

JANUARY 2007

**ACADEMIC
YEAR
2006-2007**

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

GCC

GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

The front and back end of this report was prepared by Dr. Ray Somera, Assistant Director, Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) while the tables were organized by Richard Quaimbao, GCC's Institutional Researcher. Additional administrative assistance was provided by Lucille Palomo. The IDEA Center, a non-profit organization in Kansas, provided the technical assistance in the collection and analysis of the online survey data. The GCC administrators who willingly participated in this assessment project are also acknowledged.

CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATORS'
ASSESSMENT REPORT II
January 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comprising the final component 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, a second round of administrator assessments was implemented from November 1 to 30, 2006. Following the system that was implemented with the first round of administrators a year earlier, full-time college employees were surveyed anew regarding their perceptions of job performance for GCC administrators (both in the academic and non-academic areas) using two online instruments developed by the IDEA Center.

One hundred ninety five (195) employees with college electronic mail accounts served as the total sample population. While this total sample evaluated one Vice President 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.

Response rates for both academic and non-academic administrators ranged from a high of 72% to a low of 38%. While general administrator results for job performance ranged from a high of 4.0 to a low of 2.0, the overall mean for job performance was **3.3** (on a 5-point scale) and confidence in the administrators' leadership was **3.3** (on a 4-point scale). For the deans, the overall mean for job performance was **3.3** (on a 4-point scale) while confidence in the deans' ability to manage was **3.9** (on a 5-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. Because these results must be grounded in the limitations of the survey tool, sample size, response rates, and other extraneous variables, the reader is reminded to avoid generalizations and comparability. 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. In this light, the reader must bear in mind that *abuse of anonymity* is also at play in this respect; that is, when respondents are given the assurance of confidentiality, they use it to vent pent-up frustrations that need an outlet or expression. Readers should not place too much importance on individual comments, either excessively positive or excessively negative, until a pattern emerges from multiple sources. Good assessment practice dictates that only when individual stakeholders take assessment results seriously by working toward making appropriate changes that institutional improvement truly begins.

Two notable observations are drawn from the integrated results of the two cycles (year 1 and year 2) of administrator assessments at the college, namely: (a) the administrators' lack of a clear role in the minds of the survey respondents, particularly as it relates to a real understanding of the administrative responsibility of individual administrators vis-à-vis institutional mission; and (2) the administrators' pervasive image as bureaucrat, with a strong adherence to fixed rules, and the perception of underdeveloped social skills when it comes to interpersonal relations. What these perceived limitations imply, and how they can be used for an improvement-driven assessment process is discussed at the end of this report.

Finally, the results documented in this consolidated report provide a useful guide for dialogue and discussion between and among administrators and their constituents. 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	i
I. Introduction and Objectives	1
II. Methodology	1
III. Setting the Stage: Preparing the Campus Environment	2
IV. How the Consolidated Report is Organized	3
V. What the Results Mean and What to Look For	4
VI. Food for Thought: Limitations of the Methodology	5
VII. After the Results are Out, What Happens Now?	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, Business and Finance	13
• Asst. Director, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness	20
• Coordinator, Student Financial Aid	23
• Coordinator, Facilities Maintenance	25
• Coordinator, Admissions and Registration	28
• Administrator, Environmental Safety	31
• Program Specialist, Student Support Services	32
• Program Specialist, Adult Education	34
• Program Specialist, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness	37
• Program Specialist, Career Placement Center	40
• Program Specialist, Instructional Technology Center	42
• Program Specialist, Planning and Development	44
• Program Specialist, Center for Student Involvement	46
• Program Specialist, Project AIM-TRIO Programs	48

•	Dean, School of Technology and Student Services	50
•	Associate Dean, School of Trades and Professional Services	52
IX.	Consolidated Job Performance Ratings of GCC Administrators and Deans by Division (Year 1 and Year 2)	53
X.	Concluding Observations, and Next Steps	54
<i>Appendix A</i>	<i>Email Message Sent to all Concerned Administrators, October 2006</i>	57
<i>Appendix B</i>	<i>Information and Protocols for GCC Administrators' Performance Assessment</i>	58

I. Introduction and Objectives

November 2006 was designated **Administrator Assessment Month** at Guam Community College as a follow up to the first systematic effort of assessing job performance of administrators that was implemented a year earlier¹. As organized and coordinated by the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE), an online survey developed by the IDEA Center was administered campus wide for a second group of administrators from November 1 to 30, 2006.² The contract with Kansas-based IDEA (acronym for **Individual Development and Educational Assessment**) was renewed by AIE and this non-profit organization implemented the same online survey for convenience, speed, efficiency, and confidentiality.³ The major objectives of the assessment effort echoed the same objectives articulated the year before, namely:

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

II. Methodology

Two separate instruments developed by the IDEA Center were used to survey perceptions of GCC employees regarding their administrators' job performance. One instrument was intended for the Deans/Associate Deans (*IDEA Feedback for Deans*) while the other instrument (*IDEA Feedback for Administrators*) was meant for the general administrators, such as the Vice President, Assistant Director, Department/Unit Administrators and Program Specialists.

Because IDEA was an off-island vendor that needed local campus assistance in organizing, coordinating, and eventual scheduling of the implementation of the online survey, AIE took this responsibility. AIE was initially requested by the IDEA Center to provide an electronic list of raters' e-mail addresses and names so that the server system can be set up. With the assistance of the Management Information Systems (MIS) office, a list of one hundred ninety five (195) GCC full-time employees with college e-mail accounts was

¹ See the online version of the report at http://www.guamcc.net/assessment/core_documents/inst_reports.html.

² For purposes of manageability, the first group of college administrators (n=14) was evaluated in fall 2005.

³ Visit <http://www.idea.ksu.edu> for a preview of the instruments utilized in this study.

generated.⁴ These employees eventually became the total sample population (n = 195) for this online survey study.

Two Vice Presidents (Academic Affairs, and Administrative Services) completed their IDEA job performance evaluation last year and only one Vice President (BFD) was slated for evaluation for this period. Because the Vice President's role covers complex institution-level responsibilities, this Vice President was rated by the total college sample, which was practically all *full time* college employees.⁵ As to 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. With respect to sample size, the total number of respondents who rated various administrators are indicated in Table IA and IB.

III. Setting the Stage: Preparing the Campus Environment

Like the previous year, AIE sufficiently prepared the college community for the implementation of the IDEA online survey. For purposes of manageability, all college administrators were divided into two groups the year before, with the first group comprising of fourteen administrators. The second group, slated for evaluation for this period, comprised sixteen administrators. In order to generate focus, easy recall, and retention, a poster campaign was developed early on. As a strategic campaign to publicize the names and faces of selected administrators that were slated for evaluation,⁶ these posters were strategically mounted 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.⁷

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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.

⁶ The poster's design and layout was developed by Cathy Gogue, Asst. Director, Office of Communications and Promotions.

⁷ See Appendix A, "Information and Protocols for GCC Administrators' Performance Assessment" which was emailed to all eligible raters of the two surveys.

Following the same system that was implemented last year, AIE also developed a two-round system for the implementation of this year's online survey. In the first round of evaluations (from November 1 to 15), the first eight administrators were evaluated while the second round (from November 16 to 30) involved the remaining eight administrators. To control or minimize **survey fatigue** at each round, respondents were advised to rate *at least three administrators* only. AIE advised the IDEA Center of these protocols and scheduling arrangements and the online survey was administered among the respondents following the above schedule. AIE also arranged for the IDEA Center to send periodic friendly reminders to all raters in both rounds for so that they can complete the surveys in a timely manner.

IV. How the Consolidated Report is Organized

This consolidated report compiles the individual results of sixteen (16) IDEA surveys conducted toward the end of fall semester 2006 for the administrator positions identified below. The first fourteen (14) administrators were rated using the *IDEA Feedback for Administrators* while the last two (2) were rated with the *IDEA Feedback for Deans*.

