

JANUARY 2006

**ACADEMIC
YEAR
2005-2006**

CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATORS' COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE ASSESSMENT (CCA) ASSESSMENT REPORT

GCC

GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE

*Kulehon Kumunidât Guáhan
Accredited by the Western Association
of Schools and Colleges*

The front end of this report was primarily written by Dr. Ray Somera, Assistant Director, Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) and Chair, Committee on College Assessment (CCA). Administrative assistance was given by AIE staff Priscilla Johns and Rose Taitingfong. The IDEA Center, a non-profit organization in Kansas, provided the technical assistance in administering the online survey. AIE also wishes to acknowledge the survey respondents for their participation in this project.

CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATORS'
ASSESSMENT REPORT
DECEMBER 2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From November 1 to 30, 2005, full-time college employees were surveyed regarding their perceptions of work performance for GCC administrators (both in the academic and non-academic areas) using two online instruments developed by the IDEA Center. This assessment piece comprised the last part of a series of campus wide assessment projects that included the various stakeholders of the college community, such as the President, Board of Trustees, Foundation Board, and students.

The Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) took the lead in researching, organizing, coordinating, and eventual scheduling of the online survey. One hundred ninety eight (198) employees with college email accounts served as the total sample population. While this total sample rated the two Vice Presidents included in the study, the other administrators were rated using inclusion criteria that took into account the college's organizational structure, administrative leadership, committee memberships, and support personnel. Consequently, the total sample for the other administrators varied in size and scope because of these unique sets of administrator-specific criteria. To limit survey fatigue among the raters, another set of administrators are slated for online survey evaluation in November 2006.

Response rates for both academic and non-academic administrators ranged from a high of 69% to a low of 43%. While general administrator results for job performance ranged from a high of 3.6 to a low of 2.5, the overall mean for job performance was **3.12** (on a 5-point scale) and confidence in the administrators' leadership was **3.25** (on a 4-point scale). For the deans, the overall mean for job performance was **3.2** (on a 4-point scale) while confidence in the deans' ability to manage was **3.8** (on a 5-point scale). The individual results for job performance, however, ranged from a high of 3.5 to a low of 3.0 (on a 4-point scale.)

This report consolidates all these quantitative results and provides a guide to interpretation for each of the tables so that the reader can view the numerical results

within the context of certain statistical standards. As a caveat, these results must be grounded in the limitations of the survey tool, sample size, response rates, respondent types, quantity and quality of interaction, and other extraneous variables. In this light, the reader is reminded to avoid simplistic generalizations, that is, arriving at conclusions based on mere comparison of ratings between and among the administrators who have been the subjects of the evaluation. A good source of validation for general trends in respondents' perceptions are the richly-descriptive qualitative comments that follow the consolidated tables. One must always keep in mind that good assessment practices often produce very frank results, sometimes brutally so. When the opportunity to make anonymous comments is provided, some respondents vent in ways that are unkind. Readers should not place too much importance on individual comments, either excessively positive or excessively negative, until a pattern emerges from multiple sources. Sustained institutional improvement begins when the college's stakeholders confront brutal realities and work toward making appropriate changes.

The results documented in this consolidated report provide key, meaningful *points for dialogue* on various aspects of administrative functioning for GCC administrators. The administrators' valuable contributions to this goal hinges largely on the actions that they are willing to take towards dialogue and self-improvement.

Consolidated GCC Administrators' Assessment Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	i
I. Introduction and Rationale	1
II. Methods and Instrumentation	1
III. Preparing the Campus Environment	2
IV. Organization of the Consolidated Report	3
V. What To Look For In the Results	4
VI. What to Remember While Reading/Interpreting the Results	5
VII. What to Expect, or a Suggested Course of Action	6
Table I.A Overall Effectiveness Ratings for General Administrators	7
Table I.B Overall Evaluation Ratings for Deans	
Table II.A Areas of Strength and Improvement in Performing Administrative Roles for General Administrators	8
Table II.B Ratings for Administrative Effectiveness in Specific Activities for Deans	9
Table III.A Administrative Style and Personal Qualities for General Administrators	10
Table III.B Administrative Style and Personal Qualities for Deans	12
VIII. Qualitative Responses: Strengths and Areas of Improvement	
• Vice President, Academic Affairs	13
• Vice President, Administrative Services	23
• Controller, Business and Finance	32
• Administrator, Materials Management	35
• Administrator, Student Support Services	38
• Administrator, Management Information Systems	40
• Administrator, Human Resources	42
• Asst. Director, Planning and Development	45
• Asst. Director, Communications and Promotions	48
• Asst. Director, Apprenticeship Training	51
• Dean, Trades and Professional Services	54
• Adjunct Assoc. Dean, Trades and Professional Services	55
• Associate Dean, Technology and Student Services/Cont. Education	56
• Associate Dean, Technology and Student Services	57

CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATORS'
ASSESSMENT REPORT
DECEMBER 2005

I. Introduction and Rationale

As organized and coordinated by the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE), an online survey developed by the IDEA Center was implemented campus wide for selected college administrators from November 1 to 30, 2005. A non-profit organization based in Kansas, IDEA stands for **Individual Development and Educational Assessment**, and was contracted by AIE to administer the online survey for convenience, speed, efficiency, and confidentiality.¹ As the first systematic assessment effort implemented for administrators at the college, it was meant to address two major objectives, namely:

- a. to provide helpful feedback to the administrators regarding their performance vis-à-vis faculty and staff expectations; and
- b. to serve as a basis for dialogue between the college's administrators and the constituency they serve.

II. Methods and Instrumentation

Two instruments were utilized by the IDEA Center in implementing the online survey on campus. One instrument was intended for the Deans/Associate Deans (*IDEA Feedback for Deans*) while the other instrument was meant for the general administrators, such as the Vice Presidents, Assistant Directors, and Department/Unit Administrators (*IDEA Feedback for Administrators*).²

AIE took the lead in researching, organizing, coordinating, and eventual scheduling of the implementation of the online survey. In the process of preliminary arrangements, AIE was initially requested by the IDEA Center to provide an electronic list of raters' e-mail addresses and names so that the system can be set up. With the assistance of the Management Information Systems (MIS) office, a list of one hundred

¹ Visit the organization's website at <http://www.idea.ksu.edu> for a comprehensive information on their online evaluation services.

² Explore the above website for preview copies of the instruments; click on Feedback Systems on the homepage to access the sample surveys.

ninety eight (198) GCC full-time employees with college e-mail accounts was generated.³ These employees eventually became the total sample population (n = 198) for this online survey study.

Because their respective roles covered complex institution-level responsibilities, the two Vice Presidents (Academic Affairs, and Administrative Services) of the college were rated by the total sample, which was practically all *full time* college employees.⁴ With the rest of the other administrators, several inclusion criteria were determined for convenient sampling purposes. These inclusion criteria took into account the college's organizational structure, administrative leadership, committee memberships, and support personnel. Consequently, the total sample for the other administrators varied in size and scope because of these unique sets of administrator-specific criteria.

III. Preparing the Campus Environment

The GCC community was sufficiently prepared for the implementation of the IDEA online survey. Because of the spate of assessment activities that have occurred on campus previously, the month of November was tagged as Administrator Assessment Month. This was a publicity strategy meant to generate focus, easy recall and retention. In addition, posters were developed by AIE to publicize the names and faces of selected administrators that were slated for evaluation.⁵ They were posted strategically in visible places across campus. Most importantly, these posters also included specific instructions, along with the two major objectives of the assessment project. This public relations strategy essentially set the campus stage, so to speak, for the implementation of the online survey.⁶

Because fourteen administrators were involved in this first cycle of evaluations, AIE also developed a two-round system for the implementation of the online survey. In the first round of evaluations (from November 1 to 15), the Vice Presidents,

³ Though it was initially planned that adjunct employees should also be included in the online survey, certain problems (e.g., no reliable record of individual email addresses) later precluded their inclusion in the survey sample.

⁴ It would have been ideal to use this sample size for all administrator surveys but the *issue of cost* essentially prevented AIE from adopting this approach.

⁵ The poster was designed by Christopher Estioca, a student enrolled in the Visual Communications program, as part of his practicum assignments.

⁶ See Appendix A, "Information and Protocols for GCC Administrators' Performance Assessment" which was emailed to all eligible raters of the two surveys.

Dean/Associate Deans were rated while the second round (from November 16 to 30) involved the general administrators consisting of Assistant Directors, Controller, and Department/Unit Administrators. At each round, respondents were advised to rate at least three administrators only in order to limit survey fatigue. AIE advised the IDEA Center of these protocols and scheduling arrangements and the online survey was administered among the respondents following the schedule outlined above.

It must also be emphasized that in order to further minimize survey fatigue among the prospective survey respondents, another round of online surveys will be conducted in November 2006 for a different set of GCC administrators.⁷ This will ensure that, though on a staggered basis, all administrators of the college will undergo work performance evaluation.

