
IDEA Feedback for Department Chairs Report



Insight. Improvement. Impact.®

Summary for:

Charles Sample
Department of Education
IDEA University

Report date: 4/6/2010

Table of Contents

1. How to Use This Report	2
2. Report Summary	3
3. Reviewing Your Strengths	4
4. Insights on Improvement	6
5. The Details	11

1. How to Use This Report

This report requires careful reflection and, if possible, follow-up conversations with a trusted colleague. Its value will be greatly enhanced if you set aside a half an hour to an hour for careful review.

The report highlights administrative strengths and possible areas for improvement regarding your responsibilities as department chair/head, and it indicates which concrete administrative methods and personal characteristics are associated with high performance. To this end, we have analyzed the responses to the faculty survey and your responses to the chair information form. This report:

- Describes your overall effectiveness and the confidence your staff places in your ability to lead the department.
- Charts and highlights (1) the relative importance you place on each responsibility, along with your self-rating on performing these responsibilities; (2) the percentage of faculty and staff who rated you highly on each responsibility; (3) any discrepancies between your perceptions and faculty perceptions; and (4) relevant administrative methods and personal characteristics related to each responsibility.
- Extrapolates key insights from the analysis to help focus your improvement efforts.
- Identifies administrative methods and personal characteristics for improving your performance on targeted responsibilities.

In brief, the purpose of this report is to address two important leadership questions:

- How effective am I perceived to be?
- What might I do to improve?

2. Report Summary

You asked 17 individuals to rate your performance as department head or chair and, of those, a total of 16 (or 94%) responded.¹

Overall Ratings of Effectiveness

Your overall ratings of effectiveness regarding your leadership abilities are reflected in faculty responses to the following two statements:

Summary Judgment 1: "I have confidence in the head/chair's ability to provide future leadership to the department."

- 76% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, while 6% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Summary Judgment 2: "Overall, this chair has provided excellent leadership."

- 81% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, while 0% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

¹ Issues of representativeness and reliability are always of concern when using survey data. You can have greater confidence in information when the response rate is high (exceeds 65% of those asked to respond) and at least 10 individuals respond to the survey. In smaller departments where fewer than 10 people may be asked to respond there is less confidence in the reliability of the data. Thus, in small departments it is even more important to achieve a high response rate in order for the information to be most useful.

3. Reviewing Your Strengths

Responsibilities Where Respondents Rated You Most Positively

You identified **19** responsibilities as relevant to your role as department chair/head. You received positive ratings for **4** of the **19** responsibilities (at least 70% of respondents rated you "Good" or "Outstanding"). For the 6 responsibilities you identified as your "highest priority," they rated you positively on 2 of the 6 (**bolded** below).

Respondents rated you most positively ("Good" or "Outstanding") on the following responsibilities:

- 1. Attending to essential administrative tasks (e.g., class scheduling, staffing, finances/budgeting, facilities) (94% positive)
- **5. Guiding the development of sound procedures for assessing faculty performance (81% positive) - A Highest Priority Responsibility**
- 16. Facilitating curriculum development (81% positive)
- **2. Fostering good teaching in the department (e.g., encourages course updating, use of appropriate technology, attending to student feedback) (75% positive) - A Highest Priority Responsibility**

Your Most Positively Rated Administrative Methods and Personal Characteristics

The IDEA Center has conducted research to identify administrative methods and personal characteristics that are most highly related to successful accomplishment of chair/head responsibilities. Different administrative methods and personal characteristics assume more or less importance, depending upon the responsibilities you have deemed most relevant to your role as chair/head. For the 30 administrative methods and personal characteristics included in the survey, faculty rated you positively on **14** of them (at least 70% of respondents rated you positively).

