To: Dean Van Galen, Chancellor  
116 North Hall  
University of Wisconsin-River Falls  

From: Wes Chapin, Chair  
Faculty Senate  
University of Wisconsin-River Falls  

May 9, 2013  

RE: UWRF Faculty Senate Motion 2012-13/151  

At the May 8, 2013 meeting of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls Faculty Senate, this motion was passed. The motion is forwarded to you for your action.  

Motion from the Executive Committee (Wes Chapin, Chair) to receive the Campus Climate Studies-related documents from the Diversity and Inclusivity Committee (Cyndi Kernahan, Chair) (see attached documents: DIC-Motion to Implement CSW Work-Life Campus Climate, DIC 2009 QWL Survey Report, DIC Campus Climate 2010 Final Report Presentation).  

Approved  

Disapproved  

Dean Van Galen, Chancellor
Beginning in Fall 2008, three significant studies of UWRF’s campus climate have been undertaken, but their findings and recommendations have yet to be fully implemented. This memo summarizes the three studies below, and includes appendices summarizing the recommendations from each study. Overlaying the analyses and recommendations of these studies, we offer two policy proposals that address these studies’ most salient and critical intersections:

1. To address the need for equity in decisions regarding tenure and promotion, we propose a college committee (replacing the role of the college dean) that reviews and makes recommendations on personnel decisions after they leave the department.

2. To address the need for fair, respectful, and accountable interactions among both faculty and staff, we propose a supervisory management / department chair training summer institute, where participants are paid to participate, and where the issues of harassment and bullying, conflict resolution, and strategies for recognizing and rewarding employee contributions will be presented and their implementation will be tracked and reported.

Study #1: A Report on Faculty and Staff Job Engagement at UW-River Falls - January 2009

Popularly known as the “Quality of Work/Life Study” or QWL, this study was contracted through Russell Consulting, Inc., in Madison, WI. In Fall 2008, UWRF faculty and staff completed the anonymous online questionnaire assessing a range of factors influencing the climate for UWRF employees (i.e., job satisfaction, peer relations, decision making and problem solving, communication, recognition and rewards, equity in compensation, work/life balance, cultural competence and diversity, quality of supervision, quality of leadership, job design/enrichment, community, and more). The answers were analyzed by demographics (age, race/ethnicity, rank, gender, years working for the campus, and college/division) and reported both in raw data and in recommendations for action divided into actions needing immediate, mid-range, and long-term implementation.

The study results were made available to the campus community in January 2009, implementing the first recommendation for immediate action: communication. To the best of our knowledge, no further actions or implementations of the findings have occurred as of April 2013. The study is available upon request, and a summary of its recommendations is attached here (See Appendix A: Quality of Work-Life Report Recommendations - January 2009).
Study #2: Committee on the Status of Women at UWRF Report – April 2009

In the Fall of 1998, UW-System President Katharine Lyall announced the establishment of the UW-System Initiative on the Status of Women. The Committee on the Status of Women, which she appointed, issued its report in 1999: *Equality for Women in the UW System: A Focus for Action in the Year 2000*. Every campus was then mandated to produce a campus-specific study, evaluating campus climate and policies enacted on the basis of the five recommendations from the 1999 report:

1. Expand educational opportunities for women students
2. Increase the hiring, promotion, and retention of women faculty, academic staff, and classified staff
3. Make the learning and working environment more welcoming to women, especially women of color and women who identify as lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered
4. Provide conditions that allow for balancing work and personal life
5. Create an effective organizational structure for improving the status of women in the University of Wisconsin system.

While eleven of the thirteen UW-campuses produced studies, and subsequently provided updates, UW-River Falls and UW-Parkside had done neither. In a memo dated September 15, 2008, Chancellor Connie Foster authorized a Diversity and Inclusivity Sub-Committee on the Status of Women to complete the UWRF campus-specific report that was ten years overdue. The report was completed in April 2009 and its findings were never forwarded beyond the Diversity and Inclusivity Committee (See Appendix B: Summary of Recommendations from the Committee on the Status of Women at UWRF, and the attached “WI Gender Wage Gap” April 2013). The full study is available upon request.

Study #3: Campus Climate Survey – April 2010

During 2009-10, UWRF contracted Susan Rankin & Associates to conduct an anonymous online survey of Campus Climate, augmented by focus group discussions. Its purpose was to obtain information regarding how diverse constituent groups feel about their particular campus climate and how the community responds to them (e.g., pedagogy, curricular issues, professional development, inter-group/intra-group relations, respect issues). The results of the assessment were to be used in the current and on-going work regarding diversity (e.g., Inclusive Excellence, Equity Scorecard). Among UWRF’s Core mission statements is the goal to ...“Serve the needs of women, minority, disadvantaged, disabled, and nontraditional students and seek racial and ethnic diversification of the student body and the professional faculty and staff.”

Findings of the Campus Climate Survey were presented to the campus community in a series of meetings April 26-27, 2010, and are available upon request. Findings confirmed significant racial tension at UWRF, differential treatment of employees by university status, and ongoing homophobia and heterosexism. The survey recommended a “call to action” to address the challenges uncovered in the report. To the best of our knowledge, after the presentations, no further action on the findings has been taken as of April 2013. (See Appendix C: Campus Climate Survey Summary of Findings April 2010).

| Immediate Actions | 1. Share the results with the campus community  
2. Ensure that UWRF integrates the Assessment findings into its Strategic/Long-Range Planning Process  
3. Ensure that UWRF’s Divisions/Colleges/Offices/Departments Discuss the Survey findings and recommendations  
4. Communicate the Actions that UWRF is Taking Based Upon this Assessment | Actions | Communicate and discuss findings |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mid-Range Actions | 1. Improve the Work Environment/Climate  
2. Enhance Systems for Ensuring Accountability  
3. Enhance Leadership/Management Effectiveness  
4. Address Issues Concerning Decision Making and Problem Solving  
5. Explore Differences Between Demographic Groups  
6. Find Answers to Unanswered Questions from this QWL Assessment | Actions Recommended | • UWRF’s HR office should conduct an assessment of UWRF’s performance management systems and training programs that support them.  
• Individual members of the Cabinet should develop a personal Leadership Development Plan that identifies specific actions s/he will take to strengthen her/his leadership relationship with others.  
• UWRF’s leaders should take steps to define and introduce a more formal approach to decision making and problem solving (i.e., conflict resolution): developing a model, identifying guiding principles, establishing broad guidelines and parameters, and training all leaders in the tools of the process.  
• Leadership should explore the causes of differences in mean scores for different demographic groups. Once the underlying issues are better understood, a task force or work group could recommend solutions. |
| Long Term Actions | 1. Address Workload and Staffing Issues  
2. Continue Effort to Address Perceived Insufficiencies in Pay, Rewards, and Recognition  
3. Address Remaining Staff Concern Regarding Health Benefits  
4. Conduct a Follow-Along Reassessment | Actions Recommended | • Create a campus workgroup to guide discussions at the division, college, and department level, and identify campus-wide actions for addressing the issues of limited resources and a growing workload. |
## Appendix B: Recommendations from the Committee on the Status of Women at UWRF (April 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five key areas of concern</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Expand educational opportunities for women students | - Expand Women’s Studies into a Major & a Department  
- Develop GLBT Studies courses [one created in 2010], GLBT Studies Program  
- Create a Women’s Resource Center (WRC)  
- Create a staff position for the WRC to maintain information flow, provide trainings, coordinate events |
| 2. Increase the hiring, promotion, and retention of women faculty, academic staff, and classified staff | - Ensure job descriptions include gender/race/sexuality equity and are placed/publicized in suitable venues to attract diverse applicants  
- Educate search/screen committees for equity  
- Increase professional development opportunities  
- Create a Mentoring Network  
- Review grievance procedures & policies to ensure there is no gender bias (i.e., grievance can only recommend a re-vote by the biased body; why not external reviewers?)  
- Evaluate administrators on responsiveness to gender/equity related problems in workplace  
- Conduct regular headcount and evaluations of gender/racial equity in faculty & staff according to rank & salary  
- Provide domestic partnership benefits [WI Legislative change 2012; benefits taxed]  
- Create an annual post-doc position for a woman of color to teach half-time, lecture, mentor, & do her own research |
| 3. Make the learning and working environment more welcoming to women, especially women of color, and women who identify as lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered | - Unlearning racism incorporated into GE requirements (ETHN 200)  
- Sex/Gender/Orientation harassment training  
- Hate speech reporting & education  
- Unisex / family bathrooms constructed & maps provided [15 added by 2012]  
- Equal number of women’s bathrooms  
- Create a Women’s Resource Center (WRC)  
- Create a staff position for WRC, to provide/coordinate trainings  
- Create a Women’s Network |
| 4. Provide conditions that allow for balancing work and personal life | - Investigate workload expectations: cap on service committees, specify office hour reqs., create research track (cf. UWEC)  
- Flexible scheduling for classes & meetings, & for staff  
- Part-time options  
- Telecommuting  
- Jobsharing  
- Stop-the-clock policies for tenure  
- Parental leave beyond FMLA  
- Mothers’ Rooms (2-4 across campus) for nursing moms [Achieved Fall 2012]  
- Breastfeeding policy  
- Child care expanded options, incl. evenings  
- Subsidized child care for employees  
- Temporary child care for employees’ kids on K-12 school vacations |
| 5. Ensuring Genuine Institutional Transformation | - Create a CSW as a standing entity, advisory to the Chancellor |
## Appendix C: Campus Climate Survey Summary of Findings - April 2010

| 1. Racial Tension at UW-River Falls | • Twice as many Respondents of Color (31%, n = 51) reported personally experiencing harassment when compared to their White counterparts (15%, n = 316).  
• Forty-nine percent (n = 25) of Respondents of Color said the harassment was based on their race, while only three percent (n = 8) of White respondents indicated the basis as race.  
• People of Color were also more likely than White people to observe offensive, hostile, exclusionary, or intimidating conduct.  
• Of those who observed harassment, 41% (n = 295) believed it was based on race.  
• People of Color were less comfortable than White respondents with the overall climate for diversity, the climate in their departments/work units, and the climate in their classes.  
• Employees of Color were more likely than White employees to report:  
  • colleagues expect them to represent “the point of view” of their identity  
  • their colleagues have lower expectations of them than of other employees  
  • that they have to work harder than their colleagues do in order to be perceived as legitimate.  
• Employees of Color were also more likely to believe they had observed discriminatory hiring practices and employment-related disciplinary actions. |
| 2. Homophobia and Heterosexism | • LGBQ respondents were more than twice as likely than heterosexual respondents to believe that they had experienced harassment.  
• Of those who believed they had experienced this type of conduct, 46% (n = 19) of LGBQ respondents versus two percent (n = 7) of heterosexual respondents indicated that this conduct was based on sexual orientation.  
• A much higher percentage of LGBQ respondents believed they had observed offensive, hostile, exclusionary, or intimidating conduct than did heterosexual respondents (50% compared with 30%).  
• Heterosexual respondents were more comfortable than LGBQ respondents with the overall climate for diversity at UW-River Falls, the climate in their departments/work units, and the climate in their classes.  
• LGBQ employee respondents were less likely than heterosexual respondents to believe the workplace climate was welcoming based on sexual orientation.  
• Sexual minority employees and students were more likely than heterosexual employees and students to have seriously considered leaving the institution. |
| 3. Differential Treatment by University Status | • For those who reported they experienced harassment, university status was the most common basis.  
• Of those respondents who believed that they had observed discriminatory hiring, discriminatory employment-related disciplinary actions, and discriminatory practices related to promotion, UW-River Falls status was indicated as the most common basis for discrimination.  
• A greater percentage of classified staff respondents (38%, n = 47) believed they had been harassed than did academic staff respondents (33%, n = 41). |
| Process Forward |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Fall/Winter 2010| Share report results with community |
|                 | Community dialogue regarding the assessment results |
|                 | Community feedback on recommended actions |
|                 | Executive Summary available at UW-River Falls website |
|                 | Full Report will be available in June 2010 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Action-&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended planning “advance” to begin a “call to action” regarding the challenges uncovered in the report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UW-River Falls**

Campus Climate Assessment

Results of Report

April 26th - 27th, 2010

---

**Assessing Campus Climate**

- Campus Climate is a construct
- Climate in Higher Education
- Current attitudes, behaviors, and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution
- Personal Experience
- Perceptions
- Institutional Efforts

---

**Campus Climate & Students**

- How students experience the campus environment, learning and development, and inclusiveness?
- Discriminatory environments have a negative effect on student learning.
- Research supports the pedagogical value of a diverse student body and faculty on enhancing learning outcomes.

---

**Campuses as Social Systems**

- Climate as a system of knowledge creation and dissemination.
- Climate as an axis for working and learning.

---

**Climate In Higher Education**

- Climate axis for working and learning.
- Climate as a system of knowledge creation and dissemination.

---

**Why conduct a climate assessment?**

- To foster a caring University community that provides leadership for constructive participation in a diverse, multicultural world.
- To open the doors wider for underrepresented groups to create a welcoming environment.
- To improve the environment for working and learning on campus.
Project Objectives

Provide UW-River Falls with information, analysis, and recommendations as they relate to campus climate.

This information will be used in conjunction with other data to provide UW-River Falls with an inclusive view of campus and a system-wide review.

Projected Outcomes

- UW-River Falls will add to their knowledge base with regard to how constituent groups currently feel about their particular campus climate and how the community responds to them (e.g., pedagogy, curricular issues, professional development, inter-group/intra-group relations, respect issues).
- UW-River Falls will use the results of the assessment to inform current/on-going work regarding diversity (e.g., Inclusive Excellence, Equity Scorecard).

Inclusive Excellence

- Inclusive Excellence broadens and expands our notion of "diversity" and what it means to truly be an inclusive campus community.
- Honoring the multi-faceted, intersectional differences among us, enables us to address the needs of individuals and groups thereby creating an "equitable" and welcoming campus environment.
- Inclusive Excellence is not limited to compositional diversity, but extends to include curricular transformation, improved policies for all campus members, better retention of students and faculty, and a welcoming campus climate for all.

The Climate Project & Inclusive Excellence

- The Climate Study is foundational to Inclusive Excellence in that it is the first time in the UW System that we are collecting data on multiple and intersectional identities based on experiences and perceptions of campus life by all members of the community.
- It is a population study that encouraged every campus community member to provide input on the campus climate.
- The input, data, and final results will be used in tandem with other data as a starting point to build an action plan that speaks to Inclusive Excellence.

Setting the Context

- Examine the Research
  - Review work already completed
- Preparation
  - Readiness of the campus
- Assessment
  - Examine the climate
- Follow-up
  - Building on the successes and addressing the challenges
University of Wisconsin
System Mission

The mission of the system is to develop human resources, to discover and disseminate knowledge, to extend knowledge and its application beyond the boundaries of its campuses and to serve and stimulate society by developing in students heightened intellectual, cultural and humane sensitivities, scientific, professional and technological expertise and a sense of purpose inherent in this broad mission are methods of instruction, research, extended training and public service designed to educate people and improve the human condition. Basic to every purpose of the system is the search for truth.

Core Mission of the University Cluster

..."Serve the needs of women, minority, disadvantaged, disabled, and nontraditional students and seek racial and ethnic diversification of the student body and the professional faculty and staff."