IV. Organization of the Consolidated Report

This consolidated report compiles the individual results of fourteen (14) IDEA surveys conducted toward the end of Fall semester 2005 for the administrator positions identified below. The first ten administrators were rated using the *IDEA Feedback for Administrators* while the last four were rated with the *IDEA Feedback for Deans*.

- Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Vice President, Administrative Services
- Controller, Business & Finance
- Administrator, Materials Management
- Administrator, Student Support Services
- Administrator, Management Information Systems
- Administrator, Human Resources
- Asst. Director, Planning and Development
- Asst. Director, Communications and Promotions
- Asst. Director, Apprenticeship Training
- Dean, Trade and Professional Services
- Adjunct Assoc. Dean, Trade and Professional Services
- Associate Dean, Technology and Student Services/ Continuing Education

- Associate Dean, Technology and Student Services

Three consolidated tables appear in the succeeding pages of this report to correspond with the three important sections of each individual report for these administrator positions. These tables are accompanied by a GUIDE TO INTERPRETATION (located at the bottom of each table) that allows the reader to view the numerical results within the context of certain statistical standards. These results are further grounded in the limitations of the survey tool, sample size, response rates, respondent types, quantity and quality of interaction, and other extraneous variables. In this light, the reader is reminded to avoid simplistic generalizations, that is, arriving at conclusions based on mere comparison of ratings between and among the administrators who have been the subjects of the evaluation.

A good source of validation for general trends in respondents' perceptions are the qualitative comments that follow the consolidated tables. For the General Administrators, the following three open-ended questions were posed to respondents in order to generate the qualitative data necessary to validate the quantitative results:

- What are this administrator's main assets?
- What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?
- What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

For the deans, however, a single open-ended statement requested respondents "to provide comments to clarify or elaborate on your general impressions or to offer suggestions pertaining to the dean, the operation of the dean's office, or the college."

The responses to the above questions have been consolidated in this report and are presented in the order outlined at the beginning of this section.

V. What to Look For in the Results

Each individual result reported for administrators contain three important sections. These are their individual comprehensive ratings in the following areas:

- Overall Effectiveness;

⁷ See Appendix A for the specific schedule of the next batch of GCC administrators slated for evaluation in Fall semester 2006.

- Strengths and Weaknesses in Performing Administrative Roles (for General Administrators)/ Ratings of Administrative Effectiveness in Specific Activities (for Deans); and
- Administrative Style and Personal Attributes.

The numerical averages for each of these dimensions are reported as the “mean,” which refers to the average of the value in all responses on either a 4- or 5-point scale, at least in this online survey. From a quantitative perspective, it is an indicator of where people’s perceptions lie, particularly in regard to certain aspects of an administrator’s managerial functioning and performance.

VI. What to Remember While Reading/Interpreting the Results

- A survey, by and in itself, can not provide all the data for a holistic evaluation of administrative performance;
- The survey approach to evaluation has several limitations/constraints/weaknesses inherent in the tool itself.
- No rating scale can include all relevant questions, and what is relevant varies from campus to campus; hence, the results can not be considered totally comprehensive;
- No survey instrument can *universally* capture the wide variances in administrative functions and responsibilities as indicated in every single administrator’s job description;
- Administrators’ job functions and responsibilities may also change, either through expansion or contraction (say, to address a pressing need), and a survey instrument may not capture such processes of change *in flux*;
- Terminologies used for assessment may differ from campus to campus, and careful attention must be given to these differences when warranted;
- Certain weaknesses in all rating processes that reduce the validity of ratings include the following:
 - LENIENCY– a tendency to give the benefit of the doubt to those being rated;
 - HALO EFFECT– the tendency to allow one’s general impression of the administrator to systematically influence responses to all items; and

- ERROR OF CENTRAL TENDENCY– a reluctance to make extreme ratings, high or low, and hence assume that it is safe to be in-between.
- “Survey fatigue” is also a variable to consider when respondents tend to rate similarly for all items;
- Raters have varying levels of exposure and opportunity to observe the “quality” of administrative performance; other tools, like focus groups, may be a more appropriate methodology in certain cases;
- Response rates must be considered carefully when evaluating survey results; 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 considered 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.

VII. What To Expect, or a Suggested Course of Action

The results documented in this consolidated report provide *key, meaningful points for dialogue* on various aspects of administrative functioning for GCC administrators. As such, one should feel free to raise these issues with administrators he or she is in contact with, so that a healthy discussion can ensue when necessary and appropriate. This is the critical role that everyone must play in bringing about improvement in “the way things are done” at GCC in general, and in college administrative functions, in particular.

Conversely, administrators who have been the subject of this assessment process are likewise cognizant that this exercise was meant to address formative, rather than summative, purposes. How they each address this challenge in a meaningful way will translate to their individual commitment to assessment as a true measure of accountability and improvement. When this happens, improved administrative functioning at the college –either directly or indirectly-- will impact significantly on institutional effectiveness, program quality, as well as the teaching and learning environment.

The administrators’ valuable contribution to this goal hinges largely on the actions that they are willing to take towards dialogue and self-improvement.

**TABLE I.A. OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS
FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS**

Note: See Guide to Interpretation at the bottom of this table.

Consolidated Report of IDEA Feedback Ratings for General Administrators									
Fall 2005									
Position	Total Respondents	Number Responding	Response Rate	MEAN, Job Performance (where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent, 5=Superb)	% Neg (1 or 2)	% Pos (4 or 5)	MEAN, Confidence (where 1=Definitely not, 2=No, but I have reservations about this, 3=Yes, but I have reservations about this, 4=Definitely yes)	% Neg (1 or 2)	% Pos (3 or 4)
VP, AAD	198	118	60%	3.6	14	59	3.4	13	87
VP, ASD	198	119	60%	2.8	40	31	2.9	33	67
MIS Admin	51	22	43%	2.9	45	35	3.0	30	70
Controller	49	23	47%	2.8	28	22	3.1	24	76
MM Admin	54	23	43%	3.4	14	55	3.7	5	95
C&P Asst. Dir.	48	29	60%	2.9	39	25	3.1	22	78
SS Services Admin	53	23	43%	2.5	40	5	2.8	35	65
P&D Asst Dir	44	26	59%	3.5	4	48	3.7	4	96
Apprenticeship Asst Dir	54	32	59%	3.4	15	50	3.5	12	88
HR Admin	57	31	54%	3.4	21	48	3.3	18	82
Overall Mean				3.12 (on a 5-pt. scale)			3.25 (on a 4-pt. scale)		

TABLE I.B. OVERALL EVALUATION RATINGS FOR DEANS

Consolidated Report of IDEA Feedback Ratings for Dean/Associate Deans									
Fall 2005									
Position	Total Respondents	Number Responding	Response Rate	MEAN, Overall Evaluation Rating (where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent)	% of Maximum Score (4.0)	% 3 or 4	MEAN, Confidence in Dean's ability to manage (where 1=Hardly ever, 2=Less than 1/2 the time, 3=About 1/2 the time, 4=Most of the time, 5=Always)	% of Maximum Score (5.0)	% 4 or 5
Dean, TPS	56	30	54%	3.1	77	76	3.9	77	73
Adjunct Asso Dean, TPS	56	32	57%	3.0	75	73	3.6	72	61
Assoc Dean/CE, TSS	67	46	69%	3.5	86	98	4.1	83	86
Assoc Dean, TSS	43	28	65%	3.2	81	86	3.7	74	64
Overall Mean				3.2 (on a 4-pt. scale)			3.8 (on a 5-pt. scale)		

GUIDE TO INTERPRETATION: For General Administrators: Overall effectiveness was assessed by replies to two questions: (1) What kind of a job is this administrator doing?; and (2) Does this administrator have your confidence? The scales are 1 to 5 for the former question and 1 to 4 for the latter question. The average numerical response (also called the MEAN) is shown for all respondents. In addition, the percentage of respondents who chose one of the two highest or two lowest rating categories is included in the table. If the percentage of the positive responses is at least 75, respondents regarded the administrator as highly effective. If the administrator was rated in the lowest two categories at least as often as in the highest two categories, respondents had reservations about how effectively the administrator was performing at least some of his or her responsibilities, and he or she is encouraged to examine results in Section II.

For Deans: Table I.B above consolidates respondents' ratings of the deans' overall effectiveness, confidence in the deans' ability to manage the school he or she is responsible for. Mean responses are provided, as well as "Percent of Maximum Score" to make ratings on 4- and 5-point scales more comparable. The percent giving the two highest numeric ratings is also given. When interpreting these figures, consider the Percent of Maximum Score and the Percent of the Two Highest Ratings. If these are 75% or higher, the respondents clearly regard the administrative performance as effective. If they are below 50%, the respondents regard the deans' effectiveness as marginal, and hence, these items should be areas of needed improvement.