Respondents rated you most positively on the following administrative methods and personal characteristics:

- 22. Problem solving ability (94% positive)
- 25. Trustworthy (94% positive)
- 30. Enterprising (94% positive)
- 29. Consistency (88% positive)
- 32. Clarity (88% positive)
- 48. Acts as though visible department accomplishments were vital to him/her (88% positive)

Your success as head/chair is dependent on continuing to perform well on responsibilities, administrative methods, and personal characteristics where you are currently highly rated as well as trying to improve in areas where your ratings were lower. Be sure to appreciate those accomplishments and set them as a standard to maintain.

4. Insights on Improvement

One approach to improvement is to focus your efforts on specific responsibilities rated less positively than you desired. This section helps you to identify responsibilities that may warrant improvement and associated administrative methods and personal characteristics that may facilitate that improvement.

The tables on page 7-10 present administrative responsibilities you selected as relevant to your work as head/chair, beginning with those you identified as your highest priority. Beneath each responsibility, you will find personal characteristics and administrative methods associated with high performance of that responsibility. In the right-hand columns are 1) the percent (%) of faculty who gave you a rating of either "More Strength than a Weakness" or a "Definite Strength," 2) your self-rating, and 3) your rating compared to your faculty.

We recommend using the following three-step process as you review the charts on pages 7-10.

Step One. First, highlight highest-priority responsibilities (Page 7) where respondents rated you below the standard you hoped to achieve (items that received less than a 70% positive rating are indicated with a ➔).² Next, highlight other relevant, but not highest priority, responsibilities on pages 8-10 where ratings are lower than desired. From those you have highlighted, select areas where you wish to focus your improvement efforts.

Step Two. For each responsibility you selected in Step One, review the supporting personal characteristics and administrative methods listed below it that are associated with high performance of that responsibility. Do your ratings for any of them fall below 70% (identified by ➔)? Are some of those administrative methods and personal characteristics listed with more than one responsibility?

Focusing on administrative methods and personal characteristics where ratings are lower than desired and listed with more than one responsibility may be a good place to begin directing your improvement efforts.³

Step Three. Identify all administrative responsibilities, administrative methods, and personal characteristics where you rated yourself (self-rating) "higher" than the respondents. If faculty did not rate you as positively as you rated yourself, you may wish to discover why differences in perception exist.⁴

² Setting expectations for desired performance is good practice.

³ Initially, it may be best to focus on just a few responsibilities, administrative methods, or personal characteristics. Trying to address too many things at once may prove counterproductive.

⁴ Any administrative method or personal characteristic that is only a few points below the 70% criterion, but has a Self-Compared-to-Faculty rating of "Similar," may not be the best place to direct improvement efforts.

Summary of Your Highest Priorities

Below 70%	Your Highest Priorities and Their Supporting Personal Characteristics and Administrative Methods	% Positive	Self-Rating	Self Compared to Faculty ¹
	5. Guiding the development of sound procedures for assessing faculty performance	81	Fair	Lower
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
	42. Lets faculty members know what is expected of them	75	In Between	Lower
➤	49. Maintains definite standards of performance	63	Def Strength	Higher
➤	50. Puts faculty suggestions into action	56	Strength	Similar
➤	53. Provides feedback to faculty on their major objectives	63	Def Weakness	Lower
	2. Fostering good teaching in the department (e.g., encourages course updating, use of appropriate technology, attending to student feedback)	75	Good	Similar
➤	35. Assists faculty in developing their own goals and priorities	63	In Between	Lower
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
➤	40. Sees to it that faculty members are working up to capacity	56	Strength	Similar
➤	49. Maintains definite standards of performance	63	Def Strength	Higher
➤	50. Puts faculty suggestions into action	56	Strength	Similar
➤	13. Ensuring that new faculty and staff are acquainted with departmental procedures, priorities, and expectations	69	Good	Similar
➤	35. Assists faculty in developing their own goals and priorities	63	In Between	Lower
	42. Lets faculty members know what is expected of them	75	In Between	Lower
➤	44. Makes sure the work of the faculty is coordinated	69	In Between	Lower
➤	49. Maintains definite standards of performance	63	Def Strength	Higher
➤	53. Provides feedback to faculty on their major objectives	63	Def Weakness	Lower
➤	10. Guiding the development of a sound long-range plan to carry out departmental programs	63	Good	Similar
	22. Problem solving ability	94	Def Strength	Higher
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
➤	44. Makes sure the work of the faculty is coordinated	69	In Between	Lower
➤	49. Maintains definite standards of performance	63	Def Strength	Higher
➤	18. Promoting a positive image of the department to off-campus constituencies	63	In Between	Lower
	22. Problem solving ability	94	Def Strength	Higher
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
➤	38. Demonstrates that high faculty morale is vital to him/her	69	Strength	Similar
	48. Acts as though visible department accomplishments were vital to him/her	88	Strength	Similar
➤	19. Rewarding faculty in accordance with their contributions to the department	63	In Between	Lower
	27. Fairness	75	Def Strength	Higher
➤	41. Looks out for the personal welfare of individual faculty members	63	Weakness	Lower
➤	46. Lets faculty members know when they have done a good job	69	In Between	Lower
➤	50. Puts faculty suggestions into action	56	Strength	Similar
➤	53. Provides feedback to faculty on their major objectives	63	Def Weakness	Lower