Process to Date
2004-2005

- Academic Planner (C. Saulnier) made aware of bias incidents at several campuses & began conversation regarding system-wide campus climate project
- Taskforce committee formed to investigate consulting firms who conduct climate assessments in higher education.
- Rankin & Associates identified as leading expert in multiple identity studies in higher education

Process to Date
2005-2006

- Conversations at system level continued
- Proposal presentation made to UW System Provosts and various constituent groups in Madison in September 2006

Process to Date
2006-2007

- UWS Administrators form Climate Study Working Group (CSWG)
  - Conducted in-depth interviews with other higher education institutions who had contracted with R&A resulting in very positive reviews
  - In collaboration with R&A identified potential fact-finding groups and developed protocol
  - Identified "next steps" in process

Process to Date
2006-2007

- President Reilly pledges support for the project and agrees to finance 75% of the costs
- Five campuses volunteer to participate in climate assessment in the first year
- Participating institutions Provosts' Teleconference with R&A to discuss process, Scope of the Work, Projected Time-line, Proposed Budget
- At the request of R&A, the Provosts were invited to add additional members to the CSWG to ensure institutional representation
**Process to Date 2006-2007**

- Project Co-Chairs and Project Coordinator named
  - Vicki Washington (Co-Chair, CSWG)
    - Interim Assistant Vice President of the Office of Academic Development and Diversity, UW System Administration
  - Ed Burgess (Co-Chair, CSWG)
    - Department of Dance, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
  - Lisa Beckstrand (Project Coordinator)
    - Academic Planner, Director of Inclusivity Initiative, Office of Academic & Student Services, UW System Administration

**Process to Date Participating Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Colleges</td>
<td>UW-Stout Chico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-La Crosse</td>
<td>UW-Parkside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-Milwaukee</td>
<td>UW-River Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-Oshkosh</td>
<td>UW-Whitewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-Stevens Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview of the Project**

- **Phase I**
  - Fact-Finding Groups

- **Phase II**
  - Assessment Tool Development and Implementation

- **Phase III**
  - Data Analysis

- **Phase IV**
  - Final Report and Presentation

**Phase I**

**September 2007**

Fact-finding groups were held with UW System students, staff, and faculty from various constituent groups to discuss their perceptions of the college climate.

Information from the fact finding groups used by CSWG to identify baseline system-wide and institutional challenges and to assist in developing survey questions.

**Phase II**

**August 2007 - February 2008**

Bi-monthly meetings with CSWG to develop the survey instrument.

Development of Communication Plan

CSWG developed the final survey instrument template that was administered to the five participating institutions in spring 2008.

**Phase II cont'd**

**Summer and Fall 2009**

Diversity Leadership Committee (DLC) at UW-River Falls revised the survey to better match the campus context at UW-River Falls.

Approved by UW-River Falls Institutional Review Board (IRB) on July 13, 2009.

The survey was distributed in Fall 2009.
Survey Instrument

- Final instrument
  - 93 questions and additional space for respondents to provide commentary
  - On-line or paper & pencil options
- Sample = Population
  - All members of the UW-River Falls community were invited to participate
- Results include information regarding:
  - Respondents' personal experiences at UW-River Falls
  - Respondents' perceptions of climate at UW-River Falls
  - Respondents' perceptions of institutional actions
  - Respondents' input into recommendations for change

Survey Assessment Limitations

- Self-selection bias
- Response rates
- Caution in generalizing results for constituent groups with significantly lower response rates

Method Limitation

- Data were not reported for groups of fewer than 5 individuals where identity could be compromised.
- Instead, small groups were combined to eliminate possibility of identifying individuals.

Phase III
January – March 2010

Quantitative and qualitative analyses conducted

Phase IV
April 2010

Draft of the report reviewed by UWRF DLC committee members

Draft report forwarded to UWRF DLC representatives

Presentation of survey results to the campus community

Results

Response Rates
Who are the respondents?

- 2,290 people responded to the call to participate (31% response rate overall).
- Several respondents contributed remarks to the open-ended questions.

Faculty Response Rates

- Professor (63%, n = 77)
- Assistant Professor (64%, n = 30)
- Associate Professor (47%, n = 24)
- Instructional Academic Staff (22%, n = 30)
- Adjunct Faculty (13%, n = 15)

Staff Response Rates

- Classified Staff Exempt (91%, n = 39)
- Non-Instructional Academic Staff (55%, n = 73)
- Classified Staff Non-Exempt (46%, n = 88)
- Limited Term Employee (28%, n = 29)
- Limited Academic Staff (12%, n = 5)
- Administrators (n = 18)

Student Response Rates

- Bachelor Degree Student (25%, n = 1448)
- Master Degree Student (13%, n = 56)
  - Transfer (n = 159)
  - Associate Degree (n = 85)
  - Dual Enrollment (n = 3)
  - Non-Degree Seeking (n = 27)
  - Professional Degree (n = 29)

Student Response Rates by Selected Demographics

- By Race
  - Students of Color 47% (n = 819)
  - White Students 53% (n = 1652)
- By Gender
  - Women Students 51% (n = 1219)
  - Men Students 49% (n = 551)
Results

Demographic Characteristics

Student Respondents by Class Standing (n)

Student Residence

35% of student respondents lived in off-campus apartment or house

1% of student respondents lived in fraternity or sorority housing

Income by Student Status (n)

Employee Respondents by Position Status (n)

Collapsed Employee Status (n)
Respondents with Conditions that Substantially Affect Major Life Activities (n)

- Students
- Faculty
- Academic Staff
- Classified Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Disability</th>
<th>Learning Disability</th>
<th>Psychological Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship Status by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-citizen</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-citizen - naturalized</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident (immigrant)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident (refugee)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (F-1, J-1, or H-1-B, or other visa)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Comfort Levels

- Campus Climate (86%)
- Department/Work Unit (66%)
- Classroom (86%)

Overall Satisfaction

- Employees who were "highly satisfied" or "satisfied" with their jobs at UW-River Falls.
- Employees who were "highly satisfied" or "satisfied" with the way their careers have progressed at UW-River Falls.
- Students who were "highly satisfied" or "satisfied" with their education UW-River Falls.
- Students who were "highly satisfied" or "satisfied" with the way their academic careers have progressed at UW-River Falls.
Employee Satisfaction with Their Jobs by Selected Demographic Categories (%)

Employee Satisfaction with the Way Their Careers Have Progressed by Selected Demographic Categories (%)

Employee Comments with Regard to Job and Career Progression Satisfaction

- Employees who were satisfied with the way their careers have progressed indicated they had the "ability to make a contribution," were "challenged intellectually," "had flexibility" in their jobs, had "good benefits," had a passion for their work, enjoyed their work environment and co-workers, loved working with students, and felt valued by colleagues at UW-River Falls.

- Those employees who were not satisfied with their career progression indicated they saw "no clear path for advancement," were overburdened in terms of their workloads, earned "deficient" salaries, lacked respect from supervisors/administration, endured job insecurity, have been passed over for promotions, and worked in "stressful" departments or units.
Student Satisfaction with Education at UW-River Falls (%)

Student Satisfaction with Academic Career at UW-River Falls (%)

Student Comments with Regard to Satisfaction with Academic Experiences

- Students who were satisfied with the way their academic careers have progressed said they enjoyed their choice of majors, felt well prepared for UW-River Falls' academic rigor, felt appropriately challenged in their courses, met people they call friends, earned "good grades," and liked their professors and advisors.

- Dissatisfied students wished they had more guidance from academic advisors and career counselors, felt academically underprepared for college-level courses, thought their student peers were apathetic toward academic life, had difficulty scheduling courses (especially dual majors), thought some faculty members imposed arbitrary or unfair "rules" in class, and faced a variety of "personal problems" (e.g., "depression," "personal tragedy," "financial obligations").

Challenges and Opportunities

Experiences with Harassment

381 respondents indicated that they had personally experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct that interfered with their ability to work or learn at UW-River Falls

17%

Personally Experienced Based on...(%)

P Style (n=148)
K儒家 (n=133)
Age (n=129)
Enrolled Academic Level (n=124)
Enrolled Characteristics (n=108)
Religious Views (n=104)
Gender (n=103)
Ethnicity (n=72)
LGBTQ (n=40)
Flowers Orientation (n=37)
Form of Perceived Offensive, Hostile, or Intimidating Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatally for my physical safety</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stared at or treated &quot;oddly&quot; regarding my identity</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination at work</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of or actual profanity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of or actual violence</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of or actual death</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened I would be excluded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents Who Believed They Were Deliberately Ignored or Excluded

Where Did The Perceived Conduct Occur?

- 38 percent (n = 78) - in a class
- 30 percent (n = 61) - in a meeting with a group of people
- 30 percent (n = 61) - at a campus job
- 23 percent (n = 46) - in campus housing

Respondents who believed they were deliberately ignored or excluded (n = 98)

Between 1986 and 1991, 98 percent of respondents who felt ignored or excluded said they were treated this way because of their identity.

Respondents Who Believed They Were Intimidated or Bullied

Where Did The Perceived Conduct Occur?

- 32 percent (n = 78) - at a campus job
- 28 percent (n = 61) - in a meeting with a group of people

Respondents who believed they were intimidated or bullied (n = 98)

Between 1986 and 1991, 98 percent of respondents who felt intimidated or bullied said they were treated this way because of their identity.

Respondents Who Believed They Received Stares

Where Did The Perceived Conduct Occur?

- 55 percent (n = 46) - while walking on campus
- 52 percent (n = 44) - in a class

Respondents who believed they received stares (n = 98)

Between 1986 and 1991, 98 percent of respondents who felt stared at said they were treated this way because of their identity.

Source of Perceived Conduct by Position Status (n)

![Bar chart showing the source of perceived conduct by position status.]

- Student Respondents: 35
- Faculty Respondents: 27
- Academic Staff Respondents: 18
- Classified Staff Respondents: 11

What did you do?1

Personal responses:
- Was angry (58%)
- Felt embarrassed (38%)
- Told a friend (55%)
- Ignored it (55%)
- Avoided the harasser (35%)

Reporting responses:
- Didn’t know who to go to (20%)
- Made a complaint to a campus employee/official (15%)
- Did not report the incident for fear of retaliation (15%)
- Didn’t report it for fear my complaint would not be taken seriously (15%)
- Did report it, but my complaint was not taken seriously (9%)

Respondents could mark more than one response.
Sexual Harassment/Sexual Assault

The survey defined sexual harassment as “A repeated course of conduct whereby one person engages in verbal or physical behavior of a sexual nature, that is unwelcome, serves no legitimate purpose, intimidates another person, and has the effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work or classroom environment.”

The survey defined sexual assault as “Intentional physical contact, such as sexual intercourse or touching, of a person’s intimate body parts by someone who did not have permission to make such contact.”

Respondents Who Experienced Sexual Assault

80 respondents were victims of sexual assault

2%

Respondents Who Believed They Were Sexually Assaulted

By Gender
- Women (5%, n = 46)
- Men (1%, n = 3)
- Transgender (11%, n = 1)

By Sexual Orientation
- Heterosexual (2%, n = 33)
- LGBTQ (5%, n = 4)

By Race
- White People (17%, n = 41)
- People of Color (11%, n = 7)

By Position
- Faculty (63%)
- Employees (n = 2)
- Students (n = 929)

Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving UW-River Falls

41% (n = 929) of all Respondents

Faculty (64%)
Academic Staff (61%)
Classified Staff (54%)
Students (35%)
Employee Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving UW-River Falls

Employees:

Men (61%); Women (59%)
White Employees (60%); Employees of Color (54%); LGBTQ Employees (72%); Heterosexual Employees (59%)

Student Respondents Who Seriously Considered Leaving UW-River Falls

Students:

Men (39%); Women (35%)
Students of Color (50%); White Students (34%)
LGBTQ Students (44%); Heterosexual Students (35%)

Perceptions

Respondents Who Observed or Were Personally Made Aware of Conduct That Created an Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive and/or Hostile Working or Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Race (%)

- White People (n=631)
- People of Color (n=63)

Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Gender (%)

- Women (n=477)
- Men (n=236)
Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct by Sexual Orientation (%)

- LG (n=84)
- Heterosexual (n=532)

- Students (n=604)
- Faculty (n=27)
- Academic Staff (n=56)
- Classified Staff (n=58)

Form of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct

- Verbal
  - 167 (16.4)
- Derogatory remarks
  - 123 (12.4)
- Slurs
  - 122 (12.2)
- Deliberately isolated or excluded
  - 180 (20.2)
- Sexually explicit comments
  - 152 (15.3)
- Intimidation/bullying
  - 148 (15.8)
- Someone isolated or left out because of their identity
  - 129 (13.1)
- Severe physical violence
  - 107 (11.0)

Source of Observed Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, or Hostile Conduct (%)

- Students (40%)
- Did not know source (29%)
- Faculty members (13%)
- Colleagues (11%)
- Staff members (8%)

Respondents Who Observed People Making Graffiti

Where Did The Perceived Conduct Occur?

- 68 percent (n=202) - in a public space on campus
- 17 percent (n=51) - in a residence hall
Respondents Who Observed People Making Derogatory Remarks

Where Did The Perceived Conduct Occur?
- 39 percent (n = 92) - in a public space on campus
- 34 percent (n = 82) - while walking on campus

Respondents Who Observed Someone Being Subjected to Racial Profiling

Where Did The Perceived Conduct Occur?
- 45 percent (n = 107) - in a public space on campus
- 37 percent (n = 87) - while walking on campus

Perceived Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiring (25%)</th>
<th>Employment Practices up to and including dismissal (23%)</th>
<th>Employment Practices Related to Promotion (23%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to Position (31%)</td>
<td>Due to Position (27%)</td>
<td>Due to Position (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Gender (22%)</td>
<td>Due to Gender (25%)</td>
<td>Due to Gender (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Age (12%)</td>
<td>Due to Parental Status (14%)</td>
<td>Due to Age (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work-Life Issues

The majority of respondents expressed positive attitudes about work-life issues.

Work-Life Issues

79% (n = 337) of employee respondents were comfortable asking questions about performance expectations.

32% (n = 134) believe there are many unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with colleagues in their work units.

23% (n = 97) were reluctant to bring up issues that concern them for fear that it will affect their performance evaluation or tenure decision.

70% (n = 178) believed that they had colleagues or peers who gave them career advice or guidance when they needed it.

Work-Life Issues

59% (n = 174) believed they had support from decision makers/colleagues who supported their career advancement.

50% (n = 87) of faculty thought their research interests were valued by their colleagues.

20% (n = 84) consistently felt under the scrutiny of/their colleagues.

20% (n = 111) felt they had to work harder than their colleagues do in order to be perceived as legitimate.

35% (n = 56) thought their compensation was equitable to their peers with similar levels of experience.
Work-Life Issues

65% (n = 273) of employees are usually satisfied with the way in which they were able to balance their professional and personal lives.
45% (n = 189) found UW-River Falls supportive of family leave.
32% (n = 132) have had to miss out on important things in their personal lives because of professional responsibilities.
16% (n = 66) felt that employees who have children were considered less committed to their careers.
17% (n = 70) felt that employees who do not have children were often burdened with work responsibilities.

