GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ASSESSMENT
REPORT

June 2008

Third Consolidated Administrators' Assessment Report

GCC
GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Kulehon Kumunidát Guåhan

CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATORS'
ASSESSMENT REPORT III
June 2008

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of Guam Community College's (GCC's) comprehensive assessment initiative, the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) conducted a third round of administrator assessments at the college from February 1, 2008 to March 10, 2008.

Using two online survey instruments developed by The IDEA Center, full-time college employees were surveyed about their perceptions of the job performance of fifteen (15) GCC administrators in both academic and non-academic areas. Two hundred and eight (208) employees made up the total sample population. While this total sample evaluated one Vice President, the other administrators were rated using inclusion criteria that took into account the college's organizational structure, administrative leadership, committee memberships, and support personnel. The underlying criterion is that the rater is in a position to observe the behavior being rated. Consequently, the total sample for administrators varied in size and scope because of administrator-specific criteria.

Response rates for both academic and non-academic administrators ranged from a high of 85% to a low of 62%. While general administrator results for job performance ranged from a high of 3.8 to a low of 2.6, the overall mean for job performance was **3.19** (on a 5-point scale) and confidence in the administrators' leadership was **3.27** (on a 4-point scale). For the deans, the overall mean for job performance was **3.07** (on a 4-point scale) while confidence in the deans' ability to manage was **3.70** (on a 5-point scale).

This report consolidates quantitative data into tables and provides a guide to interpreting the data. As mentioned in the previous administrator assessment reports, since these results must be grounded in the limitations of the survey tool, sample size, response rates, and other extraneous variables, readers must avoid generalizations and comparability. Quantitative data may be validated by the qualitative comments made by respondents. Because survey responses are anonymous, *abuse of anonymity* may result. In other words, respondents may use the survey instrument as a means for venting their frustrations. Therefore, readers should not place too much weight on individual comments until a pattern emerges from multiple sources.

The following observations are derived from a review of the qualitative comments made by survey respondents and the quantitative results of the survey:

- Administrators are perceived as knowledgeable. Perhaps because several administrators who were evaluated this third cycle have been at the college for many years, they have accumulated a wealth of institutional knowledge as well as job-specific knowledge.
- Administrators are reported to have good interpersonal skills and are team players. A number of respondents described administrators as approachable.
- Administrators are believed to have integrity. Respondents described administrators as honest, trustworthy, and fair.
- Communication is an area of improvement for administrators.   Respondents believe that administrators need to communicate more and to seek feedback from others. Moreover, they need to be more visible.
- Respondents believe that administrators need to be more proactive/assertive/aggressive in order to get things done.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   Introduction and Objectives

Two online surveys developed by the IDEA Center were administered campus-wide on February 1, 2008 to March 10, 2008.   IDEA is an acronym for Individual Development and Educational Assessment and is a non-profit organization based at Kansas State University.[1] This is the off-island vendor that GCC contracted to implement the data collection and analysis for the study.

The objectives of this assessment are:

(1) To provide useful feedback to administrators regarding their performance in relation to faculty and staff expectations; and

(2) To serve as a basis for discussion between the college's administrators and the constituency they serve.

II.   Methodology

The two survey instruments used in this study were the *IDEA Feedback for Deans* and the *IDEA Feedback for Administrators.* The *IDEA Feedback for Deans* considers the deans' role in providing leadership, developing and allocating resources, providing organizational services, and making key personnel decisions. The instrument assesses key personal characteristics and administrative styles related to effective performance, while revealing the unique experiences and impressions of constituencies affected by the dean's decisions. The *IDEA Feedback for Administrators* is used to assess administrators who are not directly involved in academic programs (i.e. vice presidents, assistant directors, department and unit administrators and program specialists). Both survey instruments include multiple choice items as well as open-ended questions.

Since The IDEA Center is an off-island vendor, AIE provided assistance in organizing, coordinating, and scheduling the online surveys. AIE sent The IDEA Center the names of the administrators to be assessed and the email addresses of their corresponding raters. These corresponding raters represent the total sample population *(n= 208)* for the study. In order for the data to be processed, The IDEA Center sent an online *Administrator Information Form* to all administrators being evaluated. Additionally, GCC's Management Information Systems (MIS) department verified that the campus servers worked with the IDEA mail server. The IDEA

---

[1] See *http://www.idea.ksu.edu* for a preview of the instruments utilized in this study.

Center then coordinated the administration of the surveys and sent periodic email reminders to all eligible raters to complete the surveys during the designated dates.

Only one Vice President (ASD) was evaluated during this period. Since the Vice President's role involves institution-level responsibilities, he was rated by the total sample population *(n=208)*. As for the other administrators, inclusion criteria were established for sampling purposes. Consideration was given to the college's organizational structure, administrative leadership, committee membership, and support personnel. Thus, the total sample for administrators differed in size and scope because of administrator-specific criteria. As for the sample size, the total number of respondents who rated each administrator is identified in Table IA and IB (p. 7 of this report).

III.   Preparing the Campus Environment

This third round of administrator assessments follows GCC's two-year assessment cycle and is intended to evaluate those administrators who were first assessed in November 2005. Initially, administrator assessments were scheduled for November 2007, however, because of network stability issues, assessments were pushed back to Spring 2008.

A total of 15 administrators were assessed in this round of assessments. Of the 14 administrators who were evaluated in November 2005, ten were assessed again this year. The other four administrators were not assessed because of retirement and resignation. Three new administrators were also assessed. These administrators have worked at GCC for at least one year. Another two administrators who were assessed in November 2006 were also included in this round of assessments.

As with the previous two cycles of administrator assessments, a poster was created with the names and photos of selected administrators scheduled for evaluation. The poster included information on how the surveys will be administered as well as the two major objectives of the assessment. The purpose of the posters was to create a campus-wide awareness of the upcoming administrator assessments. These posters were strategically placed on bulletin boards throughout the campus.

Similar to the first and second administrator assessments, the third administrator assessment was divided into two rounds. The first round was held on February 1, 2008 to February 29, 2008 with eight administrators being assessed and the second round was held on February 16, 2008 to March 10, 2008 with seven administrators being assessed. Initially, the

first round of surveys was scheduled for February 1, 2008 to February 15, 2008 and the second round was scheduled for February 16, 2008 to February 29, 2008. However, because of low response rates, AIE requested that The IDEA Center extend the evaluation period. AIE sent campus-wide reminders for raters to complete the survey.

Prior to the start of the administration of the surveys, an e-mail message was sent by AIE to all GCC employees explaining the *Administrator's Assessment On-Line Idea Survey* (Appendix A). Information such as the reason for the survey, the timeframe for administration, protocols for assessment, and statement of confidentiality was included in the message.

Individuals were asked to rate three administrators. The rationale for this is that if asked to complete more than three surveys, the response rates could be lower due to survey fatigue; consequently decreasing the reliability of the results.

IV.   How the Report is Organized

This report includes survey results of the fifteen administrators assessed at the beginning of spring semester 2008. The first thirteen (13) administrators were rated using the *IDEA Feedback for Administrators* survey instrument while the last three (3) were rated with the *IDEA Feedback for Deans* survey instrument.

- Vice President, Administrative Services Division
- Assistant Director, Apprenticeship
- Assistant Director, Communications and Promotions
- Assistant Director, Planning and Development
- Administrator, Management Information Systems
- Administrator, Supply Management
- Administrator, Student Support
- Administrator, Human Resources
- Coordinator, Financial Aid
- Institutional Researcher
- Program Specialist, Student Support Services (Night Administration)
- Program Specialist, Continuing Education
- Dean, Trades and Professional Services (TPS)
- Associate Dean, Technology and Student Services (TSS)- Continuing Education

- Associate Dean, Technology and Student Services (TSS)

Although several of the above administrators have assumed new positions (because of internal movements) prior to the administration of the surveys, raters were instructed to base their evaluations of these administrators on their previous positions. The Program Specialist for Continuing Education and the Institutional Researcher were not included in the last two administrator assessments because they are relatively new to their positions. Also, except for the Associate Dean (TSS), all administrators remained the same. The Associate Dean (TSS) who was assessed in November 2005 is not the same Associate Dean (TSS) who was assessed in this cycle.

The following pages contain consolidated tables of survey results and a *Guide to Interpretation* at the bottom of each table which allows readers to examine results within the context of certain statistical standards. As mentioned earlier, 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.[2]   General trends in respondents' perceptions can be validated by the qualitative comments that follow the consolidated tables.[3]

Respondents were asked the following three open-ended questions in order to generate the qualitative data necessary to validate the quantitative results for General Administrators:

- 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?

As for deans, respondents were provided an opportunity to "elaborate on any of the ratings made of the dean's administrative effectiveness or to comment on other aspects of his/her performance" and to "provide comments to clarify or elaborate on general impressions or to offer suggestions pertaining to the dean, the operation of the dean's office, or the college."

V.   What the Results Mean and What to Look For

Administrator results are divided into the following three categories:

- Overall Effectiveness;

---

[2] Conclusions should not be arrived at by merely comparing the ratings between and among administrators.

[3] The reader must keep *abuse of anonymity* in mind.

- Areas of Strength and Improvement in Administrative Role Performance *(for General Administrators)*/Ratings of Administrative Effectiveness in Specific Activities *(for Deans)*; and
- Administrative Style and Personal Qualities

The numerical averages for each of these categories are reported as *means*. For the IDEA surveys, a *mean* is the mathematical average of responses on either a 4- or 5-point scale. From a quantitative viewpoint, it is an indicator of respondent's perceptions on certain aspects of an administrator's performance.

