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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to study the effects of the environment, especially the work environment, on employee well-being in order to identify ways in which the environment may be improved. Key elements of a methodology called social and ethical auditing and accounting (social auditing) were used to determine the impact of a university college’s policies and practices (environment) on employees’ (faculty, support staff, and administration) well-being.

Focus groups were conducted to determine which policies and practices employees believed affected their well-being. Most factors identified were consistent with the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework (Polanyi et al., 1998). Data from the focus groups was used to create a social audit survey that was administered to all employees at the university college. The response rate was 39% or 450 respondents.

Generally the employees reported a high level of health or well-being. They also believed the organization was a good place to work. Employees had a sense of autonomy, control, belonging and caring. The employees perceived a low level of trust, communication, and organizational justice. They also reported that their stress and workload had increased over the last year, yet they were able to balance their work life and personal life. Recommendations made include actions to increase trust and communication, ensure the practices in the organization are fair and equitable, and monitor stress and workload.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Background

In the last 10 years, Canadian employees have had to deal with increased responsibilities and labour market changes associated with restructuring and technological innovation (Duxbury & Higgins, 2001). Although much has been written about the impact of these changes, few organizations have performed audits to examine the specific impacts of their policies and practices on employee well-being (Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability (AccountAbility), no year; Zadek, 1997). Even though organizations understand the importance of healthy employees to the productivity of the organization, the dominant concern of administrators has been balancing financial statements (Elkington, 1999). There has been some focus on physical hazards in the workplace through health and safety committees and programs aimed at behavioral changes, but few organizations have assessed the impact of the environment, including policies and practices, on employee health (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Restructuring, increased use of technology, global competition and the speed of change affect not only the organization, but also its employees and in turn their well-being. The Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework (Polanyi, Eakin, Frank, Shannon & Sullivan, 1998) recognizes that the environment affects well-being, but it is not common practice to assess the environment’s impact on employees. One way of assessing the impact of the organizational environment on employee well-being is through the process of social auditing, yet social auditing, unlike financial auditing, is not common practice.
Many organizations are required by law to report on financial performance. This practice allows shareholders and/or stakeholders to understand how the company is performing financially. There is, however, no legislation in Canada that requires companies to report on social performance. The ethical and social accounting movement started in the 1960s, but it was not until the 1990s that there was a global attempt to encourage companies to assess and report their social performance. The following organizations were established to promote a greater concern for social responsibility:

1. The New Economics Foundation (NEF) was created in 1986 and is located in London, England. It is an independent think tank that develops solutions for social, economic and environmental issues at the local and international level. It created a social auditing process and founded the Institute of Social and Ethical AccountAbility.

2. Business for Social Responsibility (BSR), formed in 1992 as an association of 50 companies, is headquartered in San Francisco, California. It helps organizations remain profitable while being socially responsible.

3. Canadian Business for Social Responsibility (CBSR), formed in 1995, is a non-profit association, which helps companies develop, share and implement corporate social responsibility.

4. Institute of Social and Ethical AccountAbility (AccountAbility), formed in 1996, is an international non-profit organization in the United Kingdom. It promotes social, ethical and overall accountability of organizations by formulating, designing and implementing standards of social auditing.

The growing interest in social performance, according to BSR staff (no year, 4-6), grew out of several factors:

- **Changing Expectations of Stakeholders Regarding Business:** The public and various stakeholders expect corporations to be good public citizens and contribute to society. As well, there is growing demand for disclosure about a company’s social performance.
• Shrinking Role of Government:
In many countries, globalization has encouraged governments to decrease regulations. Companies are expected to adopt their own policies to govern environmental performance, work conditions and ethical marketing practices.

• Increased Customer Interest:
There is a growing interest from consumers about corporate social responsibility. In a study by Environics, The Conference Board and the Price (Prince) of Wales Business Leadership Forum in 1999, 17% of the 25,000 respondents (consumers) stated they avoided products of companies they perceived as not socially responsible. An increasing number of companies, governments, universities and other institutions are using social criteria to make purchasing decisions.

• Supply Chain Responsibility:
Companies are imposing codes of conduct on their suppliers to ensure that other companies’ practices do not negatively affect them.

• More Competitive Labour Markets:
Many workers, especially professionals, are seeking employers who operate within their belief system. Employers find it easier to recruit if employees identify them as an employer of choice. Also, companies are able to retain employees if they develop social policies such as “family-friendly” work places.

• New and Emerging Issues:
In the last few years, there has been an increase in the breadth of topics considered under “corporate social responsibility.” Some of the topics are governance, how boards are selected and compensated, religious freedom in the workplace, access and privacy and environmental sustainability.

With this increased move toward social accountability, more public and private organizations have become involved in monitoring social performance. While social auditing was initially undertaken by “non-mainstream” organizations, now mainstream companies such as Telus Communications, BC Hydro, Royal Bank, North Island College and Vancouver City Savings Credit Union (VanCity) are conducting regular social audits.
VanCity was one of the first Canadian companies to conduct a social audit and North Island College was the first post secondary institution in Canada to conduct a social audit.

Social auditing is a way of assessing, reporting and improving the social performance of an organization. It assesses the performance of the organization against the aims of all its stakeholders.

The purpose of this thesis was to understand how the work environment impacts employee well-being at one university college in the College and Institute System in British Columbia.

Community colleges and institutes were created in the 1960s and 1970s to deal with issues of access and breadth of educational opportunities (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986). The colleges were to offer 2-year programs of study as well as programs of interest to the local communities; the institutes were to provide programs related to specific skills. Currently, the College and Institute System consists of (5) institutes, (11) colleges, (1) agency and (5) university colleges. The College and Institute Act was amended in 1989 to allow an entity called a university college and by 1995 five colleges had been designated as such, to provide increased access to university studies. University Colleges were authorized to offer applied undergraduate degrees. In 1995, Kwantlen was the last institution added to this group.

Stakeholder groups in the College and Institute System include government, community members, suppliers, board members, students, employees and taxpayers. The institution’s employees are an important stakeholder group, which directly create the work environment by their actions or inactions. There are many pressures in the College and Institute System that impact employee well-being including an increased need for
post secondary education, growing emphasis on accountability, restricted funding and government demands.

Over the past several years, enrollment in post secondary education has increased and there is continuing demand for more seats and a greater variety of programs. In 1996, 63% of British Columbia’s population between the ages of 22-24 had some post secondary education (Government of British Columbia, 2001, p. 6). Post secondary enrollment increased from 92,223 in 1990 to 118,431 in 1998 (Ministry of Advanced Education, Training and Technology, 2002). One explanation for this increase may be found in the projections from the Canadian Occupation Projection Model from 1998-2008, which shows that 72.4% of job openings in British Columbia (BC) will require post secondary education (Government of British Columbia, 2001, p. 5). This factor, plus demographic changes, contributes to the ongoing increase in demand for post secondary education.

There is also growing pressure in the post secondary sector for greater emphasis on accountability, educational value for dollars spent. The following three government actions indicate movement toward increased accountability:

1. From June 1987 to March 2003, there was a Standing Committee on Evaluation and Accountability (SCOEA). This committee had responsibility for evaluation and accountability in the post secondary system in British Columbia. The committee produced yearly reports on the performance of post secondary institutions. In 2003, the Ministry of Advanced Education had an “Accountability Branch”.

2. In 2001, the BC government passed the Budget Transparency and Accountability Act to commit ministries to report on performance.

Funding from government has not kept pace with increased employee costs, leading to the elimination of programs and employee positions and creating additional stress in the workplace. Moreover, the Ministry of Advanced Education intends to decrease funding to post secondary institutions over the next 3 years. As an example, Kwantlen University College’s grant from government in 2002-2003 is $50,167,974, but will decrease to $50,020,961 (a 0.3% decrease) for 2003-2004 and $49,367,000 (a further 1.3% decrease) in 2004-2005 (Government of British Columbia, Ministry of Advanced Education, 2002a, p. 3). Although the dollar figures indicate a slight decrease, the effect is much larger when increased employee and material costs, due to negotiated contracts and yearly inflation, are taken into account.