Work-Life Issues

7% (n = 20) believed the institution was unfair in providing health benefits to unmarried, co-parenting partners.
27% (n = 109) thought they had equitable access to domestic partner benefits.
16% (n = 53) believed they had equitable access to tuition reimbursement.

Welcoming Workplace Climate

- More than half of all employees thought the workplace climate was welcoming of "difference."
- Exceptions include: mental health status, gender expression, and learning disability status.
- Respondents of Color and sexual minority respondents were least likely to believe the workplace climate was welcoming for employees based on race and sexual orientation.

Welcoming Classroom Climate

More than half of all student respondents felt that the classroom climate was welcoming for students based on "difference" across all dimensions.

- 52% of Students of Color and 69% of White students thought the classroom climate was welcoming based on race.
- 48% of LGB students and 60% of heterosexual students thought the climate was welcoming based on sexual orientation.

Institutional Actions

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
River Falls

Visible Leadership

More than half of the respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the Chancellor, College Deans, Enrollment Services, Governance groups, Student Life, Residence Life, and Human Resources provided visible leadership that fosters inclusion of diverse members of the campus community.
Inclusive Curriculum

More than half of all students and faculty felt the courses they took or taught included materials, perspectives, and/or experiences of people based on "difference."

The exceptions included mental health status, immigrant status, learning disability, physical disability, and veteran/military status.

Factors that Influence Attendance at Diversity Initiatives

More than half of all respondents:
- believed that diversity initiatives are relevant to their work
- believed that diversity events are well advertised
- felt welcome at these events
- felt school/work load prevents them from attending
- felt they learned from these events

Less than half of all respondents:
- thought diversity events fit into their schedules
- thought diversity initiatives were not relevant to their roles on campus
- believed they were expected to attend diversity events
- received a personal invitation to attend from a member of the institutional leadership

Employees
Campus Initiatives That Would Positively Affect the Climate

- More than half of all employee respondents recommended:
  - training mentors and leaders within departments to model positive climate behavior
  - offering diversity training/programs as community outreach would positively affect the climate
  - that faculty/staff/students learn a second language, participate in service-learning projects with lower socioeconomic status populations, and work with underrepresented/underserved populations
  - providing on-campus child care services
  - providing gender neutral/family friendly facilities

Employees
Campus Initiatives That Would Positively Affect the Climate

- More than half of all employee respondents recommended:
  - providing, improving, and promoting access to quality services for those individuals who experience sexual abuse
  - providing mentors for minority faculty/students/staff new to campus
  - providing a clear protocol for responding to hate/hostile incidents at the campus level and departmental level
  - requiring the Affirmative Action Office to provide diversity and equity training to every search and screen committee

Employees
Campus Initiatives That Would Positively Affect the Climate

- Less than half of all employee respondents recommended:
  - providing tenure clock options with more flexibility for promotion and tenure for faculty/staff with families would positively affect the climate
  - providing recognition and rewards for including diversity in course objectives throughout the curriculum
  - rewarding research efforts that evaluate outcomes of diversity training
  - diversity-related activities as one of the criteria for hiring and/or evaluation of staff, faculty, and administrators
  - reallocating resources to support inclusive climate changes on campus

Summary

Strengths and Successes
Challenges and Opportunities
Summary of Findings
Strengths and Successes

- 86% percent of students were satisfied with their education at UW-River Falls.
- 79% of employees were satisfied with their jobs at UW-River Falls.
- Over 75% of respondents reported that they were very comfortable or comfortable with the overall climate, climate in their departments or work unit, and climate in their classes.
- Many respondents praised the diversity on campus with regard to ethnicity, religion, and sexual orientation as well as the College’s efforts to create a welcoming atmosphere.

Racial Tension at UW-River Falls

- Twice as many Respondents of Color (31%, n = 51) reported personally experiencing harassment when compared to their White counterparts (15%, n = 316).
- Forty-nine percent (n = 235) of Respondents of Color said the harassment was based on their race, while only three percent (n = 8) of White respondents indicated the basis as race.
- People of Color were also more likely than White people to observe offensive, hostile, exclusionary, or intimidating conduct.
- Of those who observed harassment, 41% (n = 205) believed it was based on race.

Summary of Findings
Opportunities and Challenges

- Challenge 1
  - Racial Tension
- Challenge 2
  - Homophobia and Heterosexism
- Challenge 3
  - Differential Treatment by University Status

Racial Tension at UW-River Falls

- People of Color were less comfortable than White respondents with the overall climate for diversity, the climate in their departments/work units, and the climate in their classes.
- Employees of Color were more likely than White employees to report:
  - colleagues expect them to represent the “point of view” of their identity
  - their colleagues have lower expectations of their than of other employees
  - that they have to work harder than their colleagues do in order to be perceived as legitimate.
- Employees of Color were also more likely to believe they had observed discriminatory hiring practices and employment-related disciplinary actions.

Homophobia and Heterosexism

- LGBTQ respondents were more than twice as likely than heterosexual respondents to believe that they had experienced harassment.
- Of those who believed they had experienced this type of conduct, 46% (n = 19) of LGBTQ respondents versus two percent (n = 7) of heterosexual respondents indicated that this conduct was based on sexual orientation.
- A much higher percentage of LGBTQ respondents believed they had observed offensive, hostile, exclusionary, or intimidating conduct than did heterosexual respondents (50% compared with 30%).

Homophobia and Heterosexism

- Heterosexual respondents were more comfortable than LGBTQ respondents with the overall climate for diversity at UW-River Falls, the climate in their departments/work units, and the climate in their classes.
- LGBTQ employee respondents were less likely than heterosexual respondents to believe the workplace climate was welcoming based on sexual orientation.
- Sexual minority employees and students were more likely than heterosexual employees and students to have seriously considered leaving the institution.
Differential Treatment by University Status

- For those who reported they experienced harassment, university status was the most common basis.
- Of those respondents who believed that they had observed discriminatory hiring, discriminatory employment-related disciplinary actions, and discriminatory practices related to promotion, UW-River Falls status was indicated as the most common basis for discrimination.

Differential Treatment by University Status – Classified Staff

- A greater percentage of classified staff respondents (38%, n = 47) believed they had been harassed than did academic staff respondents (33%, n = 41).
- Classified staff members were less satisfied with their jobs and much less satisfied than with the way their careers have progressed when compared with academic staff.
- Classified staff members were more likely than academic staff members to believe they had observed discriminatory disciplinary actions and unfair promotion.

Next Steps

Process Forward Fall/Winter 2010

- Share report results with community
  - Community dialogue regarding the assessment results
  - Community feedback on recommended actions
  - Executive Summary available at UW-River Falls website
  - Full Report will be available in June 2010

- Recommended planning “advance” to begin a “call to action” regarding the challenges uncovered in the report

Tell Us What You Think...

- Additional questions/comments on results?
- Thoughts on process?
- Suggested actions?

Questions..? Other Ideas..?
A Report on Faculty and Staff Job Engagement at UW-River Falls

A Report of Findings and Recommendations for Action

January 2009
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Section 1: An Assessment of QWL/Job Engagement at UW-River Falls

A. The Organization

The University of Wisconsin at River Falls (UWRF), located in Northwestern Wisconsin, is a comprehensive, career-focused university where students, faculty and staff use applied learning, scientific theory and research to solve real-world problems, grow the state economy and serve society. With approximately 877 faculty and staff, UWRF has an international reputation for the quality of its education as well as its approach to continuous improvement and quality.

B. Objectives of the Quality of Worklife Assessment

UWRF entered into a partnership with Russell Consulting, Inc. (RCI) in 2008 to conduct a comprehensive and far-reaching assessment of faculty and staff attitudes and perceptions towards their overall quality of worklife (QWL) and job engagement. UWRF expressed interest in working with RCI and in joining with UW-Stout initially and eventually other academic institutions in seeking to gauge the worklife quality of faculty and staff. UWRF joined with Stout in working with RCI to create the Academic QWL/Job Engagement Assessment Survey which was used for this assessment.

UWRF’s long-term objective in conducting this assessment of QWL and Job Engagement is to better understand the drivers of faculty and staff commitment and performance and to compare UWRF’s QWL/Job Engagement with other academic institutions.

Specifically, the objectives of this Academic QWL/Job Engagement Assessment process are to:

1. Identify the current level of job satisfaction and engagement by faculty and staff on a wide variety of issues relating to worklife quality and job engagement.
2. Identify and describe obstacles to job engagement at UWRF.
3. Offer insight into how various demographic groups at UWRF may experience differences in the level of their job engagement on diverse workplace issues (i.e., analyzing the data by role, gender, ethnicity, division, and years working at UWRF).
4. Offer guidance to UWRF’s faculty, staff, and leaders to help them understand, focus on, and then address the critical QWL/JE issues facing the campus.
5. Offer specific immediate, mid-range, and long-range *recommendations* for how UWRF might address the issues identified by the survey data.

### C. Designing the Academic QWL/Job Engagement Survey

Beginning in 2007, the principals from RCI worked closely with Stout and UWRF to design and validate an Academic Quality of Worklife/Job Engagement Assessment Survey. An initial draft of the assessment tool was developed by RCI as a precursor to a validation process that included a panel comprised of staff and faculty from UWRF and Stout—all of whom were human resource professionals and/or experts in survey research and psychology. A “pilot” group of Stout faculty and staff reviewed a paper version of the survey and shared their reactions and suggestions for improvement. Based upon feedback from the expert panel and the survey pilot, RCI revised and finalized the instrument.

The validation process was completed in early 2008, with the final Academic QWL/Job Engagement Assessment Survey ready for distribution to UW-Stout in April 2008 and to UWRF in November 2008.

### D. Administering the Academic QWL/JE Assessment Survey

The Academic QWL/Job Engagement Assessment Survey was administered online to all UWRF faculty and staff in early November, 2008. RCI distributed an e-mail to all faculty and staff inviting them to complete the online survey.

Five hundred and forty-four (544) faculty and staff out of a total of 877 faculty and staff working for UWRF as of November completed a survey for a response rate of 62.0%.

The Academic QWL/Job Engagement Assessment Survey (included in this report as Appendix A) was comprised of four sections:

1. **Section I: Employee Perceptions of QWL/Job Engagement Issues**—Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement or frequency with each of 97 statements concerning various aspects of worklife at UWRF.

2. **Section II: Open-Ended Questions**—Respondents were asked to indicate in their own words what factors most contributed to their job satisfaction and engagement at UWRF and to identify one thing that they would change about their jobs or the campus to improve their level of job satisfaction and job engagement at UWRF. They were also asked to identify their overall level of job satisfaction on a 10-point scale.
3. **Section III: Demographic Information**—Respondents were asked to indicate on the survey their campus role, employment status, gender, ethnicity, years working for the campus, and college/division.

### E. Reading and Understanding the Data

To guide the reader in understanding and interpreting the survey data and to help him or her focus on the most **critical areas** for action, this report provides an overall histogram for each survey statement. While these histograms highlight the campus-wide mean score for each variable, it is most useful to see the number of respondents who selected each of the options on the six point scale used throughout this assessment. The histogram displays this detailed information.

The main body of this report features the campus-wide findings for each of the agree/disagree and frequency statements and the overall job satisfaction question. **Appendices E through Appendix K** at the back of this report highlight the differences that exist between groups within each demographic category for each of the statements.

When reading the information in the appendices, however, it should be noted that not every difference between groups is significant enough such that leaders and staff should take action to address the issue. Rather than focusing on differences in mean scores for specific statements, the reader is instead encouraged to look for broad patterns and trends in the differences across all of the measures.

### F. The Creation of Composite Variables and Indicators of Statistical Significance

To aid the reader in discovering and interpreting broad trends in the data and to help identify **real** differences between groups, RCI created a series of **composite variables**. Each composite variable combines faculty and staff responses for a number of specific and correlated measures into a single variable that measures the overall average response on the chosen subset of variables.

The composite variables created from correlated variables from the survey include:

1. **Overall Satisfaction with Worklife Quality**—combines the responses to all of the six point scale levels of agreement and frequency statements in the survey (survey statements 1 through 97).

2. **Satisfaction with the Job Itself**—combines the responses to statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 85.
3. Peer Relations and Teamwork—combines the responses to statements 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 86.

4. Communication—combines the responses to statements 15, 16, 87, 88, and 89.

5. Decision Making and Problem Solving—combines the responses to statements 17, 18, 19, 20, 93, and 94.

6. Job Ownership—combines the responses to statements 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 61.

7. Quality of Supervision—combines the responses to statements 9, 16, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 80, 91, and 92.

8. Quality of Leadership/Management—combines the responses to statements 34, 35, 36, 89, and 90.

9. Skill Training and Development—combines the responses to statements 31, 37, 38, and 39.

10. Career Advancement Opportunities—combines the responses to statements 37, 40, 41, 42, and 43.

11. Vision and Strategy—combines the responses to statements 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 50.


13. Recognition, Rewards, and Compensation—combines the responses to statements 25, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, and 68.

14. Improving Quality and Customer Focus—combines the responses to statements 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 91.

15. Work/Life Balance—combines the responses to statements 79, 80, 81, and 82.

16. Cultural Competence and Diversity—combines the responses to statements 18, 32, 36, 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78.

17. Overall Job Engagement—combines the responses to statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 21, 22, 23, 24, 31, 32, 36, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 79, 83, 84, 90, and 91.

18. Job Design/Enrichment—combines the responses to statements 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 21, and 59.

19. Fair Treatment and Equity—combines the responses to statements 22, 32, 36, 62, 68, 72, 73, 90, and 91.

20. Community—combines the responses to statements 11, 12, 13, 67, and 71.

21. Strategic Alignment—combines the responses to statements 46, 47, 48, 49, and 50.
22. **Organizational Support**—combines the responses to statements 1, 31, 43, 51, 52, 56, 58, 60, and 79.

23. **Resilience**—combines the responses to statements 14, 23, 24, 61, 83, and 84.

For each of these composite variables, this report compares the differences between groups for each demographic category through error bar charts. Error bar charts enable a comparative analysis of the overall differences between groups for each composite value and highlight when differences are *statistically significant* at the .05 level. The error bar charts also assist the reader in identifying the broad differences trends that emerge across the demographic characteristics of respondents.

*Appendix B* displays a sample error bar chart and some guidelines to use in interpreting the differences between the scores on each composite variable.
Section 2: Faculty/Staff Perceptions of Quality of Worklife Issues

The first section of the QWL survey included ninety-seven survey statements that asked respondents for their perceptions of the work environment at UWRF. For the first eighty-four of these QWL statements, respondents were asked to check one of the following boxes to indicate their level of disagreement or agreement with each statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the final thirteen statements, respondents were asked to check one of the following boxes to indicate how frequently they perceive each statement as occurring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Generally</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the ninety-seven statements that follow in this section of the report, responses are displayed in a histogram. To explore the differences in means between groups within each demographic category for each of these survey statements, the reader is encouraged to review the tables in Appendices E through K.

**Part A** of this section displays a histogram for each of the statements.

**Part B** summarizes the means for the QWL composite variables, displays a histogram for each composite variable, and presents a table identifying the survey statements that comprised each composite variable.

**Part C** summarizes the means for the Job Engagement composite variables, displays a histogram for each composite variable, and presents a table identifying the survey statements that comprised each composite variable.
A. Quality of Worklife Issues Histograms

1. I have the knowledge, skills, and abilities that I need to accomplish my performance goals.

Chart 2-1

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I have the knowledge, skills, and abilities that I need to accomplish my performance goals.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
2. My work fully utilizes my talents and capabilities.

