

Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

Prepared by:

Anthony Morris, MLS

Annie Smith, MLS

Mary Naylor Stephens, MLS

Annabel Carroll

Justin Felkins

Question

Faculty Evaluation of Administrators – Some senators have brought the suggestion to make a process & policy for faculty to evaluate administration. Senate is interested to see if there is any literature about this, or if any peers do this already.

Keywords

Faculty and evaluation and administration; “faculty evaluation” and administration; faculty evaluation of administration; “administrator evaluation” and “higher education”; “administrator evaluation” and “higher education” and faculty; “administrator evaluation” and “college faculty”; DE "College administrators -- Rating of"; “subordinate appraisals”; “upward appraisals”; "360-degree feedback"; faculty and (evaluat* or feedback or assessment) and (supervisor or administrat* or manager); faculty and (evaluat* or feedback or assessment or appraisal) and (upward or supervisor or administrat* or manager); (evaluat* or feedback or assessment or appraisal) and (upward or supervisor or administrat* or manager) and (college or university or "higher education"); ((evaluat* OR feedback OR assessment OR appraisal) AND (upward OR supervisor OR administrat* OR manager) AND implement*) AND su((college OR university OR "higher education"))

Summary

Most of the literature found for this review is a bit older than usually accepted. Most studies about upward appraisal were published in the 1990s and early 2000s; this review uses those as well as any more recent studies that were available. Although there is limited literature about this type of appraisal in academic settings, what is available describes upward feedback as mostly successful as long as there is appropriate organizational support. Literature about upward appraisal in other settings also describes many positive outcomes. This review contains research from both academic and business settings.

It is worth noting the variety of terms used to discuss this concept. While this review will use the term “upward appraisal,” other terms to describe this or similar concepts included 360 degree feedback, stakeholder appraisal, full-circle appraisal, multi-rater feedback, multi-source assessment, subordinate and peer appraisal, group performance appraisal, multi-point assessment, and multi-perspective ratings (McCarthy & Garavan, 2001, p.2).

The bulk of research into whether upward appraisal is proven to work discusses the corporate environment. These studies suggest that upward appraisal is very commonly used and often successful on a number of cases, if only in small amounts (Smither, London, & Reilly,

2005; Drew, 2009). Kudisch, Fortunato, and Smith (2006) list several findings from research in the 1990s. They found that most Fortune 1000 firms use some kind of upward appraisal, and that it has been found to improve administrative performance, empower employees, and increase knowledge of administrator's performance (p. 503). McCarthy and Garavan (2001) found that upward appraisal is widely accepted to enhanced communication both upwards and downwards, and “can build more effective work relationships; increase opportunities for employee involvement; uncover and resolve conflict and demonstrate respect for employee opinions on the part of top management” (p. 9). Tourish and Robson (2003) found that upward appraisal helped reduce the “gap between managers’ self rating and those of their subordinates” and also lead to “[the] creation of improved forums for obtaining information, garnering suggestions, defusing conflicts and facilitating the expression of discontent” (p. 151).

Perhaps the most important argument in favor of upward appraisal comes from Drew (2009), who found that, of all types of feedback, administrators are most likely to listen to feedback from those they supervise. She writes, “Whether a feedback exercise invoked multi-source feedback or upward feedback only, the feedback from staff is the most important dimension to be gathered” (p. 582). When it came time for administrators to set development goals, subordinate ratings were most influential factor.

There is a fair amount of available literature on how to implement upwards appraisals successfully. Several factors contribute to successful implementation, including establishing their purpose, institutional support, participants’ attitude, and high feedback. These will be outlined in greater detail below:

1. When using upward appraisals, it is important to establish their purpose.

Establishing purpose is of twofold importance. Administrators and subordinates need to know what aspect of their jobs are to be evaluated. All employees must know how it is going to be used. Rosser, Johnsrud, and Heck (2003) point out, “Any number of different aspects of the role could potentially be evaluated including performance (e.g., on-the-job behavior), cognitive processes (e.g., ability to solve problems or make appropriate decisions), or effectiveness (e.g., results oriented activities such as increasing resources, improving the quality of programs” (p. 4). Without a clearly established purpose and clearly articulated criteria to be evaluated, feedback tends to be unfocused, unspecific, and unhelpful. Cogburn (1998) develops the argument further, pointing out that regardless of how the feedback will be used, that purpose must be clearly defined, otherwise subordinates will not be able to provide appropriate feedback or, even if useful feedback is given, the administrators will not be able to utilize it effectively (p. 72).

2. Institutional support for development increases the efficacy of upward feedback.

Several studies drew attention to the need for institutional support in order to make an upward feedback program successful. Kudisch *et al.* (2006) show that upward feedback can only succeed when reviewers believe that they can give genuine feedback without negative consequences. If the reviews are to be anonymous, organizations must show how anonymity is respected and protected. When employees are distrustful of their organizations, they may worry that a low upward rating could affect their future job prospects or opportunities for tenure and promotion and may, therefore, not give honest feedback (p. 507).

Further, Drew (2009) shows that without proper organisational support, programs are not likely to succeed. Support can include paying for and implementing upwards appraisal surveys or software, giving employees time and money as incentive, offering nominations or promotions by supervisors to encourage support, and training to ensure employees know how to use the software and improve their leadership expectations and skills (p. 586). In their study of upward appraisal at an academic library, Turrentine *et al.* (2004) found that the library dean's push for participation and distribution of feedback to managers was critical for success (p. 307).

3. Participants' attitude affects success.

Somewhat similar to the point above, employee and supervisor attitudes will drastically affect the success of the program. Drew (2009) noted that some employees may refrain from participation because they "may not consider rating their supervisor a role-appropriate activity" (p. 506). Further, she writes, "That a group of participants, confident in their ability to learn, reported the 360-degree exercise a positive learning experience concurs with the observation of Maurer *et al.* (2002, p. 91) who said that 'people who believe that they can improve their skills and abilities [...] feel favourably toward a feedback system that informs them of the skills or abilities that need improvement'" (p. 589). Without buy-in from both sides of the appraisal, success is unlikely.

4. High feedback rates are key.

Gleaning accurate and actionable information from the reviews is dependent on high feedback rates. Kudisch *et al.* (2006) point out that low participation calls into question the credibility and quality of the ratings. In addition, since many administrators have different interactions with different employees, limited feedback calls into question whether it is a full picture of that administrator's ability. As the information has the potential to be biased or incomplete, low feedback rates are also less likely to support change. (p. 504). Thus, successful upwards appraisal programs need to solicit as much feedback as is possible.

