduce a positive bias since such choices often reflect personal preferences and perceived compatibility.

Representativeness of Raters. Presumably, all or a representative sample of a given type of respondent were asked to reply. If results are to be representative, a high response rate is necessary. Response rates of over 80 percent are considered excellent, while those between 60 and 79 are acceptable. If the rate is below 60 percent, little confidence can be placed in the results unless there is a high degree of consistency across rating subgroups. Likewise, the number of respondents of a given type is important; usually, satisfactory reliability for a given group (obtaining the same result on multiple occasions) requires 10 or more raters.

Section I. Overall Effectiveness

Overall effectiveness was assessed by replies to two questions: (1) **What kind of a job is this administrator doing?** (Options were 1=*Poor*, 2=*Mediocre*, 3=*Good*, 4=*Excellent*, and 5=*Superb*); and (2) **Does this administrator have your confidence?** (Options were 1=*Definitely not*, 2=*No, but I have reservations about this*, 3=*Yes, but I have reservations about this*, and 4=*Definitely yes*).

The average numerical response is shown for all respondents and for each subgroup. In addition, the percentage of respondents who chose one of the two highest or two lowest rating categories is shown.

If the percentage of your positive responses is at least 75, respondents regarded you as a highly effective administrator. If you were rated in the lowest two categories at least as often as in the highest two categories, respondents had reservations about how effectively you are performing at least some of your responsibilities, and you are encouraged to examine results in **Section II**, page 3.

Subgroup	Number ¹	Average Rating		Percent Positive and Negative Ratings			
		Job Performance	Confidence	Job Performance		Confidence	
				Negative (1 or 2)	Positive (4 or 5)	Negative (1 or 2)	Positive (3 or 4)
All Respondents	62	4.1	3.6	10	79	10	90
Position							
Faculty	30	4.4	3.9	0	87	0	100
Student	10	4.3	3.8	0	89	0	100
Administrative Staff	7	4.0	3.4	14	86	14	86
Associate	9	3.7	3.4	22	78	22	78
Relationship							
Colleague	8	4.3	3.9	0	88	0	100
Subordinate	33	4.2	3.8	6	85	6	94
Client	5	4.6	3.8	0	100	0	100
Informal	8	4.1	3.7	0	86	0	100
Frequency of Contact							
Once a week or more	14	4.1	3.8	7	86	7	93
1-3 times/month	21	4.1	3.6	5	76	5	95
1-3 times/term	19	4.6	4.0	0	100	0	100
Less than once/term	2	**	**	**	**	**	**
Years at Institution							
More than 5 years	29	4.3	3.8	0	86	0	100
3-5 years	11	4.0	3.6	9	82	9	91
1-2 years	7	4.7	4.0	0	100	0	100
Less than 1 year	3	**	**	**	**	**	**

¹The total number of respondents and the number who indicated membership in each subgroup is reported in this column. In some cases individuals did not respond, or did not provide a usable response, to an item. Missing or unusable responses are excluded from the calculations of averages and from "percent positive" or "percent negative" summary information.

Note: To protect anonymity, subgroup results are not provided if fewer than 5 responded to any given item. Also, when only 1 category in a subgroup has more than 5 respondents, subgroup information is not provided for any category within that subgroup.

Section II. Strengths and Weaknesses in Performing Administrative Roles

Respondents rated 10 characteristics of the administrator on a 5-point scale (1=*Definite weakness*, 2=*More a weakness than a strength*, 3=*In between*, 4=*More a strength than a weakness*, 5=*Definite strength*). These 10 characteristics represent 5 administrative roles: (1) Planner, (2) Consultant, (3) Communicator, (4) Expert, and (5) Community Builder. The report shows the average for all respondents, the percent rating each item as a "strength" (4 or 5) and a "weakness" (1 or 2), and, in the last column, **Atypical Subgroups** whose average rating was at least 0.5 higher or lower than that for all respondents.

In general, if the average rating is 4.0 or higher, or the percent of "strength" ratings exceeds 75, a high degree of effectiveness can be inferred. If the average rating is below 3.0, or if the percent of "weakness" ratings is higher than 40, there is substantial room for improvement.

These ratings should be useful in understanding the Overall Effectiveness ratings reported in **Section I** as they identify specific roles in which the administrator excels (or performs with marginal or poor results). In this way, administrators can focus attention on roles where performance is strong and on those where improvement is most desirable.