In 1993, a Provincial Government Commission (known as the Korbin Commission) was set up to examine the coordination of human resource policies in the Public Service Sector System. The commission’s mandate included an examination of union/employer relationships in the College and Institute System; its emphasis was on improving the effectiveness of human resource policies to decrease costs. The commission estimated that in 1992-1993, 76% of the College and Institute System’s $620 million budget was spent on employee salaries and benefits (Korbin, 1993, p. F31). The government’s primary concern was productivity, defined as the requirement for colleges and institutes to graduate a certain number of students within a specified budget, as required by the College and Institute Act (Korbin, 1993, p. F31). The Korbin Commission concluded that, “pay and employment equity, personal and sexual
harassment policies, and training and career development are treated inconsistently and on an ad hoc basis among colleges and institutes” (Korbin, 1993, p. F34). Since Korbin’s final report (1993), Kwantlen University College has created written policies and negotiated collective agreements to deal with all of the above (Kwantlen University College, 2001c). The collective agreements for both unions, KFA (Kwantlen Faculty Association) and BCGEU (British Columbia Government and Service Employees Union), deal with equity and harassment issues. These documents and others contribute to the work environment of Kwantlen University College. The interaction of employees with the environment, both internal and external, results in a state of health called “well-being,” which is the assessment of a person’s physical, mental, social, emotional and spiritual state. Environmental factors affect all post secondary institutions, yet few assess the influence of these factors on employees.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study sought to identify areas where policy or practice changes may be desirable to improve employee well-being in a post secondary institution through the process of social auditing.

In this thesis, I report the results of a social audit conducted at Kwantlen University College (Kwantlen), which studied employees’ perceptions of the environmental factors that have an impact on their well-being. The goal was to understand both the current state of employee well-being and the relationship between various policies and practices and perceptions of well-being.
Research Questions

The specific research questions that guided the study were:

1. What environmental factors do employees of Kwantlen University College identify as having an impact on their well-being?

2. What impact do employees believe these factors have on their well-being?

3. What implications do these beliefs have for policies and practices at Kwantlen University College?

The organization cannot control every factor that impacts employee well-being, but it can affect policies and practices within the organization to create a work environment supportive of employee well-being. Once the employees, administration and unions (the Kwantlen Faculty Association and British Columbia Government and Service Employees Union) have a better understanding of how the work environment is impacting well-being, they may make plans to change it.

My Role in the Organization

I am an employee of Kwantlen University College and a researcher who is enmeshed in the practices of my institution. I have an advantage as a researcher because being a part of the system, I know the history, documents and policies, both written and unwritten and I am part of the work environment of the institution.

I have the opportunity to reflect upon the practices at Kwantlen and suggest ways to improve the work environment and in turn employee well-being. I became interested in conducting a social audit at Kwantlen for several reasons:
1. As a long-term employee, I have seen the organization go through many changes and seen the impact of negative and positive policies and collective agreements.

2. Because the values of equity and fairness are important to me, I wanted to find a way to assess how my institution is performing in relation to these valued goals.

3. As a nurse, I know that the environment in which employees work and live affects employee well-being.

4. I wanted to improve my workplace for the benefit of all employees.

Since what one chooses to study reflects who one is, I provide a brief biographical sketch so the reader will have a clearer sense of why I decided to conduct this study.

I am a 44-year-old Indo-Canadian female, who was born in a rural village in Punjab, India and raised in Vancouver, BC from the age of six. I am married with three children and live and work in the community of Surrey. I am a nurse educator who teaches and lives the philosophy of “health for all.” I believe that “health is created by caring for oneself and others, by being able to make decisions and have control over one’s life circumstances and by ensuring that the society one lives in creates conditions that allow the attainment of health by all its members” (WHO, 1986).

With this broad definition of health, I recall from my earliest memories that I have always been interested in the culture or environment where people live and work and how conditions conducive to healthy living can be created. To this day it amazes me how in our small village in India, not affluent by my present life standards, no one ever entered and left hungry. The entire village would share their food and provide assistance to
anyone in any form, whether it was money, hand tilling soil, or solving domestic
problems. People cared for each other.

In 1966, my mother and I emigrated to Canada, to join my father who had
emigrated when I was one year old. I looked for that sense of community in Vancouver.
I woke up at five a.m. and went to the local Gurdwara (Sikh place of worship) and helped
cook meals in the community kitchen. I enjoyed contributing to the community.

During my years in university, I joined the undergraduate society executive to
help create a better environment for us, the students, and continued this commitment in
my first place of work. Here, I challenged the social structure: as a registered nurse, I
was supposed to sit on a specific seat and the nursing care aides (now called resident care
attendants) were to sit on another seat while we all listened to shift reports. I saw this as
a power and privilege issue and refused to follow the unwritten rules. To me, we were all
employees, all humans that needed to be treated with dignity and respect. In my next job
as a nurse manager, I worked with the employees to document their workloads to
improve their working conditions. In addition, I became a union representative who
sought to improve the working conditions of my colleagues.

As a faculty member, I have experienced many changes. I was there through the
building of new campuses, several changes in administration and governance structure,
the development of new programs, the creation of equity policies and the implementation
of a faculty evaluation process. There is greater use of information technology, such as
distributed learning courses and the use of computers in the classroom and the office.
Also over the years, I have watched colleagues get sick, burn out and talk about feeling
excluded from management decisions.
I personally have not felt excluded and have been involved in creating the environment of the workplace. Since I believe that an individual has no right to complain about a system unless he or she is willing to get involved and change it, I have been a member of many committees at Kwantlen. Within my program, I have served on: admissions, progressions, student policies, department, curriculum and faculty search committees. Outside the department, I have served on the Committee on Diversity Inclusion and Action, the Tributes Committee, the Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Wellness Centre’s Advisory Committee, the Kwantlen Faculty Association’s Executive Committee and on Kwantlen’s Education Council. I have also participated in strategic planning sessions.

With a strong belief in community service and entrenched values of equity and fairness, I continue my commitment to improve society. I have served on the Strawberry Hill Library’s Advisory Committee representing Kwantlen, on the BC Parole Board, as President of the Indo-Canadian Women’s Organization, on the Perinatal Advisory Committee for the South Fraser Health Region, on the Women’s Interministerial Committee, on the Health Goals Advisory Committee of British Columbia and currently, I am on the Canada Pension Plan Review Tribunal and the Board of the Canada-India Education Society. As a mother of three, I am involved in my children’s sports teams and schools. I have served a term on the newly created School Planning Council and served as President of the Parent Advisory Council.

I believe that change occurs through dialogue, when different perspectives are discussed then greater understanding is achieved. Since I believe networks to be important, I have built them in the community in which I work and live. Within
Kwantlen, I have good relationships with members of all departments to the degree that I can phone them and seek clarification and assistance. I am a “people person” and try to treat others with the same respect that I would want for myself. I treat the Clerical Worker and the President with the same respect. I relied on my network of relationships to access the people and the information needed for my study.

**Institutional Support for the Study**

Institutional support for the study had its origins in a “meta-evaluation” of Kwantlen completed in 2001, in accordance with criteria established by a provincial Standing Committee on Evaluation and Accountability (SCOEA). SCOEA was a committee that was responsible for the evaluation of colleges and institutes and accountability of the College and Institute System. It reported to both the institution’s Board and the Minister of Advanced Education. Committee members were nominated by constituent groups and appointed by the Minister (see Table 1).

The meta-evaluation involved an institutional self-study and an external audit. It assessed existing quality control mechanisms and recommended new areas in which they might be required. The Audit Team found the employees of Kwantlen were under stress, due to the expansion of the campuses and new degree development. The Audit Team also agreed with the self-study that there was “support throughout the institution for the development of improved accountability structures and processes” (Standing Committee on Evaluation and Accountability, 2001, p. 20).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Represented Constituency</th>
<th>Number of Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Councils</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry responsible for colleges, institutes and agencies*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors [Board Members]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Managers &amp; Administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Includes one Industry Training & Apprenticeship (ITAC) member so long as ITAC remains a large funder of trades training programs.

A meta-evaluation sub-committee reviewed employee relations. The recommendations included establishing an employee relations committee, identifying specific goals for employee relations, incorporating them into Kwantlen’s strategic plan and undertaking an in-depth evaluation of employee relations. In Spring 2003, the employee relations committee met twice, but has not met since then so goals for employee relations have not been established. The Audit Team also acknowledged that evaluation processes have associated monetary costs, but stated that long-term benefits of evaluation should outweigh the costs (p. 20).

A social audit that examines employee well-being may reveal aspects of policy that affect employees; it is not the same as employee relations, but there may be some overlap. The SCOEA guide stated that the institution was to “review and distribute as appropriate indicators of the effectiveness of institutional policies and the achievement of the institution’s goals and objectives with respect to employee relations” (Kwantlen, 2001b, p. 76). At the presentation of the preliminary findings of the External Audit
Team, Kwantlen’s President informed the External Audit Team that the social audit I was conducting would be a response to some of their concerns.