5. Integration with other forms of evaluation improves success.

Upward appraisal was most successful when integrated as a part of a larger progress or evaluation procedure. McCarthy & Garavan (2001) draw attention to the idea that true 360 degree feedback would include feedback from multiple sources, including an upwards appraisals from subordinates but also appraisal by peers and by supervisors (p.2). Results also need to be shared in ways that maintain confidentiality but also reach all concerned parties. For example, in the case study by Turrentine *et al.* (2004) raw responses, and evaluation team synthesis, were given to the Dean, who prepared written summaries for each individual manager, to be shared in private meetings. In a larger meeting, these results were shared more generally with the whole staff, and later some individual managers discussed what they had received with their individual staff (p. 307). Without that integrated reporting structure, upwards appraisal can feel nebulous or incompletely utilized.

Disadvantages to upwards appraisal

As with any appraisal program, upwards appraisals can have a number of disadvantages. Tourish and Robson (2003) bring to light the tendency towards positive upward feedback, especially in cases where feedback is limited or employees fear retaliation. They also found that managers tend to perceive more instances of negative feedback than there are in actuality (p. 151). McCarthy and Garavan (2001) note that when some administrators are presented with negative feedback, they become demotivated, which has a net negative consequence for the organization as a whole (p. 10). Turrentine *et al.* (2004) noted in their case study that organizations with poor relationships or low morale were unlikely to succeed at upward appraisal:

In departments where the relationships between the manager and the employees were already very strained, this appraisal process did not work nearly so well. The response rate in those departments was much lower because the employees did not trust the confidentiality or efficacy of the appraisal process. The willingness of the managers in those departments to accept the feedback of the employees was much lower. In those departments, the types of comments that employees made were more likely to center on personality issues, which were unlikely to lead to change, rather than on leadership behaviors that might reasonably be changed (p. 308-309).

Overcoming these fears and disadvantages would be the most critical part of any plan to initiate an upward appraisal program.

Peer-Reviewed Articles

Citation

Bettenhausen, K. L., & Fedor, D. B. (1997). Peer and upward appraisals: a comparison of their benefits and problems. *Group & Organization Management*, (2). 236.

Abstract

Employees may perceive peer and upward feedback more positively when the feedback is used for development, rather than when it is used for administrative purposes. This was gleaned from a study of the positive and negative outcomes that employees associate with peer or upward appraisals used solely for either administrative or developmental purposes. More positive outcomes and fewer negative outcomes were believed more likely to be produced by upward appraisals than peer appraisals. This was attributed to lower expectations of positive outcomes and higher expectations of negative outcomes for peer appraisals used for administration. A positive relationship was noted between good coworker relations and positive outcomes, while a negative relationship was observed between the former and negative outcomes. No influence was found to be wielded by supervisor relations.

Limitations

21 years old
n=141

Conclusions

“The results of this study offer additional support for previous findings that employees view appraisals used for developmental purposes more positively than they do appraisals used for administrative purposes. Furthermore, participants in this study clearly distinguished between, and responded differently to, the potential benefits of peer and upward appraisals and the negative outcomes that could ensue. As predicted by Hypothesis 1, participants’ preference for using peer and upward appraisals for developmental purposes came from the combination of perceiving positive outcomes as being more likely and negative outcomes as less likely.” (256)

“Attitudes toward the administrative use of peer and upward review were more complex. Participants believed both positive (x=3.20) and negative (x=3.21) outcomes would result when upward appraisals were used as input for administrative decisions. However, they believed negative outcomes would result (x=3.36) and positive outcomes were *not* likely (x=2.93) if peer appraisal were used as input into administrative decisions.” (257)

“Positive outcomes were seen as more likely to accrue from upward appraisals than from peer appraisal, but this result was due to participants’ beliefs that positive outcomes would not be realized from the administrative use of peer review. Perhaps because of its more immediate impact, participants’ beliefs about peer review were more divergent than their assessments of upward appraisal. Negative outcomes were reported to be most likely to result from the administrative use of peer appraisal (x=3.36), with the administrative use of upward appraisal also expected to produce negative outcomes.” (257)

<p>Link http://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsdsgo&AN=edsqcl.19623989&site=eds-live</p>	
<p>Citation Coggburn, J. D. (1998). Subordinate appraisals of managers: Lessons from a state agency. <i>Review of Public Personnel Administration, 18</i>(1), 68-79.</p> <p>Abstract Highlights one state agency's experiences with subordinate appraisals. Discussion on several general benefits of subordinate appraisals; Details on important issues and obstacles facing organizations that utilize appraisals; Conclusions.)</p> <p>Limitation From 1998</p> <p>Link https://drive.google.com/file/d/1LHe6w446J5YBGT6N6AKOf4d0D8T'Zo9Lp/view?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Conclusions “Specifically, the quality improvement steering committee, acting upon the recommendations of the subordinate appraisal action team, determined that the appraisals would be used as a means to improve communications between managers and staff. Secondly, the committee determined that the appraisals should serve as the basis for determining managerial training and development needs. By confining the objectives to feedback and managerial development, the committee believed managerial resistance would be minimized.” (71)</p> <p>“Whether an organization decides to use subordinate appraisals for feedback or for administrative purposes, the important point is that the specific purposes to be served by subordinate appraisals must be clarified and a common understanding of these purposes must be ensured (Bernardin & Beatty, 1987, 64).” (72)</p> <p>“some research exists to suggest that “subordinates are qualified to evaluate only certain aspects of the manager’s work and that the inclusion of these aspects which managers do not feel subordinates are qualified to evaluate will discredit the process” (Bernardin, Dahmus & Remon, 1993, p. 323).” (72)</p> <p>“Organizations can expect that some subordinates and supervisors will call into question certain aspects included in the appraisal survey. For these troublesome aspects, careful explanation of the rationale for a particular item’s inclusion must be made; its relevance to the dimension being assessed must be demonstrated (Maurer & Tarulli, 1996, p. 296). At SCDAH [South Carolina Department of Archives and History], however, this problem was largely averted by having the subordinate appraisal action team devise the items to be included in the appraisal instrument.” (72)</p> <p>“When constructing the subordinate appraisal instrument, the items to be rated should be very</p>

focused and they should be as specific as possible (Bernardin & Beatty, 1987, p. 71). A question that asks a subordinate to assess an abstract trait of a supervisor (e.g., “What is your supervisors level of creativity?”) will likely yield fewer meaningful responses than specific, behavior-related questions (e.g., respondents can be asked to indicate their level of agreement with a statement: “My supervisors provides clear instructions for assigned tasks: never/sometimes/always”).” (73)