Role	Average	Percent Negative (1 or 2)	Percent Positive (4 or 5)	Atypical Subgroups (see codes below)	
				At Least .5 Lower Than Average	At Least .5 Higher Than Average
Planner					
1. Displays visionary plan	4.2	10	84	None	$R_{CLI}=4.8, Y_{1-2}=4.7$
2. Has sound priorities	4.3	8	85	None	$P_{STU}=4.8, R_{CLI}=5.0$
Consultant					
4. Makes wise judgments	4.2	8	78	None	$R_{CLI}=4.8, F_{3XT}=4.7, Y_{1-2}=4.7$
6. Effective team member	4.0	17	80	$P_{ASO}=3.4$	$R_{CLI}=4.8, R_{INF}=4.6$
Communicator					
8. Communicates to others	4.2	11	86	$P_{ASO}=3.6$	$R_{CLI}=4.8$
9. Seeks others' opinions	3.7	23	68	None	$R_{CLI}=4.4$
Expert					
3. Is knowledgeable	4.4	5	84	None	None
5. Anticipates problems	4.1	12	76	None	$P_{STU}=4.8, R_{CLI}=4.8, R_{INF}=4.7,$ $F_{3XT}=4.7, Y_{1-2}=4.7$
Community Builder					
7. Builds institution's image	4.2	11	80	None	$P_{STU}=4.7, R_{CLI}=5.0, Y_{1-2}=4.9$
10. Earns trust/respect	4.1	13	75	None	$Y_{1-2}=4.9$

Subgroup Codes

Characteristics of Raters

A. Position

Faculty member	P_{FAC}
Student	P_{STU}
Member of the administrator's staff	P_{ADM}
Associate	P_{ASO}

B. Relationship to Administrator

Colleague	R_{COL}
Subordinate	R_{SUB}
Client	R_{CLI}
Informal	R_{INF}

Characteristics of Raters

C. Frequency of Contact with Administrator

Once a week or more	F_{1W+}
1-3 times a month	F_{3M}
1-3 times a term	F_{3XT}
Less than once a term	$F_{<1}$

D. Years at the Institution

6 or more years	Y_{6+}
3-5 years	Y_{3-5}
1-2 years	Y_{1-2}
Less than 1 year	$Y_{<1}$

Note: To protect anonymity, subgroup results are not provided if fewer than 5 responded to any given item. Also, when only 1 category in a subgroup has more than 5 respondents, subgroup information is not provided for any category within that subgroup.

Section III. Administrative Style and Personal Characteristics

This section summarizes respondent perceptions of the administrator's personal characteristics and management style, believed to be major determinants of effectiveness. Ratings of 18 bipolar elements (traits that have opposite characteristics as "anchors") were made using a 7-point scale. Although on the instrument "desirable" characteristics were sometimes listed as the low anchor (1) and sometimes as the high anchor (7), the report always assigns a "7" to the "desirable" anchor. In **Part One**, the ratings are grouped to represent three dimensions of Administrative Style. **Part Two** contains Personal Characteristics grouped into three dimensions. **Atypical Respondent Subgroups** whose average ratings are at least 0.5 above or below that for all raters are identified in the last column.

While high ratings (6 or 7) are generally preferred to low ratings (1 or 2), some effective administrators develop unique styles that depart markedly from this expectation. Results in this section should be considered within the context of the effectiveness ratings reported in **Sections I and II**. If effectiveness ratings are high, it is desirable to maintain current administrative methods. But if they are low, the following information may suggest a focus for improvement efforts.

The average for the 7-point scale is provided, together with the percent giving extreme ratings (1 or 2 and 6 or 7). A characteristic is considered "highly descriptive" if 50% or more faculty give it one of the two highest or two lowest ratings.