In 2000, Jennifer Holden, Director of Human Resources at North Island College, based in Courtney, BC, conducted an extensive social audit of the human resource function of the college as her thesis research for an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of British Columbia. She presented the results of her study, “A Social Audit of North Island College,” at various meetings and conferences across British Columbia. Kwantlen’s Associate Vice President of Human Resources, Liz McKinlay, the Faculty Association President, Doug Fletcher, and the BC Government and Service Employees Union President, Maureen Berry, heard her discuss her thesis. When I approached these individuals about doing a social audit at Kwantlen, they were extremely positive. In fact, the President of the Faculty Association informed me that in March 2001 the report by the Employee Relations Working Group recommended that Kwantlen undertake an in depth study of employee relations using the process of social auditing. This committee was set up to “demonstrate the extent of Kwantlen’s compliance with the Standing Committee on Evaluation and Accountability (SCOEA) requirements” (Kwantlen Employee Relations Working Group, 2001, p. 2).

I had one-on-one discussions with the President of Kwantlen, the Presidents of both unions, two Vice Presidents, one Associate Vice President, three Deans, two Executive Assistants and numerous Faculty members and Staff. I also spoke to individuals in Kwantlen’s Office of Institutional Research, Contract Services and Public Relations department. People were very accepting of the idea and willing to supply me with any information in their area that would help. In the Fall 2001 semester, I presented
my research proposal to the Senior Leadership Team and the Deans’ group. The research proposal was also discussed at meetings of union groups. All groups endorsed the proposal to conduct a social audit. I received approval in principle from everyone I asked prior to conducting the social audit.

The next step was to obtain funds to support this project. When I initially spoke to Kwantlen’s President in Fall 2000, he stated he would try to designate some funds in the 2001-2002 budget for the project. These funds did not materialize. The was able to cover only typesetting and printing costs. I approached both unions for funds. Both unions stated they totally supported my work, but would not fund the study because they felt that was the responsibility of management. The unions stated that they would help with recruitment by asking their memberships to complete the social audit survey.

Some employees offered assistance in terms of their research expertise, editing skills or just discussing my ideas. There was uniformly strong support from those who I approached. The President of Kwantlen wrote a letter to the University of British Columbia to support my research. Another indicator of support was that I was granted a two semester educational leave to complete the study.

Organization of the Thesis

This thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter two describes the context, Kwantlen University College and the post secondary sector in British Columbia, Canada. It presents a brief history of Kwantlen, its mandate and mission statements, program offerings, structures and governance, student demographics and employee profile.

environmental factors affect employee well-being. Drawing on systems theory, it describes Kwantlen as a living system with permeable and flexible boundaries to explain how the external and internal environment impacts those who work in the organization. It explains how there can be no organization without employees and how healthy employees are vital to the organization. It also describes the methodology of social auditing, summarizes the history of social auditing and reviews the process of social auditing used at North Island College.

Chapter four explains the methodology of the social audit conducted at Kwantlen, the two primary methods of data collection: focus groups and a survey. It describes the recurring themes of the focus groups that were used to construct the survey. As well, this chapter presents the demographics of the population and the respondents.

Chapter five presents the results of the social audit. It categorizes the survey results under the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework themes and presents the responses in terms of the percent of respondents who “agree” with the items.

Chapter six is a discussion of the noteworthy findings of the social audit survey in the broader context of organizational life. It highlights the significant concepts revealed by the audit in relation to well-being.

Chapter seven provides a summary and presents recommendations for the Board of Governors, Administration and the Unions. It also provides recommendations for the social auditing process, for theorists and for future research.
CHAPTER TWO
CONTEXT

It is important to understand the context of the organization in which the study was conducted in order to make sense of its rationale, methodology and implications. I examine Kwantlen both as it resembles other organizations and in its own individual characteristics. The organization's history, strategic framework, programs and offerings and structure and governance are outlined. As the organization is affected by government policy documents, collective agreements, funding, technology, student demographics, employee characteristics and campus work environment, each of these factors is discussed, to provide a clear sense of what Kwantlen is like as a place of work and study.

The Organization

Kwantlen University College is a part of British Columbia’s post secondary education system and is the largest university college in Canada. It serves the largest region of any college in the province. It has four campuses: Surrey, Richmond, Langley and Newton. A brief history of Kwantlen is presented before I explain the organization’s strategic framework, programs and offerings and structure and governance.

History: Kwantlen’s Roots

Kwantlen College was established in April 1981 when the government split Douglas College into two entities. Kwantlen serves the Lower Mainland south of the Fraser River and includes the communities of Richmond, Delta, Surrey, White Rock and Langley.

In the beginning, Kwantlen had four campuses housed in temporary or rented buildings: a campus of portable buildings on 140th Street in Surrey; the Newton campus,
still housed in warehouses on 77th Avenue just west of King George highway; the Richmond campus in modified retail space on Cedarbridge Way; and the Langley campus, in portable buildings, on its present site on Langley By-pass road. In 1983, the institution on Langley By-pass road was closed and classes operated in rented space, down the street on Glover road, until the new campus was constructed. The new Surrey campus on 72nd Avenue was opened in 1990 replacing the old campus. Because of the dramatic increase in housing prices in Vancouver that lead to people moving out of the city and into Surrey and the surrounding area that Kwantlen serves and government’s effort to increase post secondary graduation rates, Kwantlen’s enrollment continued to increase. The Surrey campus was full to capacity when it opened.

Kwantlen’s lobbying for a new campus for Richmond started in 1986 and in 1992, the Richmond campus was opened on Lansdowne road (Kwantlen College Board, 1986). It too was almost filled to capacity when it opened. Kwantlen continued its efforts to construct permanent buildings and opened its Langley campus in 1993 on Langley By-pass road, the same location as the 1981 campus. The population of the region Kwantlen serves continues to grow and there are continuing pressures on government to create more post secondary seats.

In 1992, the Minister of Advanced Education Training and Technology (now called Advanced Education) established a committee made up of representatives from unions, business, government and post secondary education to determine the best way to meet the increased demand for post secondary education in the Fraser Valley within the context of the provincial post secondary education system (Fraser Valley Committee on Post Secondary Education, 1993, p. 1). In 1993, the government committee submitted a
"Report of the Fraser Valley Committee on Post Secondary Education Phase 1” to the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Training stating that there was an education and training crisis in British Columbia. Regional demographics showed that a major expansion of post secondary education was needed in the Lower Mainland. The committee also stated that the Fraser Valley should be targeted because of below average participation rates in post secondary education. The report concluded that simply increasing the numbers of the current types of institutions in the province would not be adequate to meet the needs of the region. It recommended that a new form of institution be created to meet the social, economic, environmental and cultural needs of society. The Report (1993) suggested that nine matters be addressed in the creation of a new organization:

- The mandate of the new institution be developed in the context of the future plans of the existing institutions and all post secondary education in the Fraser Valley be coordinated.

- The appropriate credentials to be offered by the new institution must be identified.

- An appropriate governance structure needs to be planned.

- Human resource policies that protect academic freedom and preserve organizational flexibility be defined.

- Size of the institution should be optimal to achieve administrative, fiscal and educational efficiency.

- Multi-mode delivery systems are incorporated into the organizational planning and funding mechanisms.

- Courses and programs should be able to articulate and ladder internally and externally.

- The Board needs the skills to facilitate partnerships with other organizations and the private sector.
The Board and CEO must be committed to implementing the criteria (p. 42).

The report suggested further that a new type of degree granting institution be created in the Fraser Valley by 1995, that existing first and second year university programs and existing non-university programs be expanded and new career/technical and vocational programs be established to meet community needs.

The government responded to the recommendation of creating a new institution in the Fraser Valley by releasing the Report of the Fraser Valley Committee on Post Secondary Education Phase 1 (1993) in 1995. In 1989, the provincial government had created university colleges to offer degrees. Instead of creating a new institution, the government amended The College and Institutes Act to designate Kwantlen as a university college with applied degree-granting status. It would continue to offer its citation (six months or less), certificate (1 year) and diploma programs (2 years), but would now have the ability to offer applied undergraduate degrees (4 years). The government was specific; only applied degree proposals would be approved, with credentials leading directly to employment; traditional arts and sciences degrees were not supported. In 2002, the government passed legislation that allowed university colleges to offer applied masters' degrees as well as traditional arts and sciences bachelors' degrees (Government of British Columbia, Ministry of Advanced Education, 2002b).
**Kwantlen's Strategic Framework**

The strategic framework of an organization is the blueprint of the organization. It explains the reason for the organization's existence and its plan for the future.

In spring, 1997, over 150 people including Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Board Members and Advisory Group Members met and participated in a one-day session to establish a strategic framework for Kwantlen. Kwantlen's strategic framework provides a synopsis of external conditions that impact the organization, describes the direction for the organization and identifies strategic objectives. It is consistent with the policy documents of the Ministry of Advanced Education to which it reports. The framework consists of: a mission statement; values and goals; a shared vision statement; and strategic objectives in relation to the goals of the Ministry of Advanced Education.

**Mission Statement**

The mission statement of an organization states the purpose or goal of the organization and the reason for the organization’s existence.

**Kwantlen's Mission Statement**

"We create quality life-long learning opportunities for people to achieve personal, social and career success."