Chart 2-2

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.8
Std. Dev. = 1.391
N = 540

My work fully utilizes my talents and capabilities.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 0 = Strongly Agree
3. I am energized and invigorated by my work.

Chart 2-3

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.81
Std. Dev. = 1.129
N = 640

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
4. I am able to bring imagination and creativity to my work.

Chart 2-4

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
5. My work is meaningful to me.

Chart 2-5

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree  to  6 = Strongly Agree
6. On most days, I enjoy my work so much that I find it easy to lose myself in it.

Chart 2-6

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

On most days, I enjoy my work so much that I find it easy to lose myself in it.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree  to  6 = Strongly Agree
7. I am proud of the work that I do for this campus.

Chart 2-7

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 5.44
Std. Dev. = 0.821
N = 656

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree

I am proud of the work that I do for this campus.
8. My co-workers value the work that I do.

Chart 2-8

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.74
Std. Dev. = 1.163
N = 608

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
9. My supervisor/department chair encourages the people in my work area to work as a team.

Chart 2-9

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

My supervisor/department chair encourages the people in my work area to work as a team.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
10. I trust and respect my co-workers.

Chart 2-10

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.68
Std. Dev. = 1.142
N = 539

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
11. My co-workers care about me as an individual.

Chart 2-11

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.74
Std. Dev. = 1.168
N = 602

My co-workers care about me as an individual.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
12. I consider some of my co-workers to be my friends.

Chart 2-12

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
13. My co-workers treat me respectfully.

Chart 2-13

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
14. I feel comfortable asking for help from others when needed.

Chart 2-14

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
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15. I have the information that I need to do my job well.

Chart 2-15

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I have the information that I need to do my job well.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
16. There is good communication between my supervisor/department chair and myself.

Chart 2-16

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.76
Std. Dev. = 1.354
N = 594

There is good communication between my supervisor/department chair and myself.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
17. My work area has clear goals or expectations that help me make decisions and guide me in my work.

Chart 2-17

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

My work area has clear goals or expectations that help me make decisions and guide me in my work.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
18. Diversity (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, experience, etc.) enhances our campus' ability to make decisions and solve problems.

Chart 2-18

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Diversity (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, experience, etc.) enhances our campus' ability to make decisions and solve problems.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
19. When addressing a problem on this campus, we try to get at the root cause of the problem before implementing solutions.

Chart 2-19

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

When addressing a problem on this campus, we try to get at the root cause of the problem before implementing solutions.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
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20. I know when I have the authority to make decisions on my own in my work.

Chart 2-20

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 4.73  
Std. Dev. = 1.983  
N = 694

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
21. I am satisfied with the level of independence that I have in my job.

Chart 2-21

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I am satisfied with the level of independence that I have in my job.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree
22. I take the initiative when I see a job that needs to be done.

Chart 2-22

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I take the initiative when I see a job that needs to be done.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
23. I am responsible for creating my own success in my job.

Chart 2-23

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
24. When I'm dealing with a difficult problem or challenge, I can usually figure out a solution or know who to go to for help.

Chart 2-24

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

When I'm dealing with a difficult problem or challenge, I can usually figure out a solution or know who to go to for help.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
25. My immediate supervisor/department chair recognizes me for my accomplishments.

Chart 2-25

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

My immediate supervisor/department chair recognizes me for my accomplishments.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
26. I feel free to approach my supervisor/department chair with my work-related questions and concerns.

Chart 2-26

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I feel free to approach my supervisor/department chair with my work-related questions and concerns.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree  to  0 = Strongly Agree
27. My supervisor's/department chair's/tenure committee's expectations for my performance are clear to me.

Chart 2-27

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
28. My supervisor/department chair efficiently manages the resources (e.g., employees, equipment, and information) of my work area.

Chart 2-28

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

My supervisor/department chair efficiently manages the resources (e.g., employees, equipment, and information) of my work area.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree  to  6 = Strongly Agree
29. My supervisor/department chair keeps us informed about what's going on within and outside of our work area.

Chart 2-29

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

![Histogram chart showing the distribution of responses to the statement about keeping informed. The mean is 4.62, with a standard deviation of 1.333 and N = 532. The number of responses at each level are 22, 26, 46, 97, 188, and 153. The scale ranges from 0 to 200.]

My supervisor/department chair keeps us informed about what's going on within and outside of our work area.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
30. My supervisor/department chair provides the assistance and support I need to achieve my performance goals.

Chart 2-30

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

My supervisor/department chair provides the assistance and support I need to achieve my performance goals.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree
31. My supervisor/department chair encourages me to increase my knowledge and grow in my job.

Chart 2-31

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

My supervisor/department chair encourages me to increase my knowledge and grow in my job.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
32. My supervisor/department chair treats people fairly.

Chart 2-32

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

My supervisor/department chair treats people fairly.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
33. My supervisor/department chair is responsive to my concerns regarding my work assignments.

Chart 2-33

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.84
Std. Dev. = 1.269
N = 538

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
34. The leaders on this campus model the behaviors they expect of others.

Chart 2-34

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.27
Std. Dev. = 1.338
N = 460

The leaders on this campus model the behaviors they expect of others.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree  to  0 = Strongly Agree
35. The campus leader who oversees my work area is responsive to ideas and suggestions.

Chart 2-35

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.62
Std. Dev. = 1.319
N = 404

The campus leader who oversees my work area is responsive to ideas and suggestions.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
36. The campus leader who oversees my work area treats people fairly.

Chart 2-36

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

The campus leader who oversees my work area treats people fairly.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
37. At least annually, my supervisor/department chair and I get together to discuss my professional development/career goals.

Chart 2-37

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

At least annually, my supervisor/department chair and I get together to discuss my professional development/career goals.

Mean = 4.15
Std. Dev. = 1.641
N = 464

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
38. I have received the training/development that I need to do my job well.

Chart 2-38

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I have received the training/development that I need to do my job well.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
39. I am encouraged to use/apply the new ideas and approaches that I learn in training/development classes.

Chart 2-39

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 6.74
Std. Dev. = 1.185
N = 465

I am encouraged to use/apply the new ideas and approaches that I learn in training/development classes.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree
40. The systems on this campus for deciding job promotions and opportunities are fair.

Chart 2-40

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

The systems on this campus for deciding job promotions and opportunities are fair.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
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41. I have a clear understanding of the opportunities for advancement that are available to me.

Chart 2-41

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I have a clear understanding of the opportunities for advancement that are available to me.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree

Mean = 4.04
Std. Dev. = 1.416
N = 404
42. I know the steps I need to take and the process I need to follow to advance my career on this campus.

Chart 2-42

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree
43. Over the past year I have had opportunities to learn, grow, and develop in my job and career.

Chart 2-43

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Over the past year I have had opportunities to learn, grow, and develop in my job and career.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
44. Our campus’ mission, vision, and values give me guidance in my daily work.

Chart 2-44

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Our campus’ mission, vision, and values give me guidance in my daily work.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree

Mean = 5.02
Std. Dev. = 1.36
N = 518
45. The mission and vision of my department/work area give me guidance in my daily work.

Chart 2-45

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

The mission and vision of my department/work area give me guidance in my daily work.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
46. I feel optimistic about the future of this campus.

Chart 2-46

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I feel optimistic about the future of this campus.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
47. This campus’ plan for achieving its mission and vision is clear to me.

Chart 2-47

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

This campus’ plan for achieving its mission and vision is clear to me.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree  to  6 = Strongly Agree
My department/work area's plan for achieving its mission and vision is clear to me.

Chart 2-48

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree
49. The campus vision and mission help me to see the importance of my work here.

Chart 2-49

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 5.03
Std. Dev. = 1.36
N = 610

The campus vision and mission help me to see the importance of my work here.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree
50. The goals and priorities of this campus are reflected in my job's goals and priorities.

Chart 2-50

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

The goals and priorities of this campus are reflected in my job's goals and priorities.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 0 = Strongly Agree
51. The number of staff in my work area enables us to meet our performance goals.

Chart 2-51

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

The number of staff in my work area enables us to meet our performance goals.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
52. My physical work environment enables me to perform well and do quality work.

Chart 2-52

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

My physical work environment enables me to perform well and do quality work.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 0 = Strongly Agree
53. The performance standards that are used to evaluate my work performance are fair and reasonable.

Chart 2-53

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

The performance standards that are used to evaluate my work performance are fair and reasonable.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
54. All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for the decisions they make.
55. All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for their actions.

Chart 2-55

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 3.29
Std. Dev. = 1.44
N = 403

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree

All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for their actions.
56. All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for the results they achieve.

Chart 2-56

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for the results they achieve.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
57. The performance review process gives me an opportunity to identify what I need from the campus (e.g., training, equipment, information, etc.) to do my job well.

Chart 2-57

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

![Histogram of All Responses - Agreement](image)

The performance review process gives me an opportunity to identify what I need from the campus (e.g., training, equipment, information, etc.) to do my job well.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
58. I have the resources, tools, technology, and equipment that enable me to do my job well.

Chart 2-58

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
59. I am actively involved in setting my own performance goals and expectations.

Chart 2-59

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I am actively involved in setting my own performance goals and expectations.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
60. When assigned a new task, I am given an adequate transition time to learn the task and get "up to speed."

Chart 2-60

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

When assigned a new task, I am given an adequate transition time to learn the task and get "up to speed."

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
61. I am confident in my abilities to meet almost any performance challenge set before me.

Chart 2-61

**Histogram of All Responses - Agreement**

I am confident in my abilities to meet almost any performance challenge set before me.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree  to  6 = Strongly Agree
62. People who work hard and do good work on this campus are rewarded (e.g., recognition, promotions, opportunities for advancement, or other rewards).

Chart 2-62

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree  to  8 = Strongly Agree
63. To the best of my knowledge, the pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on this campus receive for doing comparable work.

Chart 2-63

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

To the best of my knowledge, the pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on this campus receive for doing comparable work.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
64. To the best of my knowledge, the pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on other campuses receive for doing comparable work.

Chart 2-64

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
65. **UWRF has made significant progress in addressing the issue of salary compression (Note: salary compression is defined as the narrowing of the pay differentials between people in the same job or between people in different — usually adjacent — jobs in an organizational hierarchy over time.)**
66. The Wisconsin Department of Employee Trust Funds (ETF) has been responsive to the needs of our campus regarding health benefits.

Chart 2-66

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

The Wisconsin Department of Employee Trust Fund (ETF) has been responsive to the needs of our campus regarding health benefits.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
67. Over the past two months or so, others on campus (e.g., leaders, supervisors, department chairs, or employees) have recognized me for doing good work.

Chart 2-67

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.02
Std. Dev. = 1.816
N = 201

Over the past two months or so, others on campus (e.g., leaders, supervisors, department chairs, or employees) have recognized me for doing good work.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
68. I am fairly rewarded for my contributions to and involvement with the campus.

Chart 2-68

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I am fairly rewarded for my contributions to and involvement with the campus.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
69. I am encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing my work.

Chart 2-69

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.52
Std. Dev. = 1.183
N = 520

I am encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing my work.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
70. When things go wrong, this campus' culture encourages me to look for cause and solutions, not blame.

Chart 2-70

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 3.00
Std. Dev. = 1.308
N = 484

When things go wrong, this campus' culture encourages me to look for cause and solutions, not blame.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree
71. My work-related ideas and suggestions are taken seriously by others here.

Chart 2-71

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

My work-related ideas and suggestions are taken seriously by others here.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree   6 = Strongly Agree

Mean = 4.45
Std. Dev. = 1.203
N = 616
72. I am comfortable challenging existing rules, policies, or practices when I see something that needs changing.

Chart 2-72

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I am comfortable challenging existing rules, policies, or practices when I see something that needs changing.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
73. I am comfortable offering suggestions and ideas for improvement.

Chart 2-73

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
74. Campus leaders make a concerted effort to ensure that faculty and staff of different cultural backgrounds feel a part of the campus community.

Chart 2-74

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Campus leaders make a concerted effort to ensure that faculty and staff of different cultural backgrounds feel a part of the campus community.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
75. I would recommend this campus to other people I know as a place that is sensitive to racial, ethnic, age, gender, cultural, and other differences.

Chart 2-75

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.51
Std. Dev. = 1.164
N = 500

I would recommend this campus to other people I know as a place that is sensitive to racial, ethnic, age, gender, cultural, and other differences.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
76. I feel comfortable discussing cultural differences and assumptions I sometimes make about others.

Chart 2-76

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.69
Std. Dev. = 1.11
N = 600

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
77. I make an effort to reach out to campus faculty and staff who come from different cultural traditions and backgrounds.

Chart 2-77

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.57
Std. Dev. = 1.046
N = 469

I make an effort to reach out to campus faculty and staff who come from different cultural traditions and backgrounds.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree
78. The campus enhances cultural relations through a variety of means such as guest speakers and multicultural events.

Chart 2-78

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

The campus enhances cultural relations through a variety of means such as guest speakers and multicultural events.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
79. The daily requirements and demands of my job enable me to maintain a healthy work/life balance.

Chart 2-79

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 3.79
Std. Dev. = 1.553
N = 526

The daily requirements and demands of my job enable me to maintain a healthy work/life balance.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
80. My supervisor/department chair is receptive to arrangements that help me maintain a healthy work/life balance.

Chart 2-80

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 8 = Strongly Agree
81. I am aware of campus policies that promote a healthy work/life balance.

Chart 2-81

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

- Mean = 3.75
- Std. Dev. = 1.368
- N = 602

I am aware of campus policies that promote a healthy work/life balance.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
82. I am comfortable requesting work and schedule arrangements that help me maintain a healthy work/life balance.

Chart 2-82

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 4.32
Std. Dev. = 1.40
N = 401

I am comfortable requesting work and schedule arrangements that help me maintain a healthy work/life balance.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
Chart 2-83

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

I am comfortable with change.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree
84. When I experience setbacks and failures I am usually able to bounce back.

Chart 2-84

Histogram of All Responses - Agreement

Mean = 5.29
Std. Dev. = 0.778
N = 522

When I experience setbacks and failures I am usually able to bounce back.

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 0 = Strongly Agree
85. I like the work that I do.

Chart 2-85

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

Mean = 4.87
Std. Dev. = 0.823
N = 627

I like the work that I do.

Scale: 1 = Never to 6 = Always
86. There is good cooperation and collaboration among the co-workers in my work area.

Chart 2-86

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

There is good cooperation and collaboration among the co-workers in my work area.

Scale: 1 = Never  to  6 = Always
87. There is good communication about work-related issues within my work area.

Chart 2-87

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

There is good communication about work-related issues within my work area.

Scale: 1 = Never to 6 = Always
88. There is good communication about work-related issues between work areas and departments.

Chart 2-88

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

There is good communication about work-related issues between work areas and departments.

Scale: 1 = Never to 6 = Always
Chart 2-89

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

The campus leader who oversees my work area keeps me informed about issues affecting the campus and its future.

Scale: 1 = Never to 6 = Always
90. The leaders on this campus are receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.

Chart 2-90

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

The leaders on this campus are receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.