- Vice President, Business and Finance (BF)
- Assistant Director, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE)
- Coordinator, Financial Aid (FA)
- Coordinator, Facilities Maintenance (FM)
- Coordinator, Admissions and Registration (AR)
- Safety Administrator, Environmental Safety (ES)
- Program Specialist, Student Support Services (SSS)
- Program Specialist, Adult Education (AE)
- Program Specialist, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE)
- Program Specialist, Career Placement Center (CPC)
- Program Specialist, Instructional Technology Center (ITC)
- Program Specialist, Planning and Development (P&D)
- Program Specialist, Center for Student Involvement (CSI)
- Program Specialist, Project AIM/ TRIO Programs
- Dean, Technology and Student Services (TSS)
- Associate Dean, Trades and Professional Services (TPS)

Three consolidated tables (Tables IA, IB, IIA, IIB, IIIA and IIIB) appear in the succeeding pages of this report to correspond with the three important sections of each individual report for these administrator positions⁸. 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.⁹

A good source of validation for general trends in respondents' perceptions are the qualitative comments that follow the consolidated tables¹⁰. 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 the Results Mean and What to Look For

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

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

⁸ For a comprehensive picture of job performance ratings of administrators and deans at the college, a general table combining the quantitative results of Year 1 (2005) and Year 2 (2006) appears at the end of this report.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ The reader must also bear in mind that *abuse of anonymity* is at play in this respect; that is, when respondents are given the assurance of confidentiality, they use it to vent frustrations that need an outlet or expression.

- 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. Food for Thought: Limitations of the Methodology

- 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.
- 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; those with higher response rates have a greater degree of *representativeness* than those with lower rates of response.

VII. After the Results Are Out, What Happens Now?

“So then, what?” is a relevant question that each GCC employee may ask when presented with the results documented in this consolidated report. Because this report identifies *key, meaningful points for dialogue* on various aspects of administrative functioning for GCC administrators, this question is meant to be answered at two levels.

At the primary level, the employee or the rater should feel free to raise these issues with administrators he or she is in contact with (particularly immediate supervisors), so that a healthy discussion can ensue when necessary and appropriate. This is the critical role that every GCC constituents must play in bringing about improvement in “the way things are done” at GCC in general, and in college administrative functions, in particular.

At the secondary level, administrators who have been the subject of this assessment exercise are likewise cognizant that this process was meant to address formative, rather than summative, purposes¹¹. 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. Most importantly, the question, “so then, what?” will be answered by concrete and doable strategies that will bring the college to an even greater degree of efficiency and effectiveness.

The last section of this report integrates the results of the two rounds of administrator assessments by division (2005 and 2006) and discusses specific recommendations that would bring all concerned stakeholders to the discussion table and begin to face the critical task of self-reflection that leads toward personal and institutional transformation.

¹¹ In order to reinforce this purpose, a debriefing session for all administrators evaluated during this period was conducted by the Institutional Researcher on January 25, 2007. Questions and clarifications on the quantitative component of the individual reports were explained using statistical standards, and numbers were interpreted more fully for a better understanding of the results.

**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 2006									
Position	Total Respondents	Number Responding	Response Rate	MEAN, <i>Job Performance</i> (where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent, 5=Superb)	% Neg (1 or 2)	% Pos (4 or 5)	MEAN, <i>Confidence</i> (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)
Vice Pres, BF	195	95	49%	3.9	8	65	3.7	8	92
Asst Dir, Assessment & Inst. Effectiveness	58	38	66%	4.0	6	83	3.6	8	92
Coordinator, Financial Aid	45	29	64%	3.8	7	72	3.7	7	93
Coordinator, Facilities Maintenance	55	32	58%	2.0	64	0	2.1	54	46
Coordinator, Admissions & Registration	51	32	63%	3.5	14	55	3.5	14	86
Safety Administrator, Environmental Safety	39	19	49%	3.1	17	22	3.3	5	95
Prog. Specialist, Student Support Services	40	25	63%	2.6	70	25	2.7	32	68
Prog. Specialist, Adult Ed	41	26	63%	2.8	48	24	2.8	32	68
Prog. Specialist, AIE	48	31	65%	3.6	3	55	3.7	3	97
Prog. Specialist, Career Placement Center	39	21	54%	3.6	7	47	3.7	8	92
Prog. Specialist, Instructional Tech Center	40	15	38%	3.4	14	43	3.5	7	93
Prog. Specialist, Planning & Development	40	19	48%	3.2	23	31	3.3	18	82
Prog. Specialist, Center for Student Involvement	39	28	72%	3.9	9	70	3.7	4	96
Prog. Specialist, Project AIM-TRiO Programs	40	21	53%	3.0	33	44	2.8	39	61
Overall Mean				3.3 (on a 5-pt. scale)			3.3 (on a 4-pt. scale)		

TABLE I.B. OVERALL EVALUATION RATINGS FOR DEANS

Consolidated Report of IDEA Feedback Ratings for Dean/Associate Deans									
Fall 2006									
Position	Total Respondents	Number Responding	Response Rate	MEAN, <i>Overall Evaluation Rating</i> (where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent)	% of Maximum Score (4.0)	% 3 or 4	MEAN, <i>Confidence in Dean's ability to manage</i> (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, TSS	59	40	68%	3.0	76	71	3.6	72	60
Associate Dean, TPS	46	28	61%	3.5	87	88	4.1	83	82
Overall Mean				3.3 (on a 4-pt. scale)			3.9 (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 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.

For Deans: Table I.B above consolidates respondents' ratings of the deans' overall effectiveness, and confidence in the deans' ability to manage the school. 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	VP, BF	AD, AIE	Cord. SFA/ BO	Cord., FM	Cord., AR	SA, ESO	Prg. Spec. NA/ TSS	Prg. Spec. AEd	Prg. Spec. AIE	Prg. Spec. CPC	Prg. Spec. ITC	Prg. Spec. PD	Prg. Spec. .CSI	Prg. Spec. A-T
Planner														
Displays visionary plan	4.2	4.5	3.9	2.0	3.7	3.3	2.7	3.2	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.5	4.4	3.4
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	9	3	6	67	11	11	53	38	0	10	8	18	4	28
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	76	89	72	5	70	28	37	48	70	80	58	55	83	50
Has sound priorities	4.5	4.4	4.3	2.0	3.8	3.3	3.1	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.4	4.3	3.4
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	4	3	0	64	7	11	47	35	0	0	8	8	9	38
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	88	86	90	5	75	33	41	50	78	77	42	42	86	56
Consultant														
Makes wise judgments	4.4	4.4	4.5	2.1	4.0	3.6	3.0	3.1	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.5	4.1	3.3
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	4	0	0	52	10	5	33	35	3	7	8	0	9	40
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	85	89	88	5	76	53	38	40	83	67	69	42	74	53
Effective team member	4.3	4.3	4.3	2.0	4.0	4.0	2.9	2.9	4.2	4.1	4.3	3.7	4.4	3.6
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	6	3	4	78	10	0	43	45	7	12	0	8	4	38
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	82	81	83	13	76	67	38	41	87	71	86	54	78	63
Communicator														
Communicates to others	4.3	4.4	4.5	2.4	3.9	3.6	3.3	3.3	4.4	4.3	3.7	3.4	4.3	3.6
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	7	3	0	46	10	11	30	30	3	0	8	23	4	29
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	82	86	92	17	79	58	50	45	94	81	54	46	83	64
Seeks others' opinions	4.0	3.7	4.3	2.1	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.1	3.7	4.1	3.8	3.6	4.1	3.6
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	10	10	5	70	11	6	18	42	11	9	8	8	9	31
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	70	55	85	15	71	72	41	42	59	82	54	54	78	63
Expert														
Is knowledgeable	4.6	4.6	4.6	2.6	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.6	4.4	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.4	3.5
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	1	0	0	35	14	0	18	22	0	0	8	0	5	31
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	89	92	93	17	82	58	50	61	90	71	85	69	82	63
Anticipates problems	4.4	4.2	4.3	1.9	3.9	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.5	4.3	3.4
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	3	3	0	64	18	26	35	40	0	0	17	9	0	33
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	87	82	82	5	71	42	40	45	67	58	42	55	83	53
Community Builder														
Builds institution's image	4.4	4.7	4.4	2.3	4.1	3.8	3.0	3.3	4.4	4.5	4.3	3.5	4.4	3.6
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	6	3	4	48	10	5	36	26	3	0	0	15	4	29
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	85	92	92	17	83	63	32	48	90	88	93	54	83	65
Earns trust/respect	4.2	4.1	4.6	2.2	4.0	3.9	2.9	2.9	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.2	4.3	3.3
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	10	8	0	57	10	0	48	52	6	7	8	31	4	40
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	82	76	92	13	76	63	33	43	84	73	62	46	83	60