“Specifically, the appraisal follow-up survey contained specific items that relate to managerial and subordinate fear. In short, the survey showed that subordinates did not attempt to “get even” with their managers. Specifically, 96% of the employees surveyed indicated that they had provided honest and fair evaluations of their managers...managers (77%)...felt that subordinates did indeed evaluate them honestly and fairly.” (73)

“in the initial implementation of subordinate appraisals at SCDAH, an entire work group (consisting of five subordinates) refused to participate, fearing the negative consequences they would suffer from their manager. Organizations can help to alleviate such concerns by reminding subordinates that the entire process assures the anonymity of raters: multiple raters are required for each manager, the appraisal surveys are anonymous, rating for a manager are reported in aggregate form, etc...In the case of the reluctant SCDAH work group, an alternative forum was devised for the wary subordinates to air their concerns--the employees met in personal interviews with their manager’s supervisor to discuss their concerns.” (74)

“During the [appraisal training] sessions, the goals of subordinate appraisals were discussed, the rating procedures were described, and the actual rating form was circulated for inspection. Additionally, all employees were given hard copies of the goals and procedures of subordinate appraisals.” (74)

“Perhaps the most important aspect of managerial training [for subordinate appraisals], however, is the need to clearly establish what will be done with the results of subordinate appraisals. If, on the one hand, the appraisals are going to be used to judgmental purposes, then what to do with the results will largely be a question for upper-management and the human resource staff. On the other hand, if the goals of the appraisal process are to provide feedback and improve manager-subordinate communications (as was the case at SCDAH), then identifying exactly how those goals are to be achieved is important. Specifically, managers must be trained on how to

	<p>discuss their appraisals with subordinates. This includes preparing managers to handle difficult issues in a constructive, professional manner.” (74-75)</p> <p>“At SCDAH, the post-appraisal problems were unquestionably the most serious shortcomings of the system. The hope was that managers and subordinates would meet to discuss the concerns raised in the appraisals. Some managers met formally with subordinates to discuss the concerns raised in the appraisals, while other managers, in effect, ignored the results altogether. According to the follow-up survey, only about one-third of the respondents (34%) reported that their supervisors met with them to discuss the results of the appraisals... (It is worth noting that, following the disappointing survey results, SCDAH modified the post-appraisal process. Now, facilitators are used at post-appraisal meetings in which managers and their staff discuss the the appraisals. The initial indications from SCDAH are that the approach has increased the consistency, openness, and constructiveness of the post-appraisal process).” (75)</p>
<p>Citation Drew, G. (2009). A "360" degree view for individual leadership development. <i>Journal of Management Development</i>, 28(7), 581-592. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02621710910972698 Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/216354487?accountid=14779</p> <p>Abstract This paper explores the perceived usefulness to participants of a particular 360-degree leadership survey process to assist an understanding of how ratees receive and respond to 360-degree feedback. The paper includes a sample of eight new and emergent leaders at one university in Australia who completed a 360-degree feedback survey. Participants were asked to report on their</p>	<p>Conclusions “Specifically, the goal was to discover more about how leaders respond to 360-degree feedback exercises and how, from the insights of the sample group, 360-degree processes might be strengthened for maximum impact.” (582)</p> <p>“The vexed question of 360-degree surveying. Some research shows that, whether a feedback exercise invoked multi-source feedback or upward feedback only, the feedback from staff is the most important dimension to be gathered. One study by Brutus et al. (1999) revealed that ratees listen most to feedback from people whom they supervise. The study, covering data from 2,163 managers, showed that multi-source feedback contributed to the selection of developmental goals, and that subordinate ratings, compared to ratings from other sources, were most influential in the setting of goals.” (582)</p> <p>“Smither et al. (2004) found a very small though statistically significant proportion of variance in improvement occurred over time. Van Dierendonck et al. (2007) examined a sample of 45 managers and 308 staff members of a health care organisation receiving an upward feedback report and a short workshop to facilitate interpretation. The study invoked two measurement points within six months. It found that managers lack insight into the impact of their behaviour (which in itself suggests the usefulness of gaining feedback) but that the upward feedback</p>

learning as a result of undertaking the 360-degree exercise. The research study finds that, in equal proportion, participants report receiving: 1. no surprising feedback but reinforcement and affirmation, and 2. new insights, with developmental strategies identified to effect change as a result of feedback. The results of the semi-structured conversations held with the small sample attest to the importance of self-efficacy (belief of capacity to learn and develop) on the part of ratees to act on feedback gained, and of the organisation's role in assisting self-efficacy in 360-degree programs. The paper concludes by providing some guidelines for conducting effective 360-degree feedback discussions.

Limitations

Conducted in Australia, 8 administrative and academic leaders interviewed

Link

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/216354487?accountid=14779>

program had small overall positive effect.” (582)

“Of the literature scanned, most authors commenting on multi-source feedback supported “in principle” the notion of leader obtaining feedback, but it would appear that the link between 360-degree feedback and development action has been relatively little researched (Maurer et al., 2002).” (583)

“This paper argues that the perceived success of a 360-degree feedback process turns largely upon how the intervention is contextualised and delivered organisationally, including whether/how ratees are assisted to be high self-monitors able and willing to make adjustments where useful to do so.” (583)

“A useful question relevant to 360-degree survey success is whether the organisation appears to value and reward the behaviours reflected in the survey. Reilly et al. (1996) attempted to answer this question in a study of 92 managers during four iterations of an upward feedback program over two and a half years. The study found that managers whose performance was perceived by subordinates as low improved between the first and second iteration of the program and sustained that improvement two years later. The study found that rewarding and top-down modelling of desired behaviours appeared to be the most important factor leveraging improvement. Dominick et al. (1997) agree that people will be more motivated to develop the behaviours that they believe are rewarded. In fact, Dominick et al. (1997) found that employees can change behaviour merely by becoming aware of the behaviours that are rewarded in the organisation.” (583)

“There is evidence to suggest that institutional support of various kinds plays a significant role in the likelihood of 360-degree processes leading to continuous improvement. Aspects of institutional support may include how the 360-degree process is to be contextualised and introduced; if and how it links to other performance assessment mechanisms; how the results will be transmitted to participants; and what mechanisms are in place to support learning and follow-through assistance (London, 2002). A study undertaken by Maurer et al. (2002) found that a significant difference-making element was the way in which the feedback process was implemented and facilitated.” (584)

“First, some comments are made on the wider cultural and contextual environment of the organisation in which the research study was undertaken. The relevant organisation, an Australian university, provides strong institutional support for development. At that university, for development purposes, the QLP 360-degree survey is undertaken twice in a five-year contract for academic and general (professional) senior staff holding significant supervisory responsibility. Participants involved in the research study enjoyed particular support for development, having been nominated by their supervisors to undertake an accelerated succession leadership development program at the relevant university. Participants were eight in number and were equally distributed across gender and across academic and professional (administrative) senior supervisory staff at the university, such as heads of school and managers of administrative sections.” (586)