Scale: 1 = Never  to  6 = Always
91. My supervisor/department chair is receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.

Chart 2-91

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

Mean = 4.3
Std. Dev. = 1.2
N = 514

My supervisor/department chair is receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.

Scale: 1 = Never to 6 = Always
92. My supervisor/department chair gives me feedback on my work performance.

Chart 2-92

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

Scale: 1 = Never  to  6 = Always
93. I am given an opportunity to offer timely input into decisions being made *within my work area* that affect me.

Chart 2-93

**Histogram of All Responses - Frequency**

I am given an opportunity to offer timely input into decisions being made *within my work area* that affect me.

Scale: 1 = Never to 6 = Always
94. I am given an opportunity to offer timely input into decisions being made at the campus level that affect me.

Chart 2-94

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

Scale: 1 = Never to 6 = Always
95. The deadlines that I am given enable me to do quality work.

Chart 2-95

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

Mean = 4.2
Std. Dev. = 1.066
N = 904

The deadlines that I am given enable me to do quality work.

Scale: 1 = Never to 6 = Always
Chart 2-96

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

On most days, my workload is not a barrier to my doing quality work.

Scale: 1 = Never to 6 = Always
Chart 2-97

Histogram of All Responses - Frequency

My work assignments and responsibilities are clear to me.

Scale: 1 = Never  to  6 = Always
### B. Composite Quality of Worklife Variables

This section reports on the overall means for all of the *Quality of Worklife* composite variables. Chart 2-98 highlights the overall mean for each composite variable (including the "Overall Quality of Worklife" composite mean that includes the mean values for all 97 QWL variables). The histograms and tables that follow summarize the means for each of the composite variables and the individual statements included within each of the composite variables. In the tables, the individual variables are rank-ordered from the largest to smallest means.

**Chart 2-98**

**Comparison of QWL Composite Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Engagement</td>
<td>4.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence and Diversity</td>
<td>4.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Life Balance</td>
<td>4.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Customer Focus</td>
<td>4.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition/Rewards/Compensation</td>
<td>3.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>4.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Strategy</td>
<td>4.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Advancement Opportunities</td>
<td>4.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Training and Development</td>
<td>4.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Leadership</td>
<td>4.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Supervision</td>
<td>4.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Job Ownership</td>
<td>4.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making and Problem Solving</td>
<td>4.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Communication</td>
<td>4.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationship/Teamwork</td>
<td>4.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the Job Itself</td>
<td>4.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality of Worklife</td>
<td>4.392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never  to  6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Tables 2-1 through 2-15 summarize the individual variables included within each composite variable.
Chart 2-99

Histogram of All Responses

Overall Quality of Worklife

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Overall QWL Score: Comparison of UWRF with Non-Academic Norm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison with Norm</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall QWL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Norm</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Norm</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWRF</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2-100

UWRF Comparison to Academic and Non-Academic Norms

95% CI QWL Composite Variable

Non-Academic Norm  Academic Norm  UWRF

Academic and Non-Academic Norms

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never  to  6 = Strongly Agree/Always
**Chart 2-101**

**Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables**

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 8 = Strongly Agree/Always

**Table 2-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with the Job Itself</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q1  I have the knowledge, skills, and abilities that I need to accomplish my performance goals.</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q7  I am proud of the work that I do for this campus.</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q5  My work is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q4  I am able to bring imagination and creativity to my work.</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f85 I like the work that I do.</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q3  I am energized and invigorated by my work.</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q2  My work fully utilizes my talents and capabilities.</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q6  On most days, I enjoy my work so much that I find it easy to lose myself in it.</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2-102

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Relations/Teamwork</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q14 I feel comfortable asking for help from others when needed.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13 My co-workers treat me respectfully.</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q12 I consider some of my co-workers to be my friends.</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q10 I trust and respect my co-workers.</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q11 My co-workers care about me as an individual.</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q8 My co-workers value the work that I do.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q9 My supervisor/department chair encourages the people in my work area to work as a team.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f86 There is good cooperation and collaboration among the co-workers in my work area.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2-103

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Communication</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q15 I have the information that I need to do my job well.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q16 There is good communication between my supervisor/department chair and myself.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f87 There is good communication about work-related issues within my work area.</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f89 The campus leader who oversees my work area keeps me informed about issues affecting the campus and its future.</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f88 There is good communication about work-related issues between work areas and departments.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Making and Problem Solving</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q18 Diversity (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, experience, etc.) enhances our campus' ability to make decisions and solve problems.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20 I know when I have the authority to make decisions on my own in my work.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17 My work area has clear goals or expectations that help me make decisions and guide me in my work.</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f93 I am given an opportunity to offer timely input into decisions being made within my work area that affect me.</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q19 When addressing a problem on this campus, we try to get at the root cause of the problem before implementing solutions.</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f94 I am given an opportunity to offer timely input into decisions being made at the campus level that affect me.</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Job Ownership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q22 I take the initiative when I see a job that needs to be done.</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q24 When I'm dealing with a difficult problem or challenge, I can usually figure out a solution or know who to go to for help.</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q23 I am responsible for creating my own success in my job.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q21 I am satisfied with the level of independence that I have in my job.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20 I know when I have the authority to make decisions on my own in my work.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q6 On most days, I enjoy my work so much that I find it easy to lose myself in it.</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Supervision</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q26 I feel free to approach my supervisor/department chair with my work-related questions and concerns.</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q21 I am satisfied with the level of independence that I have in my job.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q32 My supervisor/department chair treats people fairly.</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q33 My supervisor/department chair is responsive to my concerns regarding my work assignments.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q25 My immediate supervisor/department chair recognizes me for my accomplishments.</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q16 There is good communication between my supervisor/department chair and myself.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q80 My supervisor/department chair is receptive to arrangements that help me maintain a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q9 My supervisor/department chair encourages the people in my work area to work as a team.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q31 My supervisor/department chair encourages me to increase my knowledge and grow in my job.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q29 My supervisor/department chair keeps us informed about what’s going on within and outside of our work area.</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q30 My supervisor/department chair provides the assistance and support I need to achieve my performance goals.</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quality of Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q27 My supervisor’s/department chair’s/tenure committee’s expectations for my performance are clear to me.</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q28 My supervisor/department chair efficiently manages the resources (e.g., employees, equipment, and information) of my work area.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f91 My supervisor/department chair is receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q37 At least annually, my supervisor/department chair and I get together to discuss my professional development/career goals.</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f92 My supervisor/department chair gives me feedback on my work performance.</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart 2-107

**Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables**

![Histogram](image)

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

### Table 2-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Leadership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q36 The campus leader who oversees my work area treats people fairly.</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q35 The campus leader who oversees my work area is responsive to ideas and suggestions.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q34 The leaders on this campus model the behaviors they expect of others.</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f89 The campus leader who oversees my work area keeps me informed about issues affecting the campus and its future.</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f90  The leaders on this campus are receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.

Chart 2-108

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Training and Development</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am encouraged to use/apply the new ideas and approaches that I learn in training/development classes.</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor/department chair encourages me to increase my knowledge and grow in my job.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received the training/development that I need to do my job well.</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least annually, my supervisor/department chair and I get together to discuss my professional development/career goals.</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2-109

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Advancement Opportunities</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q43  Over the past year I have had opportunities to learn, grow, and develop in my job and career.</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q37  At least annually, my supervisor/department chair and I get together to discuss my professional development/career goals.</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q41  I have a clear understanding of the opportunities for advancement that are available to me.</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q42  I know the steps I need to take and the process I need to follow to advance my career on this campus.</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q40  The systems on this campus for deciding job promotions and opportunities are fair.</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision and Strategy</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q46 I feel optimistic about the future of this campus.</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q45 The mission and vision of my department/work area give me guidance in my daily work.</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q48 My department/work area’s plan for achieving its mission and vision is clear to me.</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q50 The goals and priorities of this campus are reflected in my job’s goals and priorities.</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q49 The campus vision and mission help me to see the importance of my work here.</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q44 Our campus’ mission, vision, and values give me guidance in my daily work.</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q47 This campus’ plan for achieving its mission and vision is clear to me.</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Management</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q61 I am confident in my abilities to meet almost any performance challenge set before me.</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q59 I am actively involved in setting my own performance goals and expectations.</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f97 My work assignments and responsibilities are clear to me.</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q30 My supervisor/department chair provides the assistance and support I need to achieve my performance goals.</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q27 My supervisor's/department chair's/tenure committee’s expectations for my performance are clear to me.</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q53 The performance standards that are used to evaluate my work performance are fair and reasonable.</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q60 When assigned a new task, I am given an adequate transition time to learn the task and get “up to speed.”</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f95 The deadlines that I am given enable me to do quality work.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q50 The goals and priorities of this campus are reflected in my job’s goals and priorities.</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q52 My physical work environment enables me to perform well and do quality work.</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f96 On most days, my workload is not a barrier to my doing quality work.</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q58</td>
<td>I have the resources, tools, technology, and equipment that enable me to do my job well.</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q57</td>
<td>The performance review process gives me an opportunity to identify what I need from the campus (e.g., training, equipment, information, etc.) to do my job well.</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q56</td>
<td>All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for the results they achieve.</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q54</td>
<td>All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for the decisions they make.</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q55</td>
<td>All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for their actions.</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q51</td>
<td>The number of staff in my work area enables us to meet our performance goals.</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2-112

**Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition, Rewards, and Compensation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rewards, Recognition, and Compensation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q25</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor/department chair recognizes me for my accomplishments.</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q67</td>
<td>Over the past two months or so, others on campus (e.g., leaders, supervisors, department chairs, or employees) have recognized me for doing good work.</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rewards, Recognition, and Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q68 I am fairly rewarded for my contributions to and involvement with the campus.</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q63 To the best of my knowledge, the pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on this campus receive for doing comparable work.</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q62 People who work hard and do good work on this campus are rewarded (e.g., recognition, promotions, opportunities for advancement, or other rewards).</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q65 UWRF has made significant progress in addressing the issue of salary compression.</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q64 To the best of my knowledge, the pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on other campuses receive for doing comparable work.</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2-113

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

![Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables](chart)

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improving Quality and Customer Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q73 I am comfortable offering suggestions and ideas for improvement.</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q69 I am encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing my work.</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q71 My work-related ideas and suggestions are taken seriously by others here.</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improving Quality and Customer Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f91</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q72</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q70</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2-114

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Mean = 4.12
Std. Dev. = 1.103
N = 523

Work/Life Balance

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/Life Balance</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor/department chair is receptive to arrangements that help me maintain a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable requesting work and schedule arrangements that help me maintain a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The daily requirements and demands of my job enable me to maintain a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of campus policies that promote a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Competence and Diversity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q32 My supervisor/department chair treats people fairly.</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q18 Diversity (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, experience, etc.) enhances our campus’ ability to</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make decisions and solve problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q78 The campus enhances cultural relations through a variety of means such as guest speakers and</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multicultural events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q36 The campus leader who oversees my work area treats people fairly.</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q77 I make an effort to reach out to campus faculty and staff who come from different cultural</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditions and backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q76 I feel comfortable discussing cultural differences and assumptions I sometimes make about</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q75 I would recommend this campus to other people I know as a place that is sensitive to racial,</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic, age, gender, cultural, and other differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q74 Campus leaders make a concerted effort to ensure that faculty and staff of different</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural backgrounds feel a part of the campus community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Job Engagement Composite Variables

This section reports on the overall means for all of the *Job Engagement* composite variables. Chart 2-116 highlights and compares the *overall* mean scores for all composite variables (including the “Overall Job Engagement” composite mean that includes the mean value for all Job Engagement variables). The histograms and tables that follow summarize the means for each of the composite variables and the individual statements included within each of the composite variables. In the tables, the individual variables are rank-ordered from the *largest* to *smallest* means.

Chart 2-116

Comparison of Job Engagement Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Engagement</td>
<td>4.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Strength and Resilience</td>
<td>5.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>4.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alignment</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Treatment and Equity</td>
<td>4.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Design/Enrichment</td>
<td>4.919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never  to  6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Tables 2-16 through 2-21 summarize the individual variables included within each composite variable.
Chart 2-117

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always
Chart 2-118

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never  to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Design/Enrichment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q7 I am proud of the work that I do for this campus.</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q5 My work is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q21 I am satisfied with the level of independence that I have in my job.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q4 I am able to bring imagination and creativity to my work.</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q59 I am actively involved in setting my own performance goals and expectations.</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q3 I am energized and invigorated by my work.</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q2 My work fully utilizes my talents and capabilities.</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q6 On most days, I enjoy my work so much that I find it easy to lose myself in it.</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart 2-119

**Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables**

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never  to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

![Histogram](image)

### Table 2-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair Treatment and Equity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q22 I take the initiative when I see a job that needs to be done.</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q32 My supervisor/department chair treats people fairly.</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q36 The campus leader who oversees my work area treats people fairly.</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q73 I am comfortable offering suggestions and ideas for improvement.</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f91 My supervisor/department chair is receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q72 I am comfortable challenging existing rules, policies, or practices when I see something that needs changing.</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f90 The leaders on this campus are receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q68 I am fairly rewarded for my contributions to and involvement with the campus.</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q62 People who work hard and do good work on this campus are rewarded (e.g., recognition, promotions, opportunities for advancement, or other rewards).</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2-120

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q13  My co-workers treat me respectfully.</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q12  I consider some of my co-workers to be my friends.</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q11  My co-workers care about me as an individual.</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q71  My work-related ideas and suggestions are taken seriously by others</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q67  Over the past two months or so, others on campus (e.g., leaders,</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisors, department chairs, or employees) have recognized me for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing good work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2-121

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Alignment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q46 I feel optimistic about the future of this campus.</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q48 My department/work area’s plan for achieving its mission and vision is clear to me.</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q50 The goals and priorities of this campus are reflected in my job’s goals and priorities.</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q49 The campus vision and mission help me to see the importance of my work here.</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q47 This campus’ plan for achieving its mission and vision is clear to me.</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2-122

Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Support</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q1 I have the knowledge, skills, and abilities that I need to accomplish my performance goals.</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q31 My supervisor/department chair encourages me to increase my knowledge and grow in my job.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q43 Over the past year I have had opportunities to learn, grow, and develop in my job and career.</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q60 When assigned a new task, I am given an adequate transition time to learn the task and get “up to speed.”</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q52 My physical work environment enables me to perform well and do quality work.</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q58 I have the resources, tools, technology, and equipment that enable me to do my job well.</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q79 The daily requirements and demands of my job enable me to maintain a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q51 The number of staff in my work area enables us to meet our performance goals.</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Histogram of All Responses - Composite Variables

Composite Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Table 2-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Strength and Resilience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q24 When I'm dealing with a difficult problem or challenge, I can usually figure out a solution or know who to go to for help.</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q61 I am confident in my abilities to meet almost any performance challenge set before me.</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q23 I am responsible for creating my own success in my job.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q14 I feel comfortable asking for help from others when needed.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q83 I am comfortable with change.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q84 When I experience setbacks and failures I am usually able to bounce back.</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Open-Ended Responses

In Section II of the survey, UWRF's faculty and staff were asked to respond to two open-ended questions and to indicate their overall level of job satisfaction on a ten-point scale. This section of the assessment report summarizes the responses to these questions.