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 “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, TSS	Assoc Dean, TPS
Activity A: Impact on College's Major Programs Weighted Mean for <i>Improving College's Major Programs</i>		
Respondent Ratings – Mean	3.7	4.0
Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5	61	71
Activity B: Developing Resources Weighted Mean for <i>Developing Resources</i>		
Respondent Ratings – Mean	3.3	4.1
Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5	48	77
Activity C: Organizational Matters Weighted Mean for <i>Organizational Matters</i>		
Respondent Ratings – Mean	3.7	4.3
Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5	64	82
Activity D: Program Leadership Weighted Mean for <i>Program Leadership</i>		
Respondent Ratings – Mean	3.5	4.2
Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5	59	77
Activity E: Personnel Management Weighted Mean for <i>Personnel Management</i>		
Respondent Ratings – Mean	3.6	4.1
Respondent Ratings - % 4 or 5	58	73

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 III.A. ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE & PERSONAL QUALITIES
FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS

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

Role	VP, BF	AD, AIE	Coord .SFA/ BO	Coord FM	Coord .AR	SA, ESO	Prg. Spec. NA/ TSS	Prg. Spec. AEd	Prg. Spec. AIE	Prg. Spec. CPC	Prg. Spec. ITC	Prg. Spec. PD	Prg. Spec. SI	Prg. Spec. A-T
Part One: Administrative Style														
Democratic Practice														
Remote (1)/ Approachable(7)	5.1	4.9	6.0	3.8	5.1	5.7	4.5	3.6	5.2	5.3	6.0	4.6	5.9	5.1
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	16	14	7	30	14	5	24	43	10	25	0	21	9	18
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	56	42	74	26	52	63	48	26	65	63	79	43	74	59
Autocratic(1)/ Democratic(7)	4.8	4.3	6.0	3.6	5.1	5.3	4.3	3.6	4.9	5.4	5.2	4.9	5.7	4.4
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	12	24	0	26	11	6	21	35	17	8	15	0	0	31
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	46	32	73	13	52	56	37	25	53	67	54	36	64	50
Opinionated(1)/ Receptive to Ideas(7)	5.3	5.1	6.2	4.6	5.0	5.6	4.2	3.6	5.7	5.0	5.9	5.5	6.1	4.2
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	7	9	0	19	14	0	32	45	0	14	0	0	0	28
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	54	50	80	43	52	61	32	27	63	50	71	36	78	33
Structuring														
Disorganized(1)/ Organized(7)	6.1	6.2	5.7	3.9	5.2	5.2	4.7	4.0	6.3	5.4	4.2	5.1	6.0	4.7
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	4	8	4	27	7	0	11	33	0	14	36	15	4	27
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	77	86	63	23	52	42	37	33	90	64	36	46	75	47
Ambiguous(1)/Clear(7)	5.8	5.7	6.1	3.4	5.3	5.2	4.5	4.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.9	6.0	4.2
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	4	0	0	32	10	6	14	27	3	13	14	8	0	33
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	70	67	76	14	55	44	33	32	61	50	29	33	70	33
Erratic(1)/Predictable(7)	5.6	6.0	5.7	4.7	5.1	5.4	5.3	4.4	5.6	5.1	4.8	5.6	5.7	4.3
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	5	0	5	9	10	0	13	22	0	17	8	0	0	29
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	67	74	73	32	48	61	56	35	63	58	38	40	73	36
Vigor														
Indecisive(1)/Decisive(7)	5.9	6.0	5.4	3.4	5.5	4.9	4.6	4.6	5.6	5.2	5.0	4.8	5.9	5.2
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	6	9	8	37	7	11	21	22	0	15	14	15	0	13
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	73	80	64	16	64	37	47	39	59	62	50	38	78	53
Lethargic(1)/Vigorous(7)	5.6	5.8	5.2	2.7	5.3	4.8	4.1	4.9	5.4	5.3	5.4	4.4	6.0	5.2
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	3	3	8	45	7	6	15	14	0	8	7	8	0	19
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	63	72	50	5	50	29	20	41	52	50	50	31	70	63
Passive(1)/Active(7)	5.7	5.6	5.8	2.7	5.6	4.8	3.9	4.7	5.6	5.5	5.6	4.5	5.9	5.3
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	6	3	4	50	4	6	30	13	3	7	8	8	4	17
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	65	60	69	0	52	29	30	35	58	60	62	25	70	61
Part Two: Personal Characteristics														
Interpersonal Sensitivity														
Unfeeling(1)/Caring(7)	5.3	5.5	6.1	4.5	5.5	5.6	4.9	4.2	5.7	5.4	5.4	5.1	6.1	4.5
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	6	6	4	18	7	5	15	23	0	14	0	8	0	40
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	59	59	80	36	64	68	45	27	68	64	50	42	78	53
Insensitive(1)/ Understanding(7)	5.6	5.3	6.2	4.5	5.3	5.7	4.8	3.9	5.8	5.4	5.6	5.6	6.0	4.7
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	5	6	4	14	10	0	11	32	0	7	7	0	4	19
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	63	56	85	36	66	74	39	27	68	57	71	64	74	50
Aloof(1)/Warm(7)	4.7	4.6	5.8	3.6	5.2	5.4	4.2	3.8	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.0	6.0	4.6

<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	13	14	0	32	10	6	18	33	6	15	0	14	4	24
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	46	39	73	18	41	53	27	24	55	62	54	50	70	53
Integrity														
Untruthful(1)/Honest(7)	5.8	6.0	6.4	4.6	5.8	5.3	4.9	5.0	6.3	5.7	5.5	4.9	6.1	4.7
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	7	6	4	13	4	5	11	5	0	15	8	15	0	27
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	68	79	88	35	70	47	44	42	87	77	62	54	82	53
Unfair(1)/Fair(7)	5.6	5.9	6.2	4.0	5.6	5.6	4.6	4.8	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.2	6.0	4.7
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	4	3	4	23	7	0	22	5	0	0	0	8	0	31
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	67	74	79	18	59	58	44	37	67	71	57	58	74	56
Untrustworthy(1)/Trustworthy(7)	5.8	5.9	6.2	4.9	5.7	6.1	4.6	4.9	6.2	5.5	6.0	5.5	6.2	4.3
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	4	6	4	9	4	0	24	15	0	8	0	9	0	33
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	70	79	81	41	67	79	41	50	80	67	71	64	78	47
Character														
Manipulative(1)/Straightforward(7)	5.7	5.3	6.3	4.0	5.7	5.5	4.9	3.9	5.8	5.8	5.1	4.6	5.8	4.6
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	6	9	0	23	4	0	21	36	0	0	7	15	4	29
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	66	65	85	18	61	63	47	27	74	70	43	46	70	59
Inconsistent(1)/Consistent(7)	6.1	6.0	5.5	4.3	5.3	5.4	4.9	4.2	6.0	5.1	5.1	4.8	6.1	4.6
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	3	6	12	14	14	6	15	25	3	21	14	8	0	31
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	81	79	69	27	66	61	40	30	83	50	57	31	78	50
Self-centered(1)/Institution-centered(7)	5.6	5.6	6.3	3.1	5.6	5.6	3.1	4.2	5.6	5.4	5.1	4.8	5.8	4.7
<i>Percent Negative (1 or 2)</i>	10	8	0	45	7	0	58	30	0	7	7	8	4	25
<i>Percent Positive (6 or 7)</i>	64	64	83	14	46	65	21	39	63	64	43	42	70	50