VI.   Limitations of the Methodology

Since the assessment tool used in this study is the same as that used in the previous administrator assessments, the limitations reported in the previous administrator assessments are the same for this assessment. The following statements recap such constraints:

- A survey cannot provide all the necessary information for a holistic evaluation of an administrator's performance;
- The survey tool has several inherent limitations/constraints/weaknesses;
- The results of rating scales are not comprehensive because no rating scale can include all relevant questions;
- Rating scales are not tailored to the specific position being evaluated;
- No survey instrument can *universally* capture the wide variances in administrative functions and responsibilities as indicated in each administrator's job description. Although some administrative processes can be generalized, other processes are role specific;
- Administrators' job functions and responsibilities may also change and a survey instrument may not capture the change*;*
- The following weaknesses in the rating process may reduce the validity of ratings:
  - HALO Bias- tendency of evaluators to be influenced in rating one aspect of performance by the rating they have given in another.
  - Leniency or Severity Bias- when a disproportionate number of administrators receive high or low ratings.

- ○ Central Tendency Bias- tendency of some evaluators to give only average ratings and avoid the positive and negative ends of the rating scale.
  - ○ Recency Bias- the effect of recent events having undue influence on performance appraisals.
  - ○ Guessing Bias- occurs when evaluators offer an opinion on particular aspects of administrative performance even though they have no basis for it.
- Raters may have varying levels of exposure and opportunity to observe administrator performance. Consequently, other assessment methods like focus groups should be considered; and
- Surveys with higher response rates have a greater degree of representativeness than those with lower response rates.

VII.   What's Next?

The survey results are intended to provide formative feedback to administrators such as areas where they might focus improvement efforts. The *IDEA Feedback for Administrators* and the *IDEA Feedback for Deans* is only one source of evidence in the administrator's feedback process.

The administrator assessment is a means to collect information. It is not an end in itself but it can be an instrument of change. The information obtained from this assessment may be used by administrators to implement some changes to improve their performance.

The last section of this report integrates the results of the three rounds of assessments by administrator in order to view perceived changes in individual performance. Additionally, several observations and recommendations are discussed.

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								
	Spring 2008								
Position	**Total Respondents**	**Number Responding**	**Response Rate**	**MEAN,** *Job Performance* **(where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent. 5=Superb)**	**% Neg (1 or 2)**	**% Pos (4 or 5)**	**MEAN,** *Confidence* **(where 1=Definitely not, 2=No, but I have reservations about this, 3=Yes, but I have reservations about this, 4=Definitely yes)**	**% Neg (1 or 2)**	**% Pos (3 or 4)**
VP, Administrative Services Division	208	143	69%	**2.9**	37	32	**3.0**	26	74
Administrator, Management Information Systems	50	34	68%	**2.7**	48	26	**2.8**	38	62
Coordinator, Financial Aid	40	26	65%	**3.7**	10	57	**3.8**	0	100
Administrator, Supply Management	45	33	73%	**3.7**	7	63	**3.8**	0	100
Assistant Director, Communications & Promotions	49	38	78%	**2.6**	53	26	**2.7**	38	62
Administrator, Student Support Services	48	34	71%	**3.3**	19	45	**3.3**	13	87
Program Specialist, Student Support Services	47	34	72%	**2.8**	36	27	**3.2**	29	71
Program Specialist, Continuing Education	39	24	62%	**3.0**	27	27	**2.9**	40	60
Assistant Director, Planning & Development	41	29	71%	**3.7**	12	58	**3.7**	13	87
Assistant Director, Apprenticeship	35	23	66%	**3.5**	20	47	**3.5**	9	91
Institutional Researcher	37	28	76%	**2.6**	36	5	**3.1**	26	74
Administrator, Human Resources	49	35	71%	**3.8**	12	65	**3.5**	13	87
Overall Mean				**3.19** *(on a 5-pt. scale)*			**3.27** *(on a 4-pt. scale)*		

TABLE I.B. OVERALL EVALUATION RATINGS FOR DEANS

	Consolidated Report of IDEA Feedback Ratings for Dean/Associate Deans								
	Spring 2008								
Position	**Total Respondents**	**Number Responding**	**Response Rate**	**MEAN,** *Overall Evaluation Rating* **(where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent)**	**% of Maximum Score (4.0)**	**% 3 or 4**	**MEAN,** *Confidence in Dean's ability to manage* **(where 1=Hardly ever, 2=Less than 1/2 the time, 3=About 1/2 the time, 4=Most of the time, 5=Always)l**	**% of Maximum Score (5.0)**	**% 4 or 5**
Dean, TPS	49	34	69%	**2.9**	73	65	**3.6**	71	59
Associate Dean, Continuing Education	49	37	76%	**3.3**	82	85	**3.9**	79	72
Associate Dean, TSS	41	35	85%	**3.0**	74	64	**3.6**	73	68
Overall Mean				**3.07** *(on a 4-pt. scale)*			**3.70** *(on a 5-pt. scale)*		

GUIDE TO INTERPRETATION:

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

highest two categories, respondents had reservations about how effectively the administrator was performing at least some of his or her responsibilities, and he or she is encouraged to examine results in Section II.

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

TABLE II.A. AREAS OF STRENGTH AND IMPROVEMENT IN ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE PERFORMANCE FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS

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

Role	Position											
	VP ASD	Admin MIS	Coord Fin Aid	Admin Supply Mgmt.	Asst Dir Com & Promo	Admin SS	Prog Spec SS	Prog Spec CE	Asst Dir PND	Asst Dir Apprenticeship	Inst Researcher	Admin HR
Planner												
Displays visionary plan	**3.3**	**2.8**	**3.6**	**3.9**	**2.8**	**3.4**	**3.2**	**3.3**	**4.2**	**3.5**	**2.7**	**4.1**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*32*	*47*	*21*	*4*	*50*	*25*	*33*	*17*	*5*	*15*	*43*	*9*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*48*	*31*	*64*	*70*	*28*	*61*	*53*	*42*	*81*	*46*	*24*	*77*
Has sound priorities	**3.3**	**2.9**	**3.6**	**4.0**	**3.0**	**3.7**	**3.7**	**3.3**	**4.1**	**3.7**	**2.7**	**4.1**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*27*	*39*	*14*	*4*	*29*	*21*	*22*	*25*	*9*	*14*	*41*	*9*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*45*	*32*	*57*	*77*	*29*	*69*	*61*	*50*	*77*	*64*	*32*	*69*
Consultant												
Makes wise judgments	**3.5**	**3.0**	**3.8**	**4.1**	**3.2**	**3.7**	**3.6**	**3.4**	**4.1**	**3.5**	**3.0**	**4.1**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*22*	*30*	*6*	*7*	*30*	*16*	*26*	*17*	*4*	*20*	*24*	*9*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*56*	*33*	*61*	*78*	*43*	*65*	*58*	*42*	*74*	*60*	*24*	*79*
Effective team member	**3.6**	**3.1**	**3.9**	**4.4**	**3.4**	**4.0**	**3.7**	**3.7**	**4.2**	**3.9**	**3.2**	**4.2**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*20*	*32*	*17*	*0*	*24*	*13*	*21*	*13*	*4*	*21*	*26*	*6*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*54*	*39*	*72*	*85*	*41*	*73*	*68*	*53*	*74*	*71*	*43*	*72*
Communicator												
Communicates to others	**3.3**	**2.9**	**4.0**	**4.2**	**3.1**	**3.9**	**3.5**	**3.6**	**4.1**	**3.5**	**2.9**	**4.3**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*30*	*39*	*20*	*3*	*36*	*13*	*27*	*19*	*9*	*23*	*35*	*6*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*46*	*29*	*70*	*83*	*33*	*71*	*59*	*50*	*78*	*54*	*30*	*88*
Seeks others' opinions	**3.2**	**2.8**	**3.9**	**4.1**	**3.1**	**3.5**	**3.5**	**3.6**	**4.0**	**3.5**	**3.1**	**3.8**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*32*	*52*	*14*	*3*	*32*	*21*	*25*	*17*	*9*	*23*	*26*	*17*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*44*	*29*	*64*	*83*	*32*	*61*	*63*	*50*	*68*	*54*	*37*	*60*
Expert												
Is knowledgeable	**3.7**	**3.7**	**4.4**	**4.3**	**3.7**	**4.1**	**3.6**	**3.5**	**4.4**	**3.7**	**3.3**	**4.5**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*18*	*16*	*5*	*4*	*9*	*10*	*20*	*15*	*0*	*20*	*23*	*6*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*60*	*58*	*86*	*86*	*53*	*77*	*65*	*54*	*88*	*67*	*55*	*88*
Anticipates problems	**3.1**	**2.8**	**3.6**	**4.0**	**3.0**	**3.7**	**3.5**	**3.3**	**4.0**	**3.6**	**2.7**	**4.1**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*35*	*47*	*25*	*7*	*34*	*16*	*26*	*31*	*9*	*23*	*42*	*12*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*42*	*27*	*50*	*76*	*31*	*65*	*68*	*46*	*68*	*62*	*16*	*79*
Community Builder												
Builds institution's image	**3.6**	**3.3**	**4.1**	**4.5**	**3.2**	**3.9**	**3.6**	**3.9**	**4.4**	**4.0**	**3.2**	**4.3**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*20*	*30*	*10*	*0*	*26*	*19*	*24*	*7*	*0*	*18*	*27*	*9*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*57*	*43*	*76*	*86*	*37*	*74*	*67*	*60*	*84*	*71*	*45*	*83*
Earns trust/respect	**3.5**	**3.0**	**4.1**	**4.3**	**3.3**	**3.8**	**3.5**	**3.7**	**4.0**	**3.8**	**3.0**	**3.9**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	*21*	*37*	*9*	*3*	*29*	*14*	*30*	*0*	*8*	*18*	*36*	*12*
Percent Positive (4 or 5)	*53*	*40*	*73*	*87*	*42*	*69*	*65*	*50*	*72*	*65*	*32*	*64*

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

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

Activity	Position		
	Dean, TPS	**Assoc Dean,TSS**	**Assoc Dean/CE, TSS**
Activity A: Impact on College's Major Programs Weighted Mean for *Improving College's Major Programs*			
Faculty Ratings - Mean	*3.5*	*3.8*	*3.9*
Faculty Ratings - % 4 or 5	*53*	*69*	*72*
Activity B. Developing Resources Weighted Mean for *Developing Resources*			
Faculty Ratings - Mean	*3.4*	*3.4*	*4.4*
Faculty Ratings - % 4 or 5	*55*	*53*	*85*
Activity C: Organizational Matters Weighted Mean for *Organizational Matters*			
Faculty Ratings - Mean	*3.7*	*3.6*	*3.5*
Faculty Ratings - % 4 or 5	*58*	*59*	*56*
Activity D: Program Leadership Weighted Mean for *Program Leadership*			
Faculty Ratings - Mean	*3.4*	*3.5*	*3.9*
Faculty Ratings - % 4 or 5	*49*	*57*	*71*
Activity E: Personnel Management Weighted Mean for *Personnel Management*			
Faculty Ratings - Mean	*3.7*	*3.6*	*3.6*
Faculty Ratings - % 4 or 5	*60*	*62*	*55*

Effectiveness ratings for specific activities were weighted in accordance with the importance the dean attached to each; ratings on activities considered *Essential* were weighted "2," those considered *Important* were weighted "1," and those which were *Of no more than minor importance* or *Not applicable* were weighted "0" (i.e., ignored).