TABLE II.A. AREAS OF STRENGTH AND IMPROVEMENT IN PERFORMING ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS

*Note: See **Guide to Interpretation** at the bottom of this table.*

Role	Position									
	VP, AAD	VP, ASD	MIS Admin	Controller	MM Admin	C&P Asst Dir	SS Services Admin	P&D Asst Dir	ATP Asst Dir	HR Admin
Planner										
Displays visionary plan	4.1	3.0	3.1	2.7	3.5	3.2	2.8	3.6	3.8	3.5
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	8	40	33	40	21	41	38	10	12	19
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	76	38	39	20	63	56	29	52	76	62
Has sound priorities	4.2	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.8	2.9	2.9	4.0	4.0	3.9
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	5	40	17	26	10	37	37	4	13	18
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	81	39	33	42	75	30	37	78	78	79
Consultant										
Makes wise judgments	4.0	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.9	3.2	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.7
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	10	33	32	30	13	23	40	9	13	21
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	71	45	47	35	65	38	45	83	83	71
Effective team member	4.0	3.5	3.5	2.9	3.9	3.5	2.7	4.0	4.0	3.7
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	15	23	15	42	9	23	42	9	8	21
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	72	53	40	47	77	58	26	86	83	68
Communicator										
Communicates to others	4.0	3.2	3.5	3.3	3.8	3.7	3.4	4.3	3.8	3.8
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	11	35	20	30	14	15	19	4	17	17
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	74	45	55	60	73	63	57	83	71	76
Seeks others' opinions	3.6	3.1	2.7	3.2	4.0	3.5	2.9	3.8	3.7	3.6
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	20	35	50	28	14	28	32	10	13	19
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	63	45	33	44	71	56	37	75	65	62
Expert										
Is knowledgeable	4.4	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.3	3.2	4.5	4.1	4.1
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	3	26	28	32	13	15	32	4	9	14
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	84	51	72	47	65	48	53	96	83	82
Anticipates problems	4.0	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.8	3.1	3.2	3.9	3.6	3.8
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	10	33	32	44	10	23	24	5	17	21
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	73	44	42	39	67	35	52	82	65	71
Community Builder										
Builds institution's image	4.3	3.4	3.5	3.3	4.1	3.7	3.0	4.2	4.2	3.7
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	5	25	30	29	10	21	30	9	11	25
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	83	52	50	57	85	64	35	91	89	68
Earns trust/respect	3.9	3.2	2.9	3.1	4.0	3.5	2.8	4.1	4.0	3.3
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	17	30	37	24	9	22	35	9	13	31
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	72	39	32	47	74	59	35	87	75	62

GUIDE TO INTERPRETATION: 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).

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 Table 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.

**TABLE II.B. RATINGS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS IN SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES
FOR DEANS**

Note: See Guide to Interpretation at the bottom of this table.

Activity	Position			
	Dean, TPS	Adjunct Assoc Dean, TPS	Assoc Dean/CE, TSS	Assoc Dean, TSS
Activity A: Impact on College's Major Programs				
Weighted Mean for <i>Improving College's Major Programs</i>				
<i>Respondent Ratings - Mean</i>	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0
<i>Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5</i>	60	69	76	70
Activity B: Developing Resources				
Weighted Mean for <i>Developing Resources</i>				
<i>Respondent Ratings - Mean</i>	3.6	3.7	4.3	3.8
<i>Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5</i>	54	65	85	61
Activity C: Organizational Matters				
Weighted Mean for <i>Organizational Matters</i>				
<i>Respondent Ratings - Mean</i>	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8
<i>Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5</i>	62	62	65	58
Activity D: Program Leadership				
Weighted Mean for <i>Program Leadership</i>				
<i>Respondent Ratings - Mean</i>	3.6	3.8	3.9	4.1
<i>Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5</i>	57	65	74	69
Activity E: Personnel Management				
Weighted Mean for <i>Personnel Management</i>				
<i>Respondent Ratings - Mean</i>	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.6
<i>Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5</i>	60	61	70	53

GUIDE TO INTERPRETATION: Respondents described the dean's *strengths* and *weaknesses* in conducting each of five major administrative activities:

- Impact on College's Major Programs
- Developing Resources
- Organizational Matters
- Program Leadership
- Personnel Management

The report above gives the numerical average of these ratings and the percent of ratings which were in the two highest categories (4 or 5). If the *mean* is 3.75 or higher and the % 4 or 5 is 75 or higher, the faculty regarded the dean's performance as a strength. A need for improvement is implemented when these figures are below 3.0 and 25%.

Ratings were made 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

Mean scores appear in bold face in the above table.

**TABLE IIIA. ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE & PERSONAL QUALITIES
FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS**

*Note: See **Guide to Interpretation** at the bottom of this table.*

Role	Position									
	VP, AAD	VP, ASD	MIS Admin	Controller	MM Admin	C&P Asst Dir	SS Services Admin	P&D Asst Dir	ATP Asst Dir	HR Admin
Part One: Administrative Style										
Democratic Practice										
Remote (1)/Approachable(7)	4.3	4.7	4.4	3.9	6.3	5.3	3.7	4.8	5.4	4.6
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	26	19	22	29	4	18	25	13	7	29
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	35	46	44	33	91	61	15	46	67	50
Autocratic(1)/Democratic(7)	4.1	4.5	3.7	4.3	6.1	5.4	3.1	3.8	5.2	3.8
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	23	22	33	20	0	4	55	38	8	38
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	28	37	28	30	79	54	15	19	54	31
Opinionated(1)/Receptive to Ideas(7)	5.0	4.7	3.7	5.6	5.7	5.3	4.1	5.0	5.8	5.0
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	13	18	21	0	9	14	30	9	8	11
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	48	44	21	71	77	64	35	57	75	54
Structuring										
Disorganized(1)/Organized(7)	5.7	4.8	4.2	4.4	5.9	4.2	4.3	5.9	5.8	5.8
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	9	14	32	22	5	27	17	13	8	11
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	74	44	32	39	77	42	17	78	84	75
Ambiguous(1)/Clear(7)	5.4	4.5	4.3	4.5	6.1	4.5	3.8	5.6	4.8	5.1
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	6	23	16	25	4	18	25	5	20	14
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	55	36	21	40	83	32	20	68	52	61
Erratic(1)/Predictable(7)	5.4	5.0	4.6	5.5	5.7	5.0	5.4	5.7	5.4	5.2
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	6	9	28	6	5	13	6	0	4	13
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	55	45	56	59	70	46	56	63	57	61
Vigor										
Indecisive(1)/Decisive(7)	5.7	4.7	4.3	4.0	5.6	4.4	5.5	5.3	5.3	5.7
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	9	15	32	30	5	18	5	17	13	7
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	70	42	37	25	68	29	47	65	65	68
Lethargic(1)/Vigorous(7)	5.4	4.0	4.5	3.6	6.2	4.6	4.1	5.6	4.7	5.3
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	6	29	16	32	5	15	22	5	19	12
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	56	26	26	16	84	42	22	62	38	58
Passive(1)/Active(7)	5.6	4.2	4.9	3.9	5.6	4.3	4.3	5.6	4.8	5.1
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	6	28	16	21	9	27	16	0	16	11
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	64	33	37	26	68	38	32	67	48	48
Part Two: Personal Characteristics										
Interpersonal Sensitivity										
Unfeeling(1)/Caring(7)	5.1	5.1	4.3	4.6	6.6	5.6	4.8	5.5	5.4	4.6
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	9	13	16	22	0	8	15	4	15	22
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	50	49	26	50	100	72	45	67	74	48
Insensitive(1)/Understanding(7)	5.2	5.0	4.2	5.0	6.4	5.2	4.9	5.3	5.6	4.9
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	7	11	22	21	0	15	10	9	12	19
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	55	51	28	68	95	59	50	61	73	56
Aloof(1)/Warm(7)	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.1	6.4	5.1	4.0	4.7	4.9	4.4
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	20	18	16	26	0	11	25	13	16	25
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	33	42	26	26	91	59	20	43	60	39

Integrity										
Untruthful(1)/Honest(7)	5.6	5.2	4.6	5.4	6.5	5.6	5.2	5.7	5.7	5.6
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	8	11	22	13	0	4	6	13	8	12
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	67	56	50	67	94	65	50	78	72	69
Unfair(1)/Fair(7)	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.9	5.9	5.1	4.5	5.4	5.6	4.8
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	16	18	11	18	5	12	15	5	8	15
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	53	45	39	59	84	54	30	62	77	58
Untrustworthy(1)/Trustworthy(7)	5.8	5.2	4.7	5.5	6.6	5.4	5.1	5.8	5.8	5.2
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	5	10	21	19	0	12	6	5	9	19
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	69	55	58	81	95	64	50	76	74	54
Character										
Manipulative(1)/Straightforward(7)	4.7	4.8	4.7	5.7	6.2	5.2	3.9	5.9	5.2	4.4
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	19	14	18	6	0	8	30	0	9	28
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	48	42	41	78	90	48	35	89	64	52
Inconsistent(1)/Consistent(7)	5.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	6.0	4.6	4.6	5.3	5.5	5.6
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	5	12	21	26	4	20	16	18	8	12
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	65	43	53	58	83	48	37	64	67	62
Self-centered(1)/Institution-centered(7)	5.3	4.5	4.7	5.2	6.3	4.8	4.4	5.8	5.4	4.9
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	12	21	17	17	0	15	20	5	8	21
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	58	35	44	61	85	44	35	75	72	54

GUIDE TO INTERPRETATION: This Table 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.