Kwantlen's President, Skip Triplett, commented in a presentation to the Legislative Committee on Post Secondary Education, "We provide, arguably, society's most important public service (education) because prosperity, quality of life, egalitarian attitudes and other social benefits correlate strongly with high levels of education" (Triplett, 2001b, p. 1). This explains why Kwantlen believes education is a key to successful lives: people come to Kwantlen for a variety of reasons and Kwantlen helps
them achieve their objectives. Kwantlen’s mission statement is broad and inclusive and is consistent with the Ministry of Advanced Education Ministry’s mission for the post secondary education system.

**Ministry of Advanced Education’s Mission Statement**

“To provide leadership and support for a top-notch advanced education and training system that provides all British Columbians with opportunities to develop the skills and knowledge to live productive and fulfilling lives and to contribute to the economic, social and cultural life of the province.”

**Values**

The values of an organization reflect what it considers important. Kwantlen’s strategic framework identifies 14 values, which it supports in implementing its mission:

1. Learning  
2. Quality  
3. Student centredness  
4. Relevance  
5. Responsiveness  
6. Diversity  
7. Openness to change and innovation  
8. Accessibility  
9. Environmental Sustainability  
10. Respect and trust  
11. Openness and communication  
12. Teamwork  
13. Participative decision-making  
14. Shared leadership and responsibility (Kwantlen, 1997).

Quality learning is to be central to everything done at Kwantlen. “We are committed to excellence and continuous improvement... ‘Quality’ is measured in relation to the needs and expectations of those we serve and to established standards of practice” (Kwantlen University College, 1997). The value statement explains that quality can be measured, but also carries the notion that we can never reach excellence in education, but we will
keep moving towards the ideal. Implicit is the idea that education responds to needs of our stakeholders, our community. This is evident in the mission statement, in the above statement about "needs and expectations of those we serve," and in other statements such as "we focus on ... needs of the people we serve," and "relevant to the needs and interests of students, colleagues, college region and society" (Kwantlen, 1997 p. 2).

The idea that education is a joint responsibility of the organization's employees and the learner and occurs through two-way communication permeates the document. Under the values of respect and trust, openness and communication, teamwork, participative and shared leadership and responsibility are ideas such as "we strive to listen and understand first and then to express ourselves and be understood, we are interdependent and we are committed to building relationships" (Kwantlen University College, 1997, pp. 2-3). This quotation states that there are relationships in education and instructors cannot educate in isolation, but must work together with students and society. The idea of participative decision-making implies that all people should be involved in making decisions because the decisions are best made by people working together, by people listening to each other and coming to an understanding.

"We value our students and colleagues and are committed to their education, learning and personal growth" (Kwantlen, 1997, p. 2). Kwantlen is publicly committed to education for employees. The statement, "We value risk taking and initiative because they are necessary for individual and organizational learning and growth," coupled with the previous two statements, supports the idea of a positive work environment where everyone is valued and works together.
Kwantlen’s Shared Vision Statement

An organization’s vision statement expresses its goals. It articulates what the organization wants to be. Kwantlen’s Shared Vision Statement is consistent with its mission and value statements. It supports the notion of relationships and a learning community as well as community service and personal responsibility. “We want to distinguish ourselves (from other university colleges) by continually emphasizing the importance of accepting personal responsibility for making societal contributions. We want our students to embrace the notion that as recipients of advanced education, they each have a duty to ‘make a difference’” (Kwantlen, 1997, p. 3). The learner will repay society for all the personal benefits he/she receives from the privilege of attending a public post secondary organization. This debt will be repaid by using the knowledge to help society, to improve social conditions.

The mission, vision statement, values and goals contribute to Kwantlen’s internal and external environment. Internally, the strategic framework helps shape relevant text and practices that create the internal environment. Externally, the strategic framework informs Kwantlen’s interactions with the post secondary system including government to address various social, political, technological and economic factors. Statements made by Kwantlen’s President, such as those in the 2001 President’s Report, “We need to maintain…a pleasant place to work… We need to continue to attract and retain the best faculty in Canada--faculty who enjoy and excel at teaching students,” support Kwantlen’s commitment to a positive work environment (Triplett, 2001b, p. 3).
Kwantlen’s Strategic Objectives

Strategic objectives explain how an organization will achieve its mission in a way that is consistent with its values. Kwantlen (1997) identified a number of objectives and planned initiatives, corresponding to the 4 goals of the Ministry of Advanced Education. The following is a list of the Ministry’s goals and Kwantlen’s areas of planned initiatives as found in its Strategic Framework.

1. Relevance and Quality
   - Societal contribution
   - Applied degrees
   - Career success skills
   - Outcomes based learning
   - Continuous quality improvement
   - Employee development

2. Access
   - Surrey expansion
   - Newton Campus Replacement
   - Internationalization
   - School district partnerships
   - Education technology
   - Room utilization
   - Partnerships with colleges and universities
   - Prior learning assessment

3. Affordability
   - Costs
   - Continuing education
   - Facilities utilization
   - Customized training and business development
   - Curriculum publishing
   - Corporate partnerships
   - Fundraising

4. Accountability
   - Outcome based learning
   - Performance measurement benchmarks and key performance indicators. (Kwantlen University College, 1997, pp. 4-9).
Kwantlen has taken actions towards meeting the provincial goals including: changes in programs and offerings, fundraising initiatives, international education, expanding the Surrey campus and prior learning assessment. Kwantlen believes in continuous quality improvement so it is open to input for improving its performance.

Programs and Offerings

Programs and offerings are created in relation to the organization's mandate and the needs of its community. Kwantlen currently has over 90 different programs and offerings from six-week citations to baccalaureate degrees (Kwantlen, 2001a). The major program areas are: University Studies/Arts; University Studies/Science; Applied Design & Communications; Business; Community & Health Studies; Horticulture & Equine Studies; Industry; Preparatory; Technology, Trades & Vocational; and Continuing Education. Applied degree programs include:

- Bachelor of Science in Nursing
- Bachelor of Applied Design in Fashion Design & Technology
- Bachelor of Applied Design in Interior Design
- Bachelor of Business Administration in Entrepreneurial Leadership
- Bachelor of Technology in Information Technology
- Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting
- Bachelor of Applied Arts in Psychology
- Bachelor of Applied Journalism
- Bachelor of Applied Design in Graphic Design for Marketing.

Kwantlen also offers a variety of support services: Access Centres, Assessment Services, Athletics, Bookstores, Co-op Education, Counseling, Educational Advisors, Employment Centre, Financial Awards, First Nation Services, Organizational Based Training, Job Placement, Learning Centre, Library & Information Resources, Prior Learning Assessment, Recreation, Security, Services for Students with Disabilities and the Wellness Center. Employees may access some of these services. Kwantlen has an
athletics department that supports men and women’s basketball teams, men and women’s
golf teams and men’s baseball teams. It also supports intramural sports and fitness
programs for the whole Kwantlen community.

Structure and Governance

The structure and governance of an organization outlines duties and
responsibilities as well as reporting relationships. All publicly funded organizations in
British Columbia report to a provincial ministry. Kwantlen reports to the Ministry of
Advanced Education. Therefore, it is responsible to the people of the region through the
government. The government also appoints community members to sit on the Board of
Governors, which sets policies and priorities that reflect community needs and values.
The President of Kwantlen is an ex-officio member and also reports to the Board.

Through legislation, in 1994, the government created education councils responsible for
approving the educational offerings of the organization. The education councils were
government’s way of including those most affected by decisions in the process of
educational matters. Thus education councils include representatives from the three
employee groups (Administration, Faculty, Staff) and students.