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

TABLE III.A. ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE & PERSONAL QUALITIES FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS
Note: See Guide to Interpretation at the bottom of this table.

Role	Position											
	VP, AAD	Admin MIS	Coord Fin Aid	Admin Supply Mgmt	Asst Dir Com& Promo	Admin SS	Prog Spec SS	Prog Spec CE	Asst Dir PND	Asst Dir Appren-ticeship	Inst Re-Search er	Admin HR
Part One: Administrative Style												
Democratic Practice												
Remote (1)/Approachable(7)	**5.0**	**4.5**	**6.3**	**6.2**	**5.2**	**5.3**	**5.2**	**5.6**	**4.8**	**4.8**	**4.1**	**4.9**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	15	23	0	7	16	19	15	0	19	7	26	18
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	54	39	73	83	58	63	60	57	50	47	39	53
Autocratic(1)/Democratic(7)	**4.7**	**3.4**	**6.2**	**5.8**	**4.8**	**4.3**	**4.5**	**4.9**	**4.5**	**4.5**	**4.8**	**4.4**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	19	47	0	4	14	27	24	0	29	7	5	35
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	42	22	81	69	36	42	47	50	43	29	42	45
Opinionated(1)/Receptive to Ideas(7)	**4.8**	**3.9**	**5.9**	**6.5**	**5.3**	**5.0**	**5.5**	**5.5**	**5.1**	**5.2**	**5.2**	**4.8**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	20	35	0	0	10	13	16	0	17	7	5	21
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	45	29	68	90	45	47	74	54	61	53	52	50
Structuring												
Disorganized(1)/Organized(7)	**4.9**	**5.1**	**5.4**	**5.6**	**4.6**	**4.7**	**5.5**	**4.5**	**6.2**	**5.8**	**4.9**	**6.5**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	9	11	0	7	18	22	12	10	8	0	23	0
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	43	48	53	64	42	41	65	30	88	62	55	91
Ambiguous(1)/Clear(7)	**4.6**	**4.3**	**5.4**	**5.8**	**4.1**	**5.1**	**5.3**	**4.8**	**5.3**	**5.1**	**4.5**	**5.6**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	15	23	5	4	19	11	20	8	12	7	5	6
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	36	37	50	74	25	54	60	42	60	50	29	68
Erratic(1)/Predictable(7)	**5.2**	**5.0**	**5.7**	**6.0**	**5.1**	**5.9**	**6.0**	**5.3**	**5.7**	**5.4**	**4.7**	**5.5**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	7	7	0	0	7	4	0	0	4	0	5	10
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	46	53	56	76	50	77	81	50	70	50	25	65
Vigor												
Indecisive(1)/Decisive(7)	**4.8**	**5.2**	**5.4**	**5.2**	**4.7**	**5.9**	**5.6**	**5.2**	**6.0**	**5.4**	**4.0**	**6.3**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	15	17	6	10	24	11	11	0	0	7	29	3
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	40	62	67	55	45	75	63	27	83	50	19	88
Lethargic(1)/Vigorous(7)	**4.5**	**4.8**	**5.4**	**5.8**	**4.5**	**4.8**	**4.9**	**4.3**	**5.1**	**4.6**	**4.0**	**5.8**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	14	7	0	7	23	15	24	10	8	7	14	3
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	32	38	44	76	32	42	65	20	48	29	19	67
Passive(1)/Active(7)	**4.2**	**4.6**	**4.7**	**5.7**	**4.3**	**4.8**	**4.7**	**4.9**	**5.6**	**4.9**	**3.6**	**5.9**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	25	14	16	3	28	14	26	0	9	7	29	0
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	32	38	42	67	38	46	53	45	73	50	21	69
Part Two: Personal Characteristics												
Interpersonal Sensitivity												
Unfeeling(1)/Caring(7)	**5.2**	**4.6**	**5.9**	**6.6**	**5.8**	**5.5**	**5.8**	**5.8**	**6.0**	**5.5**	**5.5**	**5.5**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	11	16	0	0	3	7	16	8	0	0	5	9
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	53	39	72	90	63	69	79	69	78	50	64	63

Role	VP, AAD	Admin MIS	Coord Fin Aid	Admin Supply Mgmt	Asst Dir Com& Promo	Admin SS	Prog Spec SS	Prog Spec CE	Asst Dir PND	Asst Dir Appren- ticeship	Inst Re- Search Er	Admin HR
Insensitive(1)/Understanding(7)	**5.0**	**4.7**	**6.1**	**6.2**	**5.5**	**5.6**	**5.7**	**5.8**	**5.8**	**5.6**	**5.2**	**5.6**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	15	13	0	3	3	4	11	0	4	0	5	9
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	52	35	74	83	50	68	74	54	71	69	45	67
Aloof(1)/Warm(7)	**4.9**	**4.5**	**6.0**	**6.0**	**5.1**	**4.8**	**5.4**	**5.5**	**5.2**	**5.0**	**4.4**	**5.0**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	10	10	0	3	12	17	10	0	8	0	12	10
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	39	32	71	79	48	41	65	62	56	50	28	48
Integrity												
Untruthful(1)/Honest(7)	**5.2**	**5.0**	**6.1**	**5.9**	**5.8**	**6.2**	**6.1**	**5.4**	**6.2**	**5.5**	**5.9**	**5.8**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	10	14	6	14	3	0	5	9	0	0	5	6
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	54	54	82	79	69	81	75	45	83	62	71	70
Unfair(1)/Fair(7)	**5.1**	**4.3**	**6.1**	**6.3**	**5.1**	**5.6**	**5.3**	**5.3**	**5.0**	**5.5**	**5.1**	**5.4**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	9	23	0	4	7	10	16	0	17	0	5	6
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	47	35	74	88	44	62	63	50	57	62	53	61
Untrustworthy(1)/Trustworthy (7)	**5.3**	**5.1**	**6.3**	**6.5**	**5.3**	**5.9**	**6.0**	**5.6**	**6.4**	**5.7**	**5.4**	**5.6**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	14	11	0	0	7	0	5	11	0	0	5	6
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	57	50	83	90	57	80	68	67	85	62	55	59
Character												
Manipulative(1)/Straight- forward(7)	**5.0**	**4.4**	**6.2**	**5.9**	**4.9**	**5.7**	**5.1**	**5.5**	**5.1**	**5.1**	**4.4**	**5.4**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	8	18	0	3	11	4	18	0	17	0	5	15
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	50	32	82	79	43	69	53	70	61	46	30	64
Inconsistent(1)/Consistent(7)	**4.9**	**5.1**	**5.6**	**5.8**	**4.6**	**5.6**	**5.9**	**5.2**	**5.7**	**5.3**	**5.1**	**5.9**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	13	6	5	7	13	10	6	0	9	7	10	3
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	45	48	63	78	39	69	78	30	74	43	48	71
Self-centered(1)/Institution- centered(7)	**5.1**	**4.1**	**5.9**	**5.9**	**4.6**	**5.2**	**5.0**	**5.3**	**5.7**	**5.2**	**4.4**	**5.2**
Percent Negative (1 or 2)	14	29	0	3	22	14	25	0	4	8	16	17
Percent Positive (6 or 7)	57	36	74	76	41	46	60	55	73	62	37	69

GUIDE TO INTERPRETATION:

This section summarizes respondent perceptions of the administrator's personal characteristics and management style, believed to be major determinants of effectiveness. Ratings of 18 bipolar elements (traits that have opposite characteristics as "anchors") were made using a 7-point scale. Although on the instrument "desirable" characteristics were sometimes listed as the low anchor (1) and sometimes as the high anchor (7), the report always assigns a "7" to the "desirable" anchor. In Part One, the ratings are grouped to represent three dimensions of Administrative Style. Part Two contains Personal Characteristics grouped into three dimensions.

