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2. EFFECTIVENESS

2.1 YOUR EFFECTIVENESS SCORE

This score tells you how effective you saw yourself and also how effective others saw you as a Course Coordinator.

This mean score is out of 5.

- If your score is more than 4, then you need to pay a little attention to your performance as a Program Director: a fine-tuning.
- If your score is between 3 and 4, then you need to pay some attention to your performance as Program Director: a major service.
- If your score is less than 3, then you need to pay a lot of attention to your performance as a Program Director: a major overhaul or rebuild.

The information on the following pages will assist you to decide where you might like to make some changes or to consolidate how you operate as a Course Coordinator.

* & ** Indicate a difference of 1.0 or more from the Self score.
3. ICVF RESULTS – INTEGRATOR ROLE

3.6 YOUR INTEGRATOR SCORE

This score tells you how well you are able to:

– Critically observe behaviour, including own
– Determine which operational role is appropriate in each situation
– Reflect on those observations
– Develop and learn from those observations

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Others</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Coordinators</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Managers</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there is agreement between what you say you do (Display) and what others say you do, then you have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role.

If, however, there is a difference of 1.0 or more, then you do not have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role. You will need to consider why this is so.

You need also to look at whether there are any differences in the scores given for the Importance of the role. Again where there is a difference of 1.0 or more, you need to consider why this might be so.

* & ** indicate a difference of 1.0 or more from the Self score.
3. ICVF RESULTS – INNOVATOR ROLE

3.1 YOUR INNOVATOR SCORE

This score tells you how well you are able to:

– See need for new courses/delivery approach
– Be Innovative

If there is agreement between what you say you do (Display) and what others say you do, then you have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role.

If, however, there is a difference of 1.0 or more, then you do not have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role. You will need to consider why this is so.

You need also to look at whether there are any differences in the scores given for the Importance of the role. Again where there is a difference of 1.0 or more, you need to consider why this might be so.

* & ** Indicate a difference of 1.0 or more from the Self score.
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If there is agreement between what you say you do (Display) and what others say you do, then you have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role.

If, however, there is a difference of 1.0 or more, then you do not have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role. You will need to consider why this is so.

You need also to look at whether there are any differences in the scores given for the Importance of the role. Again where there is a difference of 1.0 or more, you need to consider why this might be so.

* & ** indicate a difference of 1.0 or more from the Self score.
### 3. ICVF RESULTS – DELIVERER ROLE

#### 3.3 YOUR DELIVERER SCORE

This score tells you how well you are able to:

- Ensure course is designed and delivered
- Motivate program staff
- Set clear and achievable teaching and learning goals for the team
- Communicate and clarify goals with course staff
- Schedule, coordinate and solve course issues

#### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Others</td>
<td>Significant Others</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Coordinators</td>
<td>Unit Coordinators</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Managers</td>
<td>Line Managers</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there is agreement between what you say you do (Display) and what others say you do, then you have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role.

If, however, there is a difference of 1.0 or more, then you do not have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role. You will need to consider why this is so.

You need also to look at whether there are any differences in the scores given for the Importance of the role. Again where there is a difference of 1.0 or more, you need to consider why this might be so.

* & ** Indicate a difference of 1.0 or more from the Self score.
If there is agreement between what you say you do (Display) and what others say you do, then you have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role. If, however, there is a difference of 1.0 or more, then you do not have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role. You will need to consider why this is so.

You need also to look at whether there are any differences in the scores given for the Importance of the role. Again where there is a difference of 1.0 or more, you need to consider why this might be so.

* & ** Indicate a difference of 1.0 or more from the Self score.
3. ICVF RESULTS – DEVELOPER ROLE

3.5 YOUR DEVELOPER SCORE

This score tells you how well you are able to:

– Develop staff
– Act as a mentor and coach
– Be aware of strengths and weaknesses of course team
– Develop and maintain the course team
– Arrange for appropriate development activities for course team

If there is agreement between what you say you do (Display) and what others say you do, then you have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role.

If, however, there is a difference of 1.0 or more, then you do not have the same perceptions of the extent to which you display this role. You will need to consider why this is so.

