DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 110 HE 014 136

AUTHOR Hengstler, Dennis D.; And Others
TITLE Faculty Ratings as a Measure of Administrator Quality. AIR Forum 1981 Paper.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (21st, Minneapolis, MN, May 17-20, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Black Colleges; College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Decision Making; *Department Heads; Departments; Discriminant Analysis; Factor Analysis; Higher Education; Leadership Responsibility; Multiple Regression Analysis; *Rating Scales; State Universities; *Teacher Attitudes; *Test Reliability; Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum

ABSTRACT

The reliability, factor structure, and discriminatory power of faculty perceptions of the performance of departmental administrators were investigated, using the Administrator Evaluation Survey (AES) developed at the University of Illinois. Faculty from a major research university in the midwest, a smaller state university in the midwest, and a predominantly black state university located in the southeast participated. The approximately 350 faculty respondents represented 16 departments. Factor loadings on the 17 items of the AES were determined for each university. Two functions appeared to separate the three universities in terms of (1) the head's departmental leadership--communicating departmental needs to higher level administrators, allocating resources among faculty, directing promotion and tenure process, and making difficult decisions; and (2) the head's departmental management--handling routine duties, resolving tensions, encouraging good teaching, making difficult decisions, and improving scholarly reputation. To determine whether the AES was able to detect differences among departments within a given institution, similar multivariate analyses were conducted on the major research university's ratings. Three functions appeared to separate the department heads in terms of the department head's contribution toward improving the reputation of the department, the head's administrative ability, and the head's handling of curricular/instructional matters. A revision of the AES to 11 items was also tested. Overall, it is concluded that factor analysis of the AES suggests that department administrators are evaluated by their faculty along one general dimension or factor. Possible reasons for the observed unidimensionality of the AES are considered. A sample questionnaire is included. (SW)

FACULTY RATINGS AS A MEASURE OF ADMINISTRATOR QUALITY

by

Dennis D. Hengstler, Evaluation Specialist
Office of Institutional Research
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412
(919) 379-5930

Norman P. Uhl
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
for Research, Evaluation and Planning
North Carolina Central University
Durham, North Carolina 27707
(919) 683-6367

Donald J. Reichard, Director
Office of Institutional Research
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412
(919) 379-5930

A Paper Presented at the Twenty-First Annual Forum
of the Association for Institutional Research
Minneapolis, Minnesota
May 19, 1981

THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

This paper was presented at the Twenty-First Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Leamington Hotel in Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 17-20, 1981. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Mary Corcoran
University of Minnesota
(Editor, AIR Forum Publications)

Abstract

This study examines the usefulness of faculty ratings as a measure of administrator quality. Approximately 350 faculty from 16 departments across three universities responded to a survey which assessed their perceptions of the performance of their department heads. The study explores the reliability and validity of faculty ratings of departmental administrators and discusses the utility and applications of faculty ratings as an integral part of formal administrator review programs in a variety of institutional settings.

FACULTY RATINGS AS A MEASURE OF ADMINISTRATOR QUALITY

In response to increased fiscal and "accountability" pressures, colleges and universities are beginning to pay closer attention to the performance of departmental administrators. Many universities, notably the University of Illinois, the State University of New York, and Texas Christian University, have initiated formal evaluation procedures of department heads/chairpersons*. Other universities (e.g. Kansas State University and Ball State University) while not requiring the evaluation of administrators, have developed evaluation procedures for department heads who wish to be evaluated.

One reason why department heads are becoming the focus of attention is because of their importance within the university structure (Dressel and Reichard, 1970; Faricy, 1974; Fisher, 1978; Smart and Montgomery, 1976). It is commonly assumed that by improving the quality of the department head, the quality of the department, college or university would also be improved (Hoyt and Spangler, 1979). This symbiotic relationship between the head and the department, however, has seldom been empirically demonstrated (Hengstler, Brandenburg, Braskamp, and Smock, in press).