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 table should be considered within the context of the effectiveness ratings reported in Tables I and II. If effectiveness ratings are high, it is desirable to maintain current administrative methods. But if they are low, the above results 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.

Mean scores appear in bold face in the above table. **Percent Negative** refers to percent rating, each rating has been rated a "weakness" (1 or 2). **Percent Positive** refers to the percent rating each item has been rated a "strength" (6 or 7).

**TABLE III.B. ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE & PERSONAL QUALITIES
FOR DEANS**

*Note: See **Guide to Interpretation** at the bottom of this table.*

Activity	Position			
	Dean, TPS	Adjunct Assoc Dean,TPS	Assoc Dean/CE, TSS	Assoc Dean, TSS
Part One: Administrative Style				
Democratic Practice				
Mean for <i>Democratic Practice</i>	4.6	5.9	5.7	5.2
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	16	1	8	5
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	42	72	66	46
Structuring				
Mean for <i>Structuring</i>	5.0	5.6	5.7	5.5
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	9	3	6	1
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	47	65	65	56
Vigor				
Mean for <i>Vigor</i>	4.4	5.3	5.9	5.5
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	16	8	4	3
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	26	59	72	53
Part Two: Personal Characteristics				
Interpersonal Sensitivity				
Mean for <i>Interpersonal Sensitivity</i>	4.6	6.0	6.0	5.5
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	20	0	3	4
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	39	72	77	56
Integrity				
Mean for <i>Integrity</i>	5.3	5.8	5.9	5.5
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	9	3	4	7
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	56	71	73	60
Character				
Mean for <i>Character</i>	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.1
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	20	5	11	8
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	49	49	66	49

GUIDE TO INTERPRETATION: This table summarizes respondent perceptions of the dean's personal characteristics and management style, believed to be major determinants of effectiveness. Ratings of six major bi-polar elements (traits which 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 table 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.

While high ratings (6 or 7) are generally preferred to low ratings (1 or 2), some effective administrators develop unique styles which depart markedly from this expectation. Results in this table should be considered within the context of the effectiveness ratings reported in Tables I and II. If effectiveness ratings are high, it is desirable to maintain current administrative methods. But if they are low, the above results 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 respondents give it one of the two highest or two lowest ratings.

Mean scores appear in bold face in the above table. **Percent Negative** refers to percent rating, each rating has been related to "weakness" (1 or 2). **Percent Positive** refers to percent rating, each rating has been related to "strength" (6 or 7).

VIII. Qualitative Responses: Strengths and Areas of Improvement

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division
Guam Community College
10/31/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Has power and is able to use it, but unfortunately how he uses it is sometimes not productive to the students needs.
- The best interest of the institution and its accreditation are at the forefront of his decisions. Also his responsibility to the community to provide educated students who can read, write and compute drive his vision.
- He is visionary.
- I have not dealt with administrator professionally
- He displays great knowledge and expertise. Very effective leader.
- Background as an educator.
- Clear vision of where the College needs to go and how to get there.
- Communicating with the public and student body. Being able to communicate the financial status of the College to our leaders.
- One of the most intelligent people I know.
- Knowledgeable and professional
- When he makes a decision, it's always with the input of others.
- His care for the institution.
- Excellent communication skills
- He is quite professional in all aspects
- Academic experience and knowledge.
- He is a visionary who scans people's ideas and insights before coming up with difficult decisions. He uses humor (e.g. jokes) to share meaningful epiphanies.
- Utilizing the skills and talents of subordinates or members of the institution to carry out important tasks that needs to be performed for betterment of the institution.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division

- Knowledgeable in his area. Gives direction to the academic division of the college.
- He focuses on policies, laws and procedures and is also sensitive to personal attributes.
- He displays a wisdom and confidence regarding determining and communicating the priorities of the college. He is able to assist the college in constant improvement regardless of financial and logistical difficulties. He is well-aware of national standards for the college and its programs, and harnesses resources so that they are focused on what he sees as the most important actions to take to meet or exceed these standards.
- Very supportive of the overall mission of the college. No hidden agendas, at least from this angle.
- I'm not sure.
- Vision, making concrete, firm decisions, delegating, forming subcommittees for specific purposes to improve College, playing politics
- He is very articulate and organized. He looks at the whole of the institution when making decisions. He is even-handed on most issues.
- The good of the institution
- Has knowledge, organized, has high expectations for his staff.
- That he truly does envision what's best for the college. He listens to both sides of a story before making up his mind.
- Can't say.
- I believe that he is well versed in his duties as an Academic Affairs VP and knows how to incorporate his skills to improve the courses being offered at the college.
- Not sure what to say. Cannot approach him as easily as I can with other administrators
- This administrator's main assets are his tenure with the institution and his educational certifications.
- Knowledge on his job

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division

- Decisive
- Knows his stuff, i.e., accreditation, academics, and students rights.
- Having the image that he is the president of the college.
- Decisive; visionary; courageous; humorous; knowledgeable.
- Organization
- Self Confidence
- Always planning ahead.
- Don't know
- When they have a goal they do what ever it takes to complete it or even go over there goal.
- Energetic, has vision, and is a pleasure to work with.
- Leadership
- Experience and maturity
- Assessing, planning, implementing, evaluation.
- Vision tenacity understanding of institutional issues
- Ability to speak comfortably among staff and in public regarding the state of the college.
- Given the resources of our institution, He is definitely an advocate for our students.
- Overall knowledge of college operation.
- Ability to get things done.
- GOOD COMMUNICATOR.
- Very knowledgeable of his work and position and responsibilities to the college.
- Credentials and experience.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division

- Approachable and empathetic.
- Seems active and in charge.
- Is committed in overall improvement of services provided by the institution.
- Intelligence and integrity

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- Too steeped in academia; especially when it comes **to GE** requirements. Sometimes, is “bull headed” and doesn’t listen to faculty when it comes to what the STUDENTS want out of GCC. Open door policy is sometimes one way.
- Inconsistencies in approach to situations makes one reserved about approaching him regarding input.
- Can’t tell where he stands.
- A little reserved but not to the point of being a detriment.
- Choice of people who he supports
- Priority of apprenticeship programs.
- Sometimes he may not be fair in his decisions.
- DECISIVENESS
- None.
- Doesn’t obtain enough information to truly understand the situation between presented; specifically regarding personnel conflicts that should be addressed and taken care of right away to ensure it doesn’t occur again.
- None
- Can’t comment. Not enough contact or dealings with him.
- None
- None, except he might leave some day.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division

- No
- None at the moment. But if I ever do I will bring it to his attention.
- Give the impression of not being sincere and trustworthy.
- Need to know him more.
- Does he truly listen to faculty?
- Once he's made up his mind, he's stubborn.
- Decisions made seem to be biased and based on racism.
- None.
- Prejudice
- None
- Excellent
- None
- Not sure about what his priorities are. Has his favorites and doesn't hide it AT ALL
- No reservations. I work with him occasionally and find him to be straight to the point and is very open to discussion on some projects that we have worked to get done in a timely manner.
- This administrator I feel shows favoritism.
- That he has "cronies" that to his bidding. He can be quite insensitive at times.
- Communicates poorly. Unable to see others' point of view once he is set on something. Inflexible. Decisions are not based on research.
- Although his overall performance is good, I have doubts about his true intentions with the college and its future.
- None

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division

- He tends to be authoritarian at times. He allows some certificate programs to disregard core requirements and applies a different set of standards to others that have the same circumstances with their programs (i.e. - English & Math requirements).
- The driving force is financial resources; tends to make decisions that reduce employee wages and benefits for the long-term to increase financial resources for capital outlay for the College. The employee is not the greatest asset of the College and bears the burden of working more and earning less. Employee moral at an all-time low from years past.
- None
- None.
- I think that at times his decision making processes could be more democratic in nature.
- None
- None
- None
- Sometimes, he is stiff and formal, though it comes with the job title, I guess.
- No reservations.
- Can be persuasive in decision making, he would make a good politician!
- None.
- Some of the decisions are made autocratically, as they should be at times, but the impact they have on faculty and programs are sometimes, I feel not taken in total consideration.
- Whether he wants to accept this or not, he definitely shows favoritism among certain administrators in the College.
- No management skills.
- None

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division

- None.
- I have none.
- He doesn't seem to be open to things, once he has made a decision, and pushes it regardless. He is not open to information that is contrary to his perceived way that things should go.
- I have not dealt with administrator professionally