¹Higher=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) higher than faculty average.

Similar=Your self-rating is within a half-point of your faculty average.

Lower=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) lower than your faculty average.

Areas of concern may be indicated when your self-assessment is higher (you perceive yourself more positively) than your faculty. The numeric ratings are provided in the statistical detail (see page 12).

Summary of Other Relevant Responsibilities

Below 70%	Your Relevant Responsibilities and Their Supporting Personal Characteristics and Administrative Methods	% Positive	Self-Rating	Self Compared to Faculty ¹
	1. Attending to essential administrative tasks (e.g., class scheduling, staffing, finances/budgeting, facilities)	94	Good	Lower
	22. Problem solving ability	94	Def Strength	Higher
➤	33. Allocates faculty responsibilities in an effective and equitable manner	56	Def Strength	Higher
➤	44. Makes sure the work of the faculty is coordinated	69	In Between	Lower
	16. Facilitating curriculum development	81	In Between	Lower
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
➤	39. Tries out new ideas with the faculty	69	In Between	Lower
➤	44. Makes sure the work of the faculty is coordinated	69	In Between	Lower
➤	49. Maintains definite standards of performance	63	Def Strength	Higher
➤	7. Communicating the department's needs (e.g., personnel, space, monetary, technology) to the dean and other appropriate administrators	69	Outstanding	Higher
	22. Problem solving ability	94	Def Strength	Higher
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
➤	37. Effectively advocates for departmental interests to higher authorities	63	Strength	Similar
➤	8. Developing collegiality/cooperation among faculty members	69	Good	Similar
➤	26. Flexibility/adaptability in dealing with individuals/situations	50	In Between	Similar
	24. Practical judgment	81	Strength	Similar
➤	38. Demonstrates that high faculty morale is vital to him/her	69	Strength	Similar
➤	52. Encourages teamwork among members of the faculty	69	Strength	Similar
➤	11. Promoting a positive image of the department within the campus community	69	Good	Similar
	22. Problem solving ability	94	Def Strength	Higher
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
➤	38. Demonstrates that high faculty morale is vital to him/her	69	Strength	Similar
➤	49. Maintains definite standards of performance	63	Def Strength	Higher

¹Higher=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) higher than faculty average.

Similar=Your self-rating is within a half-point of your faculty average.

Lower=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) lower than your faculty average.

Areas of concern may be indicated when your self-assessment is higher (you perceive yourself more positively) than your faculty. The numeric ratings are provided in the statistical detail (see page 12).

Summary of Other Relevant Responsibilities (cont.)

