

LCP 1.0 TO 1.5 SCORING FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

WHY DO ASSESSMENTS LIKE THE LEADERSHIP CIRCLE PROFILE EVOLVE OVER TIME?

The Universal Model of Leadership has become the global standard for leadership. As we've grown, we have collected an increasing amount of data from global leaders, creating a fully international database. As a result, the Leadership Circle Profile (LCP) and LCP Manager Edition (ME) provided us the opportunity to create a global reference norm group that closely reflects a representative cross-section of leaders around the world. This will help leaders gain a better understanding of where they stand with respect to other leaders around the world.

Updates are common in our industry, and most assessments go through iterations over time. For example, the Myers-Briggs is on version 28 or 30. Assessments like the LCP and ME fundamentally revolve around continuous improvement.

The primary change in LCP 1.5 is to calculate the percentile scores against a new global reference norm group. It is a shift in the comparison group. It does not change any questions, any dimensions, nor does it change the way it calculates the raw scores (measured on a 1 to 5 scale). The only place you will notice a difference is in the percentiles being reported.

We will continue to evolve the LCP to remain the leading edge and global standard in assessment methodologies, and to provide the most useful insights to leaders, as well as the coaches and consultants who work with them.

WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LCP 1.0 AND LCP 1.5 SCORING?

LCP 1.0	LCP 1.5
Individual leaders are compared against all leaders in the current LCP database which continues to change as leaders are added.	Individual leaders are compared against a static global norm group of participants that closely reflects the population and characteristics of leaders around the world.

LCP 1.0	LCP 1.5
<p>Historically, more LCP participants have come from North America than the rest of the world. As a result, the LCP 1.0 normative comparisons could represent bias toward the performance of North American leaders. The result is Creative average scores being slightly higher, and Reactive average scores being slightly lower than average scores of leaders outside of North America.</p>	<p>The LCP 1.5 norm group has been optimized for globally representative average scores. This will increase Creative Dimensions (and Summary Measures) percentile rankings associated with the same raw score when compared with 1.0. In addition, LCP 1.5 percentile rankings for the Reactive Dimensions are likely to show a decrease for the same raw score in 1.0. As a whole, profiles will become more Creative and less Reactive.</p> <p>Because average Creative scores are lower in the LCP 1.5 norm group, percentile rankings will generally go up. The reverse is the case for Reactive Dimensions. In some cases, percentile rankings could change as much as 20 percentile points. The largest changes will be in the center of the bell curve (either side of 50%), because more data is clustered there.</p>
<p>The LCP 1.0 database continues to change such that a particular raw score achieved in one year may reflect a slightly different percentile than the same score from another time period. Thus, a person receiving the same raw score on a dimension may have seen slightly different percentiles in their reports.</p>	<p>Every score is compared against the same global norm group over time. The same raw score always results in the same percentile ranking across reports and across years.</p>
<p>Percentiles are computed by rank ordering all raw scores in the database and calculating the percentage of scores that fall below the leader's score.</p> <p>Note that each rater group (e.g., Boss, Peers, Direct Reports, etc.) have their own norm group. This will not change in LCP 1.5</p>	<p>Percentiles are computed based on a more standardized method. Raw scores are first transformed into t-scores, or standard scores. This sounds complicated but it is commonly used in IQ scoring. Each t-score is then converted to a percentile based on the normal distribution of scores in the global reference norm base. We will not report out t-scores on the report, but we felt it was helpful for you to know, in addition to updating our global norms, we are enhancing the calculations for percentile rankings.</p>

LCP 1.0	LCP 1.5
When reports are reprocessed, percentiles on reports may shift slightly due to a continuously changing database comparison.	All old reports will be reprocessed with LCP 1.5 scoring. Thus, percentiles won't shift. The same raw score will always result in the same percentile.

WHO COMPRISES THE GLOBAL NORM GROUP AND HOW WERE THEY SELECTED?

The reference global norm group comprises thousands of leaders that have been selected from the larger TLC database so that the distribution of leaders reflects the global population of leaders. The proportion of leaders within the global norm group reflects very closely the concentration of leaders within various countries and industries and is similar in distribution between genders in leadership positions around the world.

To determine the selection criteria for the global norm group, we reviewed 15 leadership databases (e.g., Dun & Bradstreet Hoovers, World Bank Global Database, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Forbes Global 2000 List) and 23 global research studies of leadership (e.g., World Economic Forum –Employment Trends, Workplace Trends – the Global Workforce Leadership Survey, Institute of Management Accountants Global Survey, Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends, Borderless – 2016 Survey on Leadership Development). Some of the factors we considered included:

- Country Labor Force Size
- Concentration of specific industries by country
- Country GDP
- Percentage of male and female workforce
- Percentage of leaders by level of leadership (e.g., C-suite, Managers, etc.)

We then pulled leaders from our large TLC database with similar characteristics to those we discovered in our research, such that the norm group matched as closely as possible to the distribution of these characteristics among global leadership. Leaders were selected using a random stratified sampling. That is, we first stratified (sorted) the database on the characteristics desired and then randomly pulled leaders from each category until the proportion of all database leaders within that category matched the global distribution proportion obtained from our research.