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	
	D, TSS	AD, TPS
Part One: Administrative Style		
Democratic Practice		
Mean for <i>Democratic Practice</i>	4.3	6.0
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	24	2
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	36	71
Structuring		
Mean for <i>Structuring</i>	5.1	6.0
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	8	3
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	50	76
Vigor		
Mean for <i>Vigor</i>	5.4	5.7
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	5	2
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	54	68
Part Two: Personal Characteristics		
Interpersonal Sensitivity		
Mean for <i>Interpersonal Sensitivity</i>	4.9	6.1
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	13	4
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	48	73
Integrity		
Mean for <i>Integrity</i>	4.9	6.3
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	13	0
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	46	80
Character		
Mean for <i>Character</i>	4.9	6.1
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	10	4
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	47	77

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 Improvement¹²

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Vice President, Business & Finance Division
Guam Community College
10/31/2006 - 11/15/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Very knowledgeable of her roles and responsibilities; makes timely decisions; open to new ideas; good team player.
- She is very intelligent. She is very knowledgeable about the College, Education on Guam, finance, policies, laws, etc. She is a doer. She plans, executes and delivers results.
- She has exceptional skills in finance and budget and an exceptional memory to recall details.
- Intellect, Expertise, Goals, Strength, Vision, Support
- Administrator listens. She reviews the work and either suggests alternatives or accepts the work.
- Intelligence, sees priorities, acts decisively, kind
- Work experience and knowledgeable about GCC.
- She really knows her job, and applies it well.
- Appears to be very knowledgeable in field.
- Knowledge, character, hard working
- Accounting.. .money management.
- She is personable and pleasant and deals with people in a very humane way. She carries herself in a dignified manner by way of dress and demeanor.
- Trust
- No comments
- Can make decisions and remain firm on them if they are fair. I just know this as a personal experience.
- Knowledge, ability, intelligence, positive and straightforward attitude. This person has my utmost respect.

¹² *Spell check* was performed on these qualitative comments in the process of transcription.

- She knows her stuff and gets along well with her subordinates
- Professionalism, responsiveness, enthusiasm.
- Experienced in her field.
- She listens to my concerns and provides excellent responses and examples on how to accomplish specific needs.
- She knows her stuff.
- This administrator is very intelligent and works toward what is best for the institution.
- Knowledge
- Her honesty and firmness.
- Good at job duties and responsibilities
- Her education and experience.
- I am not sure at this point.
- She knows her job.
- Her experience and education.
- Do not know.
- Job knowledge
- Mary has an excellent knowledge of the accounting system in the Government of Guam. Mary works well with others. Mary is approachable. Mary is a professional.
- Aggressive, energetic, and motivated.
- I have reservations. I have never worked with this administrator in any capacity.
- Smart achiever. Team player. DEFINITELY KNOWS FINANCE!
- No comments
- I have no idea.
- N/A
- Has held jobs in the accounting/business offices so she should be pretty well versed in financial matters.

- N/A
- Knowledge about her job.
- Finance expert. Knowledgeable. Personable. Effective communicator. Motivator. Possesses strong leadership character. Professional.
- Not in contact professionally with this person.
- Her main assets is to ensure that the College is in good standing
- She is very knowledgeable and intelligent. Her door is always open when concerns and questions arise. She is a driver and does not want to waste time. She is calm and listens. She knows her job as well as her entire division.
- Good management of resources, such as funding
- Knowledge of Area.

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

- Limited access to student education outside of the Finance.
- Not approachable! Unfriendly
- She may be seen as a very serious person but she does have a caring side.
- None
- Sameas#31.
- None.
- None
- n/a
- She is a little aloof and stand-offish. May be to her advantage to be more open and outgoing to fellow coworkers, whether in positions of authority or not.
- n/a
- No comments
- Not too friendly and approachable at times. An observations made was that at times she would makes unfavorable facial expressions during discussions with people--the look of "I don't care and so what"....
- Never been in contact with this administrator.

- Too ambitious. May be victim to the “Peter Principle”.
- I have no reservations about Mary’s professional abilities.
- Approachability
- None
- None
- None
- Her negative impression in interpersonal relationship with others.
- Narrow-minded in institution wide, especially academic side.
- No reservations.
- None
- I’m concerned she may be swayed by her friends without having the whole picture.
- She is unapproachable, has poor people skills, her unit is one of the poorest in terms of quality, people under her are inefficient and can be rude. This is a reflection of her style.
- None
- Too many personal relationship amongst other administrators which hinders her from practicing professionalism.
- She is still growing into her position.
- Quiet
- None. She is one outstanding person, who knows her job and does it far above expectations.
- No comments
- She knows her responsibilities and carries them to the fullest extent of her capabilities.
- People skills
- None
- n/a

- Although this administrator is very knowledgeable and well organized, sometimes she does not appear to be very approachable or personable.
- She's a woman of her own class. She can be subjective.
- None
- She is unapproachable and does not make the environment comfortable when she is around. She either needs to enroll in more customer service classes or needs to take a class in Sociology/Interpersonal Relations.
- I have no reservations with this administrator
- NONE.
- None
- None
- None.

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

- She should manage more divisions. The divisions under her are very successful. She should manage the unsuccessful divisions or share her management style with others.
- Nothing comes to mind
- No changes at this time.
- A good administrator is like a good teacher, if the students like you, they will succeed. I believe that is what it takes to make an institution operable, but when communication is lost, everything begins to fail and the institution becomes ineffective, this is where most of our problems prevail. It won't hurt to have her smile and be more welcoming no matter how stressful the job is, the real job is how you build your relationship with your colleagues and subordinates.
- Looking at putting the best needs of the students to the forefront than the process or policy.
- This office has gone through so many changes. The staff has worked hard to produce the work required by the College. Unfortunately, it is difficult working with the Controller who has a micro-management style which cause undue stress and discord within the office. I suggest that the administrator look into this situation in order for the staff to feel appreciated.
- Don't interact with her often enough to make a recommendation.

- Has too many balls in the air-needs to drop a couple.
- n/a
- Friendlier approach and keep an open mind to subordinates.
- Keep up the good work
- People skills
- She needs to lighten up sometimes, and smile more often.
- No comments
- She must be more aware of her COMPTROLLER! He seems to be making a mockery of her department. Low morale and trying to get other departments to do his department's work. Seems some people have special treatment with the comptroller. The VP needs to have more control over this situation.
- None
- More on-going communication with the campus: about financial status, changes in budget allocations and reasons for them, and to get input to use in the budget requests from the legislature.
- To be more sociable.
- Have clear policies, deadlines, stop changing policies midway without letting the college know, provide better follow-up and make changes when concerns arise, stop taking things personally and just do a better job
- I have no recommendations for her to improve.
- Doing it
- Maintain her excellent management style.
- Understand and communicate with the bottom-side of the institution.
- Can't say.
- None
- Her interpersonal relationship with other employees at the Institution.
- Staff Development Policies.
- None.

- Style
- I would like to see Mary teach one class each semester.
- None
- Don't know--don't know her well enough to make sound judgment.
- Needs to work on people skills just a bit more.
- No comments
- More involved with staff on campus. Some of us don't know her and how she works.
- N/A
- Be more outgoing.
- N/A
- Unable to answer
- None.
- Same as#31.
- None, she got the College best interest
- She is doing a great job.
- Need to be more accommodating and more approachable

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Assistant Director, Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness
Guam Community College
11/15/2006 - 11/30/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Focus and knowledge
- Ray is extremely knowledgeable and current in his field.
- Very knowledgeable of his area and gets the job done.
- He has excellent communication skills both written and oral. He's extremely intelligent not only in his area of expertise, but in general. He developed the student outcomes assessment and institutional effectiveness and became one of the most intelligent and successful projects ever done at GCC.
- Organized, focused, capable
- Great asset to the Institution.
- Organized, well-read, excellent written communication
- Very Knowledgeable in his are of responsibility.
- Knowledge, vigor, completeness.
- I view him as a visionary and a leader. He is doing a great job in his role as the head of Assessment. Communicates the expectations of Assessment Division to other areas of the College. He is also very focused on his job.
- Dedication to work
- Very knowledgeable in his area of expertise.
- Intelligence, very well versed in the area he is responsible for. Just outstanding
- His knowledge on assessment of higher education.
- Very effective and efficient.
- Knowledge of the assessment process and the ability to evaluate the data.
- An asset to the college. His knowledge of assessment needs and processes is amazing. His ability to communicate to others is very good.
- He is very articulate and very knowledgeable.