Below 70%	Your Relevant Responsibilities and Their Supporting Personal Characteristics and Administrative Methods	% Positive	Self-Rating	Self Compared to Faculty ¹
➔	21. Actively supporting student recruitment and retention efforts	69	Good	Similar
	Note: This is a new item with research currently being conducted to identify related characteristics and administrative methods.			
➔	6. Facilitating successful recruitment and selection of promising faculty	63	Good	Similar
	22. Problem solving ability	94	Def Strength	Higher
➔	33. Allocates faculty responsibilities in an effective and equitable manner	56	Def Strength	Higher
➔	35. Assists faculty in developing their own goals and priorities	63	In Between	Lower
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
➔	12. Fostering the development of each faculty member's special talents or interests	63	Good	Similar
➔	26. Flexibility/adaptability in dealing with individuals/situations	50	In Between	Similar
➔	35. Assists faculty in developing their own goals and priorities	63	In Between	Lower
➔	38. Demonstrates that high faculty morale is vital to him/her	69	Strength	Similar
➔	41. Looks out for the personal welfare of individual faculty members	63	Weakness	Lower
➔	14. Clearly communicating expectations of the campus administration to the faculty	56	Outstanding	Higher
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
	42. Lets faculty members know what is expected of them	75	In Between	Lower
➔	45. Explains the basis for his/her decisions	63	In Between	Lower
➔	53. Provides feedback to faculty on their major objectives	63	Def Weakness	Lower

¹Higher=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) higher than faculty average.

Similar=Your self-rating is within a half-point of your faculty average.

Lower=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) lower than your faculty average.

Areas of concern may be indicated when your self-assessment is higher (you perceive yourself more positively) than your faculty. The numeric ratings are provided in the statistical detail (see page 12).

Summary of Other Relevant Responsibilities (cont.)

Below 70%	Your Relevant Responsibilities and Their Supporting Personal Characteristics and Administrative Methods	% Positive	Self-Rating	Self Compared to Faculty ¹
➤	17. Establishing trust between himself/herself and members of the faculty	56	Outstanding	Higher
	24. Practical judgment	81	Strength	Similar
➤	26. Flexibility/adaptability in dealing with individuals/situations	50	In Between	Similar
	27. Fairness	75	Def Strength	Higher
➤	38. Demonstrates that high faculty morale is vital to him/her	69	Strength	Similar
➤	20. Ensuring the assessment of student learning outcomes is meaningful and ongoing	56	Good	Similar
	Note: This is a new item with research currently being conducted to identify related characteristics and administrative methods.			
➤	4. Leading in establishing and monitoring progress on annual or biannual department goals	50	Good	Similar
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
➤	49. Maintains definite standards of performance	63	Def Strength	Higher
➤	53. Provides feedback to faculty on their major objectives	63	Def Weakness	Lower
➤	3. Assisting in securing funding from external sources (e.g., grants, contracts, gifts, partnerships)	38	Fair	Lower
➤	35. Assists faculty in developing their own goals and priorities	63	In Between	Lower
	36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing departmental directions/priorities	75	Strength	Similar
	48. Acts as though visible department accomplishments were vital to him/her	88	Strength	Similar

¹Higher=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) higher than faculty average.

Similar=Your self-rating is within a half-point of your faculty average.

Lower=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) lower than your faculty average.

Areas of concern may be indicated when your self-assessment is higher (you perceive yourself more positively) than your faculty. The numeric ratings are provided in the statistical detail (see page 12).

5. The Details

Although the information provided in the preceding sections helps direct your improvement efforts, there is more to consider. When the IDEA Feedback for Chairs instrument was revised in 2009, eight administrative methods and personal characteristics were added to the form. They were selected because, after conducting a thorough review of literature and obtaining input from numerous professionals in higher education, it appeared they are related to certain aspects of effective chair/head functioning. Research is currently being conducted to examine their relationship with the responsibilities included in the previous section. Given their potential value, reviewing the following results may provide further insights about your strengths and where you might focus improvement efforts.