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

The average for the 7-point scale is provided, together with the percent giving extreme ratings (1 or 2 and 6 or 7). A characteristic is considered "highly descriptive" if 50% or more 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 rated a "weakness" (1 or 2). Percent Positive refers to the percent rating each item has been rated a "strength"

TABLE III.B. ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE & PERSONAL QUALITIES FOR DEANS
Note: *See guide to interpretation at the bottom of this table.*

Activity	Position		
	Dean, TPS	**Assoc Dean,TSS**	**Assoc Dean/CE, TSS**
Part One: Administrative Style			
Democratic Practice			
Mean for *Democratic Practice*	**4.8**	**5.0**	**5.2**
Percent Positive (6or7)	*48*	*51*	*58*
Percent Negative (1or2)	*20*	*16*	*13*
Structuring			
Mean for *Structuring*	**4.9**	**5.6**	**5.1**
Percent Positive (6or7)	44	65	58
Percent Negative (1or2)	11	4	12
Vigor			
Mean for *Vigor*	**3.9**	**4.6**	**5.8**
Percent Positive (6or7)	26	41	71
Percent Negative (1or2)	28	14	6
Part Two: Personal Characteristics			
Mean for *Interpersonal Sensitivity*	**4.6**	**5.4**	**5.5**
Percent Positive (6or7)	47	55	62
Percent Negative (1or2)	21	8	6
Integrity			
Mean for I*ntegrity*	**5.3**	**6.1**	**5.3**
Percent Positive (6or7)	62	78	61
Percent Negative (1or2)	15	5	10
Character			
Mean for *Character*	**5.1**	**5.3**	**5.1**
Percent Positive (6or7)	51	53	53
Percent Negative (1or2)	15	10	14

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 18 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 section should be considered within the context of the effectiveness ratings reported in Sections I and II. If effectiveness ratings are high, it is desirable to maintain current administrative methods. But if they are low, the following information may suggest a focus for improvement efforts.

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

VIII. **Qualitative Responses: Strengths and Areas of Improvement for GCC Administrators (IDEA Feedback for Administrators)**

The following listing of qualitative comments is culled from all the respondents who participated in this survey. Their comments were directed towards various administrators of the college. For general administrators, comments are divided into three categories: (A) Assets, (B) Reservations, and (C) Needed Changes. For deans, comments are divided into two categories: (A) Administrative Effectiveness and Performance and (B) General Impressions or Needed Changes

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- His knowledge, abilities, skills, and ability to work with people are his main assests. His openness to new ideas and his willingness to better things.

- He makes sure the college involves their input on changes etc. He's a people person. He cares of others concerns.

- Knowledgeable on the running of the campus.

- I cannot comment, I've never worked with him.

- Has institutional history and experience; knowledgeable about governmental operations.

- He says hi.

- Institutional knowledge

- NO RESPONSE.

- This administrator is receptive to faculty input and advice.

- No comment

- Cares about college and students

- Gets things done!

- Cannot judge

- He is easy to talk to and has a down-to-earth personality. At least that's my experience with him.

- Very approachable and is a people-person.

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- Can't judge we hardly see each other because his office is at the administration building and we are located in lower campus.

- He is approachable and a good manager.

- None that I know of.

- I just know him by name.

- None

- Can't judge

- listens

- Possesses wealth of information regarding future plans for the college's physical structure improvements and additions.

- His Leadership skill, very approachable, and supportive of the employees he manages within his Division.

- His great knowledge in his position.

- Institution-centered, caring, active, and warm

- Dedication to work

- cannot judge

- In order to make this survey meaningful, I must know the individual well enough to provide realistic evaluation of this person. As it is, I do not know this person nor have I ever engaged in conversation, committee, or institutional activity with this person. I feel it is a waste of my time to evaluate an administrator that has no working relationship with me. I would be unfair to continue this survey.

- Experience. Approachable. Insight into how people work.

- A wealth of experience.

- Lunch with peer

- None

- Personnel

- Knowledge. Experience. Personable.

- I have not worked at GCC long enough to comment on this item.

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- connections

- UNDERSTANDING AND WILLING TO HELP

- His friendliness and his approachability are his best assets.

- He has been at the College for more than 15 years.

- Acknowledges one's presence

- No opinion, no affiliation with this person.

- Institutional knowledge.

- The short time I have getting to know the staff here at GCC, he has shown great leadership and is very well respected.

- The college has changed…and he has tried to keep up.

- Very approachable and will listen to you. He may not act on your suggestions but he will give you the time to express yourself. A good manager overall.

- Not sure

- His being a team player in management decisions.

- Knowledge of facilities. Although he is an administrator, he works among his subordinates.

- I have not formally met him, nor have I heard him speak so it would be unfair to answer any of the following questions.

- His communication.

- He definitely has the respect of his subordinates.

- Cannot answer

- Nothing.

- Experience and knowledge of the institution

- In some areas he is fine, but in many areas he is outside of his area of expertise.

- n/a

- Knowledge in certain areas.

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- planning and organizing assets

- N/C

- Aggressive

- Understanding of GovGuam procedures. Ability to let supervisees guide their own work.

- Leadership and excellent management skills.

- He contributed to the institution's positive and beautiful image thus establishing pride in belonging to the GCC family. Great Job!

- He is a nice guy.

- Open to ideas and concerns with the college community.

- Friendly

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- I have no reservations

- None.

- Says one thing then does another

- I don't know him professionally to judge, nor have I ever worked with him.

- Departments under his purview seem to be out of touch with both students and faculty needs. Handling of MIS & MyGCC was not transparent.

- Not friendly and approachable

- He needs to communicate his vision for our college to all. Reactive vs. proactive.

- His lack of communication with staff and faculty, his favoritism of employees, his inability to lead his section in being efficient, his lack of follow-up and common sense on matters, his continued lack of leadership.

- Few new ideas

- NO RESPONSE

- N/A

- no comment

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- Detached from daily activities

- Not as "visible" to lower campus

- None

- cannot judge

- None

- None

- He needs to take control of his department and make sound decisions for the benefit of all.

- None.

- I just know him by name.

- none

- I'm not so sure if I even met this person. I really don't know who he is.

- Can't judge

- office politics

- Does not always follow through with details or respond on a timely basis.

- None

- None.

- None

- Keep up the good work

- Cannot judge

- Takes too long to make decisions. Sometimes lets things fall to the wayside because of no decision. Defends people who other (most) people feel aren't doing their jobs well or are roadblocks.

- None.

- lack of ability and foresight

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- Not aggressive for position he holds.

- None, Good overall administrator

- None

- Does not seem to have good organizational skills

- I have not worked at GCC long enough to comment on this item.

- NO RESERVATIONS

- No reservations for him as an administrator

- Doesn't follow through when issues are brought to his attention pertaining to overall impact on the institution's safety concerns.

- No opinion, no affiliation with this person.

- Unable to lead effectively.

- None at this time he is very pleasant person to work with.

- Old school methods…perceptive to change, but holds back. Doesn't hold others to task. (getting people to do their jobs.)

- He needs to be less "buddy-buddy" with subordinates. He has to listen to both sides of the story before actually taking action. This should keep his actions from blind-siding subordinate supervisors.

- Not sure

- Too slow in responding to concerns that impact on student safety (e.g. busted lights in parking lot), instructional quality (e.g. requisitions), among others

- None.

- see above

- None at all.

- Retirement mode

- None

- He's been around for a long time and he has not shared his vision with the college. I have not seen too much improvements here at the college. Facilities need a lot of

- improvements. The first on one would be to number the buildings so students can find their classes. When buildings were painted, signages were removed.

- In some areas that his job covers, he just doesn't have the knowledge necessary to make the decisions, and thus completely defers to those under him.

- n/a

- He's not a team member.

- I can talk to him. Down to earth person

- N/C

- None

- Many decisions do not involve receiving information from the GCC community. There needs to be more communication with GCC employees and students about plans and priorities.

- No reservations.

- None

- He needs to take control and either help lead his administrators or get them out. There are too many ineffective people in his area and nothing is being done to get them moving.

- Needs to follow-up on status of projects and timelines.

- Understanding priorities for his department (if this is the department he oversees).

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- He is doing so well and hopefully he does not retire soon.

- Visuality.

- Possibly make his identity more well known. Not very many people know him.

- Become aware of student & faculty needs. Don't operate only on a usual schedule. The college runs into the evenings, find out what they need.

- Need to have more visions in the overall GCC infrastructure plan and be more open-minded and approachable.

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- Communicate more.

- He should retire. Until then, he should earn his pay, receive training in leadership, become more self aware and develop morals and values.

- Inform community about what his job/role is and why projects, in general, have failed or succeeded.

- NO RESPONSE

- N/A

- no comment

- More involved

- Nothing, he's doing an outstanding job.

- cannot judge

- No comment

- Put more effort into taking some action to make the appearance of the College more appealing. It looks like a dump.

- I just know him by name.

- none

- Can't judge

- Nothing

- Respond to people with the information they need on a timely basis so other projects outside his area or scope of responsibility can be accomplished within their deadlines.

- None.

- None

- Just continue improve what you have started.

- needs to be visible to community(GCC)

- He needs to understand that if someone is a roadblock in the process, he must do something about it as soon as possible.

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- None.

- Be aggressive and show production of work.

- None

- needs to develop a more holistic thinking; needs better understanding of all programs in order to make better decisions to prioritize improvements

- I have not worked at GCC long enough to comment on this item.

- NO CHANGES, DOING A GOOD JOB

- Not too sure what changes he should make.

- Pay more attention to the college's environment, specifically with safety. Example, are fire extinguishers monitored? Does every room have an extinguisher? The staircase in the rotunda has chips, the rubber skids need replacement.

- No opinion, no affiliation with this person.

- Take control of departmental issues.

- None

- The department needs to change- and falls to this administrator.

- Consult with subordinate supervisors before making a decision that impacts work operations and employee relations.

- Not sure

- Be more proactive in finding out what facility improvements need to be done by being engaged with faculty and their day-to-day concerns

- Start holding administrative services weekly management team meetings to keep his employees abreast with the present and future changes affecting the College.

- see above

- None.

- needs to retire

- unknown

- Make it clear to all what his responsibilities and duties are. Share what he has done.

Vice President, Administrative Services Division

- I believe that these items that he doesn't have the background for, would be transferred to others that either have the knowledge, or could at least get input from those that do, and make real judgments rather than just rubber stamping things.

- n/a

- Prioritize differently and finish what he started.

- None at this time

- N/C

- None

- Working harder to learn what employees and students believe are priorities. Communicating how decisions and plans relate to the priorities.

- Clone him…we need more leaders like him.

- None

- Be a little more aggressive.

- More responsive and provide awareness to faculty regarding changes to the departments he oversees.