“Two contrasting themes, equally represented amongst participants, derived from the analysis. The first theme was that the 360-degree survey yielded no surprising feedback but that useful reinforcement of self-perceptions had occurred. The second theme was that the process had yielded new insight and that development strategies and change had been attempted as a result.” (587)

“The design of the development program aligned with the researched factor structure of the QLP (outlined earlier in this paper). The first module of that program had provided an introductory context for the 360-degree feedback exercise, explaining its intent for development purposes and gaining the engagement of participants. The implementation briefing to participants included a suggestion that participants advise at least their directly reporting staff that they would be inviting them to complete the survey, outlining its developmental purpose, and that the process would be confidential. Further modules of the program held approximately every six weeks over a year, had dealt with staff motivation and involvement and a range of strategic and operational issues. In informal settings, participants could interact with senior executives of the university and other presenters, and each other.” (588)

“That a group of participants, confident in their ability to learn, reported the 360-degree exercise a positive learning experience concurs with the observation of Maurer et al. (2002, p. 91) who said that “people who believe that they can improve their skills and abilities [...] feel favourably toward a feedback system that informs them of the skills or abilities that need improvement.””

	<p>(589)</p> <p>“The findings concur that as more people in the organisation involve themselves in activities provided to sharpen reflection and action, favourable critical mass will develop.” (590)</p> <p>“It is acknowledged that the study took place in an environment when support for development existed. Whether participants would have felt so positive about the process had institutional support not been provided remains a question.” (590)</p> <p>“The findings positively affirm a place for 360-degree surveys as a useful tool in leadership development with the caveat that the process be supported by sound facilitation and, if possible, active institutional endorsement.” (590)</p> <p>“The study suggests that, whether the feedback largely affirms current practice for the ratee, or identifies areas for improvement, it is most important that the ratee feels comfortable to gain the feedback and to act upon it.” (590)</p>
<p>Citation Kudisch, J. D., Fortunato, V. J., & Smith, A. F. R. (2006). Contextual and individual difference factors predicting individuals' desire to provide upward feedback. <i>Group & Organization Management</i>, 31(4), 503-529. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/203352556?accountid=14779</p> <p>Abstract This study examined the influence of several factors on employees' desire to provide upward feedback to their supervisors on an impending upward feedback system. Self-report data from 153 university employees indicated that the desire to provide upward feedback related</p>	<p>Conclusions “Recent surveys estimate that multirater feedback, also called 360-degree and multisource feedback, is used by 90% of Fortune 1000 firms (Atwater & Waldman, 1998). Multirater systems have also been shown to relate to improved managerial performance (Hazucha, Hezlett, & Schneider, 1993; Reilly, Smither, & Vasilopoulos, 1996; Smither et al., 1995; Walker & Smither, 1999), heightened employee empowerment (Hoffman, 1995; McGarvey & Smith, 1993; Yukl & Lepsinger, 1995), increased knowledge of performance (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995), and the reduction of the effects of a prejudicial or unqualified rater (London & Beatty, 1993) (p.503).</p> <p>“Low participation rates have the potential to limit the credibility, quality, and effectiveness of upward ratings (Church et al., 2000; London & Smither, 1995; Westerman & Rosse, 1997). Because feedback credibility has been shown to be one of the most important factors in determining whether or not someone acts on performance information (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979; Kudisch, 1996), ratees receiving feedback based solely on a few ratings may be less likely to use it to effect behavioral changes because they perceive the feedback to lack credibility (Church et al., 2000). Moreover, because different subordinates often have different types of interactions and relationships with the same supervisor, when feedback is received from only a small</p>

negatively to fear of retaliation and positively to role appropriateness, perceived usefulness, rater self-efficacy, leader-member exchange, knowledge of upward feedback, top management support, coworker support, and feedback-seeking behavior. The authors also found that perceived usefulness mediated the relationships among fear of retaliation, leader-member exchange, top management support, coworker support, and knowledge of upward feedback with desire to provide upward feedback. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

Limitations

Link

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/203352556?accountid=14779>

percentage of potential raters, the data received may be biased and incomplete, leading ratees to draw inaccurate conclusions regarding their performance (London & Smither, 1995). Thus, to provide comprehensive and credible information that will motivate supervisors to effect positive behavior change, it is important that a majority of subordinates participate in their upward feedback programs (London & Beatty, 1993)” p.504.

“We develop our hypotheses based on several models of rater behavior involving traditional performance appraisal contexts (e.g., Decotiis & Petit, 1978; Harris, 1994; Mohrman & Lawler, 1983; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995) and Westerman and Rosse's (1997) upward feedback model of rater behavior. In general, these models describe characteristics of the rating process that influence rater behavior, aspects of the organizational context in which performance appraisals are embedded, and individual difference variables that affect rating quality” p.505.

“Role appropriateness. Another self-perception hypothesized to influence rater behavior is the belief that providing performance appraisal ratings is a role-appropriate activity. Because most supervisors and employees expect supervisors to rate subordinates, perceptions of role appropriateness have not been examined in the context of traditional performance appraisal systems. However, in the upward feedback domain, there has been some concern that employees may not consider rating their supervisor a role-appropriate activity (e.g., Avis & Kudisch, 2000; Westerman & Rosse, 1997). In general, research has shown that raters who believe that it is appropriate for them to provide upward feedback are more likely to participate in an upward feedback program than are raters who do not believe that it is appropriate (Avis & Kudisch, 2000; Westerman & Rosse, 1997)” p.506.

“Consequences of performance appraisals may apply to the ratee or to the rater (e.g., Cleveland & Murphy, 1992; Harris, 1994). For example, positive outcomes may include improved employee performance, salary increases, and promotions, whereas negative outcomes may include fear of retaliation, damaged working relationships, loss of salary or promotion, and the perception of poor supervisory performance on the part of supervisors' supervisors. In this study, we focus on two consequences: (a) individuals' perceptions that their participation in an upward feedback program will be instrumental in leading to the attainment of valued outcomes (perceived usefulness) and (b) fear of retaliation” p.506.

“Successful implementation of upward feedback programs depends on the extent to which individuals believe that they can provide candid feedback without fear of negative consequences, such as retaliation (McGarvey & Smith, 1993; Wimer & Nowack, 1998). However, many employees are distrustful of their organizations (Farnam, 1989) and believe that providing a low upward rating may negatively affect future job assignments, opportunities for promotion, and tenure with the organization (Church & Waclawski, 1998; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995)” p.507.