- He is a perfectionist and has a lot of zest.
- Self-starter, intelligent, easy going person.

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

- None
- Ray appears to lack an assertive voice in planning and decision-making.
- None.
- I have my reservations---don't know him well enough to make that judgment.
- None, he does his job well. He's just a little reticent.
- Because he is a perfectionist, he expects everyone else to be one as well. Additionally, he is a workaholic and sometimes drives his staff batty.
- Sometimes not clear
- None
- None
- Seems strong and aggressive.
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- Sometimes does not realize the investment in time that is required of faculty to accomplish the goals and objectives of assessment. Some of us don't have any more time to give up.
- He is very focused and sometimes doesn't see the big picture.
- None

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

- None

- Assume more of a leadership role.
- None
- I am not in contact with this administrator on a daily basis.
- None
- None
- None
- None
- I do not know too much about his management style so I am not able to provide feedback on any improvements.
- None
- Needs to be a little more relaxed. He can sometimes be too rigid.
- Remember we all aren't as versed in Assessment as he is and sometimes he needs to bring it to our level of understanding.
- He's one administrator who's an asset to this college.
- None
- More interaction with administrators.
- I think his effectiveness is fine.
- He shouldn't expect everyone to have the same zest. He might also look into why there is such a quick turn around in his department.
- None

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Coordinator, Student Financial Aid, Business Office
Guam Community College
10/31/2006 - 11/15/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- In her alternate role as the GCC's Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, she does an excellent job. She is very knowledgeable about EEO matters and has the respect of individuals who work with her on EEO issues.
- Very willing to assist the students and employees needs.
- Extensive knowledge in the financial aid area.
- She is a likeable person and works well with others.
- Understands students and their needs
- Her knowledge of Financial Aid processes.
- Years of experience in the area of financial aid.
- Her knowledge, skills, abilities, sense of humor, and patience.
- People oriented. Approachable. Fair. Cheerful attitude, always ready to assist students.
- Knowledgeable with Program
- Great personality, always eager to help students and staff

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

- None.
- None.
- N/A
- Inability to complete federal/internal reports timely.
- None.
- None
- None
- None

- None

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

- She needs to be more outgoing and participate more in other areas of GCC.
- None
- None
- More staff and training for her area.
- Hire another assistant/clerk. Just two people in this department will not suffice. Too many times students are turned away because the administrator or her assistant are out to lunch, training etc. They need more help in Financial Aid. Sometimes both of them being out cannot be helped!!
- Be more organized.
- Give her more staff.
- None.
- Needs more staff
- Be more visible with recruitment activities, student activities, etc.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Coordinator, Facilities Maintenance
Guam Community College
10/31/2006 - 11/15/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- I'm not sure, he is not visible on the campus - he is not leading his division.
- I do not work with this administrator. I have no contact with him.
- Sincerity and concerns
- I do not know this person well enough to judge
- He listens and acts upon the concerns of others.
- I don't know.
- I don't know. Never met him.
- Can't tell
- Administrator is familiar with building codes/requirements.
- None. Not aggressive in work duties and responsibilities.
- Invisibility.
- Cannot make comments about this individual because I do not know and have not made contact with this individual.
- Don't know.
- Don't know
- Do not work with administrator. Unable to form an opinion.
- Not to sure.
- Policy and procedures on facility.
- Not sure.
- Friendly and easy to talk to.
- His education.

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

- Lack of direct involvement in day-to-day activities.
- Just needs to follow through and complete tasks assigned. Needs to communicate any problems or issues that arise so that other departments involved are kept in the loop. Needs to be firm.
- Not exposed to be noticed.
- No comment.
- None
- Do not work with administrator. Unable to form an opinion.
- No response because I don't deal with him daily nor do I see him around
- Don't see him enough.
- Cannot make comments about this individual because I do not know and have not made contact with this individual.
- He is not an administrator.
- Lazy. Doesn't work.
- He doesn't seem to have good relationship with the persons he supervises.
- Hardly ever saw him
- None
- Meaningless
- None.
- Effective communication
- He is not visible, he is not a leader, he does not seem to be making the decisions in his area and that's okay because it seems that others in his area are more qualified than he.

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

- Proactive
- None.

- Change
- be a true administrator
- Be more visible, communicative, and a team player
- He needs to work on improving his supervisory skills with his subordinates.
- For him to work and stop coming up with excuses.
- Replace him.
- Cannot make comments about this individual because I do not know and have not made contact with this individual.
- Be more visible to the community.
- No response. I have no interaction with administrator at all.
- Do not work with administrator. Unable to form an opinion.
- To do more and better quality control with contractors.
- Active interaction with faculty, students, and staff,
- More active with the Quality Control of on going contractor projects.
- Needs to be more assertive and organized with the projects that he oversees. Needs to work closely with the contractors to insure that the scope of work is followed and completed.
- Improve communication within his own department.
- He needs to work with his people, he needs to communicate, he needs to be visible.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Coordinator, Admissions & Registration
Guam Community College
11/15/2006 - 11/30/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Open minded
- He is approachable and makes an effort to greet people.
- initiative, dedication
- He is methodical and thorough in approaching issues that concern student enrollment and scheduling of classes.
- Smart. Understands quickly. Organized. Churns out a large volume of work.
- Work Ethic, and the desire to move ahead
- Good people and technical skills; understanding and willing to help.
- He is very approachable and willing to help solve problems concerning the institution.
- He is open minded, knowledgeable with computer systems, and very understanding. He is definitely an asset to GCC.
- He is straight forward and very knowledgeable in the Computer side of his job!
- SOME computer knowledge
- Has much knowledge about computers and software systems.
- Computer Skills a Plus
- technology background
- His experience with technology

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

- Being so new to the college
- None.

- None
- As a data person, he needs to be more proactive in regularly generating student enrolment figures that are widely disseminated on campus so that people have basic knowledge of student retention rates, program completion rates, and the like. These should not only be based on data requests. He needs to use his technical expertise with computers to good use.
- None whatsoever.
- Have not actually met him.
- None
- None
- He needs to push his people to be more computer literate and more proficient with computer systems in general. With the Banner Student coming online in the near future, he will need to be more assertive in getting his people trained to the point where they are very confident with the new system.
- None.
- When I call for information, he either does not know his department procedures, his phone is busy or he's not in.
- Not very open with his support staff He stands firm with his decisions and makes no room for discussion. He has tunnel vision when it comes to HIS decisions!!
- People Skills
- sometimes conversations appear one-sided towards his values
- None.

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

- He needs more personnel in his area.
- Unfortunately, many issues were decided before him came in, or he was left out.
- None.
- training (information technology)
- He needs to train staff under him to learn basic data generation that will help greatly in understanding student profile on campus.

- None, as far as I'm concerned, he is doing a fine job.
- Take charge and run with it and not be too afraid to make mistakes along the way.
- Needs to be a little more friendlier.
- Be familiar with what his department is about so when outside people call, he can assist rather than transfer to his staff.
- Be more of an effective administrator by trying to compromise with his staff. He cannot get ANYTHING DONE WITHOUT THEM! His staff has much knowledge about the Admissions Department, he should tap into their knowledge more.
- Also People Skills
- Being more receptive in discussions, listen before responding or making judgments

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Safety Administrator, Environmental Safety Office
Guam Community College
11/15/2006 - 11/30/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- No comment
- Ability to get along with others. Very friendly and likable.
- Knowledge; approachable
- No comment
- n/a

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

- No comment
- Visionary plans for the institution. Not sure what he or his Vice President's plans are for improving safety on campus.
- Not proactive
- No comment

N/A

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

- . No comment
- Safety training and practice drills.
- Facilitation; communication
- Need to develop a safety plan that is disseminated to the college community.
- Individual should be more active in working with the administration in fixing and securing many areas on campus, such as the cracks on the stairs in the SS&A bldg. One day someone will definitely fall and have serious injuries.
- n/a
- Needs to more strict on work that goes on here at GCC with contractors, construction

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Program Specialist, Student Support Services/Night Administration
Guam Community College
10/31/2006 - 11/15/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- This person has the ability to get others to follow her.
- Sense of humor, efficient, timely responses, team player
- People skills
- Very vocal.
- maintaining room assignments and assisting with request for rooms.
- Infectious sense of humor, and ability to adapt to any situation in good-natured spirits
- The use of her human resources.
- Very friendly and approachable. Helps with whatever problem I may have and provides timely feedback.