Part One: Administrative Style

Administrative Style	Avg.	Percent Negative (1 or 2)	Percent Positive (6 or 7)	Atypical Subgroups (see codes on page 5)	
				At Least .5 Lower Than Average	At Least .5 Higher Than Average
Democratic Practice					
13. Remote (1)/Approachable (7)	5.7	11	74	$P_{ASO} = 5.1, Y_{3-5} = 5.1$	$R_{CLI} = 6.6, F_{3XT} = 6.8, Y_{1-2} = 6.6$
16. Autocratic (1)/Democratic (7)	4.4	28	45	$F_{1W+} = 3.8$	$R_{CLI} = 6.0, F_{3XM} = 5.1, F_{3XT} = 5.3,$ $Y_{3-5} = 5.0$
24. Opinionated (1)/Receptive to Ideas (7)*	4.9	22	55	$R_{INF} = 4.3$	$P_{ADM} = 5.4, R_{CLI} = 6.0, F_{3XT} = 5.9,$ $Y_{1-2} = 6.3$
Structuring					
12. Disorganized (1)/Organized (7)*	6.1	5	83	None	None
21. Ambiguous (1)/Clear (7)	6.3	2	85	None	None
28. Erratic (1)/Predictable (7)*	5.7	9	67	None	$R_{COL} = 6.3, R_{INF} = 6.4, Y_{1-2} = 6.6$
Vigor					
11. Indecisive (1)/Decisive (7)*	6.4	7	92	$P_{ADM} = 5.9, R_{CLI} = 5.6$	$P_{ASO} = 7.0, R_{COL} = 7.0, R_{INF} = 7.0$
20. Lethargic (1)/Vigorous (7)	6.7	0	93	None	None
26. Passive (1)/Active (7)	6.5	3	87	$P_{ASO} = 5.9, F_{1W+} = 5.6, Y_{1-2} = 6.0$	None

*Reversed Score

Section III. Administrative Style and Personal Characteristics (continued)

Part Two: Personal Characteristics

Administrative Style	Avg.	Percent Negative (1 or 2)	Percent Positive (6 or 7)	Atypical Subgroups (see codes below)	
				At Least .5 Lower Than Average	At Least .5 Higher Than Average
Interpersonal Sensitivity					
17. Unfeeling (1)/Caring (7)*	5.0	20	56	P _{STU} = 4.3	P _{FAC} = 5.6, P _{ADM} = 5.5, R _{CLI} = 6.4, R _{INF} = 5.7, F _{3XT} = 5.7, Y ₁₋₂ = 6.6
23. Insensitive (1)/Understanding (7)*	5.2	20	64	None	P _{FAC} = 5.9, R _{CLI} = 6.4, F _{3XM} = 5.7, F _{3XT} = 5.8, Y ₁₋₂ = 6.3
27. Aloof (1)/Warm (7)	5.0	10	51	R _{COL} = 4.5	R _{CLI} = 6.2, F _{3XT} = 5.9, Y ₁₋₂ = 6.1
Integrity					
14. Untruthful (1)/Honest (7)*	5.8	15	79	None	R _{CLI} = 6.6, R _{INF} = 6.6, Y ₁₋₂ = 6.9
15. Unfair (1)/Fair (7)	5.6	12	67	Y ₃₋₅ = 4.7	R _{COL} = 6.1, R _{CLI} = 6.4, F _{3XT} = 6.6, Y ₆₊ = 6.2, Y ₁₋₂ = 6.9
25. Untrustworthy (1)/Trustworthy (7)*	5.7	13	75	P _{ASO} = 5.1	P _{FAC} = 6.2, R _{COL} = 6.4, R _{CLI} = 6.8, F _{3XT} = 6.4, Y ₁₋₂ = 6.9
Character					
18. Manipulative (1)/Straightforward (7)	6.1	10	83	P _{ASO} = 5.5	Y ₁₋₂ = 7.0
19. Inconsistent (1)/Consistent (7)*	6.0	10	84	P _{ASO} = 5.5	P _{FAC} = 6.6, P _{ADM} = 6.6, R _{COL} = 6.6, R _{CLI} = 6.6, R _{INF} = 6.7, F _{3XT} = 6.6, Y ₁₋₂ = 7.0
22. Self-centered (1)/Institution-centered (7)	6.0	7	80	P _{ASO} = 5.1	F _{3XT} = 6.6, Y ₁₋₂ = 6.6

*Reversed Score

Subgroup Codes

Characteristics of Raters

A. Position

Faculty member	P _{FAC}
Student	P _{STU}
Member of the administrator's staff	P _{ADM}
Associate	P _{ASO}

B. Relationship to Administrator

Colleague	R _{COL}
Subordinate	R _{SUB}
Client	R _{CLI}
Informal	R _{INF}

Characteristics of Raters

C. Frequency of Contact with Administrator

Once a week or more	F _{1W+}
1-3 times a month	F _{3XM}
1-3 times a term	F _{3XT}
Less than once a term	F _{<1}

D. Years at the Institution

6 or more years	Y ₆₊
3-5 years	Y ₃₋₅
1-2 years	Y ₁₋₂
Less than 1 year	Y _{<1}

Note: To protect anonymity, subgroup results are not provided if fewer than 5 responded to any given item. Also, when only 1 category in a subgroup has more than 5 respondents, subgroup information is not provided for any category within that subgroup.