“In the performance appraisal literature, job attitudes, such as organizational commitment, have also been shown to relate to the quality of supervisor ratings” p.509.

“On one hand, individuals with high quality relationships are more likely to participate in upward feedback programs because they feel obligated to do so, whereas individuals with low quality relationships may not feel the same obligation. On the other hand, individuals with high quality relationships (i.e., those who perceive high levels of reciprocal trust and communication) may already believe that their voice is heard and may not feel the need to provide upward feedback, whereas individuals with poor quality relationships may wish to participate in upward feedback so as to provide a formal means of opening communication channels (Funderburg & Levy, 1997)” p.510.

“Perceptions of support. Practitioners generally agree that top management support is critical to the success of multirater systems (Church, 1995; Church & Bracken, 1997; Church & Waclawski, 1998; Wimer & Nowack, 1998). To encourage participation, "senior-level executives must visibly and enthusiastically support the process" (Church, 1995, p. 42) and demonstrate to employees that management is genuinely interested in hearing from lower-level employees. Organizations can also foster a "feedback-seeking" climate, so as to increase the "receptivity or ease with which employees can seek, and feel comfortable seeking, performance-relevant information" (Funderburg & Levy, 1997, p. 218). Conversely, employee desire to provide upward feedback may be affected negatively if upward feedback programs are viewed as the "flavor of the month" (Church & Waclawski, 1998, p. 84). Thus, top management support of an upward feedback program may (a) create a sense of obligation for participation, (b) create a normative climate that the expression of an employee's opinion is important, and (c) enhance perceptions that the employee is valued” (p.510).

“Data were obtained from 153 employees of a Student Affairs Division of a large southeastern university. The majority of the respondents were White (77.1%) and female (70.6%) and had an average job tenure of just more than 7 years ($M = 7.12$; $SD = 6.36$). Of those who reported their supervisory status, 53.6% held non-supervisory positions. Although skilled workers (2.0%), maintenance workers (3.9%), executive level workers (10.5%), and clerical workers (26.8%) participated, the majority of the respondents were considered professional-level employees (52.3%). Moreover, the highest educational level attained by respondents was as follows: high school (27.5%), technical (3.9%), associate's degree (8.5%), bachelor's degree (28.1%), master's degree (21.6%), and doctoral degree (5.9%). Participants also represented a wide variety of departments within the Student Affairs Division, including the following: University Police (15.7%), Health Services (13.7%), Counseling and Career Planning (11.1%), Financial Aid (11.1%), Residence Life (11.1%), Food Services (8.5%), Registrar (7.8%), Recreational Sports (7.2%), Admissions (6.5%), and Student Union (4.6%)” (p.514).

“With the exception of LMX and feedback seeking, all items were scored using a 5-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)” p.514.

“although common method variance cannot be completely ruled out, our findings indicate that it was not a cause for concern in our study” (p.515).

“In this study, we examined the relationships among several contextual and individual difference variables and individuals' desire to participate in an upward feedback process. In general, we found support for all of our hypotheses. Specifically, rater self-efficacy, role appropriateness, perceived usefulness, fear of retaliation, top management support, LMX, coworker support, knowledge of upward feedback, and feedback-seeking behavior all related statistically significantly with employee desire to provide upward feedback. Moreover, perceived usefulness mediated the relationships among the social exchange variables and desire to provide upward feedback and between knowledge of upward feedback and desire to provide upward feedback” (p.519).

“Individuals who perceive that they have positive relationships with their supervisors and that others in the organization support the implementation of the upward feedback program are more likely to reciprocate with organizational requests, such as participation in an upward

feedback program, because (a) they develop a sense of obligation to do so and (b) believe that participation will strengthen the quality of their relationships with their organization, supervisor, and coworkers. These findings are also consistent with research that has shown that the quality of individuals' relationships with their organization, supervisor, and coworkers all relate positively with affective and normative organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors (e.g., Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Rhodes & Eisenberger, 2002) and also with the finding that organizational support relates positively with the perceived utility of a multirater system (C. L. Fecteau, Fecteau, Schoel, Russell, & Poteet, 1998)" (p.521).

"Limitations. One limitation of this study was that we used a one-item criterion measure to assess employee desire to provide upward feedback to their supervisor. From an empirical perspective, it is generally assumed that compared to multiple-item scales, single-item measures are not as reliable. However, some researchers contend that the use of carefully worded single-item measures can produce meaningful results (e.g., Kenrick & Braver, 1982) and may be acceptable in those instances where situational constraints limit or prevent the use of scales and the construct of interest is sufficiently narrow in scope, simple, and clear (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997). Nevertheless, future research may want to explore whether similar findings emerge using an expanded outcome measure.

A second limitation was that we did not actually measure employee participation in an upward feedback program. Although measuring actual participation in an upward feedback program would have been preferable to measuring employee desire to provide upward feedback to their supervisor, we note that this study was part of a larger study designed to examine the feasibility of developing and implementing an upward feedback system. However, research has shown that although behavioral intentions and actual behaviors do not correspond exactly, people typically do tend to follow through on their behavioral intentions (Ajzen, 1991)" (p.523).

"Despite the fact that the success of multirater systems depends on employee participation, little research exists examining factors related to actual or intended participation in such programs. In this study, we found that several variables previously shown to be important factors in influencing the quality of traditional performance appraisal systems (i.e., downward feedback) were also important in potentially influencing the success of an upward feedback program. Thus, it is important for organizations wishing to implement upward feedback systems to pay particular