The President of Kwantlen believes that his core value is service through
relationships and that his job is to form relationships and support the institution’s
programs and services (Triplett, 2001b, p. 1). As a consequence, Kwantlen has an
inverted organizational chart with the President at the bottom (Figure 1). This is an
unusual organizational chart because there are no lines indicating reporting relationships
and all services are mentioned, but the deans that support each area, the associate deans
and other employees and students are missing from the chart.
Figure 1. Kwantlen's Organizational Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Educational Services</th>
<th>Ventures &amp; Finance</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Advancement &amp; External Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Applied Design &amp; Communication</td>
<td>• International Education</td>
<td>• Financial Services</td>
<td>• Employee Relations</td>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applied Technology, Trades &amp; Vocational</td>
<td>• Student Judicial Affairs</td>
<td>• Accounts Payable</td>
<td>/ Personnel Services</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community &amp; Health Studies</td>
<td>• Human Rights</td>
<td>• Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>• Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>• Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Horticulture</td>
<td>• Violence/Emergency Response</td>
<td>• Budget Development</td>
<td>• Labour Relations</td>
<td>• External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humanities</td>
<td>• Office of the Registrar</td>
<td>• Payroll</td>
<td>• Job Evaluation &amp; Pay Equity</td>
<td>• Fund Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Science, Mathematics &amp; Technology</td>
<td>• Access Programs &amp; Student Services</td>
<td>• Venture Programs</td>
<td>• Benefits Administration</td>
<td>• Management / Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Sciences &amp; Music</td>
<td>• Academic &amp; Career Preparation</td>
<td>• Continuing Education</td>
<td>• Recruitment</td>
<td>• Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business Prior Learning Assessment</td>
<td>• Access Programs for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>• Computer Training</td>
<td>• Employment Equity</td>
<td>• High School &amp; Community Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructional Design/Development</td>
<td>• Assessment Services</td>
<td>• Vocational/Career Training</td>
<td>• Human Resources</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty &amp; Student Development</td>
<td>• Counseling/Advising</td>
<td>• Health and Lifestyles</td>
<td>• Information System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Course Delivery</td>
<td>• Employment Access</td>
<td>• Real Estate</td>
<td>• Harassment &amp; Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• First Nations Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institution Based Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recreational/Athletic Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Special Needs Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Testing Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Freedom of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Day Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-op Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information &amp; Educational Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Application Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technology Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• User Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Services</th>
<th>Ventures &amp; Finance</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Advancement &amp; External Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Application Services</td>
<td>• Financial Services</td>
<td>• Employee Relations</td>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology Services</td>
<td>• Accounts Payable</td>
<td>/ Personnel Services</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• User Services</td>
<td>• Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>• Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>• Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>• Budget Development</td>
<td>• Labour Relations</td>
<td>• External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Management</td>
<td>• Payroll</td>
<td>• Job Evaluation &amp; Pay Equity</td>
<td>• Fund Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>• Venture Programs</td>
<td>• Benefits Administration</td>
<td>• Management / Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuing Education</td>
<td>• Recruitment</td>
<td>• Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Computer Training</td>
<td>• Employment Equity</td>
<td>• High School &amp; Community Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vocational/Career Training</td>
<td>• Human Resources</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health and Lifestyles</td>
<td>• Information System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Real Estate</td>
<td>• Harassment &amp; Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kwantlen has numerous internal committees and, in addition, Kwantlen employees serve the public through many external committees.

Documents and Policies

Kwantlen is affected by external policies and documents, especially, those of the Ministry of Advanced Education. The documents that have a substantial impact on Kwantlen are:

- The College and Institute Act.
- “Charting a New Course.”
- Collective Agreements.

These documents were selected for study because they influence the organizational context. Actions taken by Kwantlen in response to policy documents are mentioned in the remainder of the chapter.

The Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Public Service and Public Sector in British Columbia

In 1993, the report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Public Service and Public Sector in British Columbia (known as the Korbin Commission) resulted in several major policy directives from the Provincial Government. The report called for value for money to the taxpayer, accountability and efficient utilization of resources, fair treatment of all employees and respect for the uniqueness of each community served by the organization (Korbin, 1993, C10-C11). This resulted in key changes: the creation of a Standing Committee on Evaluation and Accountability to measure institutional practices,
dividing bargaining into provincial and local matters and the creation of the Public Sector Employers’ Council (PSEC) responsible for coordinating labour relations policies and human management practices in the public sector and the Post Secondary Employers’ Association (PSEA) responsible for coordinating wages for non-unionized employees provincially, benefit administration, human resource practices and collective bargaining outcomes.

*College and Institute Act*

Kwantlen is a publicly funded organization that receives its mandate from The College and Institute Act (Government of BC, 1994). The Act defines the duties and powers of the Minister, boards and education councils. It also provides definitions of key terms, it explains personnel relations, a fair compensation method, pension plan arrangements, the role of collective agreements, federal-provincial agreements and the designation of “college,” “provincial institute” and “university college.” The Act (1994) combined previous legislation.

The Act states the “objects of a university college are to provide comprehensive: a] courses of study for a baccalaureate degree program, b] post secondary education or training and c] continuing education” (Government of BC, 1994, p. 3). In 1994, legislation set up a new governance structure for the colleges and institutes. This restructured Kwantlen University College’s Board and required an Education Council responsible for giving advice to the Board on educational policy. The Board continued to have the duty to be the policy maker of the organization, retaining ultimate responsibility for the governance of the organization. The Board now consisted of:

- eight persons appointed by government.
• one faculty member elected by faculty.
• one support staff member elected by support staff.
• two students elected by students.
• the president.
• the chair of the education council. (Government of BC, 1994).

The Education Council consists of twenty voting members: ten-elected faculty, four elected students, four educational administrators appointed by the President and two elected BCGEU Staff. There are two non-voting members: the President and a Board Member. The Education Council is responsible for creating bylaws for its own conduct and setting policies in relation to programs and offerings. In addition, it has joint responsibility with the Board for curriculum evaluation and an advisory role in developing educational policy.

Since becoming a university college, Kwantlen has obtained approval for nine bachelor's degrees. Some programs had an additional burden of gaining external accreditation. Kwantlen's Bachelor of Science in Nursing Degree was granted a six-year accreditation by the Canadian Association of University Schools of Nursing; and the Bachelor of Applied Design in Interior Design also gained full accreditation.

With new and expanding programs, Kwantlen needed to hire more faculty members, provide orientation and determine ways to decrease the stress and burden on the employees within the system. Increasingly, the entire system was challenged to be more efficient, to do more with less. Since there was not enough money for all the services Kwantlen wished to provide, a fundraising division was created. As well, to deal with increased administrative workload, the Vice President of Education conducted a review and added two Associate Dean positions.
Human Rights

As a publicly funded Canadian organization, Kwantlen is obliged to operate according to established policies related to human rights. The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human rights states:

This Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all people and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the people of Member States themselves and among the people of territories under their jurisdiction (United Nations Assembly, 1948).

Since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), Canada and the BC government have enacted their own human rights legislation. The BC Human Rights Code was passed in 1969. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms was passed in 1982 and the section that deals with equality was amended in 1985 to address the multicultural reality of the nation. As well, Kwantlen responded to the challenge of multiculturalism by developing its own policies. In 1992, Kwantlen established the Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Awareness Committee (CDEA) to promote ethnic diversity. CDEA’s goal was “to explore the dimensions of the multicultural challenge and establish an action plan” (Kwantlen College, 1992). At the time CDEA was formed, the memberships of ethnic minorities were increasing in the college region. In 1993, the Government of British Columbia passed the Multiculturalism Act and created the Advisory Council on Multiculturalism (Government of BC, 1993). In 1998, the Human Rights Act was passed (Government of Canada, 1998). The Act specified that there be no discrimination based on a person’s ethnicity as well as other characteristics.
The unions and college responded to the Human Rights Act by negotiating equity and harassment language into their respective collective agreements. In 2002, CDEA changed its name to the Committee for Diversity Inclusion and Action (CDIA) because members agreed that the organization needed to move beyond awareness to action. CDIA has participated in many initiatives to promote multiculturalism such as “diversity month,” the creation of policy and workshops on inclusion. Members of CDIA have participated in the Lower Mainland Multicultural Education Project.

Kwantlen addresses the issues of an equitable, safe and diverse workplace through policies. The following seven policies reflect Kwantlen’s commitment to create an equitable workplace free from discrimination and harassment as well as addressing the issue of diversity.

1. Policy G. 2 Human Rights -- every person has a right to work in a discrimination free environment.

2. Policy C. 35 Cultural Diversity and Inclusiveness -- every person will be treated equitably regardless of his or her origin.

3. Policy 1.6 Cultural Competency -- graduates should be prepared to work in a multicultural society.

4. Policy G. 7 Faculty Recruitment -- outlines the hiring process. It includes a piece on human rights and states, ‘The Human Rights Act’ forbids employment discrimination based on age, race, colour, ancestry, place of origin, conviction offenses unrelated to employment, mental or physical ability (that doesn’t prevent the person from performing the job), political belief, religion, sex, marital status and sexual orientation.

5. Policy G.7e Attachment to Policy G.7 Faculty Recruitment -- explains the candidate interview assessment form to help members on search committees make fair assessments. Within this document is a note to weight minority groups favorably to increase the diversity of employees.
6. Policy G. 21 Employment Equity -- there will be no discrimination as defined by the BC Human Rights Act. More specifically it states measures need to be taken to address the historical inequities that exist by reviewing organizational practices to eliminate systemic discrimination and by surveying the workforce and working toward a more diverse workforce.

7. Policy G. 23 Violence in the Workplace -- Kwantlen is committed to the promotion of a violence free workplace.

CDIA and the Associate Vice President of Human Resources have considered assessing diversity of the workforce. During CDIA meetings we have discussed the need to assess the impact of equity policies and specifically, if the policies have lead to a more diverse workforce.