A. **WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)**

- Knowledge of how to promote the college and the functions for the college.

- No Comment

- This administrator is passionate in her role. She has done a great job promoting our institution.

- Friendly and amicable

- Ability to promote the college in recent months. She has been more active in preparing communication support for the college.

- She's a creative writer.

- Experienced and intelligent.

- Her willingness to provide her services no matter how busy she is.

- Knowledge and skills in the area of concentration

- Partying

- None

- Understands the requirements of the job. Has the skills necessary to accomplish good work such as speechwriting. Able to get talented people on campus to assist with institutional projects.

- Approachable, Friendly, health conscious

- She is a nice person; unfortunately nice doesn't get the job done.

- Marketing

- She is pulled in a great number of directions. She attempts to stay engaged.

B. **WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)**

- Time management, turn around times, and coordination of promotional activities with appropriate officials and departments may need a little more improvement.

- GCC is still too quiet for the public – she needs to effectively promote the GCC image & be visible

- No comment

- None

- Frequent lack of follow through; not very reliable; takes too long to complete review of material submitted

- Needs to seek support or follow through.

- She needs support in terms of her overall effectiveness and responsibilities for the College. She also needs to be mindful about perception and image for the institution.

- Not effective for the position.

- Does not promote the college enough. Spends too much time with her friend within the college (i.e. TRIO) and focuses promo on her pet programs.

- too many to mention

- Needs to be able to fight for a better budget that is woefully inadequate

- She needs to show the institution her ability to provide services for faculty across the board (e.g. department, committees, etc.)

- She is not "present" – she is not out there as the voice of GCC. She isn't meeting the expectations of the college community.

- She needs to be more visible to the public and report more or GCC's positive image

- Needs to perform her duties rather than be a socialite

- Too many directions – she can't be effective.

- Communicate, communicate, communicate! Relevant information is not relayed to constituencies in a timely manner. For example, the availability of the annual report was never announced by her office; it was just posted online! Not too many people know about its existence.

  The quality of her work also demands attention. The college's 30th anniversary is one prime example. The lead article (written by a PDN reporter) was replete with typographical errors, misprints, and inaccuracies (42,000 GCC students?). It is such a great embarrassment to the college and its administration!

  And where is the college's Chachalani newsletter? It appears so sporadically, and never a sustained effort.

Assistant Director, Communications & Promotions

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Organizational and time management structure to improve turn around times and more ample notices of promotional activities. Perhaps a permanent administrative help to assist her to manage, organize and coordinate these promotional activities.

- she needs additional staff

- No comment

- She tends to take on too much being that she is the lone ranger for her department. She needs support staff and should not depend on the work study program for assistance. The college needs to provide staffing in order to help this administrator move the college into the level of promotion it wants to be…

- Training in effective decision-making and prioritizing

- Need to project and prioritize.

- This administrator lacks time management, does not have her priorities in line with the needs of the institution.

- Attend less meetings or hire additional personnel who will man her office if she is at meetings. She's always in meetings and not available for other important matters.

- Needs to focus on what the faculty are doing and promote their successes. She does not come to the various events and promote the college. She needs to be visible to the faculty and assist in promoting the great things we are doing. She should be out there. She is well hidden in her office.

- Remember what her job is and who she is in support of.

- More staff, larger budget.

- Develop an inviting online newsletter for faculty, staff, and potential students. Use time wisely to meet faculty from all departments, secondary and post secondary.

- This person is responsible for the marketing of this institution. We should not be the island's best kept secret. She should not wait to be "invited" to activities – but assert herself in her role. It is an expectation of her position to be present at activities in the institution taking pictures of those activities.

- Additional personnel and a bigger budget

- More advertisements about the college

- Pool the people concerned for utility of this position…revise expectations. Always. (Let's all do that.)

- Improve the quality of her work, and remain true to the spirit of her job, which is to communicate with both internal and external constituencies.

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Very thorough and organized.

- Very organized, plans well, and is also caring and understanding. Is very detailed oriented and professional.

- Working with grants.

- Knowledge of the job

- Detailed & Organized

- Knowledge of grants.

- Nice. Fairness. Institution oriented.

- Understanding of importance of taking care of family matters.

- Integrity

- Organized.
  has a strong handle on her job responsibilities.
  represents the college well.

- Has excellent knowledge of her area

- Hard working and task oriented

- She is very knowledgeable of her duties and responsibilities.

- Diligent and thoughtful.

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Is not flexible.

- None.

- None

- Availability

- I have none.

- None

- Bean counting.

- Does not set clear priorities of assignments already given amidst multitask operations. She has tendencies to interrupt assignments in progress with deadlines to make us handle matters that can be handled by appropriate departments.

- None

- can improve on one-on-one communication and interaction

- None

- None

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Be more flexible, but within the guidelines.

- Maintain department.

- Bring self to level of subordinates, understand and see the work they put in completing jobs/tasks.

- Communicate her office's goals and achievements

- No changes at this time.

- Become more involved in college activities.

- Develop better presentation skills.

- She needs to know and stick to her section's priorities and stop overstepping her responsibilities to make herself look like she can handle other projects at the expense of her staff. She pushes her staff to the point where they have to work late and on weekends because they were busy doing other projects that interrupt their actual responsibilities. Aside from this, she calls too many staff meetings which slows down productivity when meeting time could be spent accomplishing assignments.

- Promotion and higher pay

- understanding communication to improve communication with others

- None

Assistant Director, Planning & Development

- None

- Needs to know more about the programs at the college.

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Can't judge

- He is a team player and maintains focus on what's best for the institution and for the student. He is personable and he has direction.

- Cares about the college and values education.   Runs his department well.

- Knowledge of programs.

- He's team player with can get the job done.

- 1. His knowledge of the job, organizational skill, and outstanding ability to work with different organizations participating in the Apprenticeship Programs. 2. His neckties are cool!

- Longevity at the institution and as assistant director.

- He has been in the college for a long time.

- Educated and understanding. Has the management skill to work with his subordinates.

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Can't judge

- I don't have enough contact to judge.

- None.

- None.

- None.

- His ability to prioritize tasks and to recognize the need to effectuate curriculum change because of Guam's imminent employment needs.

- What does he do?

- None

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Can't judge

- Not enough contact to judge

- Be more visible

- Get more support for program.

- None.

- He seems a bit intimidating when you first meet him—quiet and no smile. But, after talking with him, I immediately realized how much he truly cares about students' ability to succeed and how hard he works to ensure their success.

- None

A. **WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)**

- He's got a lot of credentials.

- Experience, education and certifications!

- Knowledge of his field, energy, hard worker

- He is honest, competent, keeps his people informed, and instills a strong sense of teamwork.

- His staff.

- He knows his stuff.

- has genuine concern to improve technological aspects and functioning of the college

- None

- He is intelligent and always has a smile on his face.

- Knowledge, skill aggressiveness.

- tries

- Nice guy in non-work related situations.

- His knowledge and expertise in his area of specialty

- Has knowledge and expertise in the technical field.

- Department functions.

- his last name

- He is a nice guy, but not in this job.

- Knowledge of his job and willingness to help others.

B. **WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)**

- Can he lead his team and have that positive support of the campus?

- Unbalanced workload among other personnel in the department.

- Doesn't listen

- None

- Ability to manage and plan

- He needs to be concerned about using technical terms when explaining programming issues to the average systems user.

- Can improve on making more effective decisions; could improve his ability to effectively troubleshoot and apply technical knowledge

- Autocratic, and non-consultative in his management approach

- This person does not fully communicate with his people or those he deals with. He does not provide an avenue for people to disagree with him and people in his area can't even speak up. He allows for other people to be considered the "bad guys" but he is intentionally or unintentionally not providing the whole story.

- None

- Doesn't listen

- Practices obfuscation even if unintended. This and desire to have autocratic decision-making abilities over campus technology has created a sense of wary distrust between the community and department.

- Inability to prioritize and make wise decisions.

- He doesn't see accomplishments and self centered

- He seems to be in the old mainframe mentality, which has been dead for decades, and thinks his way or no way, makes sure his staff knows that going against him will not be allowed. Better to jump and ask how high rather than disagreeing.

- None.

C. **WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)**

- Needs to be a team player and more receptive as a leader.

- Review all personnel work load and performance.

- Should listen to others' opinions and expressed needs.

-

- He needs to do a better job at planning and organizing his work and department. When the department had an acting administrator, the department functioned much better and the relationships with the department and others were positive. He should take some management lessons from the acting administrator.

- Recommend this administrator keep in mind that employees of the college are his customers, i.e. if employees don't have the support of a timely manner to address their computer needs, such employee's performance impacts our student's educational support.

- strategic planning; how to prioritize responsibilities; effective decision-making; communicating with others

- Learn how to deal with people in a humane, caring way

- His division would improve if he worked elsewhere.

- Better organizational skills.

- Remember for what his job is created, and the he supports the faculty not the other way around

- He needs to learn that the department is here to support and not dictate technology use on campus. After having experienced a different person heading the department for a couple of months, it was shown that there is a different and more positive way for the department to interact with the GCC community. I'm afraid it's too late but if he doesn't learn how to create a cooperative attitude between the department and the GCC community, it doesn't look good for the future.

- Priorities, organization, time management.

- Move him to another office

- Everything…Change into the IT as a Service rather than a Control department. Put meeting needs of users at front, and look at all options.

- ?

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Able to keep her coolness even during stressful times.

- warm, caring and receptive person, works hard and pays attention to detail

- She is very personable. She goes out of her way to assist others.

- Pleasant personality

- She is always pleasant and works very hard to satisfy people. Even when she is overworked, she displays and smiling, helpful, professional attitude toward anyone and everyone. Great attitude!

- Knowledgeable of work involved and is very positive to new change happening on campus.

- Effectiveness, organized, knowledge of her department, foresight, team leader/player.

- No comment

- Great person!

- Listening and following through with tasks.

- Competent. Nice person to work with.