	<p>attention to (a) enhancing individuals' self-perceptions, (b) increasing employee knowledge of upward feedback, and (c) ensuring high quality social exchange relationships” (p.525).</p>
<p>Citation Maples, G., Harris, B., & Greco, A. M. (2010). Using a 360-degree appraisal approach to re-design advising programs. <i>Contemporary Issues in Education Research</i>, 3(1), 1-7. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/196350553?accountid=14779</p> <p>Abstract Over the past 30 years, researchers have repeatedly demonstrated the need to improve academic advising. Nonetheless, at many Universities academic advising remains a neglected endeavor-poorly measured, managed and rewarded. This paper considers the implementation of an academic advising program which parallels the 360-Degree feedback approach drawn from the Human Resources Management discipline. The details of the program are outlined and preliminary results of the program, which literally transformed academic advising at our institution, are discussed.</p> <p>Limitations</p> <p>Link https://search.proquest.com/docview/196350553?accountid=14779</p>	<p>Conclusions “The 360-Degree Feedback approach provides a consistent management philosophy meeting the criterion outlined previously. The 360-degree feedback appraisal process describes a human resource methodology that is frequently used for both employee appraisal and employee development. Used in employee performance appraisals, the 360-degree feedback methodology is differentiated from traditional, top-down appraisal methods in which the supervisor responsible for the appraisal provides the majority of the data. Instead it seeks to use information gleaned from other sources to provide a fuller picture of employees' performances. Similarly, when this technique used in employee development it augments employees' perceptions of training needs with those of the people with whom they interact.</p> <p>The 360-degree feedback approach has two fundamental tenets: 1) the most effective approach to changing behavior is through feedback; and, 2) the various stake-holders interacting with an individual provide the richest source of information for this feedback. (See Figure 1).</p> <p>Research has demonstrated measurable benefits to the technique; for instance, Brett (2006) measured a positive correlation between the use of 360 degree feedback and the increases in job satisfaction. Another advantage to the approach is that the use of many inputs tends to reduce rater bias (Taversky and Kahneman 1974). Eischenger (2004) shows that rater accuracy tends to decrease over time, with those who have known the employee for more than five years to be least accurate in providing feedback.</p> <p>The 360-Degree approach is particularly well-suited to help bring about change to a long standing problem. As Jack Welch puts it - "Its [360-Degree Feedback] main value is to "out" the unspoken."</p> <p>Criticisms of 360-Degree feedback generally are focused on its use in appraisal rather than development settings. These drawbacks include the possibility of too much negative feedback as well as employees "gaming" the system. That is, since employees rate each other they may enter into agreements that result in mutual backscratching” (p.2).</p>

Citation

McCarthy, A. M., & Garavan, T. N. (2001). 360° feedback process: Performance, improvement and employee career development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 25(1), 5-32. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/215393096?accountid=14779>

Abstract

Processes involving 360 degrees feedback have gained popularity as a performance management and career development tool in contemporary organizations. McCarthy and Garavan explore the nature of 360 degrees feedback, investigate the factors that have influenced its emergence and contrast it with more traditional performance management processes used by organizations. They specifically identify the benefits and problems associated with 360 degrees feedback in the context of management of performance and employee career development. They consider the issues surrounding different sources of feedback, i.e. peer, subordinate and self. They conclude with a discussion of the issues pertaining to the use of multi-rater feedback as a tool for performance improvement and career development. The most common applications for 360 degrees feedback focus on career and other forms of employee development. The proposed purpose of the 360 degrees feedback program will influence how the raters rate the

Conclusions

“He points out that the feedback recipient completes the same structured evaluation process that managers, direct reports, team members and sometimes external clients use to evaluate his/her performance. Lepsinger and Lucia (1997) indicate that the 360° feedback process involves collecting perceptions about a person's behaviour and the impact of that behaviour from a number of rating sources. Therefore, a 360° feedback programme seeks to relay feedback to the recipient regarding his/her behaviour in the workplace and how it affects other organisational members that work with that employee (p.2).

Common terms used to refer to 360° feedback include:

- stakeholder appraisal;
- full-circle appraisal;
- multi-rater feedback;
- multi-source assessment;
- subordinate and peer appraisal;
- group performance appraisal;
- multi-point assessment; and
- multi-perspective ratings (p.2).

“In essence, the multi-source appraisal process is closely related to the tenets of the employee satisfaction survey. Edwards and Ewen suggest that the natural next step beyond departmental surveys was either upward feedback or multi-source feedback and hence the evolution and development of 360° feedback systems by organisations” (p.3).

“Lepsinger and Lucia (1998) argue that one of the consequences of flatter organisational structures is that managers are increasingly required to work with people in other parts of the organisation and are expected to achieve results, even though they have no direct authority over them. With such work structures in place, the traditional approach to appraisal proves less useful as a source of information and demands a more comprehensive process whereby peers and customers and other stakeholders can provide feedback to the individual” (p.4).

“First, it is assumed that the provision of feedback to managers about how they are viewed by subordinates, peers, superiors and customers should prompt positive change in behaviour and

<p>recipient.</p> <p>Limitations</p> <p>Link https://search.proquest.com/docview/215393096?accountid=14779</p>	<p>performance. Second, it is assumed that the implementation of 360° feedback processes will lead to increasing levels of trust and communication throughout the organisation, fewer grievances and greater customer satisfaction” (p.4).</p> <p>“360° feedback is a particularly useful tool in leadership development programmes because of the richness of the feedback that is provided by subordinates” (p.7).</p> <p>“It is widely accepted that multi-source appraisal enhances two-way communication in the host organisation (London and Beatty, 1993; Garavan et al., 1997; Bernardin and Beatty, 1987). London and Beatty (1993) argue that 360° feedback can call attention to important performance dimensions heretofore neglected by the organisation and at the same time convey organisational values to employees. They argue that 360° feedback can build more effective work relationships; increase opportunities for employee involvement; uncover and resolve conflict and demonstrate respect for employee opinions on the part of top management” (p.9).</p> <p>“An inevitable issue with multi-source appraisal is that the feedback ratings may not always be positive and may even be quite negative (London et al., 1990). Some managers when presented with negative feedback about their performance become defensive and the feedback demotivates them, which in turn has negative consequences for the organisation (Kaplan, 1993). London and Beatty (1993) highlight that multi-source feedback raises the stakes for a manager and that the process places pressure on the employee's self-concept” (p.10).</p>
<p>Citation Rosser, V. J., Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (2003). Academic deans and directors: Assessing their effectiveness from individual and institutional perspectives. <i>Journal of Higher Education</i>, 74(1), 1-25.</p> <p>Abstract An adaptation of a presentation made at the 2000 annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education is presented. A</p>	<p>Conclusions “One way to evaluate the leadership of deans and directors is with respect to the expectations of the role and the institutional purposes for evaluation (Heck, Johnsrud, & Rosser, 2000). Any number of different aspects of the role could potentially be evaluated including performance (e.g., on-the-job behavior), cognitive processes (e.g., ability to solve problems or make appropriate decisions), or effectiveness (e.g., results oriented activities such as increasing resources, improving the quality of programs).” (p 4)</p> <p>“Institutions may develop a number of specific purposes for evaluation including improving performance, affording opportunities for professional development, or granting a merit pay increase. Institutions may also wish to demonstrate to their external stakeholders that their</p>

study examined the leadership effectiveness of academic deans and directors from individual and institutional perspectives. Participants were 865 faculty and administrative staff members at a Carnegie Doctoral/Research-Extensive university in the West. Results showed the possibility of measuring leadership effectiveness at both individual and unit levels. Results also showed that greater resources generated led to stronger group perceptions of leadership effectiveness but that dollars allocated from the central budget did not appear to influence perceptions, that deans leading larger units were rated stronger in terms of effectiveness, that female deans were rated stronger in terms of effectiveness, and that department chairs rated the effectiveness of deans more strongly than did other faculty and staff members. Further results and implications of the results are presented.