Part A summarizes the employee responses regarding what contributes most to their job engagement at UWRF; Part B offers the mean score and distribution of overall employee job satisfaction/job engagement at UWRF and a comparison to an academic and non-academic norm; and Part C lists the suggestions respondents offered for improving job satisfaction and engagement at UWRF.

A. What Contributes Most to People’s Job Engagement

Question 98 in Section II of the survey asked respondents: What do you like best about working for this campus that contributes most to your job satisfaction/job engagement? Table 3-1 lists the most frequent responses noted by the four hundred and thirty-nine people who responded to this question.

See Appendix C for a list of all verbatim responses to this question.

Table 3-1: What Contributes Most to People’s Job Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Contributes Most to People's Job Engagement**</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers/Peers/Students—supportive, hard-working; nice; diverse</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kind of Work that I Do—challenging; continually learning; making a difference; personally satisfying; working in an educational environment; uses my skills and abilities</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWRF as an Institution/Employer—its mission; location; size of campus, community; the campus culture/sense of being a community</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment—supportive; friendly; collaborative; focus on quality; feel part of a team; collegial</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Work Independently—autonomy; academic freedom; freedom to be creative; having “flexibility” in doing my work</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Schedule—allows balance in work/life; some flexibility</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair/Supervisor/Campus Leadership—supportive; fair; willing to listen; mutual respect</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Contributes Most to People's Job Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition/Appreciation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of my work/efforts by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay/Benefits/Job Security</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Opportunities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— chance to try new ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of doing things here;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can have input into how</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things could be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differently on campus,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in classroom, department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percent of the 439 respondents who listed this response
**A sampling of the types of responses given regarding this issue

B. Overall Job Satisfaction

Each employee was asked by the survey to rate their overall job satisfaction by responding to the following:

99. **Considering everything, how satisfied are you overall with working on this campus?** Place a check mark in the box that best reflects your overall job satisfaction level here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3-2
Overall Job Satisfaction Score: Comparison with Academic and Non-Academic Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison with Norm</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Non-Academic Norm</td>
<td>5904</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Norm</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UWRF</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following error bar chart displays the comparison of UWRF’s overall job satisfaction/engagement with the results from 5,904 employees from other organizations (non-academic, both public and private) and with the results from other academic institutions. UWRF’s mean score is above both the non-academic and academic norm scores. Since this difference is not statistically significant at the .05 level, however, we must make the assumption that UWRF has a level of job satisfaction/engagement that is essentially equivalent to that of both academic and non-academic organizations.

See Appendix B for assistance in reading and understanding the error bar chart.
C. Suggestions for Improving Job Engagement

Question 100 asked respondents to complete an open-ended question: *If there was one thing that you could change about your job or this campus to improve the level of your job commitment or satisfaction, what would it be?* Four hundred and thirty-two faculty and staff offered responses to this statement.

Table 3-3 presents a summary of the most frequent responses to this question. See *Appendix D* for a list of all verbatim responses.
Table 3-3: Ideas for Improving Job Satisfaction/Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay/Benefits—desired changes in salary/wage; higher pay; pay for performance;</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pay/benefit equity; more/different benefits, incl. lower health insurance cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload—smaller workload; increase staff; more equitable workload; reduce</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workload-related stress; more work/life balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate/Culture/Environment—develop better working relationships within</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and between departments/work areas; people treating each other with more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect; people wanting to feel that their work positions/areas/knowledge are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valued by campus/administration; more collaboration/teamwork within and between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works areas; more appreciation/awareness of diversity that exists on campus;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more equity, fairness; openness to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Leadership (Chancellor, Provost, Vice-Chancellors, Deans)—improve</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership skills; increase level of trust/communication between leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and departments; demonstrate that people’s input is valued and considered;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve decision making process; specific changes in leadership personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources/Physical Work Environment—better equipment; more resources of all</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinds incl. budget; improve workspace; more equitable distribution of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement/Professional Development/Job Security—more opportunities for</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancement; promote from within; less favoritism; change LTE positions to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanent ones; more commitment to/resources available for professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development; increased job security for some teaching staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Communication—between faculty and administration; within departments;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between supervisors and employees; share information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability—hold people accountable for their performance/actions/behavior</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at all levels; improve the job performance evaluation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers/Supervisors—involve others in decision making; communicate clearer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations/directions; show less favoritism; improve various supervisory/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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One thing that people would change to improve their job satisfaction/engagement on campus . . . **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Processes/Work Schedule Flexibility—less paperwork; simply specific processes; allow more flexibility in work hours</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Job Training/Orientation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Responses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percent of the 432 respondents who listed this response

**The summary text provides a sampling of the types of responses given regarding this issue
Section 4: Demographic Comparisons

An analysis was conducted on each of the QWL/Job Engagement composite variables and the overall job satisfaction variable for each of the seven demographic characteristics:

- Campus Role
- Employment Status
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Years on the UWRF Campus
- Division
- Comparison to the Academic Norm

This section of the assessment report displays—through error charts—the differences in the mean or average values among the specific groups in each of the demographic categories.

See Appendices E through K for demographic comparisons for each QWL and Job Engagement statement and the ten-point overall job satisfaction question.

Appendix B provides help in interpreting the error bar charts displayed in this section of the report.
A. Campus Role
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Classified/Project

95% CI Overall Quality of Worklife
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N = 145
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![Diagram showing comparisons of QWL dimensions across different campus roles and job engagement.]
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B. Employment Status
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Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 9 = Strongly Agree/Always

Chart 4-26

Demographic Comparisons of QWL Dimensions

Employment Status
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Employment Status
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Employment Status
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Employment Status
Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95% CI Fair Treatment and Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment Status
Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95% CI Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment Status
Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always
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Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 5 = Strongly Agree/Always
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Employment Status
Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied to 10 = Very Satisfied
C. Gender
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Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 8 = Strongly Agree/Always
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Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/ Never to 8 = Strongly Agree/Always
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Gender

Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied to 10 = Very Satisfied
D. Ethnicity

Note: Due to the low number of respondents in all but the “white” respondent groups, all non-white respondents were moved to a newly created “Racial Minority” group.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>403</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence and Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity
Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>403</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity
Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always
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95% CI Overall Job Satisfaction
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E. Years Working for UWRF
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Years Working for Campus
Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always
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Years Working for Campus

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/ Never to 9 = Strongly Agree/Always
F. UWRF College/Division

Chart 4-121
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Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always
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UWRF College/Division

Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied to 10 = Very Satisfied
G. UWRF Compared to Academic Norm
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Comparison to Academic Norm
Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 8 = Strongly Agree/Always
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Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always
Chart 4-167

Demographic Comparisons of QWL Dimensions

Comparison to Academic Norm
Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree/Never to 6 = Strongly Agree/Always

Chart 4-168

Demographic Comparisons of Overall Job Satisfaction

Comparison to Academic Norm
Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied to 10 = Very Satisfied
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Section 5: Summary Findings

The previous sections of this report highlight the results from all of the individual QWL/Job Engagement survey statements; demographic differences through exploring the composite variables, the ten-point overall job satisfaction scale, and people’s responses to the two open-ended questions. This section of the report is intended to help the reader focus in on UWRF’s strengths as a campus and areas where it could improve.

For that reason, tables have been created which highlight the specific QWL survey statements and composite variables where respondents showed overall higher levels of agreement (strengths) and lower levels of agreement (opportunities for improvement).

A. Strengths of the UWRF Campus

Table 5-1 highlights the statements that demonstrate areas of greatest strength at UWRF (all at or above a mean of 4.51 — representing Agree through Strongly Agree). In all of these areas UWRF’s faculty and staff generally reported high levels of agreement/frequency.

Tables 5-2 and 5-3 list the composite QWL and Job Engagement scores in order from the highest levels of agreement/frequency to lowest levels of agreement/frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UWRF’s Assets and Strengths as a Campus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q1 I have the knowledge, skills, and abilities that I need to accomplish my performance goals.</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q7 I am proud of the work that I do for this campus.</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q22 I take the initiative when I see a job that needs to be done.</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q5 My work is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q24 When I’m dealing with a difficult problem or challenge, I can usually figure out a solution or know who to go to for help.</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q61 I am confident in my abilities to meet almost any performance challenge set before me.</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q23 I am responsible for creating my own success in my job.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q14 I feel comfortable asking for help from others when needed.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q83 I am comfortable with change.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q84 When I experience setbacks and failures I am usually able to bounce back.</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWRF’s Assets and Strengths as a Campus</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q26 I feel free to approach my supervisor/department chair with my work-related questions and concerns.</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13 My co-workers treat me respectfully.</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q21 I am satisfied with the level of independence that I have in my job.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q4 I am able to bring imagination and creativity to my work.</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q32 My supervisor/department chair treats people fairly.</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q12 I consider some of my co-workers to be my friends.</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f85 I like the work that I do.</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q10 I trust and respect my co-workers.</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q33 My supervisor/department chair is responsive to my concerns regarding my work assignments.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q59 I am actively involved in setting my own performance goals and expectations.</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q18 Diversity (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, experience, etc.) enhances our campus’ ability to make decisions and solve problems.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q3 I am energized and invigorated by my work.</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q78 The campus enhances cultural relations through a variety of means such as guest speakers and multicultural events.</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q15 I have the information that I need to do my job well.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q25 My immediate supervisor/department chair recognizes me for my accomplishments.</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q16 There is good communication between my supervisor/department chair and myself.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q39 I am encouraged to use/apply the new ideas and approaches that I learn in training/development classes.</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q11 My co-workers care about me as an individual.</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f97 My work assignments and responsibilities are clear to me.</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q8 My co-workers value the work that I do.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20 I know when I have the authority to make decisions on my own in my work.</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q80 My supervisor/department chair is receptive to arrangements that help me maintain a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q9 My supervisor/department chair encourages the people in my work area to work as a team.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q31 My supervisor/department chair encourages me to increase my knowledge and grow in my job.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q36 The campus leader who oversees my work area treats people fairly.</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q73 I am comfortable offering suggestions and ideas for improvement.</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q38 I have received the training/development that I need to do my job well.</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q35 The campus leader who oversees my work area is responsive to ideas and suggestions.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q29 My supervisor/department chair keeps us informed about what’s going on within and outside of our work area.</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q2 My work fully utilizes my talents and capabilities.</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UWRF's Assets and Strengths as a Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q30 My supervisor/department chair provides the assistance and support I need to achieve my performance goals.</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q77 I make an effort to reach out to campus faculty and staff who come from different cultural traditions and backgrounds.</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q27 My supervisor's/department chair's tenure committee's expectations for my performance are clear to me.</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q43 Over the past year I have had opportunities to learn, grow, and develop in my job and career.</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q76 I feel comfortable discussing cultural differences and assumptions I sometimes make about others.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q69 I am encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing my work.</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q28 My supervisor/department chair efficiently manages the resources (e.g., employees, equipment, and information) of my work area.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q75 I would recommend this campus to other people I know as a place that is sensitive to racial, ethnic, age, gender, cultural, and other differences.</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5-2: Composite QWL Variables — Listed from Highest to Lowest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite QWL Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Job Ownership</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the Job Itself</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationship/Teamwork</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence and Diversity</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Supervision</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Engagement</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Training and Development</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality of Worklife</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Communication</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Leadership</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making and Problem Solving</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Life Balance</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Quality and Customer Focus</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Advancement Opportunities</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Strategy</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition, Rewards, and Compensation</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-3: Composite Job Engagement Variables — Listed from Highest to Lowest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Job Engagement Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Strength and Resilience</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Design/Enrichment</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Engagement</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Treatment and Equity</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alignment</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Areas for Greatest QWL Improvement at UWRF

The following tables highlight areas for improvement. Table 5-4 lists the *highest priority* improvement areas—highlighting those variables with mean scores between 2.49 and 3.44 (*Disagree* to *slightly disagree*). These issues warrant UWRF’s focused attention to begin addressing these areas of greatest concern.

Table 5-5 lists the *second highest priority* improvement areas—highlighting those variables with mean scores between 3.55 and 4.49 (*slightly agree*). These issues deserve some focus and attention once UWRF has developed its plan for addressing the highest priority issues in Table 5-4.

Tables 5-6 and 5-7 list the *composite QWL* and Job Engagement scores in order from the lowest levels of agreement/frequency to highest levels of agreement/frequency.

Table 5-4: Highest Priority Opportunities for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UWRF’s High Priority Improvement Areas</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q66 The Wisconsin Department of Employee Trust Fund (ETF) has been responsive to the needs of our campus regarding health benefits.</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q64 To the best of my knowledge, the pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on other campuses receive for doing comparable work.</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q65 UWRF has made significant progress in addressing the issue of salary compression.</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q51 The number of staff in my work area enables us to meet our performance goals.</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q55 All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for their actions.</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q56 All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for the results they achieve.</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q54 All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for the decisions they make.</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f94 I am given an opportunity to offer timely input into decisions being made at the campus level that affect me.</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q62 People who work hard and do good work on this campus are rewarded (e.g., recognition, promotions, opportunities for advancement, or other rewards).</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWRF's Second Priority Improvement Areas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q40 The systems on this campus for deciding job promotions and opportunities are fair.</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q19 When addressing a problem on this campus, we try to get at the root cause of the problem before implementing solutions.</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q63 To the best of my knowledge, the pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on this campus receive for doing comparable work.</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q68 I am fairly rewarded for my contributions to and involvement with the campus.</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q47 This campus' plan for achieving its mission and vision is clear to me.</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f90 The leaders on this campus are receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f88 There is good communication about work-related issues between work areas and departments.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q57 The performance review process gives me an opportunity to identify what I need from the campus (e.g., training, equipment, information, etc.) to do my job well.</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q81 I am aware of campus policies that promote a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q79 The daily requirements and demands of my job enable me to maintain a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q44 Our campus' mission, vision, and values give me guidance in my daily work.</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q49 The campus vision and mission help me to see the importance of my work here.</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q58 I have the resources, tools, technology, and equipment that enable me to do my job well.</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f96 On most days, my workload is not a barrier to my doing quality work.</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f92 My supervisor/department chair gives me feedback on my work performance.</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q70 When things go wrong, this campus' culture encourages me to look for causes and solutions, not blame.</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q42 I know the steps I need to take and the process I need to follow to advance my career on this campus.</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q67 Over the past two months or so, others on campus (e.g., leaders, supervisors, department chairs, or employees) have recognized me for doing good work.</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q41 I have a clear understanding of the opportunities for advancement that are available to me.</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q52 My physical work environment enables me to perform well and do quality work.</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q48 My department/work area's plan for achieving its mission and vision is clear to me.</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q50 The goals and priorities of this campus are reflected in my job's goals and priorities.</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q45 The mission and vision of my department/work area give me guidance in my daily work.</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f89 The campus leader who oversees my work area keeps me informed about issues affecting the campus and its future.</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q37 At least annually, my supervisor/department chair and I get together to discuss my professional development/career goals.</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f95 The deadlines that I am given enable me to do quality work.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWRF’s Second Priority Improvement Areas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f93 I am given an opportunity to offer timely input into decisions being made within my work area that affect me.</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f87 There is good communication about work-related issues within my work area.</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q34 The leaders on this campus model the behaviors they expect of others.</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q60 When assigned a new task, I am given an adequate transition time to learn the task and get “up to speed.”</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q72 I am comfortable challenging existing rules, policies, or practices when I see something that needs changing.</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f91 My supervisor/department chair is receptive to new ideas—even those that challenge the status quo.</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q46 I feel optimistic about the future of this campus.</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q82 I am comfortable requesting work and schedule arrangements that help me maintain a healthy work/life balance.</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f86 There is good cooperation and collaboration among the co-workers in my work area.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q71 My work-related ideas and suggestions are taken seriously by others here.</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q6 On most days, I enjoy my work so much that I find it easy to lose myself in it.</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17 My work area has clear goals or expectations that help me make decisions and guide me in my work.</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q53 The performance standards that are used to evaluate my work performance are fair and reasonable.</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q74 Campus leaders make a concerted effort to ensure that faculty and staff of different cultural backgrounds feel a part of the campus community.</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-6: Composite QWL Variables — Listed from Lowest to Highest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite QWL Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition, Rewards, and Compensation</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Strategy</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Advancement Opportunities</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Life Balance</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Quality and Customer Focus</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making and Problem Solving</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Leadership</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Communication</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality of Worklife</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Training and Development</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Engagement</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Supervision</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence and Diversity</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationship/Teamwork</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Findings

January 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite QWL Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the Job Itself</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Job Ownership</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-7: Composite Job Engagement Variables — Listed from Lowest to Highest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Job Engagement Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alignment</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Treatment and Equity</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Engagement</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Design/Enrichment</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Strength and Resilience</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6: Consultant Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered as a starting point for discussing, understanding, and addressing some of the perceived obstacles to employee quality of worklife, job satisfaction, and job engagement at UWRF.