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

- This person can't let go of the past and carries a lot of baggage. This prevents her from getting past personal perceptions and moving the institution forward.
- Only that she lacks the power to do some things.
- None.
- Sometimes loud and rambunctious
- lacks passion for her position - it's just a job.
- Does only what is expected of her.
- Not a team player.
- Sometimes seems overwhelmed...as do we all.
- None

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

- needs to be more “visible” on campus; i.e. management by walking around.
- Do more of the same.
- Need to have power to make changes that would improve the educational environment.
- This person does the minimum of what is required to maintain status quo - it would be beneficial if she asserted herself more.
- Lessen/minimize/stop joking behavior when the situation calls for it
- She has great ideas, but isn't heard by upper management.
- None.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Program Specialist, Adult Education
Guam Community College
10/31/2006 - 11/15/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Intelligent
- She's really a "go getter and has really expanded the services and successes in her area.
- Her understanding and knowledge of Adult Basic Education and Adult Literacy. Continuing her education in the Masters program at UOG.
- Her knowledge and understanding of Adult Basic Education and adult Literacy. She never leave her staff in any irate customer instead she help her staff and defend him/her in the situation.
- She has none! She cannot run the Adult Ed with any efficiency whatsoever!! This department is chaotic and very disorganized and lacks customer service. They really need to train the people in the Adult Ed department!!
- I do not think I have ever met this person
- Broad knowledge of the developments in her field
- Visionary and creative in running her program.
- No response
- Very open minded and educated.
- Challenging, personable, caring, fair, supportive, concerned, always willing to help and make our work smoother, and very practical.
- She can get her job done.
- To ensure that the college is in the road to helping the community

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

- Not quite clear or consistent with her supervision aspect
- Customer services skills is lacking.
- She is not a team player but is more than capable in her abilities.

- None.

- None at all.

- needs people skills

- None

- Aloof, and sometimes emotionally distant when it comes to people relationships

- Inability to consistently make decisions affecting the program.

- None

- She seems aloof and I don't think she consults other people about decisions-but this could be so because her dept. is not really part of the college per se. She may not have the opportunity to interact very often.

- Her interactions with others. She is often perceived as being very abrasive to others and she has really turned a fair amount of people against her because of very terse, almost rude, interactions.

- Organizational Skills and approaches

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

- This person would do better realizing that we're all supposed to be on the same team and we don't put others down publicly.

- She could be friendlier, more approachable. She may otherwise be a good administrator but the overall impression is not good because of her style.

- Think outside the box, proactive, receptive, organized

- None

- Demonstrate consistency in application of procedures; maintain open communication.

- I'm not sure 'ho she is.

- She needs a lot of Administrator training to improve this department. The Adult High School has gone down hill since she took over and AHRD will no longer cover for this program. This has been a disservice to our students at GCC. It leaves me to wonder what the future holds as a college that is supposed to be helping the working people who need to finish their high school diploma in order for them to further their education.

- Lighten up, and interact more with others
- Needs to learn more about the impact on decisions made to other areas of the organization.
- None
- needs people skills
- None
- None.
- She needs to learn to do her job but not at the expense of others.
- Need to communicate more effective with the employee she supervises.
- She needs to improve her communication skills. She forgets that GED and Adult Ed is not the only program within OCC. She very demanding and unprofessional at times. She needs to work on respecting and earning the respects of others in the College(esp. staff employees).

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Program Specialist, Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness
Guam Community College
10/31/2006 - 11/15/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Always open and willing to help, especially during critical deadline times.
- organized. Dedicated to the college, helpful and direct
- 1. Ability to be objective when receiving feedback. 2. Ability to communicate the big picture in relationship to Assessment.
- Very knowledgeable in the area she oversees. Very helpful with new- programs and takes the time to help you understand to move forward with the project. Strong skills to perform duties well.
- Knowledgeable. flexible, helpful.
- Priscilla is loyal and a dedicated worker. She is hardworking and persistent, thorough and organized, sometimes to a fault.
- Demeanor, dress
- Knowledgeable and helpful
- Patient, understanding and helpful. Very encouraging to end users.
- She is a very hard worker.
- She is hardworking, helpful, and knows when to accept fault.
- Good at duties and responsibilities.
- Very helpful and caring.
- Professional, knowledgeable in her area, trustworthy, and intelligent.
- Always ready to assist others in her area of expertise. Very approachable and helpful. Very knowledgeable in the area of assessment.
- Self-starter. Effective communicator. Strong listener. Dependable. Dedicated to the institution's TracDat program.
- She is well organized and is very helpful.
- Detailed

- Institutional knowledge, team player, hard-working, dedicated to the institution.

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

- Needs to participate more in a supervisory role.
- Sometimes focuses on the letter of an issue more than the spirit of the issue.
- No reservations. Pretty serious about her work.
- None.
- She needs to work on perfecting her skills on accuracy and precision, particularly when it comes to quantitative measures.
- Many times a little too pushy and overbearing. However, I admit that these characteristics may be the reason she is very efficient at her job.
- None.
- None
- None.
- None.
- Sometimes I'm not quite sure if she sees the whole picture.
- Works well in well defined structure but may be thrown off by unexpected changes
- English skills
- None
- None.
- None.
- Gets caught up in the details sometimes

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

- None at this time.

- Nothing- she's fine
- None.
- None.
- Keep doing the same.
- Awareness of weaknesses or skill gaps so that they can be corrected, or minimized.
- relax and have fun at work; you are doing a good job.
- Increase positive communication.
- More staffing and training with the technical aspect of TracDat.
- Be aggressive and work with others and not have mean face. Smile and be nice because her perception scares people.
- None
- Cannot judge. I don't work with this administrator on a daily basis.
- Be less outspoken and more empathetic with coworkers.
- None.
- Increased leadership role.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Program Specialist, Career Placement Center
Guam Community College
10/31/2006 - 11/15/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Personality and honesty. Just a nice person and easy to work with.
- She is approachable and available to all, and seeks to build effective relationships with everyone.
- Do not know.
- Works well with faculty
- No comments
- Team player
- Very friendly and approachable. Is available to be guest speaker and set up workshops.

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

- None
- n/a
- No Comments
- None
- None.
- None.
- None
- None

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

- None

- Connecting with alumni who are in positions to offer jobs / internships / mentorships to GCC graduates should be prioritized very highly. GCC's career counseling and placement functions should be linked together more closely. OCC should invest more resources in this area of the college.

- None.

- None

- No Comments

- n/a

- Follow up calls/reminders, in addition to emails. Provide hardcopies rather than depending on each faculty member to actually print out numerous email attachments.

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Program Specialist, Instructional Technology Center
Guam Community College
11/15/2006 - 11/30/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- His years of experience in the position he currently holds.
 - Nice guy. Good personality. Team player.
 - He is open and approachable. He is a team player. He is knowledgeable in his field (VISCOM/ITC).
 - no comment
 - knowledgeable and a team player
 - Intelligent & innovative.
 - Knowledge; Skills; Professionalism
 - Knowledge of area he works
- . He knows his limitations and when to ask for help. He is the best resource for audio/visual equipment help and questions. Definitely very resourceful with VisCom and IIC. Very helpful with faculty
- N/A

His experience with technology.

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

- None
- Needs to be a bit more detailed in his work. Also, needs to be a little more assertive. Communicate to all involved and needs to be firm.
- haven't work with him
- None
- Not good with details.
- None

- Does not seek input nor does he accept it when it is given. Predetermined in how things are to be and done.

