

Completed Example: Leadership 360° Assessment

PARTICIPANT PROFILE

Participant	Alina Marchetti (fictional)
Role / organization	Vice President, Field Operations Meridian Retail Group (fictional)
Scope	9 direct reports, 4 regions, 112 locations
Time in role / manager	14 months Chief Operating Officer
Assessment window	Jan 8 to Jan 19
Rater panel	1 manager, 5 peers, 9 direct reports
Response rate	15 of 15 (100%)

PURPOSE

The assessment compares how the leader experiences their own behavior with how that behavior is experienced by the people who work above, beside, and below them. It supports development and coaching; it is not a standalone performance rating.

METHODOLOGY

Four perspectives are included: Self, Manager, Peers, and Direct Reports. Peer and direct-report results are reported only in aggregate; no rater group with fewer than 3 respondents is broken out. Qualitative comments are paraphrased before they reach the participant.

Six leadership dimensions

Psychological Safety	Meaningful Work	Dependability
Structure & Clarity	Impact	Core Values

SCORING METHOD

Each dimension contains 3 behavioral questions. Each question is scored 1 to 4, for a maximum of 12 points per dimension.

Score	Label	Rater instruction
1	Negative Impact	Behavior is absent or works against the intended outcome
2	Mixed Impact	Behavior appears inconsistently or only under favorable conditions
3	Positive Impact	Behavior is reliable and produces the intended effect
4	Outstanding Impact	Behavior is reliable, visible to others, and raises the standard around it

- Others Average = mean of all non-self responses, weighted by respondent rather than by rater group.
- Gap = Self score minus Others Average. A gap greater than +1.0 is flagged for debrief discussion.

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

All scores are out of 12. A flag identifies a pattern worth exploring; it does not by itself establish a performance problem.

Dimension	Self	Mgr	Peers	Reports	Others	Gap	Flag
Psychological Safety	10.7	10.0	9.8	9.4	9.6	+1.1	Monitor
Meaningful Work	10.5	10.4	10.4	10.0	10.2	+0.3	
Dependability	11.0	10.6	10.4	9.8	10.1	+0.9	Priority 2
Structure & Clarity	10.0	9.0	9.4	8.4	8.8	+1.2	Priority 1
Impact	10.8	11.0	10.6	10.2	10.4	+0.4	
Core Values	11.3	11.2	11.2	11.0	11.1	+0.2	Strength

PERCEPTION GAP: SELF VS. OTHERS

Dimension	Self	Others	Gap	Interpretation
Psychological Safety	10.7	9.6	+1.1	Intent stronger than stakeholder experience
Meaningful Work	10.5	10.2	+0.3	Broadly aligned
Dependability	11.0	10.1	+0.9	Watch follow-through visibility
Structure & Clarity	10.0	8.8	+1.2	Largest perception gap
Impact	10.8	10.4	+0.4	Broadly aligned
Core Values	11.3	11.1	+0.2	Strongest alignment

A gap does not mean either perspective is wrong. It identifies where leadership intent and stakeholder experience may differ.

Lowest-scoring behavioral items

Behavioral item	Group	Score	Evidence
"I know what is expected of me and how my work will be judged."	Direct reports	2.2	6 of 9 rated 3 or 4 (67%)
"Priorities stay stable long enough to finish them."	Direct reports	2.5	3 raters cited mid-cycle redirection
"Commitments made to my function are closed out visibly."	Peers	2.6	Closure is assumed, not confirmed

INTERPRETATION OF THE PATTERN

- Strategic direction is generally strong; the lower scores cluster around how priorities and commitments are made visible to others.
- Direct reports are re-deriving priorities, while peers are building their own tracking to compensate for unclear closure.
- Core Values is a strength. Credibility is already present, so the development work can focus on execution habits rather than trust repair.

QUALITATIVE THEMES (PARAPHRASED)

1. Strength: Credibility and consistency

Raters describe the participant as direct, consistent, and willing to explain the reasoning behind decisions. Manager and peer comments note that the rationale does not change depending on the audience.

2. Mixed: Strong direction, uneven translation

The leader usually knows where the team needs to go, but direct reports do not always receive a stable written version of priorities, ownership, and decision rights.

3. Development: Follow-through happens, but not always visibly

Peers generally believe commitments are completed, yet several maintain shadow trackers because closure is not consistently confirmed where the commitment was made.

DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

Priority	Why selected	Behavioral implication
1. Structure & Clarity	Lowest dimension (8.8/12); largest gap (+1.2); direct reports score it lowest	Make priorities, tradeoffs, ownership, and decision rights explicit and written
2. Dependability	Overall score is adequate, but one peer-facing behavior is weak	Close commitments visibly and update stakeholders before dates slip

INTERPRETATION GUIDANCE

- Look for repeated patterns across groups; do not overreact to one comment.
- Distinguish a low score from a perception gap. Both can matter, but they answer different questions.
- Choose behaviors a third party can observe. “Communicate better” is not an action; “document priority changes within 24 hours and name the tradeoff” is.
- Use strengths as leverage. Development should not become a list of deficits.
- The report is diagnostic input. The actual work happens in the debrief, 90-day plan, practice, and reassessment.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

Step	Purpose
1. Individual debrief	Separate signal from noise and choose the two behaviors worth working on
2. Select one strength to leverage	Use an existing leadership asset to support the development work
3. Build the 90-day plan	Translate feedback into observable commitments and evidence sources
4. 30 / 60 / 90-day checkpoints	Review transfer, troubleshoot barriers, and adjust the intervention
5. Six-month reassessment	Use the same framework and a comparable rater panel to test whether stakeholder experience changed