Various criteria and appraisal methods (Farmer, 1979; Fisher, 1978; Genova, Madoff, Chin and Thomas, 1976; Smart and Montgomery, 1976; and Shtogren, 1978) have been suggested for use in the evaluation of academic administrators. Berquist and Tenbrink (1978), in a survey of four hundred American colleges and universities, identified six major procedures used in university, college, and departmental administrator evaluation which includes unstructured narration or essay appraisal, unstructured documentation, structured narration, rating scales, structured documentation, and management by objectives. In the past, the unstructured narration or essay appraisal

*No delineation was made between department heads and chairpersons in this study.

combined with the confidential interview with the dean was the most common and preferred method of department head evaluation (Lahti, 1978; Farmer, 1979). Increasingly, faculty perceptions and judgments collected systematically are being considered in an evaluation of the department head (Smart and Montgomery, 1976; Fisher, 1978; Ehrle, 1975; and Hillway, 1973).

In his review of administrator evaluation efforts, Farmer (1976) identified three primary reasons given for faculty evaluation of the department head/chairperson. The most common reason was related to institutional self-evaluation. As he pointed out: "Much of the current emphasis on the evaluation and development of academic administrators in fact originates from the trend toward institutional evaluation which of necessity includes an assessment of all groups in the educational enterprise." Farmer's second rationale for faculty evaluation of administrators stemmed from research or immediate experience with student evaluations of instruction. Often, the pressure for systematic administrator evaluation came from faculty who developed negative attitudes toward the formalized program of student evaluation of instruction on their campus (Peterson, 1976). The final reason was related to the head/chairperson's desire to have faculty opinions and judgments about their performance for self-improvement purposes.

With the increased movement toward accountability and general acceptance of the concept of administrator evaluation, it appears that the evaluation of department heads will continue to increase over the next decade. One source of information that will be particularly important in the evaluation will be faculty ratings of the head's performance.

A review of the major faculty rating forms of administrator performance reveals that all of the instruments have been developed since 1970 (Ehrle, 1975; Fenker, 1975; Galina, 1978; Goodwin and Smith, 1979; Hillway, 1973; Lahti, 1978;

McCarthy, Note 1; Ryan, Abbot, Cook, Denham, Kimball, Klein, and Metcalf, Note 2; Uhl & Pratt, Note 3). Typically, the number of items in the questionnaires ranged from twenty-five (Hillway, 1973) to sixty-eight (McCarthy, Note 1), and most questionnaires incorporated a five-point response scale.

In comparison to student ratings of instruction, research on the reliability and validity of faculty ratings of administrator performance has been relatively limited. For the most part, research has concentrated on identifying the underlying factor structure of the forms using principal components analysis with varimax rotation.

Studies by both Fenker (1975) and Klein and Denham (1974) identified four underlying factors to their respective surveys. In the Fenker (1975) study the four factors were: (1) Information/Communication - related to the accumulation of pertinent information before acting or communicating important information; (2) Goal Completion - related to planning activities, initiating and sustaining action toward a goal; (3) A delegation of responsibility factor; and (4) Personal Skills - related to ease in establishing rapport, success in working with committees, and sensitivity to the contributions of others.

Perhaps the most extensively used and researched administrator evaluation survey is the DECA system (Departmental Evaluation of Chairperson Activities), developed by Don Hoyt and his associates at Kansas State University. The goal of the DECA system is to identify discrepancies between chairperson and faculty objectives and faculty perceptions of whether the chairperson is achieving those objectives.

The DECA system initially grew out of a dissertation by McCarthy (Note 1) who expanded Siever's work (Note 4) on administrator evaluation. Spangler (Note 5) revised McCarthy's form to 15 activity items and 33 behavior items. Using data from 113 departments from four public universities, split-half and intraclass

reliability coefficients were computed on the ratings of the head/chairperson's performance. For the split-half reliability estimates of the activity items, the coefficients ranged from .60 to .91 with a median of .81. For the intra-class reliability estimates, the median was .70 and ranged fro .49 to .81. Reliabilities for the thirty-three behavior items ranged from (split-half reliability estimates) and from .55 to .76 (intraclass reliability estimates). Lin (Note 6), using Hillway's (1973) initial survey, found similar test-retest reliability coefficients. Coefficient alpha for the Hillway survey was found to be .97.