There are many possible strategies for dealing with these challenges. Since the strategies that UWRF develops and follows must be its own, these recommendations are offered more to ensure that the University develops an effective process for responding to these issues and communicating key action steps than as specific strategies to address each challenge ahead.

This QWL assessment has raised employee expectations for positive change based on what UWRF has learned from the assessment. It is essential that people at all levels read and understand the data, draw their own interpretation of the results, discuss these results and implications with others, and then take responsibility for moving things in a new direction. While leaders and managers have a special responsibility and obligation to do this, finding solutions to these challenges lies with everyone at UWRF and at every level.

Our most important recommendation for action, then, is that the expectation be set that positive, incremental change to address job satisfaction and engagement issues must be the concern and work of every faculty and staff member on campus.

Since these issues require thoughtful exploration, reflection, decisions, and actions, RCI's findings and recommendations should be used as a springboard for action by UWRF's leadership, departments, offices, and individual faculty and staff. They should serve as an important first step in a long-term process of people throughout the university working together to tackle its current and future challenges.

The next several pages offer some possible "next steps" in communicating the assessment results across the campus and for encouraging action by everyone to address the opportunities for strengthening UWRF for the future.

The "immediate" action recommendations should be relatively easy to implement and yet are the most likely to clearly and quickly communicate that the leadership is concerned about UWRF's QWL and job engagement.

The "mid-range" and "long-term" action recommendations may require more substantive campus commitment and coordination, but can frequently have a greater long-term return on the invested efforts.
These recommendations are not listed in any order of importance within each section.

A. Recommendations for Immediate Action

1. Share the Results of the Academic QWL/Job Engagement Survey Report with the Campus Community: All faculty and staff should be informed about the findings from this QWL/Job Engagement assessment, what recommendations were made by the consultants, and what actions are being proposed by the leadership to begin addressing some of the challenges identified in this assessment. It is recommended that all faculty and staff have online access to at least a summary report of the key findings and recommendations, that all members of the UWRF Cabinet receive a copy of the full report, and that the results be discussed in detail at future department and team meetings.

   Action: All faculty and staff have access to an online version of an executive summary of the report and have controlled access to review the full report if desired.

2. Ensure that UWRF Integrates the Assessment Findings into its Strategic/Long-Range Planning Process: If the issues raised by this assessment are to be thoughtfully addressed by UWRF, then the issues must be integrated (in one form or another) into the University’s long-range planning efforts. This assessment report has identified a variety of areas for strategic exploration and future action. For the greatest positive results, UWRF’s strategic and long-range planning, goal setting, and performance management systems should be used to guide the thoughts and actions of every leader, director, manager, faculty member, and staff member in helping to meet the challenges that have been identified here.

   Action: The findings and recommendations from this assessment are integrated into UWRF’s strategic/long-range planning efforts.

3. Ensure that UWRF’s Divisions/Colleges/Offices/Departments Discuss the Survey Findings and Recommendations: RCI recommends that UWRF leaders at every level schedule one or more meetings with their faculty/staff to review and discuss the results from this assessment. Based upon this/these meeting(s) and in concert with UWRF’s strategic response to this assessment (see Immediate action recommendation #2), each division/college/office/department should develop an action plan detailing what steps will be taken within their area in response to the assessment data. This plan will help ensure that the survey results are integrated into work area-specific actions that most directly affect faculty and staff job satisfaction and engagement.
Action: Each UWRF division/college/office/department develops an action plan in response to the assessment results.

4. Communicate the Actions that UWRF is Taking Based Upon this Assessment: People want to see positive steps and actions resulting from the findings and recommendations of this assessment process. This means that faculty and staff should be informed of the specific actions at the campus-wide level that are being taken to address the issues identified in the assessment. Key UWRF leaders should use whatever methods they have available (e.g., division, college, department, or team meetings; Falcon Daily, newsletters; bulletin boards; e-mails; memos from the leadership, etc.) to let people know and see that this assessment has the attention of the campus leadership and that this attention has led to specific strategies, initiatives, actions, and (ideally) results!

Action: UWRF leaders at every organizational level should identify the specific steps and actions they are taking to address the results from this assessment and share this information with faculty and staff on a regular basis (at the campus-wide level, this should occur at least a quarterly).

B. Mid-Range Action Recommendations

1. Improve the Work Environment/Climate: An organization’s work environment and culture plays a significant role in enabling or disabling an individual’s job engagement and performance. The data from this assessment suggests that, in a number of QWL/JE dimensions, some people find the work environment less than supportive of their performance.

More than fifteen percent of respondents to the open-ended question asking for ideas for improving job satisfaction/engagement indicated that the campus climate and culture could be improved. There was a desire for better working relationships between departments, a desire to feel that one’s work is valued by others, people in all areas showing greater respect for each other, to name a few of these work climate issues.

It should also be noted that Community (a Job Engagement dimension) was rated as one of the strongest of the Job Engagement dimensions by participants (with a mean of 4.64 – Agree). In addition, nearly 50% of respondents indicated in response to the open-ended question on what contributes to their job satisfaction/engagement that the positive, cooperative, supportive relationships that they have with many of their co-workers, peers, and students was one of the key contributors to their job engagement.
So, while the issue of campus climate is not a defining issue for most people at UWRF, with 15% of respondents expressing some concerns in this area, the leadership should take steps to ensure that this concern doesn’t become larger. RCI recommends that UWRF explore the origins of climate concerns. The data indicate that a good place to start is among tenured faculty, adjunct faculty, and instructional academic staff (see charts 4-3, 4-11, 4-13, 4-17, 4-19, 4-20, and 4-21 on pages 139 through 148). These three groups consistently score lower QWL/JE scores (sometimes significantly lower) compared to one or more other demographic groups in the Campus Role category. RCI encourages UWRF to begin a dialogue among these groups to better understand their issues and concerns and to track elements of the campus climate especially in relation to these groups. UWRF may want to consider conducting focus groups or study circles on the UWRF climate/community to help find creative solutions to these issues.

**Action:** The leadership of UWRF should investigate the location and causes of the lower levels of community and begin a dialogue with groups of faculty and staff on ways to address these issues. Conducting follow-along focus groups or convening study circles would be a good beginning to addressing this issue.

2. **Enhance Systems for Ensuring Accountability:** All of the QWL statements relating to accountability received some of the lowest average scores in this assessment:

   - #54 — All faculty and staff are held accountable for their decisions. (mean of 3.33, slightly disagree)
   - #55 — All faculty and staff are held accountable for their actions. (mean of 3.28, slightly disagree)
   - #56 — All faculty and staff are held accountable for their results. (mean of 3.33, slightly disagree)

   In addition, approximately 7% of respondents to the open-ended question regarding suggestions for improving job satisfaction/engagement indicated “holding people accountable for their performance and actions” as a key area for improvement.

   In terms of performance feedback, survey statements related to performance reviews and feedback were also on the lower end compared to other statements:

   - #57 — The performance review process gives me an opportunity to identify what I need from the campus. (mean of 3.70, slightly agree)
   - #92 — My supervisor/department chair gives me feedback on my work performance. (mean of 3.98, slightly agree)
   - #53 — The performance standards that are used to evaluate my work performance are fair and reasonable. (mean of 4.48, slightly agree)
Holding people accountable for decisions, actions and results is central to ensuring quality and performance. An organization only works as well as its system for managing performance and holding people accountable for results. RCI recommends that UWRF evaluate its performance management systems and any formal training program currently in place for building performance review/feedback competencies in UWRF’s managers and supervisors. If the campus doesn’t have a good performance management system in place (including methods for tracking performance) or hasn’t trained its managers and supervisors in the skills of giving constructive feedback and conducting performance reviews, then the campus leadership should work hard to put such systems and training into place.

RCI recommends that Human Resources conduct an assessment of the current state of performance feedback and accountability systems on campus and then make recommendations concerning how best to strengthen performance management and accountability for different campus groups. HR may find it useful to contact other campuses to identify “best practices” and approaches that address the unique challenges of performance management and accountability for each of these diverse campus populations. The result of this assessment should lead to recommendations for enhancing the systems that govern performance management and accountability and the training that managers and performers should receive to ensure that the performance feedback discussions occur on a regular basis.

**Action:** UWRF’s HR office should conduct an assessment of UWRF’s performance management systems and training programs that support them. Identifying best practices and benchmarking against other academic institutions may be helpful in finding the appropriate approach to performance management for different groups within the campus community.

3. **Enhance Leadership/Management Effectiveness:** During times of change, the role of leadership involves making tough decisions—decisions that some find affirming and supportive and others find undermining and counterproductive. Leadership is not about meeting everyone’s expectations, it is about being bold and decisive when faced with difficult choices. Nearly 13% of respondents indicated that strengthening senior leadership was an important thing that could be done to enhance their job engagement.

Additional concerns were raised regarding leadership’s receptivity to new ideas (#90, mean of 3.70, *generally*), leaders modeling the behaviors that they expect of others (#34, mean of 4.27, *slightly agree*), and campus leaders keeping them informed on issues (#89, mean of 4.13, *generally*). Significantly lower levels of agreement/frequency on the Quality of Leadership dimension were expressed by
tenured faculty as compared to a number of other groups in the Role on Campus
category (see chart 4-8, page 141).

UWRF’s senior leadership, led by the Cabinet, should closely review these
QWL/JE assessment results for insights into the location and causes of discontent
with the campus leadership. There may be sufficient data in this assessment
report to offer some insights into actions that the leadership could take to
address these issues, but, as with other recommendations, gathering more data
may be helpful. Convening a focus group comprised of faculty and staff to
explore causes and solutions to the leadership relationship challenges is
recommended.

RCI also recommends that each member of the Cabinet closely review these
findings and recommendations and then develop a personal Leadership
Development Plan that identifies specific actions that he or she will take to
strengthen his or her capacities to enhance leadership in his/her department and
the campus as a whole. In the end, leadership involves developing trust and
strengthening relationships with those who choose to follow in the leader’s path.
The personal commitments made by UWRF’s “titled” leaders to truly become
leaders of others are central ingredients to making improvements in this area.

Finally, RCI recommends that UWRF have each member of the Cabinet go
through a 360 leadership assessment process. A feedback process that provides
each leader with specific and actionable data on his or her leadership will
demonstrate that UWRF’s leaders are open and receptive to feedback and that
they are willing and capable of adopting new behaviors to strengthen their
leadership effectiveness. Once the Cabinet undergoes the 360 feedback process,
the process can be gradually expanded to include all UWRF leaders, managers,
and supervisors—perhaps including department chairs. RCI is available to manage
and facilitate the 360 process for UWRF.

**Action:** Individual members of the Cabinet should develop a personal Leadership
Development Plan that identifies specific actions that he or she will take to
strengthen his or her leadership relationship with others. Focus groups might be
convened to explore the expectations and challenges of leadership and to
identify possible strategies for enhancing leadership at UWRF. UWRF may also
want to explore the use of 360 leadership assessments to provide more specific
behavioral feedback to individual leaders.

4. **Address Issues Concerning Decision Making and Problem Solving (DMPS):**
Decision making and problem solving within a large and diverse community are
challenging for any organization and the data from this assessment indicates
that, for UWRF, this is an area for some improvement. Respondents indicated
relatively low levels of frequency in being given opportunities of offering timely input into campus decisions (#94, mean of 3.35, sometimes) and only a moderate frequency at being given an opportunity of offering timely input into work area decisions (#93, mean of 4.21, generally). In addition, respondents reported relatively lower levels of agreement on whether the campus gets at the root cause of problems before implementing solutions (#19, mean of 3.58, slightly agree) and only moderate levels of agreement that their work area has clear goals to guide their decision making (#17, mean of 4.47, slightly agree) and that their work-related ideas and suggestions are taken seriously by others (#71, mean of 4.45, slightly agree).

It is neither possible nor desirable, however, that all decisions made at UWRF be done in such a way that each person affected by a decision has a say in that decision. In a large organization, being nimble in decision making and problem solving allows the realization of opportunities and the avoidance of barriers and setbacks. None-the-less, UWRF should take concerted steps to enhance its decision making and problem solving approaches with an eye toward improved participation and collaboration.

RCI recommends that UWRF’s leadership examine its core decision making and problem solving methods and strategies and identify areas where these processes can be either be improved or more consistently applied.

It’s been our experience as consultants working for a variety of organizations that a common problem with DMPS is that the organization hasn’t defined and standardized its approach for making decisions and solving problems. In the absence of a well-defined process, people tend to approach the problem solving or decision making process intuitively (which is appropriate some of the time) or simply fail to take up the problem or make a decision . . . until things either spiral out of control or critical actions aren’t taken, at which time one or more leaders might step in and impose unilateral decisions or solutions.

Thoughtful, data-based problem solving and decision making requires the development of a clear and consistent DMPS methodology or process and then training leaders, faculty, and staff in both the principles of DMPS and the core methodology and tools to use within the process.

RCI recommends that UWRF’s leadership study and adopt a formal DMPS process, embrace a set of core DMPS principles to guide the DMPS work of leadership, faculty, and staff throughout the University, and then train all leaders, faculty, and staff in the new DMPS process, principles, and tools.

Another key dimension that should be addressed within a newly defined DMPS process is the role of participation and involvement in the decisions being made.
Most employees understand and accept that not all UWRF decisions should or will be open to participation by all faculty and staff—even on matters that influence their daily work. People do, however, want to know the times when their involvement is possible and when it’s not. And, when their participation in a decision is possible, they want to know how best to offer their perspective and they want to feel assurance that their contribution to the decision was heard and, to the greatest extent possible, considered and integrated into the final decision. Further, if ideas aren’t accepted or integrated into the final decision, people would ideally want to know why an idea wasn’t accepted.