- He is between a rock and a hard place. He needs to determine if he is doing what he is supposed to and know for certain if he is doing it at the right place and the right time.

- N/A

- None.

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

- He needs more personnel in his area.

- Time Management

- Maybe some organization.

- no comment

- Shift from emphasis on mission, vision, history and values to focus on core know how and past achievement. While mission and vision are important, they tend to define aspirations more than reality.

- Start asking before deciding and understand that the Tech building does not belong to him.

- To be more receptive and understanding to what people are telling him and communicate those thoughts to people that need to know.

- N/A

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Program Specialist, Planning & Development
Guam Community College
11/15/2006 - 11/30/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- I do not know this individual well enough.
- She is well known publicly.
- I don't work with this person.
- Dedicated, energetic and loyal to the institution.
- Goal orientated; knowledge

.N/A

.N/A

- Team player, cooperative, flexible to change
- Very Student Centered

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

- Occasionally makes decision without obtaining approval from superior.
- None
- Summarization

.N/A

•N/A

- Can't say at this time.
- None

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

- No comment.

- None

- Organizational

.N/A

.N/A

- Don't know.

- None

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Program Specialist, Center for Student Involvement
Guam Community College
11/15/2006 - 11/30/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Intelligence, devotion to students, enthusiasm, humor
- She has a very pleasant personality.
- Her personality and her vision.
- Barbara LG is a warm person, and easy to relate to on a personal level. She also brings her jovial disposition, as well as her optimistic attitude, in her dealings with everyone, particularly with students.
- Friendliness, approachability, communication
- Energetic and multi-tasker.
- Enthusiasm and drive; student focused
- She is dedicated to the team and works towards the good of OCC.
- Very organized and friendly.
- Focus on the students

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

- None
- None.
- None
- None.
- None
- None
- NONE
- None
- None

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

- None.
- None
- None.
- None
- The paperwork for student organizations is burdensome. Perhaps less paperwork and more electronic reporting? Just need to think of ways to cut down on getting so many approvals for student activities.
- None
- None
- N/A

IDEA Feedback for Administrators

Program Specialist, Project AIM-TRiO Programs
Guam Community College
11/15/2006 - 11/30/2006

What are this administrator's main assets?

- Coordinator
- Very friendly a team player
- None. Complains too much and talks bad about others.
- Friendliness, generosity
- Her passion and personality.
- Warm, trustworthy, consistent, efficient, institution-centered
- Not certain.
- Cannot say
- N/A
- Don't know.
- I do not have enough meaningful contact with this individual.

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

- Doesn't always look at the big picture
- Untrustworthy, Dishonest,
- None
- Thinks she knows it all

None

None

- Have not really heard anything new or productive about her work
- None

- N/A

- Don't know.

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

- check all facts before making rash decisions

- She needs to show genuine and sincere actions for the college's mission and not be self-centered

- None

- Listen to others when advice is given.

- None

- None.

- Be available and stop the gossip meetings

- n/a

- Don't know.

IDEA Feedback for Deans

Dean, School of Technology & Student Services
Guam Community College
10/31/2006 - 11/15/2006

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.

- This Dean works hard towards achieving measurable goals and performance; and has been successful in achieving positive results. TSS has made major improvements and growth since she took over as Dean. Major improvement from the last Dean of TSS.

. Feedback has improved.

- Needs to develop leadership skills.

- The Dean's strong personality matches well with her strong leadership skills. She can sometimes be brusque but firm, and pushy but understanding. She has the interests of the college in her heart all the time.

- The Dean would need to assist departments with the identification of grants and other resources so departments can address their needs. A suggestion would be to attend department meetings periodically.

- Dean Santos is an effective administrator. She is still growing into her Dean role, and over time will become even more effective as a Dean.

- The Dean does not appear to be a uniter among the faculty she oversees. She needs to take more time to understand needs and day to day requirements to run her school effectively.

- Focuses too much on following the exact letter of things, rather than following the spirit.

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.

- Looking at allowing Faculty the freedom to provide instruction to the students in the best manner.

- Sometimes Dean Santos expresses an initial strong reaction when she has a disagreement with an employee. Once she takes time to think about the issue over time, she becomes more approachable.

- I am learning her style of communication. It would be nice to know what visions management have of each program/department and to communicate this with everybody or appropriate personnel. At the same time, have the program/department share their visions for the college and identify resources to make these visions a reality.

Dean Santos has changed from when she first came to the college. I believe that she has been given advice and/or she has looked within herself to see how others view her and has decided that there was room for improvement. I believe she is a much better person to work with although it was rocky in the beginning of her tenure as dean.

- Question #32 - Autocratic when needs to be, democratic when appropriate

- Depending on the Deans mood of the day, many colleagues do not know how to approach her.

- Has NOT practiced the Customer Service training received by ALL. Is rude at times to staff and any below her in front of students, customers and other employees.

- Intentions were originally misunderstood, but with increased interaction, she has gained my full confidence in her support of the division and personnel. She is very supportive and fair.

- Excellent and hard working Dean.

IDEA Feedback for Deans

Associate Dean, School of Trades & Professional Services
Guam Community College
11/15/2006 - 11/30/2006

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.

- She is always on top of what's going on.
- Because this dean is largely focused on support services for instructors, she has not had a credible impact on pedagogical issues involving teaching and learning processes on campus. This is such a pity considering that she is intellectually equipped to lead, guide, and steer faculty into this area of much-needed improvement at the college. In this light, she needs to be more assertive in making her voice heard or presence felt on this issue.
- Very well thought out person. As a first year Associate Dean she is doing remarkable well and is well liked by the faculty she has purview over.
- She is very organized, open, and assisting when it comes to the needs of the people in our department. She ensures proper follow-through on all tasks.

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.

- The dean should be more proactive in raising issues that concern teaching efficacy and effectiveness, rather than simply providing support services to teachers. It is good to have a running faucet or bookshelf or electricity in one's classroom, but the delivery of instruction or teaching mode is as important an issue to be involved in. The dean should participate more actively in these kinds of discussions on campus.
- A true professional!
- This associate dean is always willing to give assistance in finding solutions to problems concerning the college.
- #38 self-centered vs. institution-centered; appropriately balances between the two

IX. Consolidated Job Performance Ratings of GCC Administrators & Deans by
Division (Year 1 & Year 2)

Comprehensive Report of IDEA Feedback Ratings for GCC General Administrators (Round 1 and 2) AY 2005-2006 & AY 2006-2007					
Position	Total Respondents	Number Responding	Response Rate	MEAN, <i>Job Performance</i> (where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent, 5=Superb)	MEAN, <i>Confidence</i> (where 1=Definitely not, 2=No, but I have reservations about this, 3=Yes, but I have reservations about this, 4=Definitely yes)
<i>Administrative Services Division</i>					
VP, ASD	198	119	60%	2.8	2.9
MIS Admin	51	22	43%	2.9	3.0
P&D Asst Dir	44	26	59%	3.5	3.7
Coordinator, FM	55	32	58%	2.0	2.1
Safety Administrator	39	19	49%	3.1	3.3
Prog. Specialist, P&D	40	19	48%	3.2	3.3
Overall Mean				2.92 (on a 5-pt. scale)	3.05 (on a 4-pt. scale)
<i>Business & Finance Division</i>					
VP, BF	195	95	49%	3.9	3.7
Controller	49	23	47%	2.8	3.1
Admin, Human Resources	57	31	54%	3.4	3.3
Coordinator, Financial Aid	45	29	64%	3.8	3.7
Materials Management Admin	54	23	43%	3.4	3.7
Overall Mean				3.46 (on a 5-pt. scale)	3.5 (on a 4-pt. scale)
<i>President's Office</i>					
Asst. Dir, Comm. & Promotions	48	29	60%	2.9	3.1
<i>Academic Affairs Division</i>					
VP, AAD	198	118	60%	3.6	3.4
Asst Director, AIE	58	38	66%	4.0	3.6
Asst Director, Apprenticeship	54	32	59%	3.4	3.5
Coordinator, Admissions & Reg	51	32	63%	3.5	3.5
Admin, Student Support Services	53	23	43%	2.5	2.8
Prog. Specialist, Student Support Serv	40	25	63%	2.6	2.7
Prog. Specialist, Adult Ed	41	26	63%	2.8	2.8
Prog. Specialist, AIE	48	31	65%	3.6	3.7
Prog. Specialist, Career Placement	39	21	54%	3.6	3.7
Prog. Specialist, Instructional Tech C	40	15	38%	3.4	3.5
Prog. Specialist, Center for Student Inv	39	28	72%	3.9	3.7
Prog. Specialist, AIM-TriO	40	21	53%	3.0	2.8
Overall Mean				3.32 (on a 5-pt. scale)	3.31 (on a 4-pt. scale)