Spangler (Note 5) also conducted several principal component factor analyses with varimax and oblique rotations on the ratings of the department head/chair-person's performance for both the activity and behavioral items. The factor analysis of the average faculty performance ratings (i.e., the department as the unit of analysis) on the activity items yielded three factors which accounted for seventy-four percent of the total variance. The first factor was labeled "Personal Management Activities" and included such items as rewards faculty appropriately, maintains faculty morale, allocates faculty responsibilities, fosters faculty development and guides faculty evaluation procedures. The second factor, "Planning and Development," included such items as guides curriculum development, guides organization and planning, fosters good teaching, encourages balance among specializations, and faculty recruitment. The third factor, "Concern for Department's Reputation," centered on items dealing with the head/chairperson's facilitation of extramural funding, communication of departmental needs, improving departmental image, and stimulating research/scholarly activity.

A factor analysis of the individual faculty ratings of administrators was also conducted on the activity items. Here, only one factor was extracted. All

items had high loadings on this factor, which strongly suggests that the faculty ratings of the head's performance were susceptible to halo effects (Spangler, (Note 5).

As is apparent, no consistent factor structure has emerged in regards to faculty ratings of administrator performance. Although the test-retest and internal consistentcy measures of faculty rating instruments appear to be fairly high, generalizations are extremely dangerous given the limited number of studies.

The purpose of the present study was thus, to investigate the reliability, factor structure, and discriminatory power of faculty perceptions of the performance of departmental administrators.

METHOD

Instrument

The instrument used in this study was the Administrator Evaluation Survey (AES) developed at the University of Illinois (Office of Instructional Resources and Office of Planning and Evaluation, Note 7). The development of the AES was guided by a principle that the instrument should consist of a core set of items and an optional set to be selected by the individual department head from an item catalog. Based on a review of the literature and related questionnaires, nine major components of departmental administration were identified (i.e. Faculty: recruitment, promotion/tenure/salary, development; Curriculum and Instruction, External Relations: college/university, discipline, public and private agencies; Personnel/Administration, Financial Management, Students, Governance, Goals/Policies/Programs/Planning, and Leadership: interpersonal, informational, and decision roles). Items were constructed for each component and organized into the AES Item Catalog. After the item catalog was completed, one or more items from each component were selected for inclusion in the AES (Table 1). The response

Table 1

Administrator Evaluation Survey (AES)

	Poor				Excellent	No Opinion	Not Applicab
1. The leadership of the head in the promotion and tenure process.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
2. Encouragement of the scholarly and professional growth of the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
3. Facilitates appropriate balance among academic specializations within the department.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
4. Leadership in planning and developing curricular/instructional programs.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
5. Encouragement of good teaching in the department.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
6. Effectiveness in communicating departmental needs to the Dean and/or central administration.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
7. Contribution toward improving/maintaining the reputation of the department within the discipline.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
8. Support of faculty efforts to obtain grants and contracts from external sources for faculty research.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
9. Performance in handling the routine administrative affairs of the department.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
10. Effectiveness in allocating available funds and other resources among the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
11. Receptivity to faculty suggestions and opinions on important departmental matters.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___

Table 1 (Cont'd)

	Poor				Excellent	No Opinion	Not Applicable
12. Effectiveness in providing academic direction to the department.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
13. Effectiveness in resolving tensions within the department.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
14. Recognition and reward of faculty contributions to the department.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
15. Effectiveness in keeping faculty informed on matters of potential importance or interest.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
16. Willingness to make difficult decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___
17. The scholarly reputation of the head within the discipline.	1	2	3	4	5	___	___

format for the 17 AES items consisted of a five-point bipolar (poor-excellent) response scale.

Subjects

The data source utilized in this study was faculty from three diverse universities (Universities A, B, C) who completed the AES. University A is a major research university located in the midwest. Six departments from a variety of disciplines (e.g., business, education, fine and applied arts) agreed to participate in the study. A total of 233 faculty or 79 percent of those receiving the AES at University A completed the survey. The return rate of the faculty in the six departments ranged from 70 to 94 percent.

The second university participating in this study was also a public university located in the midwest having a much smaller enrollment than University A. Four departments administered the AES to their faculty. The overall response rate from University B was 80 percent (N=49); the lowest return rate was 64 percent from Department One.

The third university (University C) participating in the study was a predominantly black public university located in the southeast. Six departments administered the AES to their faculty. The overall response rate from University C was 62 percent (N=51). The lowest return rate was from Department Three with 43 percent. The lower rate for University C may be due in part to the fact that the evaluations of the department heads were not mandatory as was the case for University B and for four of the six departments at University A.