WILL THE LCP MANAGER EDITION (ME) HAVE ITS OWN SEPARATE NORM, OR USE THE LCP NORM GROUP?

Front-line leadership can be quite different from higher levels of leadership and comparing a manager to a C-Suite executive is not an apples-to-apples comparison. The ME has its own database separate and distinct from the LCP database. These two databases are maintained separately as the types of leaders who complete the two assessments are often at different levels of management and the two assessments do not comprise the exact same dimensions. Therefore, when we selected the updated global norm groups, we pulled separate norm groups from each database. We sampled middle-managers through to top-level leaders from the LCP database and sampled lower-level managers for the ME database. As a result, the standardization of scores, and resulting percentiles, are different for the two assessments.

ARE THE DATABASES FOR THE COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT (CLA) AND PULSE UPDATING, TOO?

The LCP 1.5 global norm group reflects updates to the Leadership Circle Profile and LCP Manager Edition databases only. The CLA database and Pulse database will not be adjusted during this update.

HOW FREQUENTLY WILL TLC CONDUCT THIS RESEARCH TO UPDATE ITS NORMS?

It is important to review the research every three to five years to be sure that the norm group is still globally relevant. The degree to which the norming will change will depend on new research and how much leadership will have evolved.

HOW DO I KNOW THE RESULTS ARE STATISTICALLY VALID?

As TLC's database has grown and become international, we have truly set the standard for global leadership. A great deal of validity research has been done on the Leadership Circle Profile and is explained to all practitioners who are certified to use the LCP and ME. This research is also available online to clients in position papers. In addition to our own validity research, statisticians from many different organizations have vetted the LCP's validity, and the instrument always performs extremely well. The statistical basis is solid.

WHAT IS COMPASSIONATE SCORING?

When leaders score toward the low end in the Creative Dimensions, the resulting report can feel harsh, leading to adverse reactions. For example, a percentile ranking of 1% on Relating means that 99% of leaders score higher than that leader, and consequently there won't be any visible shading in that Creative Dimension of the accompanying graphic. To prevent undue discouragement, we have put a floor on Creative percentiles of 5%. This is the lowest percentile a leader will see on their graph, even if their actual scores result in a lower percentile. Those in the bottom fifth percentile are well below average and there is no statistically meaningful

difference between the first percentile and the fifth. However, with Compassionate Scoring, the leader will receive a graph report with at least some shading in the Creative, allowing for hope and encouragement to develop their effectiveness in that particular category. Reactive percentiles are not adjusted. Compassionate Scoring is used consistently across all reports.

WHAT DO I TELL MY CLIENT IF THEY SEE AN OVERALL 10-15% UPWARD TREND IN THEIR REPORT?

The global norm group reflects a global standard of leadership. This shift was able to occur once our database had enough representation from global leaders.

In LCP 1.0, our database was more North America centric. Globally, average Creative raw scores tend to be lower, meaning the baseline is lower. This in turn creates higher percentile scores, if a participant is above the average. With LCP 1.5, leaders are receiving a global norm comparison, as a result, their scores may adjust.

WHEN ORDERING A LCP RETAKE, WILL ALL PREVIOUS REPORTS RUN ON THE NEW SYSTEM?

When ordering a LCP report for a leader that has prior LCP reports, the system will automatically regenerate all previous reports, using the same email, with the LCP 1.5 scoring. This will allow for a more direct comparison across reports.

FOR A LCP RETAKE, WILL WE GET THE ORIGINAL REPORT PLUS THE RETAKE REPORT?

Yes, you will get the new report, plus any previous reports automatically regenerated on the new LCP 1.5 database. This is to ensure a more direct, apples-to-apples comparison when reviewing reports side by side.

IF I AM RUNNING A PROJECT WHERE HALF OF THE TEAM IS ON LCP 1.0, AND THE OTHER HALF IS ON LCP 1.5, CAN I STILL ORDER A GROUP REPORT? HOW WILL THIS WORK?

Yes, you can still order a Group Report for the full team. The Group Report will be on LCP 1.5.

WHAT IF MY PARTICIPANT IS DOING A LCP RETAKE, BUT THEIR ORIGINAL SURVEY WAS UNDER ANOTHER PRACTITIONER?

This will not impact your ability to get the automatic regeneration of the original report. The system will recognize the Retake and you'll be shown a box to check the participant as a Retake. However, if the original practitioner used a different email address for the participant, then the system will not recognize your participant as a Retake. The email addresses must match.

WHAT IF MY PARTICIPANT ONCE COMPLETED THE LCP MANAGER EDITION (ME), AND NOW IS TAKING THE LCP, DOES THIS COUNT AS A RETAKE?

No, this is not a Retake. The LCP and ME are considered different tools that have different norms and slightly different models.

WILL REPORTS SHOW THE LCP DATABASE VERSION?

Yes, we will display “V1.5” on the report cover, indicating the LCP 1.5 version.

WILL A RAW SCORE OF 5.0 IN THE CREATIVE SHOW AT THE 100TH PERCENTILE?

Yes.