Below 70%	New Administrative Methods and Personal Characteristics	% Positive	Self-Rating	Self Compared to Faculty ¹
➔	23. Demonstrates caring	56	In Between	Lower
	25. Trustworthy	94	Def Strength	Higher
	28. Organizational skills	75	Strength	Similar
	29. Consistency	88	Strength	Lower
	30. Enterprising	94	In Between	Lower
➔	31. Institution-centered	69	Strength	Similar
	32. Clarity	88	Strength	Lower
➔	43. Promotes inclusiveness and diversity among students and faculty	63	Def Strength	Higher

¹Higher=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) higher than faculty average.

Similar=Your self-rating is within a half-point of your faculty average.

Lower=Your self-rating is at least one-half point (0.5) lower than your faculty average.

Areas of concern may be indicated when your self-assessment is higher (you perceive yourself more positively) than your faculty. The numeric ratings are provided in the statistical detail (see page 12).

The final table on page 12 of this report provides the statistical detail for each item.

You may find details in this table that were not evident in your review of previous sections. One of those details to note is the number of individuals who did not respond to an item (the number in the omit column). Although it is very rare that more than a few survey respondents choose not to respond to an item, the percentages provided in earlier sections of this report are based on those who responded to the item. If a large number did not respond to an item, care needs to be taken in interpreting its results. Also, your first-hand experience with your department may provide insights from this detailed information that others may not see.

Finally, some of the most valuable information for you to review can be found in the separate Comments and Additional Questions Reports. This detailed feedback could be highly valuable to you in your improvement efforts.