RESULTS

Factor Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis was first performed separately on the faculty ratings of the AES for each of the universities. The extraction program was PA2, part of the SPSS statistical package (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975). Communalities were estimated using squared multiple correlations, and factors were rotated to obtain an oblique simple structure factor pattern.

Based on the Scree tests (Catell, 1966), one factor was extracted from University A and C ratings on the AES. The percent of variance accounted for by the factor was 44% and 76% for University A and C, respectively. For University B, however, four factors were extracted which accounted for 74% of the total variance. The first eight eigenvalues for University B ratings were: 8.36, 1.74, 1.38, 1.09, .82, .71, .59, .43. The first eigenvalue for each university was over 7.00 suggesting a strong and important first factor. The dissimilarity of the extracted factors for University B data may be a function of the restricted sample size (N=49).

Presented in Table 2 are the factor loadings (item correlations with first principal axis) for University A and C, as well as the factor loading for University B. As indicated, the loadings on Factor I ranged from .51 (Item 1) to .71 (Item 12) for University A and from .78 (Item 9) to .95 (Item 17) for University C. This factor for University A and C was thus labeled "Overall Impression of the Administrator's Performance".

The initial AES factor extracted from University B ratings was labeled "Administrative Leadership". Ten of the 17 AES items had loadings greater than .30 on this factor. The ten items dealt primarily with the department head's effectiveness in communicating information, making decisions, and performing administrative duties. The second factor was concerned with the "department head's academic leadership". Five items helping to define this factor were those dealing with the heads: facilitation of balance among the specializations within the department, encouragement of good teaching, receptivity to faculty opinions on departmental matters, planning and developing curricular/instructional programs and allocation of funds and resources among the faculty. The third factor was related to the head's "scholarly reputation", and the fourth factor involved the head's "leadership in improving the department's reputation".

Table 2

Faculty Loadings on Items on the Administrator Evaluation Survey (AES)

ITEM		University A Factor I	University C Factor I	University B Factor I	University B Factor II	University B Factor III	University B Factor IV
1	Leadership in the promotion and tenure process	.51	.90	.17	.07	.34	-.18
2	Encouragement of professional growth of faculty	.69	.90	.49	.13	.26	.38
3	Facilitates balance among academic specialization in department	.65	.81	-.04	.88	-.05	.25
4	Leadership in planning curricular/instructional programs	.62	.86	.04	.64	.05	-.27
5	Encourage good teaching in department	.66	.86	-.05	.84	.11	-.34
6	Effectiveness in communicating dept. needs to central administration	.56	.89	.91	-.09	-.01	-.01
7	Contribution toward improving reputation of department	.70	.89	.34	.12	.36	-.55
8	Support of faculty efforts to obtain grants from external sources	.54	.84	.57	-.07	.05	-.03
9	Performance in handling routine administrative affairs of department	.62	.78	.67	.16	.00	-.07
10	Effectiveness in allocating available funds/resources among faculty	.55	.85	.24	.62	.03	.24
11	Receptivity to faculty suggestions and opinions	.71	.88	.16	.78	.05	.05
12	Effectiveness in providing academic direction to department	.73	.92	.71	.18	.01	.22
13	Effectiveness in resolving tensions within the department	.69	.88	.54	.27	.02	.14
14	Recognition and reward of faculty contributions to the department	.64	.88	.74	-.07	.10	.22
15	Effectiveness in keeping faculty informed on matters of importance	.68	.82	.84	.08	-.03	-.18
16	Willingness to make difficult decisions	.73	.81	.79	.13	-.06	-.23
17	Scholarly reputation of the head within the discipline	.65	.95	-.13	-.02	1.02	-.09

The correlations among the four AES factors ranged from .55 between Factors 1 and 2 to -.03 between factors 3 and 4. The median correlation was .19. The determinants of the correlation matrices for each of the universities were very small (i.e. less than .004). Given the size of the determinants and the restricted sample sizes for University B and C, caution must be emphasized in making generalizations from the factor patterns.