You need also to look at whether there are any differences in the scores given for the Importance of the role. Again where there is a difference of 1.0 or more, you need to consider why this might be so.

* * Indicate a difference of 1.0 or more from the Self score.
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4. ICVF RESULTS – PRIORITISED

4.1 Display & Importance: Prioritised by Significant Others & Self

**Display**

**Prioritised by Significant Others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverer</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prioritised by Self**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverer</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Importance**

**Prioritised by Significant Others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverer</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prioritised by Self**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverer</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. FACTORS IMPACTING PERFORMANCE - OVERVIEW

- Low impact
- High impact

1. The combination of academic and administrative functions s/he is expected to perform as a Program_Director: 6.0
2. The range of people s/he needs to deal with (e.g. students, other academic staff, employers, professional staff, at school and divisional level): 5.9
3. The general complexity of the role: 5.8
4. His/her skills in marketing the LCprogram to prospective students: 4.9
5. His/her skills in working with academic staff: 6.0
6. His/her skills in working with support staff: 5.9
7. His/her skills in interacting with students: 6.0
8. His/her discipline expertise: 5.5
9. His/her knowledge of the LCprogram structure/how it all works: 6.1
10. His/her previous experience as a Program_Director: 5.0
11. His/her ability to influence his/her peers: 5.4
12. The level of authority vested in him/her: 5.4
13. His/her workload: 6.3
14. Structural factors outside of his/her control (e.g. teaching space): 5.0
15. The nature of the LCprogram (e.g. mode – distance, onshore, offshore; undergraduate or postgraduate): 5.2
16. Unfair expectations of others (e.g. Head of School, professional staff): 5.0
5. FACTORS IMPACTING PERFORMANCE - DETAIL

1. The combination of academic and administrative functions s/he is expected to perform as a Program_Director
   - Combined Average: 6.0
   - Professional Staff: 5.9
   - Unit Coordinators: 6.0
   - Peers: 6.1
   - Line Managers: 6.2
   - Self: 6.2

2. The range of people s/he needs to deal with (e.g. students, other academic staff, employers, professional staff, at school and divisional level)
   - Combined Average: 5.9
   - Professional Staff: 6.1
   - Unit Coordinators: 6.0
   - Peers: 6.1
   - Line Managers: 5.8
   - Self: 5.6

3. The general complexity of the role
   - Combined Average: 5.8
   - Professional Staff: 5.9
   - Unit Coordinators: 6.0
   - Peers: 6.1
   - Line Managers: 5.8
   - Self: 5.5

4. His/her skills in marketing the LC_program to prospective students
   - Combined Average: 4.9
   - Professional Staff: 5.1
   - Unit Coordinators: 5.3
   - Peers: 5.1
   - Line Managers: 4.9
   - Self: 4.1

5. His/her skills in working with academic staff
   - Combined Average: 6.0
   - Professional Staff: 6.1
   - Unit Coordinators: 6.0
   - Peers: 6.0
   - Line Managers: 6.2
   - Self: 5.5
6. His/her skills in working with support staff

7. His/her skills in interacting with students

8. His/her discipline expertise

9. His/her knowledge of the {LCprogram} structure/how it all works

10. His/her previous experience as a {Program_Director}
5. FACTORS IMPACTING PERFORMANCE - DETAIL

11. His/her ability to influence his/her peers

12. The level of authority vested in him/her

13. His/her workload

14. Structural factors outside of his/her control (e.g. teaching space)

15. The nature of the {LCprogram} (e.g. mode – distance, onshore, offshore; undergraduate or postgraduate)
16. Unfair expectations of others (e.g. Head of School, professional staff)
6. MAKING THE ROLE MORE ATTRACTIVE - OVERVIEW