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

- None.
- None.
- I have not dealt with administrator professionally
- None, even his support staff are very effective, friendly and knowledgeable.
- Stay objective and develop management skills.
- More open to true dialog with faculty, and establishing a true shared governance of the college, one that is not just in his image.
- Quit showing favoritism. There is no moral between support staff and administrators. How are we to succeed in this institution if there is favoritism? Faculty also needs the support the Faculty.
- He's been very effective in his overall performance as the Academic Vice President.
- Priorities on what is important for the school overall might need some looking at. I know a lot of thought goes into his decisions. It could just be personal differences of opinion.
- None
- To communicate with the rest of the staff (not only administrators and faculty) in a more frequent basis.
- None

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division

- None
- More one-on-one contact with faculty members in areas where there is disagreement about the non-vocational elements of the college's direction - in order to help them to understand the reasons behind why initiatives such as assessment and general education are essential.
- More effective policy on the supervision of faculty members and administrators in the division.
- Come around to the office more often
- Priorities: (people are the greatest asset of any organization), style: experiment with techniques to motivate people; we need MIS to change and we need faculty to be assessment drive; current and past motivators have failed to improve these areas.
- I realize that sometimes you can't wait for everyone to weigh in on issues, but it would be in the institutions best interest if the dialog takes place before the enactment begins.
- None
- Personality makeover.
- I wish he were more approachable especially to non-Caucasian ethnicities.
- Restructure the college where Administration will be more accessible to those who are not housed in the Administration Building.
- Priorities.
- Needs to follow through with other departments within his area of responsibility to carry out project to completion phase.
- Be more approachable. Students would like to know who runs the college and why things happen around here the way they do.
- I do not have sufficient information to pass judgment on this administrator's effectiveness.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division

- Stronger focus on the students needs, rather than administrative procedures.
Many administrators seem to think that GCC should be like UOG, and miss the fact that we are a Vocational Community College. As a graduate of GCC, I have concerns over the focus.
- None so far, everything ok
- None
- Provide information on his plan for the college as the VP for Academics Affairs.
Needs to be more informative on what the Division plan for the school year or near future is instead of only daily operations.
- One-size-fits-all General Ed policy is not effective; some flexibility needed.
- None.
- Style
- More communication with staff personnel.
- Approving Mac computers for publications. But on top of other things for the college he is doing a great job.
- Need to establish an open dialogue and take into consideration of faculty members' suggestions.
- Encourage faculty dialogue that contributes to student excellence, while building on their professional development and providing intrinsic rewards.
- Planning
- Vertical communication
- None
- Can't comment. Not enough contact or dealings with him.
- None.
- He should be more approachable.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Academic Affairs Division

- LET HIM OR HER PERFORM.
- Bring more programs to the college.
- More forcefulness of personality.
- Be more open and forthright in intentions.
- Offer more training for his administrators. Be a better advocate for faculty with regards to technology and physical resources issues. These are important resources for faculty to be more effective in their responsibilities and it seems to be taking too long (more than two years) for this issue to have some sense of resolution.
- Consult with faculty more before making far reaching decisions.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Administrative Services Division
Guam Community College
10/31/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- None
- I have not dealt with administrator professionally or personally
- Good natured and very approachable.
- Over seeing the functions/operations of the Administrative Services Division.
- Time in service with GCC.
- Works hard. really likes his job. Has the best interests of the College at heart.
- None that I can think of
- Can't tell....
- Dedication to the College.
- None that I can put a finger on.
- He's been with the institution for a very long time.
- His ability to listen to suggestions, considers and shares his thoughts to resolve issues as well as problems. He treats each employee equally and with respect. He is very knowledgeable about his field.
- Approachable
- He is a people person. He is receptive to ideas on improvements and changes.
- Strong dedication and commitment in working to make the institution better.
- Approachable; knowledgeable
- He is able to work well with contractors and to make sure his staff are meeting the basic physical needs of the college. He is effective in responding to crises. He trusts his subordinates and gives them space to do their work.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- Very supportive of the overall mission of the college. Very straightforward--to the point, honest, and most supportive of his administrators and to the management team. Not afraid to speak his mind and offers creative problem-solving strategies.
- Keeps things going and alive
- Integrity
- I really don't know
- Friendly guy.
- Experience, longevity, broad knowledge base.
- Approachable
- I do not interact with this administrator on a regular business level to identify his main assets.
- Have yet to notice anything more than what time lunch is and smoke breaks out front
- Although, I do not work directly with him, the reflection of his work is seen in the progress of campus facility improvement, cleanliness, plus other administrative services that are needed by the GCC community and public.
- None!
- Socializing
- Can't Judge.
- To date I have had no contact with this administrator
- Not sure.
- Following through
- Inherit power

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- Approachable
- The willingness to have a better quality learning environment throughout this institution.
- He has a lot of history with the college.
- Dedication
- He does not micro manage his division and goes to his staff for information in their area of expertise. He encourages all staff members to continue their education and supports all training request that will enhance the job performance of the staff in their area of work. He is very approachable and cares for the staff he supervises. The Administrative Services Division is one of the best division to work under because of his management skills.
- He is caring and approachable
- He knows what improvements need to be made within the campus. He is a team player and is open to ideas and makes recommendations to better the institution.
- Caring, friendly
- Can't comment. I haven't had an opportunity to meet with him thus far.
- Knowledge, Leadership, and Dedication.
- No comments.
- Knowledge, experience
- Very forward-looking and tries to anticipate problems before they occur.
- c/j
- He understands the common man's needs. Interacts with the employees very well. Knows what needs to be done when the time comes for it.

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- Don't know

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- Individual must keep to the letter of his promises and make no excuses for actions that may not necessarily be forthright or candid.
- None
- This administrator doesn't really perform any meaningful responsibilities in the institution.
- I really don't think he's qualified for his job or is a leader.
- None.
- Can't comment. Have not had the opportunity to work with him.
- Not very effective leadership skills to guide the managers under him. Is not very receptive to constructive criticism. Seems to take constructive criticism personally.
- No reservations about his ability to serve as an administrator.
- His priorities for the college
- None
- His ability to see the needs of the campus community versus just his sections.
- None.
- None what-so-ever
- None
- Lack of leadership qualities portrayed to the college
- None
- Not sure.
- Qualifications.
- Poor example of an administrator. Openly displays favoritism among administrators and subordinates in the organization.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- He is not aggressive for his position to produce greatly for the institution as a VP.
- Have yet to notice anything administrative this administrator has done
- I do not interact with this administrator on a regular business level.
- Passive. Not wanting to make lasting change by documenting his decisions.
- Is not as open as he could be with regard to soliciting faculty opinions. He accomplishes tasks, but really doesn't have much of a plan that is being followed.
- None.
- For his position, he does not communicate well with the campus community. He is seen as someone out for his own purposes, who does not know how to work hard. Many departments under him are not well run. For someone who works 40 hours a week, where is the accountability?
- Could be more productive
- None
- None.
- He does not involve faculty, academic affairs personnel and students in decisions related to his division. He does not hold Management Information Systems leadership accountable for poor performance.
- His overseeing MIS has not helped college meet its needs.
- None
- He has supervision of campus facilities and maintenance, but the physical look of the campus has not improved at all. The campus, as a whole, does not appeal to the aesthetic sense.
- Not very effective decisions.
- No reservations.
- None

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- None.
- May sometimes be passive.
- This person is ineffective, does not seek consensus from constituents before acting, does not heed the advice or recommendations of others.
- Management of his administrators.
- Too quiet....
- Does not solicit, nor accept faculty input to anything.
- The rotunda building is in shambles. The least this administrator can do is make himself visible. He waits until something actually happens before he takes action i.e.; the ceiling falling down from water saturating it, now there is a pan catching water. If someone had actually gotten hurt, what good would this have served?!
- Doesn't always think through everything that will be needed on a project, often requiring additional funding to complete. Often perceived by faculty and staff as autocratic and not interested in their input.
- Too much time in service. Old school....old ways...
- He does not set a good example in the priority of assessment.
- None.
- I have not dealt with administrator professionally or personally
- Doesn't seem to have the knowledge to do the job, and makes decision while rejecting input from others. Facility committee was disbanded since its input was ignored.
- In an era where we depend on technology his division is lagging behind. GCC is portrays itself as a part of cutting edge technology but it is not true.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