The Associate Vice President Human Resources has considered collecting diversity statistics because the Federal Government stated that it would limit contracts to organizations that do not monitor the diversity of their work force and make plans to hire employees that are reflective of the community. However, some search committees are not familiar with policy G.7 Faculty Recruitment and the attachment policy G.7e (conversations with staff). This affirmative action policy was introduced to increase the diversity of the Kwantlen workforce. It is difficult to tell if this has occurred, as Kwantlen keeps no statistics on ethnicity. My observation over the last eleven years is that the numbers of visible ethnic minorities in faculty positions have increased slightly, but more so in staff positions. The President had increased diversity within senior administration. There were 5 males and 3 females on the Senior Leadership Team. One female and one male were from an ethnic minority group and the other was a status Métis. In Spring 2003, one female member of the SLT resigned and her duties were subsumed in other positions.
Although there are many initiatives to deal with human rights, equity has not been achieved. As a member of a visible minority, I can state that racial discrimination still exists. I hear comments from colleagues, such as, “those East Indians think they own Surrey” and then, there will be a qualifier to say, “but you are not like that.” I always think this is quite interesting because a stereotypical statement is made by a colleague and as quickly as it is stated the person realizes that I (being of Indian ancestry) may take offense and a qualifier is inserted. Another employee told me that she has overheard admissions staff making jokes about different ethnic names. I don’t know how widespread this is but these are two examples of racism at Kwantlen. The Office of the Vice President, Learner Support keeps data on Human Rights complaints. The highest numbers of complaints were received in the year 2002 (4). The following is a list of human rights complaints for the last few years: 2003 – 0, 2002 – 4, 2001 – 2, 2000 – 0, 1999 – 2 and 1998 – 1.

*Charting a New Course*

"Charting a New Course" (1996) was the most extensive provincial policy document on the College and Institute System. It was the strategic plan for the College and Institute system, produced by the Ministry of Skills, Training and Labour (now Ministry of Advanced Education) on the advice of a provincial steering committee that consisted of organizational presidents, board members and representatives from government, faculty unions and students. The purpose of the plan was to ensure: a well-prepared work force, that learning opportunities are available throughout life and that there is good value for money spent on education and training. “Charting a New Course”
was discussed at many Educational Council meetings to clarify its intent. It stated the Ministry’s mission for the college, institute and agency system:

To enable all British Columbians to have flexible learning opportunities throughout their lives that will assist them in developing the skills, knowledge, attitudes and values they need to participate fully in the economic, social and cultural life of the province (Government of British Columbia, 1996, p. 7).

It outlined four goals: (1) relevance and quality, (2) access, (3) affordability and (4) accountability (Government of British Columbia, 1996, p. 1) which were developed using 12 guiding values: (1) learning, (2) quality, (3) learner-centered, (4) relevance, (5) responsiveness, (5) equity and access, (7) respect and trust, (8) partnerships, (9) public education, (10) innovation, (11) positive environment and (12) fiscal responsibility and affordability (p. 9). It also outlined how the institutions should fulfill their obligations of public accountability (p. 80). Goal four, accountability, aimed at measuring the performance of the system based on continual improvement and overall effectiveness and efficiency (p. 51-53). The Ministry’s vision for colleges and institutes balanced economic and social demands, while ensuring system affordability and accountability (p. 27). The system was directed to be learner focused, oriented to outcomes, integrated, flexible and innovative. The plan refocused the system on providing education for life and on providing education and training with employability skills. It included issues such as internationalization, prior learning assessments, laddering and transferability across programs.

As with some policy documents, not everything was enacted immediately or at all. Three issues in the policy documents, internationalization, international education and prior learning assessment, will be discussed in detail. These topics are significant
because the Ministry has encouraged them as ways to deal with limited funding and changing student demographics. As well, Kwantlen established processes to implement these policy documents.

**Internationalization**

With advances in communications technology, information became readily available across the world, transforming societies (Cyganski, Orr & Vaz, 2001; Samuel & Schachhuber, 2000). People look for employment opportunities in countries other than their own. Canada is one of the countries that has become increasingly multicultural (Samuel & Schachhuber, 2000). The Provincial Government and, in turn, Kwantlen have recognized this trend and decided to respond to it through internationalization.

Internationalization is defined as a process that prepares the community for successful participation in an increasingly interdependent World. In Canada, our multicultural reality is the stage of internationalization. The process of internationalization should infuse all facets of the post secondary education system, fostering global understanding and developing skills for effective living and working in a diverse world. (British Columbia Centre for International Education (BCCIE) task force, 1993, in Kwantlen, 2000a, p. 1).

Kwantlen serves a multilingual population. In two of the municipalities that Kwantlen serves, the number of residents who speak English (at home) has decreased. In Surrey, the most frequently spoken language at home, other than English, is Punjabi (Statistics Canada, 2003). Across the street from Kwantlen’s Surrey Campus is a Punjabi Mall and less than five kilometers away is Khalsa School, a private kindergarten to grade 10 school, which focuses on the Punjabi language and Sikh religion.

In Richmond, there has been an influx of Asians, the largest group being Chinese. Many store signs are found in Chinese; as well there is an Asian shopping mall located less than five kilometers from Kwantlen’s Richmond campus. Kwantlen needs to
understand the backgrounds of the diverse communities it serves in order to provide more holistic approaches to well-being and health.

The goals and strategies for internationalization state, “we (Kwantlen) are dedicated to developing internationally competent graduates with the ability and skills to become effective leaders and participants in the global economy. Our international program seeks to broaden the educational experience of both Canadian and international students, to strengthen global partnerships and to assist in creating economic and employment opportunities for British Columbians” (Kwantlen, 2000a, p. 2). However, as a member of CDIA, I am not aware of any program at Kwantlen that has internationalized its curriculum. My understanding, as a CDIA member, is that curricula remains Eurocentric.

International Education

The focus has been on international education, the education of foreign students, which has financial benefits. International education has an enormous impact on BC’s economy. It brings in about $274 million per year (BCCIE Task Force in Kwantlen, 2000a).

International education has been a valuable generator of income to the province with potential for further economic benefits. Its economic impact is felt province-wide through tuition revenue and expenditures in communities. International education provides well paying jobs to Canadians in an environmentally friendly industry. It also contributes to the diversification of the provincial economy at a time when there is a pressing need for BC to expand beyond traditional resource sectors into knowledge-based industries. (Kwantlen, 2000a, p. 2).

“Charting a New Course” mandated international education as a system goal. The government created the British Columbia Centre for International Education to help post secondary organizations work toward it. Also, the Government of Canada has established a network of Canadian Education Centres around the world to help market
and provide information to potential students and Canadian Educational Organizations. Kwantlen created an International Education Office in 1999. As a result, all international education programs are operated on a for-profit basis, which is then used to generate income and subsequently used to support other programs or balance the university college's budget.

As well, Kwantlen has developed joint education projects in other countries, providing experience for faculty and students abroad and with recruiting students from 29 different countries. In this way, Kwantlen is introducing some of its employees (and students) to different cultures and possibly becoming more culturally competent.

Prior Learning Assessment

Prior learning assessment (PLA) is an evaluation of non-formal education/training or experience for the purpose of assigning credit in a course or program in a provincial post secondary institution. PLA was introduced in the post secondary system to deal with issues of diversity of students' learning and access. PLA is important to the social audit because it has increased the workload of Faculty.

The government in the 1980's explored PLA as did governments around the world and by 1993 the BC Council on Admissions and Transfers and the Centre for Curriculum and Professional Development established a provincial committee for PLA and appointed a PLA coordinator. Standards were created, training sessions held and a few pilot projects were funded. The need for a mechanism to provide prior learning assessments (PLA) was documented in a report, "PLA Prior Learning Assessment & Educational Reform: A Vision for Now" (1995) written (after a visioning day with stakeholders) by Susan Simosko and endorsed by the standing committee on PLA and
documented in “Charting a New Course.” It recommended that all academic programs and offerings provide transferability across and within organizations and that academic credit be given for formal and informal learning in order to increase access and enhance learning efficiency. In 1996, the provincial government put more resources into the implementation of this policy and hired PLA coordinators at each provincial institution and conducted workshops for employees to complete PLA assessments.

In 1995, Simosko’s report on PLA recognized that BC’s post secondary system sees the “concept of prior learning assessment as a separate entity, almost outside the purview of mainstream education and training practices” and for PLA to work, it must be integrated into the system (p. 12). Years later, integration has not been fully implemented.

By 2000, Simosko reported the system has moved toward implementation because there are PLA policies in most post secondary institutions and PLA work is being done. There is little argument about the benefits of PLA work as a process, but the problems of funding, acceptance, compensation and efficiency that were identified in 1995 and identified again in Simosko’s 2000 report, continue to exist and the PLA provincial steering committee, which had provincial responsibility for policy, was disbanded in 2001.