Combined Average from all categories

1. Promotion criteria that recognise his/her achievements as a Program Director 5.8
2. Number of workload points allocated to him/her for the role 5.7
3. More administrative support for him/her 5.8
4. A different type of administrative support (e.g. concentrated in one person rather than across several, or vice versa) 5.2
5. Higher level of pay compared to his/her substantive level 5.4
6. Greater level of autonomy 5.1
7. Greater level of authority 5.1
8. Automatic access to a period of study leave at the end of the set term 5.2
9. Greater recognition by others (e.g. Head of School, Course Coordinators) 5.7
10. Increased time for research (e.g. having research assistants available) 5.5
11. Increased support from professional staff 5.3
12. Allocated resources (e.g. budget) 5.4
13. Improved credibility of the role 5.8
14. Better clarity of what is required in the role 5.5
6. MAKING THE ROLE MORE ATTRACTIVE - DETAIL

1. Promotion criteria that recognise his/her achievements as a Program_Director
   - Combined Average: 5.8
   - Professional Staff: 5.8
   - Unit Coordinators: 5.7
   - Peers: 6.1
   - Line Managers: 6.0
   - Self: 5.9

2. Number of workload points allocated to him/her for the role
   - Combined Average: 5.7
   - Professional Staff: 5.8
   - Unit Coordinators: 5.8
   - Peers: 6.0
   - Line Managers: 6.0
   - Self: 5.3

3. More administrative support for him/her
   - Combined Average: 5.8
   - Professional Staff: 5.5
   - Unit Coordinators: 5.5
   - Peers: 6.1
   - Line Managers: 6.1
   - Self: 5.9

4. A different type of administrative support (e.g. concentrated in one person rather than across several, or vice versa)
   - Combined Average: 5.2
   - Professional Staff: 5.0
   - Unit Coordinators: 5.6
   - Peers: 5.2
   - Line Managers: 5.2
   - Self: 5.5

5. Higher level of pay compared to his/her substantive level
   - Combined Average: 5.4
   - Professional Staff: 5.4
   - Unit Coordinators: 5.7
   - Peers: 6.0
   - Line Managers: 5.7
   - Self: 5.3
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6. MAKING THE ROLE MORE ATTRACTIVE - DETAIL

- **6. Greater level of autonomy**
  - Combined Average: 5.1
  - Professional Staff: 5.3
  - Unit Coordinators: 5.3
  - Peers: 5.1
  - Line Managers: 5.0
  - Self: 4.6

- **7. Greater level of authority**
  - Combined Average: 5.1
  - Professional Staff: 5.4
  - Unit Coordinators: 5.2
  - Peers: 5.2
  - Line Managers: 5.2
  - Self: 4.8

- **8. Automatic access to a period of study leave at the end of the set term**
  - Combined Average: 5.2
  - Professional Staff: 4.8
  - Unit Coordinators: 4.8
  - Peers: 5.4
  - Line Managers: 5.3
  - Self: 5.0

- **9. Greater recognition by others (e.g. Head of School, {Course_Coordinators})**
  - Combined Average: 5.7
  - Professional Staff: 5.6
  - Unit Coordinators: 5.8
  - Peers: 5.6
  - Line Managers: 5.9
  - Self: 5.6

- **10. Increased time for research (e.g. having research assistants available)**
  - Combined Average: 5.5
  - Professional Staff: 5.2
  - Unit Coordinators: 5.3
  - Peers: 5.6
  - Line Managers: 5.2
  - Self: 6.0
6. MAKING THE ROLE MORE ATTRACTIVE - DETAIL

- **11. Increased support from professional staff**
  - Combined Average: 5.3
  - Professional Staff: 5.4
  - Unit Coordinators: 5.4
  - Peers: 5.4
  - Line Managers: 5.3
  - Self: 5.4

- **12. Allocated resources (e.g. budget)**
  - Combined Average: 5.4
  - Professional Staff: 5.5
  - Unit Coordinators: 5.5
  - Peers: 5.5
  - Line Managers: 5.3
  - Self: 5.5

- **13. Improved credibility of the role**
  - Combined Average: 5.8
  - Professional Staff: 5.7
  - Unit Coordinators: 5.7
  - Peers: 5.7
  - Line Managers: 6.0
  - Self: 5.9

- **14. Better clarity of what is required in the role**
  - Combined Average: 5.5
  - Professional Staff: 5.6
  - Unit Coordinators: 5.6
  - Peers: 5.5
  - Line Managers: 5.5
  - Self: 5.6