

IFAS Procedures for Utilizing the IDEA Feedback for Administrators System

Introduction

Department heads utilizing the IDEA 360-degree feedback system need to ensure that their employees understand exactly what the 360 process entails, what is expected of them, and how it will benefit them. This will ensure that everyone is prepared for the process and no one will be surprised by the survey invitation.

Explain the following to employees:

- The 360-feedback process provides leaders with a way to solicit feedback from peers, colleagues, direct reports, and their own leader. The feedback can be used as a starting point for action planning, or to plan training and set development goals.
- The 360 -program can have a powerful impact for both the individual and the organization. It helps leaders get a clear picture of performance to identify weaknesses that need improvement, as well as strengths that can be leveraged. 360-degree feedback can also renew focus on goals and objectives, encourage constructive feedback, and clarify the roles of managers, leaders, and individual contributors.

Role of the Participant

The participant is the person evaluated in the 360-feedback process. Typically, the participant along with the manager identifies the stakeholders .

Along with gathering feedback from others, the participant completes the survey themselves, which can help the leader see blind spots (where they rate themselves significantly higher than they are rated by others) and strengths that can be leveraged (where others perceive them as much stronger than they think they are).

Role of the Raters

Raters are key to the success of a 360-feedback project because they see the participant in action day-to-day, and as a result they provide the most useful and reliable feedback. The raters can include the participant's manager, peers, direct reports, and even external stakeholders such as customers, suppliers and board members.

The role of the raters is to provide honest and constructive feedback on their colleague's leadership development. Raters should feel they can provide feedback without fear of identification or retaliation. The knowledge that their identity is confidential can allow the raters to focus on each question individually and think about specific work-related examples to justify the ratings they assign.

Anonymity and confidentiality

Anonymity and confidentiality is a vital component of the 360 process. The company needs to inform the employees that the 360 project is implemented by a third-party partner that provides systematic methods for maintaining anonymity of raters and confidentiality of survey results. In other words, no matter how the rater answers the questions, it will not threaten their job. See IDEA Confidentiality Statement at end of document.

Response rate

Participants should ask for feedback from a large number of raters, if possible, in order to preserve the rater anonymity. If survey response is low, data should be combined in a way that prevents the participant from identifying raters. IFAS has designated that 2-4 rater subgroups should be used with a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 10 raters in each sub-group.

Administrative access

Administrative access by human resources is expected in order to track statistics, such as the number of surveys initiated and completed. In some cases, a summary can be provided to a supervisor or an executive team, however, it should not identify any individuals.

Open-ended comments

If raters are especially concerned about anonymity while making comments in the open-ended questions, they can word their answers in a way that avoids identifying themselves. Comments should also be reported in random order and shuffled for each question.

Maintain raters' anonymity

If the participant tries to reach out to respondents and address their input or to find out more information, they run the risk of harming the 360 process. Leaders should respect raters' anonymity and make no effort to identify individuals.

In selecting raters keep in mind the following guidelines:

1. Raters should be selected based on their working relationship with the participant.
2. Raters should know the participant's work and have frequent interactions.
3. Avoid raters that are known only through casual interactions, brief meetings, or a one-time, short-term project or presentation.

4. Include a balanced set of raters that can provide objective feedback, both positive and critical.
5. Confirm the rater selection with the participant's immediate manager.
6. A rater may decline to provide information if they have not had sufficient interaction with the participant during the year.
7. All rater feedback except that from the participant's immediate manager will be reported as a group. No individual responses will be identified in the report.
8. If only one rater responds from a rater group, their responses will be combined with another group to maintain anonymity.

All 360-degree feedback raters will be assigned to one of the following rater groups:

- **Self:** The participant.
- **Supervisor:** The participant's immediate supervisor. If the supervisor changed in the past three months, we recommend inviting the previous supervisor to participate as well.
- **Direct Report:** Include all direct reports who have been working under the participant's supervision for at least 3 months.
- **Peer:** Choose minimum of five to maximum of 10 peers that work with the participant on a regular basis.
- **Other** (optional for internal or external clients, etc.)