Reliability

To determine the reliability of the AES, coefficient alphas (Cronbach, 1951) were computed separately for each University. Coefficient alpha (α) is an estimate of the internal consistency of the survey and provides a lower bound on the reliability of the scale (Lord and Novick, 1968). Coefficient alphas for the AES were .96, .92, and .96 for Universities A, B, and C, respectively, indicating a relatively high degree of internal consistency.

Discriminant Analysis

One characteristic of a valid rating instrument is its ability to detect differences across subgroups (i.e. its ability to discriminate). In order to determine whether there were significant differences in the AES among universities, a multivariate analysis was conducted. Using the 17 AES items as dependent variables, the three universities were compared using Wilks lambda (λ) criterion (Tatsuoka, 1971). The Wilks' lambda statistic was computed and found to be .917 with a significance of $p < .05$. It was concluded that significant differences existed across the three universities.

A discriminant analysis was then conducted to determine where the differences existed. Using Bartlett's test for the significance of residual roots, two significant discriminant functions ($p < .05$) were identified. An examination of the total discriminatory power of the two discriminant functions (Sachdeva, 1973) indicated that 23 percent ($\omega^2 = .23$) of the variability in the discriminant space was attributable to group differences.

Presented in Table 3 are the standardized discriminant weights for each of the two functions. As indicated, the two functions appeared to separate the three universities in terms of (1) Head's Departmental Leadership - communicating departmental needs to higher level administrators, allocating resources among faculty, directing promotion and tenure process, and making difficult decisions; and (2) Head's Departmental Management - handling routine duties, resolving tensions, encouraging good teaching, making difficult decisions, and improving scholarly reputation. Ten of the 17 AES items were particularly effective in separating the three universities.

To determine whether the AES was able to detect differences among departments within a given institution, similar multivariate analyses were conducted on University A ratings. The small number of faculty ($N = 5$) in selected departments at University B and C prohibited the multivariate analyses for these respective universities.

Significant differences ($\lambda = .293$; $p < .001$) were also found in the ratings among the six University A departments, when the 17 AES items were used as dependent variables. Again, a discriminant analysis was conducted to determine where the differences existed.

The total discriminatory power of the set of discriminant functions was high ($\omega^2 = .70$). Approximately 87 percent of the total discriminatory power was attributable to the first three discriminant functions. Little was added by the remaining two functions. Consistent with the finding, Bartlett's test for the significance of the residual roots indicated that only the first three functions were significant ($p < .01$)

The standardized discriminant weights for the three significant AES functions are presented in Table 4. As indicated, the three functions appeared to separate the six department heads in terms of (1) the department head's

Table 3

AES Standardized Discriminant Weights for Ratings from University A, B, & C

	AES Item	Discriminant Function 1	2
1	Leadership in the promotion and tenure process	-.34	-.08
2	Encouragement of professional growth of faculty	-.15	.01
3	Facilitates balance among academic specialization in department	-.06	.05
4	Leadership in planning curricular/instructional programs	.12	-.31
5	Encourage good teaching in department	.28	.46
6	Effectiveness in communicating dept. needs to central administration	-.39	.31
7	Contribution toward improving reputation of department	-.15	.27
8	Support of faculty efforts to obtain grants from external sources	-.28	.08
9	Performance in handling routine administrative affairs of department	-.01	-.71
10	Effectiveness in allocating available funds/resources among faculty	-.36	-.03
11	Receptivity to faculty suggestions and opinions	-.01	-.25
12	Effectiveness in providing academic direction to department	.02	.14
13	Effectiveness in resolving tensions within the department	-.27	.69
14	Recognition and reward of faculty contributions to the department	.09	.28
15	Effectiveness in keeping faculty informed on matters of importance	.11	-.30
16	Willingness to make difficult decisions	.31	-.45
17	Scholarly reputation of the head within the discipline	-.09	-.36
		University Centroids	
	University A	-.26	1.00
	University B	.16	-.70
	University C	.95	.23