- I have not dealt with administrator professionally or personally
- None.
- Changes to improve full participation or administrative support for those departments that like the administrative assistance like in safety and facility maintenance.
- Develop new management skills and real understanding of technology.
- Unfortunately some of his key staff doesn't perform adequately and others have to work harder to cover for them. Getting everybody to pull their weight would help.
- Start being more responsive to the needs of the campus buildings. At least get to the priorities that may cause dangerous situations to the campus community. Quit waiting for something to happen first!
- I want my administrator to be visible.
- Listen to the concerns and issues from other employees and not just his administrators.
- Remove from position.
- Stop making excuses for why things can't get done. Be proactive in obtaining input from faculty, staff and students when in the planning stages whenever it involves the much needed upgrades to our facilities and infrastructure.
- To stay on top with his subordinates and have them more accountable.
- None.
- None he puts the college first
- I wish that the VP be more proactive in seeking faculty and staff input in improving the physical look of the campus. Landscaping the campus, for instance, can be done through cooperative and collaborative ventures among students, faculty, and administrators --at minimal cost. Tree- planting activities should be a regular OCC program under his supervision.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- None
- Follow through needs to be done.
- Provide staff with plans, updates, and progress of the institution's facilities.
- He needs to involve the college community in his division's decisions in meaningful ways. He needs to actively communicate how the directions taken by his division are made with real feedback from students faculty and staff, and how they are in the best interests of GCC.
- None. From my angle, he is doing an excellent job.
- None
- Enforce subordinates performance to excellence
- Be more productive
- Communicate, email makes this easier. Listen to what people are saying. Take what you hear into account and make changes for the better. Don't be defensive, think of this as a learning experience.
- Document things.
- I do not interact with this administrator on a regular business level.
- Prepare a strategic plan.
- Visibility. Seen him in his office and out the front door smoking but that's about it.
- Needs to get more involved with the institution and meeting the faculty and staff. Things regarding his division should be announced via him, not the VP for Academic Affairs Division.
- Administrator should conduct himself in a professional manner and be more discreet in clique socializing during working hours.
- Institution focused.
- Be involved with faculty governance.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- None
- None
- Work with faculty, students, and staff to come up with the best solutions to the colleges problems. The us versus them, or the profound us verses the HILL. Coming up with the best solutions at the best cost in the available time with the resources available.
- Develop a more transparent and pro-active/cooperative division
- None.
- Communicating better with the campus community and being more receptive to their ideas.
- Not sure
- Just communicate on other plans for future projects or changes that will affect the budget.
- Can't comment. I have had no contact with him in the past two years.
- None.
- He should retire.
- No comments.
- Don't know.
- Look to more macro vice micro organizational/institutional effectiveness.
- Perhaps be more vocal.
- Professional development on effective management, leading, and listening skills.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Controller, Business & Finance Division
Guam Community College
11/15/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- No comments!
- Solid experience and a desire to be helpful in most matters.
- Has knowledge
- Very straightforward.
- Ability to communicate with all levels of personnel. Good interpersonal relations with others (staff/faculty/students/general public).
- Can schedule and update cashier duties.
- He is able to connect with DOA and help improve the line of communication between that agency and GCC.
- Whenever the need arises, he communicates with all constituencies through informative memos (e.g. bank direct deposits) and follow-ups.
- NONE
- Integrity, honesty, willing to listen
- Fair
- Attention to details

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- None
- None
- Can't accurately judge OVERALL since my interaction with this administrator has been quite limited. Other responses are based on hearsay; it would be nice to absolutely verify this.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Controller, Business & Finance Division

- He is condescending, cold, and impersonable.
- None.
- None.
- No interpersonal skills, his method of doing job has no common sense, such as signing pos on a certain date
- Can be inflexible at times and does not always move as fast as the college needs him to process things.
- He doesn't have social contact with his staff. Atmosphere around him is cold no warm feeling that you're appreciated.

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

- Speed up decision making.
- Needs to know how to communicate and needs a better perspective on the College and how we serve others
- Assistance with release of funds from DOA! BBMR.
- None.
- Become more interested in the work i.e., knows the importance of priorities. He needs to take interpersonal relationship classes. This office has very low morale. Only through the strength and friendship amongst the workers in B&F, the administrator is able to perform the necessary deadlines.
- There hasn't been much dialogue between this administrator and the faculty as a whole. It would be nice if this person can share his goals and vision with the faculty and meet with them to inform them how he in his administrator role can be of support and assistance to the faculty. I am certain he has much to share!
- Regular and systematic reporting of assessment data from his office so that areas of concern can be identified and remedied, if need be. Communicate concerns to his staff so that teamwork is evident.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Controller, Business & Finance Division

- Be consistent with cashier office hours
- He needs to be more assertive with his staff, be a decision maker and know his staff members' tasks.
- Be fair and open to new ideas. Stop listening to other people complaints and do a desk audit to each position and facts will show who are really working under his administration.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Materials Management
Guam Community College
11/15/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- She is very straight forward, consistent about the policy and procedures. Easy to communicate. Makes sound judgments and recommendations.
- Personal attributes.
- Thoughtful and thorough.
- Communicates well and is a problem-solver.
- Very personable, open and available to discuss problems and will bend over backwards to help with problems. And, is always smiling, the sign of a person who enjoys coming to work, which is probably the reason for her doing such a wonderful job.
- Dedication
- N/A
- Pleasant and positive disposition; always smiling. Warm as a person and receptive to ideas from others.
- Honesty, adherence to policies; friendly and approachable; task oriented;
- Knowledgeable and team player.
- No comment!

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- Not aggressive, very passive for the position she holds.
- None
- None

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Materials Management

- This administrator demonstrates lack of the ability to make immediate decisions on minor problems pertaining to procurement issues.
- None.
- She's still lacking some skills for this position. At one point of time, previous administrator came in voluntarily to assist and guide her during an open bid for vendors.
- None
- None!
- None.
- She needs more experience in the job to be most effective. She is, however, coming along nicely.
- Need to make securing supplies and equipment much easier. Sometimes we cannot get the 3 recommended quotes. She needs to understand this and compromise a bit.
- None.

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

- Meetings with the faculty so that the faculty can understand the procurement process and who she is.
- No changes. I think she runs her department well.
- Continuing education in her area.
- Procurement should keep a listing of basic equipment and supplies, i.e.; desks, pens etc. with the different vendors so departments don't need to go and search for the basic necessities and quotes every time we need something. Sometimes by the time we get a quote for a particular item and the p.o. is cut the item is sold out or on backorder. This is a waste of time and effort. Also Po's need to be prepped in a more timely matter.
- Provide more staff.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Materials Management

- None!
- Increased institutional awareness
- N/A
- Communicate more frequently to constituents regarding general procurement rules that may not be known to all. Establish a system to monitor the bookstore's effectiveness so that student learning is not compromised due to late arrival of textbooks.
- Have her staff actually do what a Buyer I and Buyer II do based on the job description
- None
- This administrator needs to be more consistent and firm on decisions made affecting procedures within the department she oversees.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Student Support Services
Guam Community College
11/15/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Analysis situations and approaches from various angles that are beneficial for all affected.
- He has none
- Never sure where you stand with a situation, if one comes up.
- Ability to communicate effectively with upper level management.
- Knowledge base and experience.
- His proactive stance with regard to issues affecting students and their ability to function well in a conducive learning environment.
- Institutional history and knowledge; ability to handle difficult situations
- NONE
- Has a sense of humor, makes quick decisions and personable.
- Focuses on servicing student needs.

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- He prioritizes some issues in a different order than I would.
- Not as supportive with anti-smoking initiatives on campus
- Too autocratic; lacks real understanding of the delineation between a secondary and a post- secondary learning environment; subscribes to traditional means of discipline; humor sometimes too coarse and unsophisticated
- The "CONE"
- Pretends to be a team player, but isn't always. Has been known to undermine administrative decisions.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Student Support Services

- None.
- As in question #16, he is very autocratic when he comes to his position. He needs to learn to treat both students & employees with more respect and quit acting like he is “THE MAN”, because he is NOT!!
- None, thus far.

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator’s effectiveness?

- Mainly his attitude about his position. He does not put the students first, they are the customers. He is very egotistical. His priorities should be about the college not himself
- Think he has had many good ideals over the years, but hasn’t been given the support or resources to fully do them.
- None.
- Need to be able to communicate with lower level echelons.
- Continue his education - pursue a higher degree.
- Good modeling of an administrator’s behavior; toned-down deprecating humor

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Management Information Systems
Guam Community College
11/15/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Knowledge and experience in his field.
- Formal education and industry certification in MIS. Knowledge in the MIS field.
- He is knowledgeable and willing to learn about new technology.
- Knowledge on the different aspects of his job.
- This administrator has a high sense of commitment and often will work all day and night to assure that a project is completed or to solve a grave problem.
- Very good expression of ideas through written communication; clear thinking as evident by crisp writing
- Credentials, experience, expertise, personality, character, family, attitude.
- Nothing... With the exception of spending huge amount of money on new computers has done nothing but take use backwards. Gone from a network with over 1300 users, to a network where people log in with user id with no password. Changed network from a multi-segment network flat backbone system. Everything against what we teach in computer science.

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- Everything. The computer science department for 16 years of my 22 years at GCC, the computer department was in charge of its computers, then MIS took over everything, and removed email accounts, ability to use the network as a real network.
- He does what he wants to do instead of getting feedback from stakeholders about MIS's role on campus.
- None
- Is not proactive in capacity to illicit confidence. Not creative in keeping college at the cusp of technology. Image of his department is marginal at best.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Management Information Systems

- Inability to respond to issues that concern faculty in a timely manner; inconsistent policy regarding email blocking --sometimes it goes through, sometimes not. Too much power in making decisions (that are institutional in scope) without proper and systematic consultation with constituents that will be affected by such decisions
- None
- This person has been unable to earn the respect of the faculty in general because of the way he interacts with them.
- None!