At the local level, Kwantlen has a PLA coordinator and policy on PLA. Workshops have been offered on performing PLA and there are directives to perform this work in every department. Some PLA work is occurring in many program areas and every program has a PLA advisor. In nursing, for example, there is one trained individual who does this work, in addition to her regular duties. Some of the resource
issues discussed by Barker (2001) and Simosko (1995) are similar to those identified by PLA practitioners at Kwantlen. Some of the barriers: the definition of PLA and acceptance of PLA by the business community, are not found at Kwantlen. Kwantlen accepted the provincial definition of PLA and found the business community very accepting and encouraging of PLA work, particularly in the business programs. Lack of accredited assessors are another barrier identified by Barker (2001) but at Kwantlen, Faculty with content expertise and experience are considered appropriate assessors. One barrier at Kwantlen is lack of compensation for PLA work. It is added on to a full workload and a contributor to overload. The PLA initiative resulted in changes to academic norms and increased workload that contributed to some stresses and resistance among employees.

Collective Agreements

Two unions representing the unionized staff at Kwantlen, the Kwantlen Faculty Association (KFA) and the British Columbia Government and Service Employees Union (BCGEU), negotiate collective agreements that determine wages and working conditions. The collective agreements are the most comprehensive texts that contribute to working conditions on each campus. The collective agreements each have a section dealing with Human Rights, with language consistent with the BC Human Rights Act as well as other contractual agreements related to equity and fairness.

The Employer’s Bargaining Committee (on behalf of 14 institutions) and the Provincial Bargaining Council (on behalf of the Council of College Institute Educators’ Association (CIEA)) negotiated a common agreement. The common agreement applies to all faculty members at Kwantlen. The post secondary employers’ association (PSEA)
coordinated the negotiation of a common agreement with the British Columbia Government and Service Employees' Union (BCGEU) on behalf of some of its locals. Kwantlen's BCGEU are a member local and are bound by the agreement.

Both common and local agreements have many commonalities. All have articles dealing with the definition of terms used in the agreement, terms of the purpose of the agreement and a mechanism to deal with future legislation and conflict with policies, elements of employer/union relations, employment equity, hiring process, definitions of different types of leaves, benefits, job classification and security, contracting out language, wages and pensions. In addition, the faculty common agreement has definitions of language and a description of the process to deal with harassment, explanation of the PLA process and compensation and ownership of copyright and intellectual property. It defines the mandate and establishment of a health and welfare benefits committee, a process for early retirements and the effects of the common agreement vis-à-vis the local agreement. The common BCGEU Staff agreement also includes: transfers/mergers of programs between institutions, workplace flexibility, recruitment and retention for informational technology (if the rates are higher in the private sector, a stipend is allowed). The common agreements supersede the local agreements.

Each local of the CIEA and the BCGEU negotiates their respective local contracts. The local agreement between the KFA and Kwantlen consists of 23 articles and 18 letters of understanding. The articles cover items both similar and different from those in the common agreement including: definitions, management rights, KFA recognition, rights and security, search procedures, termination of contracts,
technological change, lay off and recall, salaries, working conditions, leave of absence, educational leave, health and welfare, professional development, dispute resolution, labour/management relations committee, evaluation, health and safety, retirement and harassment. The letters of understanding are specific to Kwantlen operations. They cover topics such as: reading break, employment equity, performance review, workload, layoff, pension buyback, international work, distributed learning and parking.

The local agreement between the BCGEU and Kwantlen has 39 articles, 10 letters of understanding, two memoranda of understanding and cover items similar to those in the common agreement. The articles include: purpose of agreement, definitions of terms, BC Human Rights Act, management/union rights and relations, grievances, salaries, holidays, vacation, professional development and educational leave, maternity/parental and other leaves, work environment, safety and health, work clothing, technological change, promotions and staff changes, job classification, workload, personal duties, retirement, search and terms of agreement.

Letters of understanding cover: student assistants, job sharing, flexible scheduling, employment equity, evaluation and technology. The memoranda of understanding include salary scales and an appeal process for placement on the salary scale.

The many articles, letters of understanding and memoranda of understanding reflect issues of equity and human rights, clarification of terms and define working relationships between the administration and union members. The agreements describe contractual relationships on issues which Kwantlen’s unionized employees and administration consider important and necessary. These common and local agreements
together cover terms and conditions that help create the working environment at Kwantlen.

The documents and how they affect Kwantlen have been discussed. I will now discuss the four factors that also affect the work environment at Kwantlen (funding, technology, student demographics and employee characteristics). In addition, the campuses are explained since there are differences and similarities among campuses.

**Funding**

Funding has affected the way Kwantlen delivers education. In the last decade, BC's debt load has increased, resulting in a restricted allocation of funding to the advanced education sector (Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 1999; Canadian Tax Payers' Federation, 2000). Kwantlen employees recognized that funding grants have decreased. Kwantlen obtained a 5% increase in its funding grant from 1996-1997 to 2000-2001. This represented an effective net decrease in the operating grant, as employee salaries and benefits increased, and due to inflation, supply costs increased as well. In 2002 it was predicted the operating grants would decrease slightly (2.5%) from $50,354,727 (2002-2003) to $49,112,902 (2004-2005), but Kwantlen actually received $50,354,727 for 2003-2004 (Government of BC, 2003). The operating grant does not cover the overall operational cost of the organization. Additional funds are generated from tuition fees, which were increased by 70% in 2002.

Kwantlen's annual operating budget was over 77 million dollars and it received the second lowest level of funding per person out of any college region in the province (Kwantlen, 2001a, p. 42). Its catchment's area houses 700,000 people (Triplett, 2001a, p. 3). As with other organizations, the majority of the budget goes toward employee
salaries and benefits (see Table 2). The percentage of the operating budget spent on employee salaries and benefits was about 80% until 2002-2003 when this decreased to 76.2%, due to the closure of the bookstore and library services on Newton campus. Closing these services was part of a strategy to deal with a budget shortfall, which included phasing out the Newton campus.

Table 2

Kwantlen's Operating Budget and Employee Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$4,078,200 (8.1)</td>
<td>$4,564,600 (8.3)</td>
<td>$4,886,900 (8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$27,481,700 (54.3)</td>
<td>$30,149,200 (54.0)</td>
<td>$32,527,628 (54.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$11,937,000 (23.6)</td>
<td>$13,095,800 (23.5)</td>
<td>$11,883,100 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$7,104,100 (14.0)</td>
<td>$8,007,100 (14.3)</td>
<td>$9,981,200 (16.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personal Costs</td>
<td>$50,601,000</td>
<td>$55,816,700</td>
<td>$59,278,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td>$62,634,200</td>
<td>$68,427,000</td>
<td>$77,804,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Cost as a % of Operational Cost</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provincial government of BC during the 1990s legislated a tuition-freeze. Some institutions responded by introducing 'user pay' initiatives. Prices for photocopying and parking were reviewed and increased at Kwantlen. The tuition freeze was lifted in 2002 allowing large tuition increases to offset funding restraints. These tuition increases, however, have not impacted enrollment.
In 2001, to provide another source of funds, Kwantlen established the Kwantlen University College Foundation, governed by community members. "The purpose of the Board is to raise and manage funds for scholarships, library resources, equipment, technology and programs" (Kwantlen, Spring 2001, p. 2). The Board has charitable tax status and the ability to hold and invest funds.

**Information Technology**

Information technology has increased the pace of work and changed how work is done at Kwantlen. In the last 10 years, rapid advances in technology allied with decreasing costs resulted in the arrival of the personal computer on every desk. This, along with access to the Internet (World Wide Web), has changed and influenced employee work life. Computers are used for processing information and for communication. This change means that employees deal with thousands of interdependent relationships—linkages to people, groups, or organizations that have the power to affect their job performance because all employees have access to the Internet and are able to access information on-line, as well as send and receive mail instantly. Technology has improved efficiency, but created more stress in the process. There is now an expectation that the mail will be answered instantly rather than in a couple of weeks as it was with conventional mail. In researching material, there is an expectation that topics in libraries around the world will be searched through the Web instead of just those in the local geographic area. This affects the working environment for employees and the learning environment for students resulting in increased expectations.

Other communication technologies such as cell phones, voice mail and faxes have made communication more efficient, but may increase the stress of users as there are
more communications and more work with each. For example, having a teleconference saves time but there is related work to deal with the content of the conference. If two conferences are attended through technology instead of one in person, the workload is increased. Every employee has an e-mail account and a message can be sent to all employees at the touch of a button. It is not uncommon to receive 50 or more e-mail messages per day. Some employees feel inundated with so much information and they have placed message filters on their e-mail accounts, which also affect communication when crucial e-mail is screened out.