Table 4

AES STANDARDIZED DISCRIMINANT WEIGHTS
FOR RATING FROM SIX UNIVERSITY A DEPARTMENTS

	ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION SURVEY ITEM	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION 1	2	3
1	Leadership in the promotion and tenure process	-.08	-.03	.29
2	Encouragement of professional growth of faculty	-.47	-.18	.24
3	Facilitates balance among academic specialization in department	-.32	.07	-.54
4	Leadership in planning curricular/instructional programs	.01	.26	.88
5	Encouragement of good teaching in department	.20	-.26	-.29
6	Effectiveness in communicating department needs to central administration	-.21	-.10	-.03
7	Contribution toward improving reputation of department	-.59	.11	-.56
8	Support of faculty efforts to obtain grants from external sources	.32	-.27	.06
9	Performance in handling routine administrative affairs of department	-.32	.73	-.57
10	Effectiveness in allocating available funds/resources among faculty	.31	.37	.22
11	Receptivity to faculty suggestions and opinions	.12	-.19	.22
12	Effectiveness in providing academic direction to the department	.56	-.17	-.51
13	Effectiveness in resolving tensions within the department	.21	-.23	-.23
14	Recognition and reward of faculty contributions to the department	.34	.05	.20
15	Effectiveness in keeping faculty informed on matters of importance	-.42	.05	-.26
16	Willingness to make difficult decisions	.19	.73	.88
17	Scholarly reputation of the head within the discipline	-.62	-.70	.26

Table 4 (Cont'd)

	DEPARTMENTAL CENTROIDS		
	1	2	3
Department 1	-2.84	1.01	- .00
Department 2	-3.95	.85	- .45
Department 3	-2.30	.73	.36
Department 4	-3.30	.74	1.18
Department 5	-4.30	-1.25	.90
Department 6	-4.00	1.70	.80

contribution towards improving the reputation of the department; (2) the head's administrative ability; and (3) the head's handling of curricular/instructional matters. Twelve of the 17 AES items were particularly effective in separating the six department heads.

Revised AES

Based upon these results and those of a previous study (Hengstler, Brandenburg, Braskamp, and Smock, in press), the AES was revised to 11 items (Table 5). Eight of the original AES items were retained, six were eliminated, two witnessed a slight change in wording and one item was added.

The revised AES was completed by faculty (N=87) from four departments in the Business and Agriculture colleges at University A. Faculty from each department ranged from 15 to 36 full-time faculty. A factor analysis of these ratings, using identical procedures described above, again yielded a one factor solution. Item correlations with the first principal axis ranged from .83 (Item 9) to .93 (Item 7). The reliability (coefficient alpha) of the revised AES was found to be very high (.95).

To determine if the revised AES was able to detect differences across departments, ratings from the four departments were submitted to a multivariate analyses as described above. Significant differences (λ =.68, $P < .001$) were found in the ratings across the four departments. The total discriminatory power of the set of discriminant functions was also very high (ω^2=.88).

Table 6 presents the standardized discriminant weights for the three discriminant functions. Similar patterns were found in the discriminant weights with those of the earlier sample form University A.

DISCUSSION

The factor analysis of the AES suggests that department administrators are evaluated by their faculty along one general dimension or factor. This result is consistent with those obtained in other factor analytic studies of faculty

Table 5

Revised Administrator Evaluation Survey

	Poor				Excellent
1. Performance in handling the routine affairs of the department.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Judicious consideration of faculty views in dealing with important departmental policies and issues.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Effectiveness in providing academic direction to the department.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Effectiveness in communicating departmental needs to the Dean and/or central administration.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Effectiveness in establishing and implementing budget priorities.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Leadership in the promotion and tenure process.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Concern for quality of education students receive.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Recognition and reward of faculty contributions to the department.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Encouragement of research and scholarly activities among faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Encouragement of good teaching in the department.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Contribution toward improving/ maintaining the reputation of the department within the discipline.	1	2	3	4	5

Table 6

Revised AES Standardized Discriminant Weights for Ratings from Four University A Departments

AES Item Old	AES Item New		Discriminant Function I	II	III
1	1	Performance in handling the routine affairs of the department	.02	-.30	.25
2	2	Judicious consideration of faculty views in dealing with important departmental policies and issues	.53	.44	-1.20
5	3	Effectiveness in providing academic direction to the department.	-.36	-.12	-.15
6	4	Effectiveness in communicating departmental needs to the Dean and/or central administration.	.37	.79	-.26
7	5	Effectiveness in establishing and implementing budget priorities	-.32	-.81	.31
9	6	Leadership in the promotion and tenure process	.74	1.06	.20
10	7	Concern for quality of education students receive	-.05	-.48	.71
11	8	Recognition and reward of faculty contributions to the department	-.00	-.63	.88
12	9	Encouragement of research and scholarly activities among faculty	-.75	.11	-.31
14	10	Encouragement of good teaching in the department	-.26	.00	.08
18	11	Contribution toward improving/maintaining the reputation of the department within the discipline	.51	-.22	-.54
			Departmental Centroids		
		Department 1	.72	-1.56	-.37
		Department 2	2.62	.57	.29
		Department 3	-1.55	-.15	1.15
		Department 4	-1.01	.44	-.58