- Very calm and considerate. Always ready and willing to assist even though her plate is full.

- dedication, knowledgeable

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Does not have any trade background to really understand the bid process.

- too nice and too trusting sometimes

- Can improve in the area of guiding staff for a more customer oriented environment.

- Needs to be more aggressive at times; especially with vendors who don't deliver on time.

- None

Supply Management Administrator, Materials Management

- None.

- I have none whatsoever.

- No comment

- No reservations.

- Sometimes takes a little too long in making decisions.

- None.

- None

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- To become more comfortable with the use of technology.

- Know the different type of trades in order to compare the different contractors' description of job bids.

- Be tougher sometimes

- Leadership and assertiveness training

- Needs to give more authority to her staff to make some basic decisions; this will allow her to work on the more important issues. Needs to demand more from vendors in terms of delivery time and conforming with the contracts.

- None.

- None at this time.

- no comment

- Needs to be a little more assertive with her staff.

- Additional personnel.

- Needs more help.

- Delegation of tasks.

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Certification in counseling.
  Dealing with disciplinary actions (students)
  Supportive of his staff
  Does well in presentations—practical and not boring.
  If you do your job well, you will have his trust.
  Understands factors that may affect an employee's work (family, kids, etc.) For this, I'm grateful.
  Sense of humor that comes naturally to him.
  Fast in decision-making in time of emergencies and does not panic. Maybe because of his past work experiences.

- Handling conflicts

- His experience and knowledge of the job are assets to the College.

- He knows his job and he has the ability to diffuse various situations as they arise.

- Very good in public speaking….funny guy!

- He's good at what he does.

- Dedication.

- Demonstrates a strong commitment to the mission of the College

- Very approachable, works well with instructors.

- has a good handle on college safety issues

- I like him. I do trust that he holds what I do as "valuable".

- Personality

- Knows how to control situations with students.

- can't judge

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEYQUESTION)

- None

- How substitute teachers are selected and evaluated.

- Power struggle

- Trust is an issue and the manner in which he puts people down.

- He needs to review existing policies and procedures of his office especially with regards to secondary faculty requesting for sub teachers. He also needs to review the qualifications and performance of his substitute teachers.

- He has my confidence.

- Excellent

- None

- could be more open-minded; once he makes a decision, it is difficult to have an open dialogue

- Only that the position of support is under funded with regard to subs for teachers. Office also needs organizational resources – like attendance system for secondary teachers.

- none

- None

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- online substitute teaching request

- communicate more

- Employ "management-by-walking-around". In other words, visit his sub teachers and see if they are actually doing their job; because most of them sleep on the job.

- None

- None

- None needed

- training and practice in improving collaborating and dialogue abilities

- Above.

- None

- Give us a suggestion box concerning student issues and how to address them.

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Her knowledge of the laws, agreements, contracts, budgets that will affect the direction of the College.

- Decisive attitude. Focus towards a goal.

- She's well versed on policies and procedure and keeps everyone in check.

- Experience

- Insight of the job and foresight to achieve institutional goals

- Organizational skills

- Knowledge of labor laws

- Administrator is a go-getter….she works along her employees.

- Her knowledge in her area of expertise

- Job knowledge

- Organized, detailed and plans well. Is focused and a team player.

- Trustworthy, honest.

- She is sharp!

- Professionalism

- Knowledge of department processes. Ability to complete tasks in specified time.

- experience and close relationship to the president

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- None

- Policy interpretation has not always proven to be the correct one. Some decisions appear to be more admin oriented vs. employee.

- None. She's done exceptionally well to maintain the integrity of her department and provide guidance in the College's overall hiring practices.

Administrator, Human Resources Office

- None

- None

- Too aggressive as an administrator. Shows favoritism.

- none

- Not sure I can trust her with confidential information. Made a sly comment to me when we were alone, that let me know that she was a "control" type of person. I only go to her if I absolutely have to.

- None

- none

- None. She is one of the most qualified people on this campus.

- None

- None

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- New filing system similar to Admissions and Registration. Active files will be well organized along side with inactive files that are currently stored in stacked boxes.

- Her department is a difficult department and overall I think she's the right person for the job. She does need to put more emphasis on employee support and necessarily through policies only.

- None

- Additional personnel

- To see the overall priorities in the office and assign accordingly. Administrator seems to "protect" a certain employee by removing some of the duties and giving to other employees.

- none

- She needs to lighten up.

- Does very well just needs to maintain.

Administrator, Human Resources Office

- little warmer

- Reach out to non-administrators

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Willingness to listen and learn and try to understand.

- She is excellent at what she does despite the personnel resources that she is surely lacking.

- Continuity – she has been with the institution for many years.

- listens

- Has a sense of humor and is well balanced.

- Willing to help.

- She is receptive to students and their needs. She is quite knowledgeable with her work area.

- She has a great personality and is very adept in her knowledge of her department. I've never heard a complaint from a student regarding the service from her department.

- Has historical knowledge

- knowledge of federal laws and guidelines pertaining to her work

- She demonstrates not only efficiency and knowledge in the financial aid process, but compassion and understanding for the students she works with. She is a student advocate and a wonderful asset to the College.

- She is very approachable and easy to talk to. She is honest and straight-forward. Students often commented that they liked her personality.

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- None

- Lacks the initiative to do more for the college, but that may just be due to the lack of personnel in her office.

- She should be more versed with questions parents may have regarding FAFSA.

- nothing

- None.

Coordinator, Student Financial Aid

- None

- We all worry about her health. And her ability to kill computers☺.

- none

- Her ability to act proactively. It does not seem that I've seen any improvement in this office's effectiveness. I'm optimistic that with the integrated banner system positive improvement will begin to emerge.

- None whatsoever.

- None.

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- ?

- She needs to be more concerned about meeting overall goals of the institution's BANNER timelines, especially as it relates to her department.

- nothing

- None

- I believe it's already happened with a Program coordinator being assigned to relieve some of the load especially with the SunGard project.

- None

- Have someone, perhaps from the feds, re-evaluate the processes used and correct the weaknesses or ineffectiveness in the process.

- She needs more staff.

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- She doesn't mince her words.

- Always on top of my request. Gets it done immediately.

- I am not familiar this person's position description.

- hardworking, honest and fair

- Interest to solve problems.

- The program seems to be making progress.

- Dedication to work

- Very friendly, helpful and supportive.

- Can't judge

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- She is not really contributing to making GCC a better place. She only does the minimum required – if that.

- Too many breaks in a given day.

- I am not familiar with this person's position description.

- None

- No Reservations on the Administrator, but the resources she was provided to do the job.

- I don't know her real well.

- So far so good

- Known as the "do nothing" administrator around campus.

- None. Always helpful, no matter how busy she is!

- Can't judge

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Make a decision about whether she wants to contribute toward improvement – if not move on to a place that will house her until retirement.

- Don't hesitate to express your true feelings and give your opinions more often.

- I am not familiar with this person's position description.

- Be move visible on campus

- As above, it is the resources the administrator has to work with that limits her abilities.

- I don't know.

- Continue improve GCC program

- none

- Can't judge

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- don't know

- She's a team player.

- Have not seen them yet.

- I have only met her once since I've been here for 2 years. Unfair to evaluate.

- Her personality and her ability to get along with other which shows that she is a great team player.

- Friendly. Even with little contact, she appears to be a hard worker.

- Approachable; Good listener.

- Have not worked closely with this individual in order to rate effectively.

- Very friendly, cheerful and a good listener.

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- a lot

- Needs more guidance and initiative to get things rolling.

- She's not perceived as an administrator

- None.

- Programs don't seem to have much contact with her. But her priorities may be somewhere else. We just don't know and it may not even matter!

- None.

- Didn't know she was an administrator

- I've had very minimal interaction with this administrator on a professional manner, therefore, can't respond with merit.

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Though I have contact with this office almost on a daily basis, I still do not see the reason this position exists or the functions of the person filling it. I see the Associate Dean doing everything I would expect this person to be doing.

- Take charge of the department.

- More exposure, maybe a more upgraded job position.

- More exposure to all facets of our institution.

- Know her departments procedures and policies

- Be more cognizant of my department's interaction and how her department's statistical information provide significantly to report writings.

A. WHAT ARE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S MAIN ASSETS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Willingness to learn, enthusiastic about his work

- A nice guy—approachable and easy to talk to.

- None

- Has knowledge of his area and seems determined to do his job well despite technical obstacles

- Nice smile.

- statistical knowledge

- He is new to higher education and is a fast learner.

- Good speaker

- I can't evaluate this person because I don't deal with him

- He did a great job on the Fact Book!

B. WHAT RESERVATIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THIS PERSON AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Not really trained for this position; research background almost absent

- Does not seem to know how to do his duties and responsibilities. Has very limited knowledge of what his position entails.

- No experience. Still trying to figure out his role and responsibilities.

- accuracy of information presented

- He needs to feel more confident with himself.

- The only reservation I have is his inability to prioritize assignments/tasks to ensure deadlines are achieved so that it does not adversely affect my department's work.

- Needs to be more goal-oriented

- No comment

- I need more time to work with him.

C. WHAT CHANGES (E.G., IN PRIORITIES, STYLE, ORGANIZATION, POLICY) WOULD DO MOST TO IMPROVE THIS ADMINISTRATOR'S EFFECTIVENESS? (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Exert more initiative in equipping himself with the appropriate skills and knowledge to make him effective-- read, read, and read more

- Because his job is a new position in the College, it would be good if his role is more clearly defined to the College community.

- Expand his knowledge to what the institutions needs are on statistics and not be so narrow minded on his duties.

- It would be helpful if he came around to the various departments to make himself known and to let us know what he could do for us.

- Be a bit more forceful about what you need or want from the rest of us.

- The job is very simple; collect, store and analyze data.

