

THE GEOMETRIC RATING ASSESSMENT FACILITATOR: AN  
INDEX FOR ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION-MAKING

Basic Description: A statement is set up to cover, delineate, or limit the dimensions to be rated. Each rater generates a ratio-scaled number to reflect their best judgment concerning the ratee's performance on the dimensions to be rated. This number is summarized in a multiply-divide format, which dictates that the geometric mean of the products and dividends be obtained. The number of raters determines which root is to be taken. The resulting rating has several advantages over other possible systems.

First, while the rater's judgments may be subjective (although it's not required that they be), the resulting index is determined strictly from the data. This contrasts with situations where, after collection of data, the decision reached is a subjective interpretation of the data.

Second, the index can be used at various points in time to obtain precise measurements of change. The ratio properties of the index allow this. Furthermore, the interpretation of the change measure, since it is also expressed as a ratio, is more straightforward than a difference measure on an interval scale.

Third, the index can be used across various ratees, allowing comparisons to be made in a precise fashion in norm-referenced situations. Such use does not preclude the use of the index in criterion-referenced situations, since the administrator could establish criteria and compare the index obtained by each ratee against the criterion.

Unlike interval scales, the index could be interpreted without the necessity of variability measures. That is, the index has meaning in and of itself. Two variability measures are suggested as further aids to decision-making. A total bounce (range) is simply the distance from the largest "divide" term to the largest "multiply" term expressed in terms of a multiplier. The second measure of variability, standard deviation, would also be expressed in multiply-divide units.

EXAMPLE: YEARLY RATINGS OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN. A dean would prepare the rating statement. Such a statement might involve the job description of the chairperson or it might simply be stated as: "The chairperson in the department of \_\_\_\_\_, (name), during (year) was \_\_\_\_\_ times (more, less) effective than a minimally acceptable chairperson, in my opinion." (Signed)

Each member of the department would make the rating. Such ratings, using the Geometric Rating Assessment Facilitator, could be made yearly as standard procedure. The dean would decide what criterion should mandate replacement, whether or not the yearly results should be public, whether or not each departmental member should be required to sign name, etc. Departmental "content" within the college could be easily assessed and compared between departments. Improvement or deterioration could be monitored yearly or at any other number of intervals.

A premier feature of the index under discussion is that it combines the insensitivity of the median to extreme scores with the precision of the mean.

Demonstration with numerical example.

Addendum: Using the time period between any two ratings, the celeration could be found indicating the rate of change.

Other uses of multiply-divide scales being developed.

Could rate on all 15 categories of department chairman job description.

Completed  
4/11/76:2312  
Stephen A. Graf