ratings of the department head (Spangler, Note 5; Fenker, 1975; Klein & Denham, 1974) which found a strong factor measuring the overall performance of the head.

The unidimensionality of the AES may be a function of both a generosity error and a halo effect. The single factor extracted by Spangler (Note 5) led him to conclude that a "halo effect may have obscured the underlying (factor) structure" of faculty ratings of the heads. Faculty may simply have a vested interest in the department and its head and give high ratings to the department and its administrator reflecting a potential generosity error. In a similar manner, faculty may rate the administrator in terms of an overall impression without differentiating specific aspects of his/her behavior. The potential halo effect in the ratings is often regarded as invalid variance; however, it could be viewed as a potential higher order or general factor which does not necessarily represent invalid variance.

Another likely contributing factor to the observed unidimensionality of the AES may be the lack of specificity in the AES items. The items may simply be too general in nature to measure specific attributes of the department head. This is similar to the argument that is currently being made in regard to student ratings of instruction (Brandenburg, Derry, and Hengstler, Note 8).

A question that is often raised with regard to faculty ratings instruments is how effective the instruments are in detecting differences among departments or department heads. In this study, the AES were found to be very effective in discriminating both among universities and department administrators. This result is consistent within those obtained by Gunter (note 9) who found significant differences in the responsibilities and characteristics of department heads from small and large universities. Heads/chairpersons from large universities placed more importance on personal research and scholarship and maintenance of departmental records. A higher emphasis was placed on their research and scholarship

and less on their teaching experience during the selection process. They had less liberty in faculty tenure procedures and policy governance. Heads/chairpersons spent more time serving on standing committees and graduate student advising and less time on teaching, undergraduate student conversations/advising and student activities sponsorship. They had more final responsibilities for budget administration and control. One would not expect to find these same discriminant functions at institutions with different missions and emphases (e.g. small private universities, community colleges). However, one should be able to detect differences in how faculty rate their department head.

In reviewing the results of the AES discriminant functions and factor analysis, one notes that there was little logical correspondence between the discriminant functions and factors. This apparent discrepancy between discriminant functions and factors can partially be explained by the purpose of the respective statistical procedures. In the factor analyses, the intent was to determine the underlying constructs or dimensions by which faculty rated the department and administrator. Items composing a particular factor are assumed to be related. In contrast, the discriminant analysis sought to find a linear combination of variables (items) that showed the largest difference between departmental means. Discriminant analysis makes no assumptions regarding the relationships between items composing a particular function. Thus, discriminant and factor analysis have different purposes in which the outcomes are expected to be different.

It has been argued (Smock and Hake, Note 10; Petrie, Note 11; Braskamp, Wise, and Hengstler, 1979; Uhl & Pratt, Note 3) that information from a variety of sources is desirable for departmental and administrator reviews. One source that can furnish important information, with satisfactory reliability, are faculty ratings.