Who should not be used as 360 Raters?

Employees who have recently (or are currently) been involved in performance or disciplinary action, or are in known conflict with their line manager, should not be included.

Organizations that are busy with restructuring or downsizing should also consider the possible prevailing feelings of insecurity and distrust, and whether some Raters should best not be included (and even whether the timing for 360 appraisals would be suitable at all).

Furthermore, 360 appraisal programs will not work in dysfunctional departments, or in organizations where there is a lack of openness and trust, and an unwillingness or fear to give and receive feedback.

Specific Information for IDEA process from the IDEA Administrators Implementation Guide

Implementation Guide- Use the Implementation Guide for a template to construct emails to the raters explaining the process. The guide also provides information on how the report is generated. The guide is located here:

<https://www.ideaedu.org/Services/Leadership-Feedback-Systems/Implementation-Guide#977472-campus-environment-for-rating-administrator-performance>

The Rater Subgroup System is not optional in the IFAS Process when using IDEA. To select subgroups, determine the most appropriate subgroups from the list below based on the role of the department head being evaluated. You must choose a minimum of 2 subgroups up to a maximum of four subgroups.

Note that there must be a minimum of five responses in a designated subgroup to receive subgroup results.

- Faculty member (or this can be two groups: Adjunct faculty and Regular faculty)
- Student
- Administrator's staff
- Professional colleague/associate
- Department head/chair
- Dean
- Governing board member
- Community member
- Alumnus/alumna
- Other

IDEA STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

One of the critical considerations in the development and administration of IDEA Feedback Systems is ensuring the confidentiality of individual responses. All data are submitted directly to a secure and protected IDEA 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 select IDEA 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 comments to open-ended questions. Responses to these questions are provided verbatim to the individual(s) being surveyed. The survey instructions advise that individuals should avoid comments that could reveal their identities. In addition, we advise that individuals completing the survey should adhere to a high level of professionalism and refrain from using inappropriate or threatening comments that could result in legal action that would compel IDEA to break confidentiality. Reports are emailed 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.

Common themes administrators are rated on via the IDEA system

1. Communicating a visionary plan.
2. Establishing sound properties.
3. Displaying knowledge/expertise required for this position.
4. Making wise decisions, judgment and recommendations.
5. Initiating actions that anticipate problems or resolving them before they become major concerns.
6. Being an effective team member.
7. Contributing positively to the institutions image.
8. Communicating relevant information to appropriate constituencies.
9. Seeking opinions of others before establishing policies or procedures that affect them.
10. Earning the trust and respect of others.

Questions that evaluate Leadership Styles

Is the Leader:

1. Indecisive vs. Decisive
2. Disorganized vs. Organized
3. Inconsistent vs. Consistent
4. Ambiguous vs. Clear
5. Unimaginative vs. Innovative
6. Rigid vs. Flexible
7. Impractical vs. Practical

Questions that Evaluate Personal Characteristics

Is the Leader:

8. Remote vs. Approachable
9. Unfair vs. Fair
10. Autocratic vs. Democratic
11. Manipulative vs. Straightforward
12. Self-centered vs. Institution-centered
13. Insensitive vs. Understanding
14. Opinionated vs. Receptive to Ideas
15. Untrustworthy vs. Trustworthy

Common Open-Ended Questions

1. What are this administrators' main strengths?
2. How might this administrator improve his or her performance?
3. What are the most important challenges facing this administrator?

Resources:

Zenger, J. and J. Folkman. (2012, September 7.) Harvard Business Review. Retrieved August 15, 2019, from <https://hbr.org/2012/09/getting-360-degree-reviews-right>

IDEA Implementation Guide.(2019) Retrieved from <https://www.ideaedu.org/Services/Leadership-Feedback-Systems/Implementation-Guide#977472-campus-environment-for-rating-administrator-performance>