- priorities

- Needs improvement with keeping better time and attendance on important matters. Although he supports the mission of the institution and department, he needs to be more cognizant about participating in activities. This administrator has good ideas, and to be heard and appreciated for his newness to the institution would be an advantage to him.

- To improve his effectiveness here at GCC, he should take charge and meet with EACH department to assess their data needs AND set up standard reports for their use.

- ODS Training

- N/A

A. USE THE SPACE BELOW TO ELABORATE ON ANY OF THE RATINGS YOU MADE OF THE DEANS ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OR TO COMMENT ON OTHER ASPECTS OF HIS/HER PERFORMANCE. (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- This administrator has no clue as to what happens in the lower campus. He rarely communicates or supports faculty or students. In fact, unless you're in "trouble," he is rarely seen – and then he often jumps to negative conclusions before ascertaining the situation.

- Must visit lower campus more. Smile more often!!

- None to comment.

- He is quite passive and needs to assert himself more.

- He is invisible.

- Keeps instructors up to date with current issues and requests feedback. Very approachable

- This administrator truly does try to make decisions in the best interest of the faculty, administrators, and staff he oversees. He is not self-serving.

B. 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. (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- He is not excitable, whether good or bad news. Mostly has a flat affect. When making an appointment to see him I feel like "I am going to the principal's office". It is hard to judge feedback from him; I understand this is mostly due to his personality traits.

- The administrator must take the leadership to determine how each and every program in his school can institute continuous improvements through regular review of curricular documents, engagement with key faculty, and substantive involvement at the department level

- He has a wealth of knowledge and understanding about the College that oftentimes gets overlooked. Leaders at the College should tap into this living, breathing resource!

A. USE THE SPACE BELOW TO ELABORATE ON ANY OF THE RATINGS YOU MADE OF THE DEANS ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OR TO COMMENT ON OTHER ASPECTS OF HIS/HER PERFORMANCE. (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- She has held this position for too short a time for me to effectively evaluate her performance. Another shortfall is that she is difficult to find.

- Her performance so far is above satisfactory

- A fresh attitude for the college definitely focused on students and serving there needs, and supporting the faculty to meet the needs.

- I'm not a faculty member, so I can't judge anything about this person. Maybe this survey was erroneously sent to me. However, my first impression of her is that she is very capable and an understanding professional and a good-hearted person.

- Still too new; has limited exposure to different areas; still need to wait and see

- It is useless to survey these administrators as many faculty members only meet these administrators once a year during the faculty evaluation period. It would be more useful and meaningful to survey the president, vice-president academics, and the deans. Although, faculty members do not see or meet with the president and AVP their policies reflect their leadership. We the faculty members can make improvements to the college if we were given an opportunity to voice our opinions regarding these three individuals. I may add that the president should reassess the functions of these administrators. I personally feel we have too many of these administrators for a small college. The ideal is to have one dean and one associate dean. I see no reason to continue this survey.

- Has not shown much yet.

- I don't know anything about her.

- This is a fairly new administrator to the institution.

B. USE THIS 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. (IDEA SURVEY QUESTION)

- Overall, she could have made a greater impact on the college if she would have focused on a few items instead on a variety of tasks.

- Operation of the Dean's office… so far so good

- Although she is able to accomplish a task there appears to be no urgency on her part to provide timely information.

- Again, a fresh person in the college open to various options, as contrasted to some that have a fixed ideal on how things should be done, and not open to changes.

- I'm not a faculty member, so I can't judge anything about this person. Maybe this survey was erroneously sent to me. However, my first impression of her is that she is very capable and an understanding professional and a good-hearted person.

- Still needs to learn more about the different programs; should make more effort to go around and meet the faculty and staff to better troubleshoot conflicts and disputes or even to suggest improvements

- Needs to attain a significant mission.

- I don't know her, but I see her do her job. Looks very confident, firm, and poise

- Needs to be more flexible to her role as an administrator of an autonomous agency vis a vis line agency.

A. Use the space below to elaborate on any of the ratings you made of the deans administrative effectiveness or to comment on other aspects of his/her performance. (IDEA Survey Question)

- No Comment

- She is truly an advocate of GCC programs. Her energy and determination in accomplishing the goals for the department and college are outstanding. Very few administrators possess these qualities in the college.

- She is one of the hardest working administrators, if not THE hardest working one. Yet, she continues to smile and build the morale of those around her. She is an inspiration.

- This administrator has an extremely high energy that isn't tapped to her fullest potential.

- As an administrator, she kept a good balance between faculty evaluation and other work, and was successful! A less talented individual would not have been able to handle the pressure. Her amiable personality also contributes immensely to her success.

- She is a real asset to the college!

- She brings in a lot of money. She should be more visible in the community just like Flora Baza is at UOG.

- My experience is that she has a very good balance of professional and personal traits.

B. 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. (IDEA Survey Question)

- No comment

- Dynamic individual with many ideas for institution. Very creative and fun.

- She gets the job done. She has the willingness and capability to successfully lead any campaign or accomplish the college's goals.

- This person's primary responsibility was focused on a specific area rather.

- She is a very hard worker who does any task at hand with great enthusiasm. I have never heard her complain about her huge workload. Instead, she gets the job done with a positive attitude no matter how unfair the circumstances may seem.

- She is extremely approachable and will give her opinion if sought. She is able to craft her opinions and responses in an articulate and assertive manner.

IX.   Consolidated Job Performance Ratings of GCC Administrators & Deans

Comprehensive Report of IDEA Feedback Ratings for GCC General Administrators AY 2005-2006, AY 2006-2007, AY 2007-2008									
Position	**Total Respondents**		**Number Responding**		**Response Rate**		MEAN, *Job Performance* (where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent, 5=Superb)		MEAN, *Confidence* (where 1=Definitely not, 2=No, but I have reservations about this, 3=Yes, but I have reservations about this, 4=Definitely yes)
Administrative Services Division									
VP, ASD	198 *(05-06 AY)*	208 *(07-08 AY))*	119 *(05-06 AY))*	143 *(07-08 AY)*	60% *(05-06 AY)*	69% *(07-08 AY)*	2.8 *(05-06 AY)*	2.9 *(07-08 AY)*	2.9 *(05-06 AY)*	3.0 *(07-08 AY)*
Administrator, MIS	51 *(05-06 AY)*	50 *(07-08 AY)*	22 *(07-08 AY)*	34 *(07-08 AY)*	43% *(05-06 AY)*	68% *(07-08 AY)*	2.9 *(05-06 AY)*	2.7 *(07-08 AY)*	3.0 *(05-06 AY)*	2.8 *(07-08 AY)*
Assistant Director, Planning & Development	44 *(05-06 AY)*	41 *(07-08 AY)*	26 *(05-06 AY)*	29 *(07-08 AY)*	59% *(05-06 AY)*	71% *(07-08 AY)*	3.5 *(05-06 AY)*	3.7 *(07-08 AY)*	3.7 *(05-06 AY)*	3.7 *(07-08 AY)*
Business & Finance Division									
Administrator, Human Resources	57 *(05-06 AY)*	49 *(07-08 AY)*	31 *(05-06 AY)*	35 *(07-08 AY)*	54% *(05-06 AY)*	71% *(07-08 AY)*	3.4 *(05-06 AY)*	3.8 *(07-08 AY)*	3.3 *(05-06 AY)*	3.5 *(07-08 AY)*
Coordinator, Financial Aid	45 *(06-07 AY)*	40 *(07-08 AY)*	29 *(06-07 AY)*	26 *(07-08 AY)*	64% *(06-07 AY)*	65% *(07-08 AY)*	3.8 *(06-07 AY)*	3.7 *(07-08 AY)*	3.7 *(06-07 AY)*	3.8 *(07-08 AY)*
Administrator, Supply Management	54 *(05-06 AY)*	45 *(07-08 AY)*	23 *(05-06 AY)*	33 *(07-08 AY)*	43% *(05-06 AY)*	73% *(07-08 AY)*	3.4 *(05-06 AY)*	3.7 *(07-08 AY)*	3.7 *(05-06 AY)*	3.8 *(07-08 AY)*
President's Office									
Assistant Director, Communications & Promotions	48 *(05-06 AY)*	49 *(07-08 AY)*	29 *(05-06 AY)*	38 *(07-08 AY)*	60% *(05-06 AY)*	78% *(07-08 AY)*	2.9 *(05-06 AY)*	2.6 *(07-08 AY)*	3.1 *(05-06 AY)*	2.7 *(07-08 AY)*
Academic Affairs Division									
Assistant Director, Apprenticeship	54 *(05-06 AY)*	35 *(07-08 AY)*	32 *(05-06 AY)*	23 *(07-08 AY)*	59% *(05-06 AY)*	66% *(07-08 AY)*	3.4 *(05-06 AY)*	3.5 *(07-08 AY)*	3.5 *(05-06 AY)*	3.5 *(07-08 AY)*
Administrator, Student Support Services	53 *(05-06 AY)*	48 *(07-08 AY)*	23 *(05-06 AY)*	34 *(07-08 AY)*	43% *(05-06 AY)*	71% *(07-08 AY)*	2.5 *(05-06 AY)*	3.3 *(07-08 AY)*	2.8 *(05-06 AY)*	3.3 *(07-08 AY)*
Program Specialist, Student Support Services	40 *(06-07 AY)*	47 *(07-08 AY)*	25 *(06-07 AY)*	34 *(07-08 AY)*	63% *(06-07 AY)*	72% *(07-08 AY)*	2.6 *(06-07 AY)*	2.8 *(07-08 AY)*	2.7 *(06-07 AY)*	3.2 *(07-08 AY)*
Program Specialist, Continuing Education		39 *(07-08 AY)*		24 *(07-08 AY)*		62% *(07-08 AY)*		3.0 *(07-08 AY)*		2.9 *(07-08 AY)*
Institutional Researcher		37 *(07-08 AY)*		28 *(07-08 AY)*		76% *(07-08 AY)*		2.6 *(07-08 AY)*		3.1 *(07-08 AY)*