For summative evaluations of the department head, faculty ratings can provide administrators with comparative information (i.e. discriminant validity). For formative evaluations, faculty ratings can identify relative strengths and weaknesses of a department head; however, the ratings may be affected by a halo effect. Consequently, for formative evaluations, more highly detailed diagnostic items than the ones included in this study are necessary if faculty ratings of the head are desired.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Mc Carthy, M.J. Correlates of effectiveness among academic department heads. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1972.
2. Ryan, J. E., Abbott, R. H., Cook, G.F., Denham, C. H., Kimball, H., Klein, G. D., and Metcalf, A. G. Unpublished preliminary questionnaire developed by the ad hoc committee evaluation of administrative offices, responsible to the academic senate, California State University, Long Beach, 1973.
3. Uhl, U. P., and Pratt, L. K. Expanding NCCU's faculty evaluation system to include evaluation of the department chair. Paper presented at the Eighteenth Annual Southeastern Invitational Conference on Measurement in Education, Greensboro, North Carolina, Febfuary, 1980.
4. Siever, R. G. The role and function of academic department chairmen in two land-grant institutions. C. O. Neidt and Ross Loomis Human Factors Research Laboratory, Colorado State University, 1969.
5. Spangler, R. K. Measuring and predicting the effectiveness of academic department heads. Unpublished master's thesis, Kansas State University, 1977.
6. Lin, Y. R. Rating scale for for academic administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1975.
7. Office of Planning and Evaluation. Administration evaluation survey: faculty form survey instrument and optional item catalog. University of Illinois, 1979.
8. Brandenburg, D. C., Derry, S., and Hengstler, D. D. Validation of an item classification scheme for a student rating item catalog. Paper presented at the National Conference on Measurement in Education, Toronto, Canada. March 1978.

9. Gunter, G. The role of department chairmen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1964.

10. Smock, H. R., and Hake, H. W. Cope: A systematic approach to the evaluation of academic departments. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association. New York City, April 1977.

11. Petrie, H. Council on program evaluation: future evaluation plans. Discussion paper #1. Urbana, Illinois: Office of Planning and Evaluation, University of Illinois, 1979.

REFERENCES

Berquist, W. H., and Tenbrink, G. J. Evaluation of Administrators. In International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, Vol. 4, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Braskamp, L. A., Wise, S. L., and Hengstler, D. D. Student Satisfaction as a measure of departmental quality. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 491-498.

Cattell, R. B. The scree test for the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1966, 4, 245-276.

Ehrle, E. B. Selection and evaluation of department chairmen. Educational Record, 1975, 56, 29-38.

Faricy, W. H. Grouping departments. Journal of Higher Education, 1974, 45, 98-111.

Dressel, P. L. and Reichard, D. J. The university department: Retrospect and prospect. Journal of Higher Education, 1970, 41, 387-402.

Farmer, C. F. Administrator Evaluation: Concepts, Methods, Cases in Higher Education. Richmond, Va.: Higher Education Leadership and Management Society, 1979.

Feuker, R. M. The evaluation of university faculty and administrators. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46, 665-686.

Fisher, C. F. New Directions for Higher Education: Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership. San Francisco: Joseey-Bass, 1978.

Galina, B. Appraisal of chairmen's performance. Atlanta: Georgia State University, College of Education, 1978.

Genova, W. J.; Madoff, M. K.; Chin, R., and Thomas, G. B. Mutual benefit evaluation of faculty and administrators in higher education. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1976.

Goodwin, G. I. and Smith, E. R. Faculty and Administrator Evaluation: Constructing the Instruments. West Virginia University, 1979.

Hengstler, D. D., Brandenberg, D. C.; Braskamp, L. A.; and Smock, H. R. Faculty ratings as a measure of departmental and administrator quality. Research in Higher Education, in press.

Hillway, T. Evaluating college and university administration. Intellect, 1973, 101, 426-472.

Hoyt, D. P., and Spangler, R. K. The measurement of administrative effectiveness of the academic department head. Research in Higher Education, 1979, 10, 291-303.

Klein, G. D. and Denham, C. H. A model for determining the validity of faculty ratings of university administrator effectiveness. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1974, 34 899-902.

Lahti, R. E. Managerial performance and appraisal. In C. F. Fisher (ed.) New Directions for Higher Education: Developing and evaluating academic leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Lord, F. M. and Novick, M. R. Statistical theories of mental test scores. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Nie, U. H. Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K. and Brent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Peterson, M. W. The academic department: Perspectives from theory and research. In J. C. Smart and J. R. Montgomery (eds.), New directions for institutional research: Examining departmental management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Sachdeva, D. Estimating strength of relationship in multivariate analysis of variance. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1973, 33, 627-631.

Shtogren, J. A. (ed.) Administrative development in higher education. Richmond, Va.: Higher Education Leadership and Management Society, 1978.

Smart, J. C. and Montgomery, J. R. (eds.) New directions for institutional research: Examining departmental management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Tatsuoka, N. M. Multivariate analysis: Techniques for educational and psychological research. New York: Wiley, 1971.