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

- Be more supportive of classroom and faculty needs in a more timely manner. Become known as a source for support rather than an obstacle.
- Follow up needs to be addressed on issues that are pending.
- This administrator could benefit by being more receptive to input from others regarding solutions to problems or ideas for improvement.
- Talk in English, not computerize, when explaining MIS issues to faculty. Do not talk down to those who are not techno-savvy.
- Work closer with all constituents to have a MIS that we all are proud of
- Think he should be removed..., but the administration, appears to think I don't know what, but they seem to think it is more important for that administrative MIS to run things than allow the academic to have any input. The users group failed, the TAC (Technology Advisory Committee) isn't doing any better.
- Continue to improve IT at the college.
- Take risks if it is for the good of the institution: BE PROACTIVE.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Human Resources
Guam Community College
11/15/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Knowledge
- Organization and knowledge base.
- She reads up on policies and does research (or directs her staff to-do so).
- Very professional.
- Intelligent, and most knowledgeable in her profession. Is a true professional and a good listener.
- Self-confident and knowledgeable of HR practices
- She has the institutional knowledge needed to carry out the functions of the Human Resource department.
- Ready to answer any questions but does not listen to full story. Jumps to conclusion.
- Very professional
- Ability to follow labor laws; knowledgeable; approachable
- She has very a very high standard of ethics.
- Very knowledgeable, friendly, and organized.
- Have not had much access to HR, since I've predated everyone there.

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- Not with the administrator, but from some of the various people that have been hired in the MIS area, question the process.
- None

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Human Resources

- The impression that HRO has the final say in terms of evaluating credentials and qualifications; her interpretation of the contract sometimes differ from the opinions of others
- None
- Issues and the number of complaints are exaggerated. She will often say, several employees complained. However, when pressed only two actually complained.
- I have no reservations.
- None
- Too much adherence to the letter of the law; unwilling to take risks, sometimes pushy
- Sometimes needs to remember that she is the HR Manager for the entire college not just the administration.
- None.
- She is arrogant, is into power and not serving GCC, lazy, and depends too much on her staff; she is not consistent and will show favoritism and bend rules to meet her needs, or the needs of those she favors.
- None.
- To involved with management

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

- None.
- Serious attitude adjustment and self-reflection. She's a legend in her own mind.
- Provide the area with more staff.
- More open and not let the BOT affect her abilities to advice or work with faculty.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Administrator, Human Resources

- Take a less stern attitude towards personnel issues; willingness to accept an alternative interpretation of the law, if warranted
- Maybe become a bit more empathetic.
- None
- More collaboration with faculty
- None
- Don't know what I would change, but believe there are some definite internal politics going on. Not in HR, but elsewhere involving hiring.
- Stop her from participating in the management team

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Planning & Development
Guam Community College
11/15/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Experience and organizational abilities.
- Her attention to detail, knows her stuff.
- Very organized.
- I do not work with her.
- N/C
- N/A
- This administrator is highly motivated in completing assigned tasks correctly and on time.
- Ability to think through issues as they affect institutional effectiveness; good relationship with the feds
- Runs a tight ship; ability to get things accomplished
- ?
- Solid ideal of the process and goals of the department.

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- Not with the administration, but with the department being more passive in the planning development, rather than proactive, but part of that is federal requirements because they rank proposals, but thing something could be done to create a proactive section of the department to help college people to apply and better prepare for things.
- ?
- Underdeveloped skills in data mining and analysis that would help her and her staff to produce meaningful reports of an institutional nature; more professional training in the area of research analysis and interpretation highly recommended

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Planning & Development

- None
- N/A
- N/C
- Not very flexible.
- None.
- She is too detailed, doesn't see the bigger picture, doesn't respond to communication in a timely manner.
- Sometimes over interprets rules and regulations.

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

- Loosen up, it does not mean going against any federal policy; it's more "thinking out of the box."
- As in 32, making a section that was more proactive in preparing the proposals. Thus creating better proposals, and have them better meet the needs of the students.
- What is the role of Planning & Development as it applies to the College as a whole? Is Planning & Development priorities just VEA and ABE?
- None
- Provide more staff.
- N/C
- Needs to be more of a team player and offer alternate ideas when she disagrees.
- N/A
- More systematic and regular dissemination of federal report highlights to constituents who need such information; develop more pro-active strategies in soliciting ideas for program agreement from faculty, specifically.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Planning & Development

- Actively communicate the findings of graduate surveys to campus
- ?

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Communications & Promotions
Guam Community College
11/15/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Kind, friendly and approachable.
- She has excellent oral communication skills. She is able to convey information to audiences in a way that is clear, appropriate, accurate, interesting and sincere. When she is unsure of how to approach a given situation, she is quick to solicit feedback from others. She is also committed to maintaining positive working relationships with all people throughout GCC.
- She has a wonderful personality.
- Willing to work with others and to research ideas.
- No assets that I can see.
- Communicates well and is very approachable.
- Very friendly
- Low-key and unassuming
- Professional, intelligent, team player, optimistic, good writing skills, has good and strong contacts within the tourism and hotel industries.
- She is a very nice person.
- She's personable.
- I have noted that she is very interested in working with others, and has some big ideals, but has not been given the support in many areas. She has been receptive to issues, but then has run into roadblocks by others to attempt to implement these changes. The problem with updating the web page against MIS has been a major problem.
- Expansion of a different marketing tool of GCC exists.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Communications & Promotions

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- Not aggressive enough to market the college as it should be. Recruitment and marketing are very important tools to expose GCC. Her work performance has not reached the caliber of exposure to the public it should be.
- Only that she hasn't been able to push thru various things, but is still trying.
- She lacks time management skills and does not meet deadlines.
- There is so much that hasn't been done!
- Seemingly unable to implement recommendations that directly relate to means and regularity of information for college constituents; relative delay in the production of institutional reports; lack of regular communication from her office (other than weekly events that are routine, anyway)
- None
- None.
- Does not seem to understand that she is a position that is to be in support of the College, its faculty and students. Seems to be more concern with her own notoriety than her real job.
- Poor follow-up, part of the problem of low enrollment rests in her office, a big part. The College is not marketed at all, generic ads don't do anything. What does she do 40 hours a week? There are so much good things going on, it's never advertised or media releases done.
- Sometimes her effectiveness is lower than desired, particularly with getting things out in a timely manner.
- Is slow in reacting to issues.
- None.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Communications & Promotions

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

- Work further in advance of events.
- Her role is very demanding. She needs more funding to secure quality work - in order for GCC to develop promotional materials of the scale that is necessary to fully establish GCC's role on Guam.
- Think she just needs support and resources to do a better job.
- Need to get the positive information about the good things GCC is doing to the public. i.e. print and media news coverage, GCC news letters, more advertisement.
- Do some work, go out there, get contacts in the media, visit classes and walk around, know the campus, the College.
- Provide staff.
- Must play a proactive role in advancing the image of the institution INTERNALLY; must serve as a more active liaison between the President and college constituents' vis-à-vis communication of important policies that affect faculty, students and other college stakeholders.
- Give priority to the College faculty and students rather than sit in her office and play administrator or part of the "Management Team"
- Needs to be more proactive and organized.
- Needs to establish better time management.
- None
- Time management, the time to complete projects...
- She needs administrative support and needs to communicate more with DCs and Program Managers for updates and feedback.
- Be more aggressive and expose more of the college's programs to the community.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Apprenticeship Training
Guam Community College
11/15/2005 - 11/30/2005

What are this administrator's main assets?

- He is a consummate professional, organized and plan full with an ability to prioritize and to represent the institution.
- On a personal level, He is very positive, friendly and seems to earn the respect of others.
- Since his return to Apprenticeship ... Professionalism. His education, knowledge, mannerism, articulation and charisma truly portray a true professional. It's about time GCC is utilizing this employee's talent in the right place.
- He's even tempered.
- Desire to do a good job and to meet the needs of his clients/students.
- One heck of a nice guy who tries really hard.
- Aggressive, dedicated and people person.
- Very friendly and professional
- He seems like a very energetic and friendly person. However, I do not work closely with him and I cannot evaluate in some areas.
- Ability to stay focused and on task
- Approachable, experienced, service-oriented
- Very professional and does an excellent job of instilling institutional integrity.
- Knowledgeable on the functions of the job.
- Definitely puts the interest of the students at the forefront.
- Visionary individual that is very productive in his duties and responsibilities.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Apprenticeship Training

What reservations do you have about this person as an administrator?