Comprehensive Report of IDEA Feedback Ratings for GCC Deans/Associate Deans (Round 1 and 2) AY 2005-2006 & AY 2006-2007					
Position	Total Respondents	Number Responding	Response Rate	MEAN, Overall Evaluation Rating (where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent)	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)
Dean, TPS	56	30	54%	3.1	3.9
Dean, TSS	59	40	68%	3.0	3.6
Assoc Dean/CE, TSS	67	46	69%	3.5	4.1
Assoc Dean, TSS	43	28	65%	3.2	3.7
Adjunct Assoc Dean, TPS	56	32	57%	3.0	3.6
Assoc. Dean, TPS	46	28	61%	3.5	4.1
Overall Mean				3.22 (on a 4-pt. scale)	3.83 (on a 5-pt. scale)

X. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS, and NEXT STEPS

When the individual qualitative comments of the survey respondents (see Section VIII, pp. 13-53) are superimposed with the quantitative results presented above, and integrated with the results of the previous year, two notable observations can be drawn insofar as the administrative functioning of GCC administrators are concerned. These are:

- (1) The administrators' lack of a clear role in the minds of the survey respondents, particularly as it relates to a real understanding of the administrative responsibility of individual administrators vis-à-vis institutional mission; and
- (2) The administrators' pervasive image as bureaucrat, with a strong adherence to fixed rules, and the perception of underdeveloped social skills when it comes to interpersonal relations.

These general observations seem to imply two general limitations of GCC administrators in general. In the first observation, it appears that LACK OF

COMMUNICATION in a regular, sustained manner seems to have contributed to this situation. Respondents are unclear about what their administrators really do because there are no formal means of institutional channels that communicate job successes, for example. If they do exist however, they are usually sporadic, so that there is very little institutional history that is incrementally built when it comes to professional milestones of individual administrators.

In the second observation, the implication is that there appears to be a LACK OF PERCEPTION CHECK among administrators in general. Because administrators are generally not keen on others' perceptions of them, they are not aware of respondents' perceptions, which are based on limited interaction with them. Administrators therefore need to re-examine their communication styles, or better still, create new and viable communication channels so that they are easily accessible and available to everyone. It is also important perhaps that certain processes need to be reviewed and evaluated for client-friendliness so that the perception of an inflexible bureaucrat is replaced with a humane, socially sensitive professional.

Recommendations

How can these general perceptions existing out there be made more meaningful, assessment-wise? It is only through a frank discussion of these general trends that these assessment results attain some measure of validity. A three-step process should be followed in order to proceed in this manner, as suggested below:

- (1) Bring this discussion to the President's Management Team, and direct the Vice Presidents to hold divisional meetings to address specific issues relative to administrator responsibilities within their respective divisions. Adopt an attitude of critical self-reflection in this process, so that it is clear that collective improvement, not fault-finding, is the ultimate goal;
- (2) Led by the Vice Presidents, have an open dialogue among all administrators so that concrete tools and strategies are formulated toward self-improvement as a group. What sort of training or dialogue is best to resolve the issues raised collectively by respondents? Steps must also be

taken so that these strategies become institutionalized to some degree so that they become an integral part of the institutional culture in the long run.

- (3) Most important of all, the IDEA online assessment tool must find its way into the existing job performance evaluation process utilized by the Human Resources office. Incorporating this instrument formally into this process may require further dialogue among all administrators so that there is a meeting of minds with regard to its validity and meaningfulness. How and when it will be implemented must be discussed lengthily and decisively by all concerned sectors.

In the final analysis, the beneficial impact of this assessment process occurs when all GCC administrators, in one cohesive voice, decide to move collectively toward critical self-reflection and improvement. This collective action, in the long run, will be the necessary impetus to foster and advance efficient and effective functioning at all levels of the college's administration.

TO: All Concerned GCC Administrators
FROM: Dr. Ray D. Somera, Asst. Director, AIE
SUBJECT: Performance Assessment for Administrators
Date: October 13, 2006
CC: Dr. H. delos Santos, President
Dr. John Rider, AVP

Following the last round of performance assessment for GCC administrators in November of last year, the next group of GCC administrators will also undergo a similar evaluation this semester. The attached document entitled “**Information and Protocols for Administrators’ Performance Assessment**” will give you a better understanding of the process, as well as the timeline involved. The Office of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) is coordinating the whole effort.

In the next week or so, you will be hearing from The IDEA Center, a not-for-profit organization based in Kansas. The email will come from admin@theideaonline.org with instructions to fill out an **Administrator Information Form** (AIF) or Dean Information Form (DIF). This first step will be necessary for the data analysis later. Remember that though this is not yet the main survey, please complete it as a requirement for data processing. The main survey to be sent to your eligible raters will be entitled **Impressions of Administrators and/or Perceptions of Academic Dean**.

All administrator assessments by GCC constituents will be done online. With The IDEA Center sending periodic email reminders, the start date will be on November 1, and will end on November 30, 2006. Each eligible rater will receive at least *three* email reminders.

Following this announcement, a memo entitled *Colleagues in the GCC community* will be sent to all college constituents to set the stage for the administrator performance assessment. This will coincide with the mounting of AIE’s **November is Administrator Assessment Month** poster in several strategic places across campus to familiarize all raters with the faces and names of the administrators to be evaluated.

Please email me for any questions or clarification at rsomera@guamcc.edu Again, thank you for your cooperation in this important assessment piece.

Dr. Ray D. Somera
Asst. Director, Office of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness, (AIE)
Guam Community College
PO Box 23069, GMF
Barrigada, Guam 96921

**INFORMATION AND PROTOCOLS FOR
ADMINISTRATORS' PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT
GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FALL 2006**

1. The Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) is coordinating an institutional effort to complete the systematic **assessment of administrators**, to follow the first round of administrator assessment that was completed in November 2005. This next piece marks the second round. The continuation of 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 you need further information on the vendor's varied services.
3. GCC administrators to be evaluated will include the following: Vice President (BFD), Dean (TSS), Associate Dean (TPS), and General Administrators with college wide, as well as sector-specific, functions. The assessment of a similar group of administrators was completed in the first round last year.
4. There will be two cycles of assessment to be held. The first cycle (Round 2A) of administrator performance assessments will be conducted from November 1 – 15, 2006. The second cycle (Round 2B) will begin on November 16 and end on November 30, 2006. November will also be designated as Administrator Assessment Month.
5. The following administrators and their respective schedules for performance assessment follows:

ROUND 2A

Suggested time frame:
Nov 1 – 15, 2006

VP:

Mary Okada

Dean:

Dr. Michelle Santos

General Administrators

Terry Barnhart

Barbara Jacala

Priscilla Johns

Micki Lonsdale

Jose Quitogua

Christine Sison

ROUND 2B

Suggested time frame:

Nov 16 – 30, 2006

Associate Dean

Dr. Virginia Tudela

General Administrators

Dr. Ray Somera

Elvie Tyler

Patrick Clymer

Wesley Gima
Joanne Ige
Barbara Leon Guerrero
Gregorio Manglona

6. 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.
7. 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 **periodic** email reminders to all the eligible raters for both Round 2A (Nov. 1-15) and Round 2B (Nov. 16-30).
8. Though all assessments will be completed *online*, the IDEA Center ensures the confidentiality of an 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 GCC Administrators' Assessment Report** will be disseminated to the entire college community at the start of the Spring 2007 semester.