Limitations

Focuses on Dean effectiveness

Link

<http://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eft&AN=507798502&site=eds-live>

administrators as a group are effective. Such a purpose requires a set of common criteria that is appropriate to each member of the group as well as a means to assess the criteria across a number of administrators, each functioning within a specific unit-level context.” (p 4)

“The varied view on the dean's role suggests that no single evaluation model is likely to include all of the important responsibilities, skills, or results associated with the leadership of deans and directors” (p 5)

“In contrast to the perspectives of superiors in describing criteria needed for success as a dean, this study focuses on the exchange process between deans and their faculty and staff members.” (p 6)

“We attempted to examine variation in leadership effectiveness of deans at two levels of analysis summarized in Figure 1. First, we assumed there would be within-unit variation in how faculty and staff viewed the dean's leadership effectiveness across the several specific leadership domains. Second, after adjusting for these clustering effects, we examined differences in leadership effectiveness among the set of deans and directors and also preliminarily explored whether group level variables (e.g., amounts of resources, size and type of unit) would affect the variation in leadership effectiveness observed among the set of Administrators.” (p 8)

“To evaluate the leadership effectiveness of deans, surveys were mailed to all 1,950 faculty and staff members reporting to the 22 deans and directors. Three mailings yielded 865 usable responses from the faculty and administrative staff (a 54% return rate) of the deans.” (p. 9)

“Faculty members were classified as instructors, researchers, specialists, and librarians. The administrative staff consisted of the executive/managerial staff, administrative, professional and technical staff, and clerical/secretarial employees of the deans” (p 9).

“The instrument was designed to gather information about the effectiveness of deans in fulfilling their leadership roles and responsibilities as perceived by their faculty and administrative staff. In developing the instrument, there was extensive consultation between all deans and a university-wide committee (consisting of deans, faculty members, administrative staff, and senior administrators). The instrument was sent to all deans for their review and comment and modified

	<p>as to incorporate suggestions of the deans. Finally, the survey was pilot tested on a subset of the deans by a committee consisting of faculty members and administrators” (p 10)</p> <p>“Seven domains of leadership responsibility were agreed upon by the committee based on the professional literature on deans and a review of existing evaluation instruments. These domains included vision and goal setting (Visgoal), management of the unit (Mgmt), interpersonal relationships (Interp), communication skills (Comm), research, professional, and community endeavors (Resear), quality of the unit's education (Quality), and support for institutional diversity (Diverse). The seven domains were defined by a total of 58 Likert-type items” (p 10)</p> <p>“A response of "1" indicated the respondent had an unsatisfactory perception of the performance of the dean on that item, and a response of "5" indicated an outstanding level of performance on that item. A choice of either NA (not applicable) or DK (don't know) was also available as a response to each item. Each leadership domain, therefore, was defined by a series of items. All leadership domains were judged to be highly reliable, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients (i.e., a measure of internal consistency) above 0.9.” (p 10)</p> <p>“we found that the level of external resources associated with the unit (0.39, $p < 0.05$) and the size of the unit (0.33, $p < 0.05$) were significantly related to differences in perceptions of leadership effectiveness. The level of external resources of the unit is one variable we might expect to account for differences in leadership effectiveness. For example, deans are increasingly expected to help their units acquire external funds. It may be that larger units are also able to accrue more external resources” (p 16)</p> <p>“In preliminary analyses, we found no significant effect of instructional and non-instructional dollars allocated to the unit or type of group unit (e.g., organized research groups, professional schools) to explain differences in the leadership effectiveness of deans. Although we might expect these latter types of resources to be related to the perception of effectiveness, it may be that deans are not perceived to have the same amount of control over these funds.” (p 16)</p>
<p>Citation Smither, J. W., London, M., & Reilly, R. R. (2005). Does performance improve following</p>	<p>Conclusions “Nearly all of the effect sizes for direct report, peer, and supervisor feedback were positive. However, the magnitude of improvement was very small. It is also noteworthy that in most</p>

multisource feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis, and review of empirical findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(1), 33-66. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/220149152?accountid=14779>

Abstract

We review evidence showing that multisource feedback ratings are related to other measures of leadership effectiveness and that different rater sources conceptualize performance in a similar manner. We then describe a meta-analysis of 24 longitudinal studies showing that improvement in direct report, peer, and supervisor ratings over time is generally small. We present a theoretical framework and review empirical evidence suggesting performance improvement should be more likely for some feedback recipients than others. Specifically, improvement is most likely to occur when feedback indicates that change is necessary, recipients have a positive feedback orientation, perceive a need to change their behavior, react positively to the feedback, believe change is feasible, set appropriate goals to regulate their behavior, and take actions that lead to skill and performance improvement.

Limitations

Link

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/220149152?accountid=14779>

instances there remained a large percentage of variance in effect sizes that was not explained by sampling error, even after accounting for the effects of moderator variables. This suggests that other factors might affect the extent of behavior change associated with multisource feedback. (p 42).

Citation

Tourish, D., & Robson, P. (2003). Critical upward feedback in organisations: Processes, problems and implications for communication management. *Journal of Communication Management*, 8(2), 150-167. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/232909606?accountid=14779>

Abstract

Given that staff-management relationships are a core concern for communication management, upward feedback is emerging as a key theme in the literature. It is, however, most often associated with upward appraisal. This study looks at upward feedback in a more general sense, and in particular at whether such feedback is critical or positive in its response to senior management decisions. One hundred and forty-six staff within a health care organisation (HCO) were surveyed, using a depth communication audit instrument. Fifteen staff were also interviewed in detail, and six focus groups each composed of six people were also convened. The results indicated that informal upward feedback was mostly absent; that where it occurred the feedback was inaccurately positive; that senior managers were unaware of such distortions and unwilling to contemplate the possibility that they did indeed exist; that they had an exaggerated impression of how much upward feedback they received; and that they discouraged the transmission of

Conclusions

“It has been argued that upward feedback, upward communication and open-door policies deliver significant organisational benefits. These include:

- The promotion of shared leadership, and an enhanced willingness by managers to act on employee suggestions
- A greater tendency by employees to report positive changes in their managers’ behavior
- Actual rather than perceived improvements in management behavior following from feedback, beyond what could be attributed to regression to the mean
- A reduced gap between managers’ self rating and those of their subordinates
- The creation of improved forums for obtaining information, garnering suggestions, defusing conflicts and facilitating the expression of discontent” (p. 151)

“Significant problems have, however, been reported with the delivery of upward feedback. Research suggests that feedback tends to flow mainly from persons in authority to their subordinates” (p 151)

“The limited upward feedback that occurs tends to be flawed in the sense that positive upward feedback is a more common occurrence than negative upward feedback...The managers concerned perceived many more instances of negative feedback than their subordinates. Both managers and subordinates, however perceived the same level of positive feedback” (p. 151)

“Nutt studied 356 decisions in medium to large-sized organizations. He concluded that one half of the decisions made within such organisations failed...key factors explaining such failures were a tendency by managers to impose solutions, limit the search for alternatives and use power rather than influence/persuasion to implement their plans.” (p 151)

Trust and openness affect how upward communication can successfully occur.

critical feedback. The implications for the practice of communication management, the development of upward influence within organisations and general theoretical reasons for distortions in feedback processes are considered.