- None. It's good the college has finally utilized his potential.
- None that I am aware of
- None.
- None. Individual is ethical and professional in dealings with the faculty and the institution's clientele.
- Need more collaboration with Co-op coordinators
- No reservations.
- None
- None.
- None.
- None
- He does not go out of way to accomplish tasks outside of his duty hours.
- I have no opinion on this.
- None.

What changes (e.g., in priorities, style, organization, policy) would do most to improve this administrator's effectiveness?

- I have no opinion on this.
- He has moved to various positions over the years, and perhaps not moving around.
- At times he could be more forward in securing commitments and agreements from agencies and associations outside of GCC.
- Allow him more authority.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Apprenticeship Training

- Continue to improve technology skills.
- He is often out of the office due to other obligations outside of the institution's goals. He uses administrative leave for off-island trips for another organization that he is involved with as a member of the Government of Guam Federal Credit Union.
- None.
- None
- Do not work closely with this person so I am not able to recommend changes to improve his effectiveness.
- Initiate communications with Co-op coordinators on a regular basis
- Being computer literate and using technology to his advantage.
- None.
- Be more visible to departments to informed of what is happening with Apprenticeship.

IDEA Feedback for Deans

Dean, Trades & Professional Services
Guam Community College
10/31/2005 - 11/30/2005

Use the space below to elaborate on any of the ratings you made of the dean's administrative effectiveness or to comment on other aspects of his/her performance.

- Dean is very supportive of faculty and department's goals.
- Dean is able to build solid relationships with his department chairs and program managers, trusting them to do their work but stepping in when there is a need to step in.
- Dean is a good man and a good boss. I think his hands are sometimes tied too tight by the AVP, otherwise he would be better.
- He should retire since he is not an effective leader.

Use the space below to provide comments to clarify or elaborate on your general impressions or to offer suggestions pertaining to the dean, the operation of the Dean's Office, or the college.

- This dean's management style is in dire need of an overhaul. He is closed-minded, biased, and apathetic. The college will be better off if he retired.
- Dean is a voice of stability in times of change. He has a good sense of perspective which allows him to define priorities and to make tough decisions.
- The dean is very good at his job but should smile more.

IDEA Feedback for Deans

Adjunct Associate Dean
School of Trades & Professional Services
Guam Community College
10/31/2005 - 11/30/2005

Use the space below to elaborate on any of the ratings you made of the dean's administrative effectiveness or to comment on other aspects of his/her performance.

- He is approachable, easy going, and fair in his decisions. He is able to see a situation objectively. He is an asset to the college.
- I have had very little contact with him to date.
- Provides valuable professional development and guidance to faculty
- I've worked directly with this person as a faculty member, and in his current position. He demonstrates a strong student focus...
- Because his position is for a limited term, his effectiveness is curtailed by the fact that he goes back to faculty status.

Use the space below to provide comments to clarify or elaborate on your general impressions or to offer suggestions pertaining to the dean, the operation of the Dean's Office, or the college.

- Very Student oriented. Works to provide the best for the students, and provide the faculty with the resources that are available.
- Suggestion: Continue building on faculty development and dialogue initiatives

IDEA Feedback for Deans

Associate Dean, Technology and Student Services/Continuing Education
Guam Community College
10/31/2005 - 11/30/2005

Use the space below to elaborate on any of the ratings you made of the dean's administrative effectiveness or to comment on other aspects of his/her performance.

- I have not dealt with administrator professionally
- She is a go getter. She needs additional support and resources to carry out the demands of the industry.
- Very aggressive in obtaining resources for the college.
- She is a wonderful Dean who is only held back by the parameters of the College. She needs additional support for her area.
- A team player and innovative thinker.
- Keeping an enjoyable staff, thing will work good with due dates, and working together as a team that brings one another up in spirit.
- Definite asset to the college.

Use the space below to provide comments to clarify or elaborate on your general impressions or to offer suggestions pertaining to the dean, the operation of the Dean's Office, or the college.

- She possesses strong leadership and dedication. Committed in providing the community "quality" college education.
- Very vivacious and outgoing personality. Good team leader.
- She needs to have a twice a month meeting with all her staff.
- Very organized and enthusiastic.
- She has a pleasant personality that conveys warmth and sincerity. She is easily liked because she makes people feel worthy and important. She is also passionate about her work. Her enthusiasm is truly infectious.
- Lovely personality - excellent representative of the college.
- I have not dealt with administrator professionally

IDEA Feedback for Deans

Associate Dean, Technology and Student Services
Guam Community College
10/31/2005 - 11/30/2005

Use the space below to elaborate on any of the ratings you made of the dean's administrative effectiveness or to comment on other aspects of his/her performance.

- At this point, she has taken a proactive role in all of her work for the college.
- Employee hired only a short time ago; insufficient time to show strengths.
- Excellent performance as a Dean
- This person is very new at the job, so opinions are based on limited interaction, but so far seems to be one that is focused more on the process than the students and process of providing vocational training.
- This Assoc. Dean has not been here long enough for me to provide informed, honest responses.
- This administrator is still new to the institution with regards to adequate exposure to various issues that relate to faculty and staff. Her assigned work appears to isolate her ability to creatively contribute to the institution. Her educational background (specific focus on service learning) and lack of sufficient teaching experience is and will continue to be a hindrance if further appropriate training in curriculum, instruction, and educational administration/leadership is not part of her professional development program.

Use the space below to provide comments to clarify or elaborate on your general impressions or to offer suggestions pertaining to the dean, the operation of the Dean's Office, or the college.

- Again, she has only been in the possible for a short time, so interaction has been limited. The interaction so far has been very procedural. Focusing on the letter of the process than the students.
- She is very effective Dean, excellent

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION AND PROTOCOLS FOR ADMINISTRATORS' PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE FALL 2005

1. The Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) is coordinating an institutional effort to complete the systematic **assessment of administrators**, to follow the assessment pieces already completed for the President, BOT, and GCC students. Once in place, this process will close the loop for the assessment of all relevant stakeholders in the college.
2. Arrangements have been made with an off-island vendor known as The **IDEA Center**, a not-for-profit organization based in Kansas, to facilitate this process. IDEA stands for **Individual Development and Educational Assessment** and the organization's URL is <http://www.idea.ksu.edu>, in case further information on the vendor's varied services is desired.
3. GCC administrators to be assessed will be the Vice Presidents, Deans, Associate Deans, and General Administrators with college wide, as well as sector-specific, functions. Because of time constraints and new appointments this year, two rounds of assessments will be sequentially implemented.
4. The first round of administrator performance assessments will be conducted in November 2005. This will also be designated as Administrator Assessment Month. The second round will happen in November 2006.
5. The following administrators and their respective schedules for performance assessment follows:

ROUND 1

Suggested time frame:

Nov 1 – 30, 2005

VPs:

Vice President, AAD

Vice President, ASD

Deans, Associate Deans

Dean, TPS

Adj. Assoc. Dean, TPS

Assoc. Dean, TSS/Cont. Ed

Assoc. Dean, TSS

General Administrators

MIS Administrator

Controller

MM Administrator

Asst. Director, C & P

SS Administrator

HR Administrator

Asst. Director, P & D

Asst. Director, Apprenticeship

ROUND 2

Suggested time frame:

Nov 1 – 30, 2006

VP:

Vice President, B & F

Dean, Associate Dean
Dean, TSS
Assoc. Dean, TPS

General Administrators
Program Specialist, Night Admin
Program Specialist, VisCom
Program Specialist, TPS
Program Specialist, Adult Ed
Program Specialist, AIE

Program Specialist, Campus Life
Financial Aid Coordinator
Safety Officer
Facilities Coordinator
Program Specialist, ETS/Proj Aim
Program Specialist, Career Center
Asst. Director, AIE
Registrar

6. The schedule for Round 1 is further divided into two time periods:
 - **November 1 to 15, 2005 (Round 1A)**
Evaluation period for Vice Presidents, Deans, and Associate Deans only
 - **November 16 to 30, 2005 (Round 1B)**
Evaluation period for General Administrators only
7. All eligible evaluators should rate at least three (3) administrators only during each time period. If you have more than 3 in your list, it is requested that you do your assessment for only 3 of them. Likewise, if you have less than 3, go ahead and rate what is on your list.
8. AIE will send the IDEA Center all the names of administrators for assessment and the email addresses of their corresponding raters. The organization will send email reminders at least **twice** to all the eligible raters for both Round 1A and Round 1B.
9. Though all assessments will be completed *online*, the IDEA Center ensures the confidentiality of individual's responses. At the time responses are submitted, no identifying information (email address, name, etc.) is linked to the data. As a result, the responses of specific individuals cannot be identified in the data. Only select IDEA Center staff have access to the online system; GCC will not have access to the system or the raw data.
10. The IDEA Center will compile, organize and process all data submitted electronically by all GCC raters.
11. Once the results are received from the IDEA Center, they will be compiled in the form of a comprehensive report.
12. A **Consolidated Administrators' Assessment Report** will be disseminated to the entire college community at the start of the Spring 2006 semester.