Statistical Detail

Part I. Responsibilities	Number of faculty responding						Mean	s.d.	Self-Rating
	1	2	3	4	5	Omit			
Key: 1=Poor 2=Fair 3=In Between 4=Good 5=Outstanding									
Items you rated as highest priority are in bold.									
1. Attending to essential administrative tasks (e.g., ...	0	0	1	5	10	0	4.6	0.6	4
2. Fostering good teaching in the department (e.g., ...	1	1	2	3	9	0	4.1	1.3	4
3. Assisting in securing funding from external sources ...	1	1	6	4	2	2	3.4	1.1	2
4. Leading in establishing and monitoring progress on ...	0	2	6	1	7	0	3.8	1.2	4
5. Guiding the development of sound procedures for ...	0	1	2	8	5	0	4.1	0.9	2
6. Facilitating successful recruitment and selection of ...	0	1	4	7	3	1	3.8	0.9	4
7. Communicating the department's needs (e.g., personnel, ...	0	0	2	4	7	3	4.4	0.8	5
8. Developing collegiality/cooperation among faculty ...	0	2	3	4	7	0	4.0	1.1	4
9. Stimulating research, scholarly activity, and/or ...	0	2	3	6	4	1	3.8	1.0	0
10. Guiding the development of a sound long-range plan to ...	1	0	5	4	6	0	3.9	1.1	4
11. Promoting a positive image of the department within the ...	0	0	4	5	6	1	4.1	0.8	4
12. Fostering the development of each faculty member's ...	1	2	3	4	6	0	3.8	1.3	4
13. Ensuring that new faculty and staff are acquainted with ...	1	0	3	7	4	1	3.9	1.1	4
14. Clearly communicating expectations of the campus ...	0	0	7	4	5	0	3.9	0.9	5
15. Stimulating or rejuvenating faculty vitality/enthusiasm	1	1	6	2	6	0	3.7	1.3	0
16. Facilitating curriculum development	0	0	3	4	9	0	4.4	0.8	3
17. Establishing trust between himself/herself and members ...	1	1	4	4	5	1	3.7	1.2	5
18. Promoting a positive image of the department to ...	0	0	5	4	6	1	4.1	0.9	3
19. Rewarding faculty in accordance with their ...	1	0	5	3	7	0	3.9	1.2	3
20. Ensuring the assessment of student learning outcomes is ...	0	1	6	3	6	0	3.9	1.0	4
21. Actively supporting student recruitment and retention ...	0	0	5	4	7	0	4.1	0.9	4
Part II. Personal Characteristics									
Key: 1=Definite Weakness 2=More Weakness than Strength 3=In Between 4=More Strength than Weakness 5=Definite Strength									
22. Problem solving ability	0	0	1	10	5	0	4.3	0.6	5
23. Demonstrates caring	1	2	4	4	5	0	3.6	1.3	3
24. Practical judgment	0	0	3	7	6	0	4.2	0.8	4
25. Trustworthy	0	0	0	8	7	1	4.5	0.5	5
26. Flexibility/adaptability in dealing with ...	1	2	5	6	2	0	3.4	1.1	3
27. Fairness	1	1	2	4	8	0	4.1	1.2	5
28. Organizational skills	0	2	2	4	8	0	4.1	1.1	4
29. Consistency	0	0	2	4	10	0	4.5	0.7	4
30. Enterprising	0	0	1	6	9	0	4.5	0.6	3
31. Institution-centered	0	0	4	5	6	1	4.1	0.8	4
32. Clarity	0	0	2	4	10	0	4.5	0.7	4
Part III. Administrative Methods									
Key: 1=Definite Weakness 2=More Weakness than Strength 3=In Between 4=More Strength than Weakness 5=Definite Strength									
33. Allocates faculty responsibilities in an effective and ...	1	0	6	4	5	0	3.8	1.1	5
34. Reduces, resolves, and/or prevents conflict among ...	0	0	6	4	6	0	4.0	0.9	4
35. Assists faculty in developing their own goals and ...	1	0	5	4	6	0	3.9	1.1	3
36. Makes sound suggestions for developing/changing ...	1	0	3	7	5	0	3.9	1.1	4
37. Effectively advocates for departmental interests to ...	0	0	4	2	8	2	4.3	0.9	4
38. Demonstrates that high faculty morale is vital to ...	1	2	2	3	8	0	3.9	1.3	4
39. Tries out new ideas with the faculty	0	1	3	2	7	0	3.9	1.1	3
40. Sees to it that faculty members are working up to ...	0	1	5	6	3	1	3.7	0.9	4
41. Looks out for the personal welfare of individual ...	1	0	5	4	6	0	3.9	1.1	2
42. Lets faculty members know what is expected of them	0	0	4	4	8	0	4.3	0.9	3
43. Promotes inclusiveness and diversity among students and ...	1	0	5	3	7	0	3.9	1.2	5
44. Makes sure the work of the faculty is coordinated	1	1	3	5	6	0	3.9	1.2	3
45. Explains the basis for his/her decisions	1	1	4	2	8	0	3.9	1.3	3
46. Lets faculty members know when they have done a good ...	0	1	4	5	6	0	4.0	1.0	3
47. Makes sure his/her part in the department is understood ...	1	0	5	4	6	0	3.9	1.1	2
48. Acts as though visible department accomplishments were ...	0	0	2	5	9	0	4.4	0.7	4
49. Maintains definite standards of performance	1	0	5	3	7	0	3.9	1.2	5
50. Puts faculty suggestions into action	0	0	6	3	6	1	4.0	0.9	4
51. Facilitates positive relationships between faculty and ...	0	0	2	3	10	1	4.5	0.7	3
52. Encourages teamwork among members of the faculty	1	1	3	2	9	0	4.1	1.3	4
53. Provides feedback to faculty on their major objectives	1	1	4	4	6	0	3.8	1.2	1
Part IV. Summary Judgments									
Key: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=In Between 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree									
54. I have confidence in the head/chair's ability to ...	0	1	3	6	6	0	4.1	0.7	NA
55. Overall, this chair has provided excellent leadership.	0	0	3	8	5	0	4.1	1.0	NA