Limitations

Old

Link

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/232909606?accountid=14779>

Citation

Turrentine, C. G., Lener, E. F., Young, M. L., & Kok, V. T. (2004). A qualitative approach to upward evaluation of leadership performance: Pros and cons. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30(4), 304-313. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2004.04.004

Abstract

This article describes a qualitative upward evaluation of the leadership performance of library managers. Follow-up studies were conducted, focusing on the advantages and disadvantages of the qualitative approach to upward appraisal. The authors discuss pros and cons to guide others who might use this methodology for upward appraisals in the future.

Limitations

Conclusions

“Eligible participants for the original upward performance appraisal were the 127 librarians and classified staff members in all branches of the University Libraries at Virginia Tech. Student employees were not eligible to participate. Instrument This study used a locally developed instrument, the Leadership Performance Survey, which is a short, locally developed, qualitative, written survey instrument focused on leadership. The instrument and cover letter appear in Appendix A.” (p 305)

“The team discussed the model of leadership developed by Kouzes and Posner. This model includes five leadership practices (challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart), with each practice subdivided into two related commitments. For example, the practice titled “modeling the way” includes the commitments to “set the example” and “achieve small wins.” Starting from this rather lengthy list, the appraisal team added and subtracted leadership practices that in their view are most important to library employees.” (p 305)

“To help respondents understand the qualities to be assessed in each section, the committee provided brief examples of each.” (p. 305)

Dated
Librarian
**Rubric included!

Link

<http://ezproxy.uvu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edselp&AN=S009913330400062X&site=eds-live>

“In each section, the respondent was asked to provide examples of “things this person does well in this area” and “things this person could do to improve performance in this area.” A brief space was provided for response in each section, and respondents were invited to use additional paper if necessary” (p 305)

“To make data analysis possible, respondents were asked to identify the person being evaluated and to check one of the following options: “I report to this person,” or “I do not report to this person, but I feel I know his or her work well enough to comment on at least some aspects of leadership.”” (p 305)

“Hard copies of the Leadership Performance Survey were distributed with a cover letter from the dean to all salaried library personnel. Respondents were given three ways to complete the survey: in hard copy, online, or by personal interview. Three e-mail reminders were sent over the following ten days, and the final due date for returning the surveys was set for two weeks after original distribution.” (p. 306)

A second survey was distributed for those who chose not to participate the first time. It included a list of options to select which varied from personal value and time to concerns about retaliations. (p 306)

A year after the first survey the team leads met with management for a semistructured interview concerning the “advantages and disadvantages of the qualitative appraisal” (p 306)

One department did a focus group with respondents as well. The manager of that department had “shar[ed] some of the feedback she had received from the dean” in an effort to “close the loop” (p 306)

“Members of the appraisal team summarized the responses concerning individual managers in a confidential report for the dean. Copies of the raw responses to the Leadership Performance Survey for each manager were included in an appendix so that she could verify the accuracy of the appraisal team’s perceptions. The report specified, however, that these responses were confidential and should not be shared with the managers about whom they were written in order to protect the confidentiality of the respondents.” (p 307)

“Based on this report and the dean’s own reading of the raw response data, she prepared a written summary for each individual manager. She shared this in a private meeting with each manager. Later the dean called a special meeting of all library employees to share in a general way the results of the upward appraisal. Then each manager met with employees to share the overall feedback he or she had received. Individual results from this portion of the assessment are not reported here to preserve confidentiality” (p 307)

In response to why staff members had not taken the original survey “The most common responses to this survey indicated concern about confidentiality (n = 12), concern about retribution (n = 9), and a belief that completing the survey was a waste of time (n = 6).” (p 307)

“The dean considered the process very successful overall and indicated a desire to repeat it approximately every five years. She found the team’s report to be well organized and useful but noted that seeing the full data herself was helpful to developing a complete picture. She also indicated a desire to see a higher response rate. In describing her one-on-one meetings with the managers, she found that while some were initially threatened by the process, most had recognized as legitimate the points identified by the survey responses as needing improvement” (p 307).

“The managers expressed a high level of satisfaction with the survey process and the degree of confidentiality maintained by the appraisal team. Those who had been through past upward evaluations that had been strictly quantitative in nature generally liked the qualitative format, although some would have preferred a mix of qualitative and quantitative questions. Nearly all managers recommended that an appraisal such as this one be conducted on a regular basis, with most suggesting a three-year interval.” (p 307)

“Managers also commented that there had been no further follow-up on the results of this appraisal to assess progress on implementing any suggested changes.” (p 307)

Both Managers and employees were concerned about confidentiality throughout the process and felt that the safeguards put in place were appropriate. However, each side of that equation felt out of the loop on the results. Employees wanted more information on what the managers had

been told to improve, and what other employees had said, and the managers had wanted more specific details or to see which employee had given various responses. Both of these requests would have removed the confidentiality of the the project.

“The authors observed that this process seemed to work best in departments where relationships between the manager and the employees were already fairly strong. In those cases, the employees felt comfortable in responding to the survey and the managers felt comfortable in receiving feedback from the survey. Most of the responses concerned suggestions for changes in specific behaviors that would be relatively easy to accomplish and that would make a visible difference in the function of the unit. This is precisely the way that an upward evaluation is supposed to work.” (p 308)

“In departments where the relationships between the manager and the employees were already very strained, this appraisal process did not work nearly so well. The response rate in those departments was much lower because the employees did not trust the confidentiality or efficacy of the appraisal process. The willingness of the managers in those departments to accept the feedback of the employees was much lower. In those departments, the types of comments that employees made were more likely to center on personality issues, which were unlikely to lead to change, rather than on leadership behaviors that might reasonably be changed.” (p 308-309)