The purpose of employee involvement and participation in decision making and problem solving is two-fold:

a. To gain the insights and perspectives that faculty and staff may have in relation to the decision being made or the problem being solved. In some respects, this is the most important reason why involvement is necessary: it ensures that campus hasn’t missed anything critical that needs to be incorporated into a decision or a solution to a problem. Leaders have only a limited perspective on the daily tasks, challenges, obstacles, hopes, and opportunities that are experienced by those on the front line (in the classroom or in the myriad of work areas that support the learning community). By integrating these important viewpoints, campus leaders are more likely to make an informed decision vs. being in the dark about information that they are not aware of.

b. To build ownership and commitment by those expected to carry out the decisions and implement solutions. The eventual success of any solution or decision that UWRF’s leaders choose to implement hinges on those who are expected to carry out that solution/decision. When people feel no ownership of or commitment to a solution/decision (because their needs or perspectives weren’t considered or consulted), they are less likely to be fully engaged with or committed to seeing that solution/decision be successful.

UWRF’s leadership should identify a set of broad principles to guide the decision making process that would help provide clarity as to when and where faculty/staff participation and involvement in decision making are both desirable and necessary and when such are not essential or desired. Once these broad parameters are defined they should be communicated to all UWRF faculty and staff—and then the leadership team must follow through and “walk the talk” in respect to these DMPS principles.
RCI is available to assist UWRF’s leadership in developing its DMPS processes, principles, parameters, and tools. It can also assist in training the UWRF’s leaders, faculty, and staff in the newly refined DMPS processes and methodologies.

**Action:** UWRF’s leaders should take steps to define and introduce a more formal approach to decision making and problem solving. This should involve (a) developing a model for decision making and problem solving; (b) identifying guiding principles to govern the DMPS process; (c) establishing broad guidelines and parameters to help leaders and managers know when and how to involve departments, faculty, and staff in the DMPS process; and (d) training all leaders, faculty, and staff on the models, principles, and tools of DMPS.

5. **Explore Differences Between Demographic Groups:** Every organization is filled with real differences between groups of people and their perceptions of the quality of their work life. Because people come from different backgrounds and cultural traditions, with different expectations, skills, knowledge, needs and desires, there will never be (nor should there be) a homogenous, fully cohesive, equally satisfied and job engaged workforce.

At the same time, the data from this assessment indicate that some groups of faculty and staff report either significantly lower levels of satisfaction/engagement than other groups or these groups trend lower across multiple QWL/Job Engagement dimensions. RCI recommends that these differences should be noted and, if deemed significant for further study, an effort be made to begin exploring the causes of significantly lower levels of satisfaction/engagement. Some of these causes may be beyond the University’s capacity to address, but there may be a range of actions, based upon a better understanding of the causes, that UWRF leaders, faculty, and staff could take.

**Action:** UWRF’s leadership should initiate an effort to explore the causes of differences in mean scores for different demographic groups. This might include a task force or work groups empowered to research these issues or convening focus groups of key stakeholders. Once the underlying issues and causes are better understood, the task force or work group could recommend solutions to the campus as a whole or to individual departments.

6. **Find Answers to Unanswered Questions from this QWL Assessment:** UWRF’s leadership should identify a set of “unanswered questions” emerging from this QWL/Job Engagement Assessment report and identify specific strategies/methods for finding answers to these questions (e.g., Why does the Tenured Faculty group routinely indicate somewhat or significantly lower levels of job satisfaction and engagement across many of the QWL and Job Engagement
dimensions? What factors might be explaining these lower end results?). Throughout the body of this report there are a number of these “unanswered questions” and the leadership should make a concerted effort in identifying these.

RCI recommends that the UWRF’s leadership create a diverse workgroup to identify these unanswered questions and to bring the list of questions to a future meeting of the Cabinet for their review. The Cabinet should then identify the most critical of these questions for further exploration as a beginning step to tackling these issues as a campus.

Action: UWRF’s leadership should create a workgroup to identify the “unanswered questions” embedded in this assessment and to then bring these lists of questions to the Cabinet for action to drive progress at finding answers and solutions to these questions.

C. Long-Range Action Recommendations

1. **Address Workload and Staffing Issues:** It is clear from the data that UWRF’s faculty and staff take pride in their work (#7, mean of 5.44), that they find their work meaningful (#5, mean of 5.27), that they have the knowledge and skills to accomplish their work goals (#1, mean of 5.56), and that they like the work that they do (#85, mean of 4.87). The interrelated characteristics converge to paint a picture of a group of faculty and staff who are fiercely dedicated to what they do and what they accomplish. This is a tremendous virtue and asset that the campus can draw upon as it faces the challenges ahead. The resulting challenge from this virtue, however, is that people have very high expectations for quality and results—expectations that are destined to be frustrated by the resource limitations imposed upon UWRF and its faculty and staff.

There are a number of variables related to workload, staffing, and resources that speak to people’s frustrations in this area:

- #51 — The number of staff in my work area enables us to meet our performance goals. (mean of 3.23, slightly disagree)
- #79 — The daily requirements and demands of my job enable me to maintain a healthy work/life balance. (mean of 3.79, slightly agree)
- #58 — I have the resources, tools, technology, and equipment that enable me to do my job well. (mean of 3.93, slightly agree)
- #96 — On most days, my workload is not a barrier to my doing quality work. (mean of 3.95, generally)
- #52 — My physical work environment enables me to perform well and do quality work. (mean of 4.06, slightly agree)
• #95 — The deadlines that I am given enable me to do quality work. (mean of 4.20, generally)

These are challenging times for the campus as it struggles to maintain academic excellence and its vibrant campus community in the face of flat and declining revenues and restrictions in its ability to move quickly to fill vacant positions. Unfortunately, given the State of Wisconsin’s budget challenges and related global economic troubles, the issues of declining revenue, limited resources, and growing workload stress are likely to get worse before they get better.

There are no easy solutions to these resource, staffing, and workload challenges. In the long-run, UWRF will likely need to make some difficulty choices as it enacts its strategic agenda in the face of these converging economic challenges. This involves making decisions concerning which academic or support service programs the campus will continue investing in and which programs may need to be set aside. Since such decisions have huge implications for the students, faculty, staff, and UWRF’s brand, they will not be easy decisions to make or implement. Change of this profound nature will be very difficult to implement.

In the short-run, however, there are actions that the campus as a whole and individual divisions, colleges, and departments can take to better understand and address workload and staffing issues. The first of these involves engaging the faculty and staff in a sustained conversation on what specifically is behind their frustrations in these areas and exploring possible solutions to the causes that are identified. Since the more concrete and specific these discussions are the better, RCI recommends that each work area, department, and college set aside time for the faculty and staff to discuss these issues and develop strategies for addressing them. RCI further recommends that a campus workgroup be created to help guide these discussions and gather best practice ideas for action at the college/department level as well as identify actions at the campus-wide level. This workgroup should develop a uniform process and facilitation guide that deans, department chairs, administrators, and managers would use to help them lead the discussions in their respective areas.

**Action:** UWRF will need to develop both short- and long-term strategies to deal with the challenges of limited resources and growing workload. The **long-term strategies** should involve making difficult choices about future programs and services and must be anchored to the strategic agenda for the campus. The **short-term strategies** should involve (a) creating a *campus workgroup* to guide discussions at the division, college, and department level, (b) developing a uniform process for facilitating these division, college, and departmental discussions, and (c) the workgroup compiling and sharing best practices and identifying possible campus-wide actions for addressing these issues.
2. **Continue Efforts to Address Perceived Insufficiencies in Pay, Rewards, and Recognition:** It is no surprise that the insufficiency of rewards and compensation were identified by respondents as one of their top concerns:

- **#64** — To the best of my knowledge, the pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on other campuses receive for doing comparable work. (mean of 2.71, *slightly disagree*)
- **#65** — UWRF has made significant progress in addressing the issue of salary compression. (mean of 3.08, *slightly disagree*)
- **#62** — People who work hard and do good work on this campus are rewarded. (mean of 3.44, *slightly disagree*)
- **#40** — The systems on this campus for deciding job promotions and opportunities are fair. (mean of 3.55, *slightly agree*)
- **#63** — To the best of my knowledge, the pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on this campus receive for doing comparable work. (mean of 3.59, *slightly agree*)
- **#68** — I am fairly rewarded for my contributions to and involvement with the campus. (mean of 3.61, *slightly agree*)
- **#67** — Over the past two months or so, others on campus (e.g., leaders, supervisors, department chairs, or employees) have recognized me for doing good work. (mean of 4.02, *slightly agree*)
- **Nearly 30%** of respondents to the open-ended question asking for the one thing that could be done to improve their job satisfaction/engagement indicated some variation on higher pay or improvements in pay and benefits.

In an age characterized by a steady erosion of taxpayer investments in higher education, it is challenging enough simply to keep the “lights on” and the campus functioning. Meeting faculty and staff expectations concerning rewards and compensation during these times of cut-backs and under-investment is a significant challenge and is likely to remain one for the foreseeable future. A complicating factor on this front is that UWRF’s solution to the pay issue can’t be easily separated from the larger UW System. Hence, any attempt by UWRF to “fix” the pay issue can’t be done in isolation or on its own.

That said, it is still important for UWRF’s leaders to understand the role that pay and rewards play in organizations. The best organizations understand the challenges of rewards and compensation and therefore take proactive measures to ensure that there is both internal and external equity in their pay system. They also take steps to ensure that non-pay forms of reward and recognition are an integral part of the “total compensation” that contributors receive for a job.
well done. RCI recommends that UWRF’s leadership continue to explore creative ways to address pay equity issues and that it begin a concerted effort to find ways of rewarding and recognizing people in non-traditional ways.

RCI’s first recommendation in this area is to have UWRF raise faculty and staff awareness, understanding, and appreciation of the monetary value of the benefits that the University provides to its faculty and staff. If it has not done so already, RCI encourages UWRF to identify the actual per person costs (on a monthly or annual basis – annual is likely to have a greater impact) of the benefits that faculty and staff currently receive through their employment at the University. It is hoped that, with this information, some faculty and staff will appreciate the substantial investment that the campus is making towards their health and welfare. For some, unfortunately, this information may not make much difference in their view that they are undercompensated for their work when compared to others in similar job situations. Nonetheless, sharing this information may help some faculty and staff see the larger framework of “total compensation” vs. a more narrow view of their take-home pay.

For those faculty and staff who may still have issues with pay equity, RCI recommends that UWRF gather market data on pay. In general and in relation to the issue of the perceived adequacy and fairness of their pay, research into the role of compensation in motivating people to work hard suggests that, while compensation is rarely a motivator, if it fails to meet minimum expectations of sufficiency, fairness, and equity, it can easily become a de-motivator. To remove the possibility of pay becoming a de-motivator for some faculty and staff, UWRF should gather market data on pay (if it has not already done so), and then share the results with faculty and staff such that they can make their own judgments and decisions based upon the facts vs. assumptions. If, based upon the research, pay adjustments for specific positions are called for, then UWRF should advocate with System Administration for permission to make these data-based adjustments. The results from this external pay equity study may also be useful in reinforcing the fact that UWRF’s current pay levels are, in fact, in line with the pay levels in comparable four-year, public higher education institutions in the Midwest (obviously, only if the pay study supports this fact!).

RCI also recommends that a similar pay equity study be conducted to examine the UWRF’s internal pay structure. Ensuring internal pay equity directly addresses issues surrounding perceptions of the fairness of the University’s pay system as it relates to comparable positions in different departments and divisions on campus.

While pay must be adequate and fair, it rarely inspires people to achieve great performance. That’s why it is also critically important for the University to
continue to explore creative ways to recognize people's contributions to UWRF's customers (students and employers), co-workers, departments, work teams and task forces, and the campus overall. RCI recommends that UWRF's leadership identify and communicate the multitude of creative ways in which managers, supervisors, departments, and teams might recognize and celebrate the efforts and contributions of faculty and staff. To facilitate identifying these creative methods, RCI suggests that UWRF create a short-term campus "Rewards and Recognition" team that is charged with exploring this issue further and identifying both conventional and more creative approaches to this ongoing challenge.

Once the exploration of comparable pay and other possible reward and recognition opportunities has been completed, the leadership team can decide on the most appropriate course of action. One strategy might involve asking UWRF leaders and managers to take specific steps to (a) recognize faculty and staff contributions in their areas, (b) recognize the efforts of teams and individuals from other departments who have served their areas well, and (c) share and celebrate faculty and staff contributions toward UWRF's success at department, team, and campus-wide meetings.

**Action:** The campus should highlight UWRF's financial investment in each faculty and staff member's benefit plan so that individual contributors can see the substantial additional annual financial investments that the campus currently makes in each faculty and staff member. In respect to pay levels, UWRF should, in concert with System Administration, conduct some form of a pay equity study (both internal and external) to review and adjust (if necessary and possible) the pay levels—or to emphasize the comparability of UWRF's pay to other four-year public institutions of higher learning. Finally, UWRF's leadership should establish as an expectation of every manager to recognize and celebrate the contributions of faculty and staff within and outside of their departments. Creating a short-term "Rewards and Recognition" project team to identify creative, accessible, and affordable methods for celebrating faculty and staff contributions is also recommended.

3. **Addressing Remaining Staff Concerns Regarding Health Benefits:** While only one statement in the QWL survey addressed the issue of health benefits (#66), this statement scored the lowest level of agreement: The Wisconsin Department of Employee Trust Funds has been responsive to the needs of our campus regarding health benefits (mean of 2.49, Disagree). RCI recommends that the campus continue exploring faculty and staff satisfaction with this issue and to continue efforts to address this issue with ETF. Human Resources should take the lead role in documenting ongoing concerns in this area and in initiating conversations with ETF.
**Action:** UWRF should continue tracking faculty and staff attitudes toward this issue. Human Resources should take the lead in documenting faculty and staff concerns and initiating discussions with ETF.

4. **Conduct a Follow-Along Reassessment:** With the results from this QWL/Job Engagement assessment, a baseline measure of job satisfaction and engagement for faculty and staff at UWRF has been established. The best organizations take periodic “readings” on employee engagement every eighteen to twenty-four months to ensure that they are always learning, changing, and responding to their environment and to the people who voluntarily choose them as a place to work.

Assessing employee engagement every 18-24 months is a lagging measure of faculty/staff QWL satisfaction/engagement. While this lagging measure is a powerful benchmark to gauge UWRF’s ongoing effectiveness at addressing faculty/staff job satisfaction/engagement issues, more frequent mini-assessments of QWL/Job Engagement can provide timelier leading indicator data on emerging QWL issues. UWRF may want to consider conducting more frequent mini-QWL assessments of a sample of employees (30% — approximately 263 people) once or twice a year would enable UWRF’s leaders, faculty, and staff to identify and respond to emerging QWL and job engagement issues. The Mini-QWL/Job Engagement Assessment Survey would be comprised of a subset of statements from the larger QWL survey that would assess the most critical QWL dimensions.

Conducting a mini-QWL assessment may be especially useful once additional normative data from other higher educational institutions becomes available.

**Action:** UWRF should conduct periodic mini-assessments of faculty/staff job engagement to track these issues as leading indicators. A full QWL/Job Engagement Assessment Survey should be conducted again in 18 to 24 months.
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