Position	Total Respondents		Number Responding		Response Rate		MEAN, *Job Performance* (where 1=Poor, 2=Mediocre, 3=Good, 4=Excellent, 5=Superb)		MEAN, *Confidence* (where 1=Definitely not, 2=No, but I have reservations about this, 3=Yes, but I have reservations about this, 4=Definitely yes)	
Dean, TPS	56 *(05-06 AY)*	49 *(07-08 AY)*	30 *(05-06 AY)*	34 *(07-08 AY)*	54% *(05-06 AY)*	69% *(07-08 AY)*	3.1 *(05-06 AY)*	2.9 *(07-08 AY)*	3.9 *(05-06 AY)*	3.6 *(07-08 AY)*
Associate Dean, CE, TSS	67 *(05-06 AY)*	49 *(07-08 AY)*	46 *(05-06 AY)*	37 *(07-08 AY)*	69% *(05-06 AY)*	76% *(07-08 AY)*	3.5 *(05-06 AY)*	3.3 *(07-08 AY)*	4.1 *(05-06 AY)*	3.9 *(07-08 AY)*
**Associate Dean, TSS	43 *(05-06 AY)*	41 *(07-08 AY)*	28 *(05-06 AY)*	35 *(07-08 AY)*	65% *(05-06 AY)*	85% *(07-08 AY)*	3.2 *(05-06 AY)*	3.0 *(07-08 AY)*	3.7 *(05-06 AY)*	3.6 *(07-08 AY)*

**Note: Two different Associate Deans for TSS were evaluated in 05-06 AY and 07-08 AY. Therefore, a performance comparison from Round 1 to Round 3 is not possible. Additionally, this is the first assessment of the Program Specialist for Continuing Education and the Institutional Researcher.

X.   CONCLUSIONS

The following observations are derived from a review of the qualitative comments made by survey respondents and the quantitative results of the survey:

- Administrators are perceived as knowledgeable. Perhaps because several administrators who were evaluated this third cycle have been at the college for many years, they have accumulated a wealth of institutional knowledge as well as job-specific knowledge.

- Administrators are reported to have good interpersonal skills and are team players. A number of respondents described administrators as approachable.

- Administrators are believed to have integrity. Respondents described administrators as honest, trustworthy, and fair.

- Communication is an area of improvement for administrators. Respondents believe that administrators need to communicate more and to seek feedback from others. Moreover, they need to be more visible.

- Respondents believe that administrators need to be more proactive/assertive/aggressive in order to get things done.

- XI.   RECOMMENDATIONS

How can performance improvement be achieved? The following recommendations are given to address this question:

- Simply giving administrators their assessment results is unlikely to motivate the administrator to make significant changes. The administrator needs to review the evaluation with his or her supervisor. During this meeting, specific suggestions should be made on how to improve performance.

- Vice Presidents should provide concrete tools for administrators to improve their performance. For example, training opportunities should be provided to administrators to help them address their weaknesses and develop their strengths.

- As recommended in the January 2007 Consolidated Administrators' Assessment Report, the IDEA online survey must somehow be integrated into the college's existing job performance evaluation process. Although this will require discussion among all administrators and may take time to be implemented, a concrete first step would be to include the IDEA performance evaluation report of a specific administrator in every HR increment form that is sent to an employee's supervisor. This will ensure that the conversation for improvement will continue between supervisor and employee.

Performance evaluation should be a catalyst for performance improvement. However, in order to achieve performance improvement, administrators must accept the value of the assessment process and have the capacity to make needed changes. An institution-wide commitment to performance evaluation will not only benefit administrators, but the institution as a whole.

Appendix A

Gina Tudela

From: Virginia Tudela [virginia.tudela@guamcc.edu]

Sent: Monday, January 28, 2008 2:00 PM

To: 'gcc.employee@guamcc.edu'

Subject: Administrator's Assessment On-Line Idea Survey

As an integral part of our comprehensive assessment initiative, the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) is soliciting systematic feedback about selected administrators this year. This is the third round of administrator assessments at the college.

In the next week or so, you will receive an email from The IDEA Center (admin@theideaonline.org) requesting your participation in an online survey providing feedback to several of your administrators. The email will provide you with specific directions. Also, there will be two rounds of administrator assessments and their dates of expected administration, as follows:

> Round 3A: February 1-15, 2008
> Round 3B: February 16-29, 2008

Please read the attached Information and Protocols for GCC Administrators' Performance Assessment for a better understanding of the process. For Round 3A, the survey will be available for you to complete until February 15, 2008. For Round 3B, you will have the chance to complete it online until February 29, 2008. You can expect periodic email reminders from The IDEA Center until you have completed the survey.

Please note: Several administrators have recently taken on new roles. For these administrators, their evaluations should be based on their previous roles, not their new ones.

OFFICE OF ASSESSMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (AIE)
GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
http://www.guamcc.edu/assessment

Memorandum

TO: Colleagues in the GCC community

FROM: AIE Staff

SUBJECT: Administrator's Assessment On-Line IDEA Survey

DATE: January 25, 2008

As an integral part of our comprehensive assessment initiative, the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) is soliciting systematic feedback about selected administrators this year. This is the third round of administrator assessments at the college.

In the next week or so, you will receive an email from The IDEA Center (admin@theideaonline.org) requesting your participation in an online survey providing feedback to several of your administrators. The email will provide you with specific directions. Also, there will be two rounds of administrator assessments and their dates of expected administration, as follows:

> Round 3A: February 1-15, 2008
> Round 3B: February 16-29, 2008

Please read the attached Information and Protocols for GCC Administrators' Performance Assessment for a better understanding of the process. For Round 3A, the survey will be available for you to complete until February 15, 2008. For Round 3B, you will have the chance to complete it online until February 29, 2008. You can expect periodic email reminders from The IDEA Center until you have completed the survey.

Please note: Several administrators have recently taken on new roles. For these administrators, their evaluations should be based on their previous roles, not their new ones.

The results will be aggregated and provided to GCC's Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness in one report. In general, the results will be used primarily for two major purposes: (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.

Since confidentiality is always a concern with this type of process, we have attached a Statement of Confidentiality provided by The IDEA Center. If you have additional concerns about the logistics of the process, please contact AIE by phone (735-5523, 5612) or email priscilla.johns@guamcc.edu or virginia.tudela@guamcc.edu.

As always, AIE values your input and feedback and strongly encourages you to take this opportunity to participate in the online survey. The results will be most meaningful if everyone provides thoughtful responses and feedback.

With your help, GCC can become a most conducive place for teaching and learning,

Sincerely,

AIE Staff

IDEA FEEDBACK SYSTEMS FOR COLLEGE
AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS

Statement of Confidentiality

One of the critical considerations in the development of the IDEA Feedback
Systems for Administrators was ensuring the confidentiality of individual's
responses. In this system, the data are submitted directly to the IDEA online
database. The system does track who has responded to the survey so reminders
can be sent to those who have not. However, when responses are downloaded for
processing, no identifying information (email address, name, etc.) is linked to the
data. As a result, the responses of specific individuals cannot be identified in our
data. Only IDEA Center staff members have access to the online system –
individuals from your campus do not have access to the system or data.

The IDEA Feedback systems do allow for respondents to make open-ended
comments. Responses to these questions are provided verbatim to the
administrator. The survey instructions advise that individuals should avoid
comments that could reveal their identities.

Reports are sent in sealed envelopes to the person identified as the campus contact
on the initial request form. To provide further levels of confidentiality,
demographic subgroup results are only reported if there are at least five
individuals responding from that category. Samples of the reports that show how
the information is summarized can be found on the IDEA Center's web site
(www.idea.ksu.edu).

(Source: IDEA Center Guide to Administering IDEA Feedback Systems for
College and University Administrators, December 2005)

**INFORMATION AND PROTOCOLS FOR
ADMINISTRATORS' PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**
GUAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SPRING 2008

1. The Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) is coordinating an institutional effort to complete the systematic assessment of administrators. 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 about the vendor's varied services.

3. GCC administrators to be evaluated will include the following: Vice President-Administrative Services Division (ASD), Dean-Trades & Professional Services (TPS), Associate Dean-Technology & Student Services (TSS), Associate Dean-TSS/Continuing Education 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 in 2005.

4. There will be two cycles of assessment. The first cycle (Round 3A) of administrator performance assessments will be conducted from February 1-15, 2008. The second cycle (Round 3B) will begin on February 16 and end on February 29, 2008.

5. The following is a list of the administrators who will be assessed and their respective schedule for assessment:

Round 3A February 1-15, 2008	Round 3B February 16-29, 2008
1. John Camacho, Vice President-ASD	1. Francisco Camacho, Administrator-Data Processing
2. Lolita Reyes, Associate Dean-TSS/Continuing Education	2. Joleen Evangelista, Administrator-Supply Management
3. Reilly Ridgell, Dean-TPS	3. Cathy Gogue, Assistant Director-Communications & Promotions
4. George Santos, Assistant Director-Apprenticeship Training Program	4. William Melendez Jr., Administrator-Student Support
5. Terry Barnhart, Program Specialist-Night Administration	5. Joann Muna, Administrator-Human Resources Center
6. Micki Lonsdale, Coordinator-Financial Aid	6. Doris Perez, Assistant Director-Planning & Development
7. Geraldine James, Associate Dean-TSS	7. Richard Quiambao, Institutional Researcher-AIE
8. Bonnie Mae Mendiola, Program Specialist-Continuing Education	

6. All eligible evaluators should rate at least <u>three (3) administrators only</u> 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. **Several administrators have recently taken on new roles. For these administrators, their evaluations should be based on their previous roles, not their new ones**.

8. AIE will send The IDEA Center all the names of administrators for assessment and the email addresses of their corresponding raters. The organization will send **periodic** email reminders to all the eligible raters for both Round 3A (February 1-15) and Round 3B (February 16-29).

9. 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 Fall 2008 semester.

*****