When technology is available, there is pressure to use it. In the academic year 2000-2001, Kwantlen secured funds to upgrade its computer systems. The newest building on the Surrey campus was wired with Internet connections throughout. With the desire to use the technology in the classrooms, computers on wheels (called COWS) were purchased. In 2003, a number of additional electronic classrooms were installed.

**Student Demographics**

Kwantlen's program offerings are affected by student demographics. Kwantlen serves the largest number of students of the entire province's sixteen colleges or university colleges (Kwantlen, 2001a, p. 21). In the 2000-2001 year, there were 19,980 registered students. Its enrollment for the Fall 2001 term was 13,481 students. In Fall 2002, there were 12,892 students. Although the number of students dropped, the full time equivalents (FTEs) continued to increase slightly every year from 2000-2001 (7888 FTEs) to 2001-2002 (8233 FTEs). More students were enrolled in full-time studies versus part-time studies. The age distribution of these students is provided in Table 3. Thirty-nine percent (39%) were male and 61% were female. Ninety-five percent (95%)
of the students were between 18-47 years of age. The students who attended Kwantlen were relatively young, indicating direct entry from secondary schools. About 63% were between 18-24 years of age. Half of the students were aged 21 or less and the mean age was 26 years. The three main educational goals for attending Kwantlen were:

- university transfer preparation (45%).
- acquire knowledge and skills for job advancement (16%).
- explore career options (10%).

Table 3

Students by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 18</td>
<td>6 (0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>8,449 (62.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-47</td>
<td>4,152 (30.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 48</td>
<td>726 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>88 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. From Kwantlen Facts (p. 11), by Kwantlen University College, Surrey, BC: Kwantlen. Copyright 2001 by Kwantlen University College. Adapted with permission.

The three top choices for transfer institutions were: the University of British Columbia (UBC), Simon Fraser University (SFU) and British Columbia Institute of Technology (BCIT).

In the Fall 2001 Student Survey, the top five reasons given for selecting Kwantlen were:

- desired program offered (92%).
- quality of instruction (84%).
- tuition fees (70%).
• reputation of programs (69%).
• proximity to home (67%).

Knowing the type of student Kwantlen serves and the reasons the students give for attending helps in planning student services and instructional delivery methods.

Kwantlen continues to serve mainly the local community. According to the fall, 2002 student survey, 79 percent of the students that attended Kwantlen lived in Surrey, Richmond, Langley or Delta (see Table 4).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students by Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the students (79%) were Canadian citizens, 13% were permanent residents, 4% were international students and 4% of the students did not answer the question. On a question about the primary language spoken at home, 83% of the students stated they spoke English. The next most common languages were Mandarin/Cantonese (10%) and Punjabi/Hindi (2%). These percentages are similar to those reported by Statistics Canada for the Vancouver area. “Chinese” is spoken by 10% of the population and “Punjabi/Hindi” is spoken by 3% of the population. Figures from Statistics Canada are not available specifically for the municipalities served by Kwantlen.

It is projected that Surrey and Langley will both experience substantial growth (31% and 13% respectively) in population from 1999-2014 (Kwantlen, 2000c, p. 16). This pattern of growth will be true for the 18-24 year old cohort as well. Surrey and
Langley will see an increase (29% and 30%) in this cohort. Both Richmond and Delta will see a decrease in the cohort (-29% and -7% respectively) (Kwantlen, 2000c, p. 18). The projected figures show that Kwantlen will continue to serve the most populous region in the province and have the largest cohort of 18-24 year olds. Knowing these projections, Kwantlen is planning for a new campus in Cloverdale and another addition to its Surrey campus in the next ten years. However, policy directives in the Government of BC include the expansion of distance learning as an alternative to traditional classroom learning. Also, there are some oversubscribed programs such as Nursing, Applied Design and Information Technology. For the academic year 2002-2003, there were over 314 applicants for the 64 available nursing seats. With a worldwide nursing shortage, this program is targeted for growth.

Since Kwantlen is in a rapidly growing region, much of the 1990s were spent lobbying the government for new student seats and new facilities. This resulted in the completion of three new campuses in the 1990s. Also, from 1994-1999, Kwantlen doubled in size reaching almost 7,700 FTEs (full time equivalents). Kwantlen continues to lobby the government on behalf of its growing region for more space. In 2003, money to prepare the ground for the construction of the replacement campus for Newton in Cloverdale was provided.

Employee Characteristics

According to Kwantlen’s Office of Institutional Research, in Fall 2002, there were 1,160 active employees, excluding those who provide janitorial and food services. As these services are contracted out, Kwantlen keeps no statistics on these individuals. Those employees directly employed by Kwantlen are in three categories: Administration,
Faculty and Staff. Administration includes the President, Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents, Deans, Associate Deans, Directors, Managers, Executive Assistants and Confidential Secretaries, who are not members of the British Columbia Government and Service Employees’ Union (BCGEU). The Faculty category consists of all teaching faculty who are full time, part time, regular or non-regular, as well as librarians, counselors, coordinators, department chairs and convenors. The Kwantlen Faculty Association represents the Faculty group and is a member local of the provincial College and Institute Educator’s Association (CIEA). The BCGEU comprises of Student Assistants and everyone who is not Faculty or Administration.

Employee statistics are kept at Kwantlen under these categories: Faculty, Staff and Administration (see Table 5). Surrey campus has 37% of Kwantlen’s employees; Langley 12%, Newton 10%, Richmond 23% and 18% of employees had no particular campus listed (Kwantlen, 2003).

Table 5
Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Categories</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kwantlen’s Office of Institutional Research clusters the age groups as under 30, 30-39, 40-49 and over 49. The employee ages range from 19 to 73 years with a mean age of 46 and a median age of 47. Kwantlen’s employees are an aging population: of the 1160 employees, 972 are over 49 years of age. As this group retires, about 75% of the Faculty will need to be replaced during the next 15 years. The Administration and
Faculty groups are mainly over 40 years of age while the Staff group is evenly distributed across the 30-39, 40-49 and over 49 groups.

**Campus Environment**

The four campuses operate under the same policies and contractual agreements. The differences lie in the types of programs offered, the employee mix and the physical structures. Many programs, including university studies programs, are delivered at Surrey, Langley and Richmond campuses. The trades programs are concentrated at the Newton and Langley campuses; design programs at Richmond; music and horticulture programs at Langley; and fine arts at Surrey.

The Surrey campus is the only campus that has a gymnasium and a Wellness Centre. The Wellness Centre coordinators and the recreation director try to organize activities on the other campuses but it is not the same as dropping into the Wellness Centre to browse through its resource materials or to the fitness centre for a workout.

The Richmond and Langley campuses operated daycares until 2002. They were cut as part of a strategy to deal with financial constraints. This did not seem to greatly affect the employees according to the focus groups and survey results.

Three campuses, Surrey, Richmond and Langley, have modern buildings, which are well designed and furnished, and pleasant to the eye. The Newton campus, on the other hand, consists of old warehouses that have had leaky roofs and moldy carpets. It is dark and dingy, and not designed for instruction. In fact, in one of the buildings, physically challenged students use the service elevator because there are no other elevators in the building. A decision was made by administration in Spring 2002 to start closing the campus and move the programs and services to the Langley or Surrey
On the Richmond and Surrey campuses there is a shortage of office space and classrooms are filled to capacity during peak operational hours. Parking space is also a major concern, particularly at the Richmond campus where one can spend up to 30 minutes trying to park a car at peak times.

Employees receive technical support for computer and telephone use as well as library resources. The libraries on Surrey, Richmond and Langley campuses operate six days a week, but they are inadequately resourced for some program areas. Twenty-two percent (22%) of the students surveyed identified library materials as a concern in the Fall 2001 registration survey. When Kwantlen applied to join the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, this organization expressed a concern regarding the completeness of Kwantlen's library collection.

Because Kwantlen has four campuses, a faculty member may teach at more than one campus and/or in the external community in any given semester. Usually, faculty members do not teach on more than two campuses in any one semester. Faculty, who teach mainly on one campus, may not be familiar with the other campuses. If employees do not teach on the Surrey campus or attend meetings and ceremonies that Kwantlen hosts, they may never meet the Senior Leadership Team. To address this concern, the President booked rooms and held open houses on each campus.

**Current Developments in the Organization**

The two current developments that are important in understanding context are the creation of a new strategic plan and the replacement of the Newton campus. A new strategic plan was developed and a draft “Strategic Plan-Discussion Paper,” was
circulated in late 2002. There are proposed revisions to Kwantlen’s mission and shared vision statement; and the values are also being reviewed.

The most dramatic issues currently facing Kwantlen are funding cuts, a growing population and the decrepit conditions of the Newton campus. In 2002, Kwantlen developed a plan to move the programs from Newton to the Surrey and Langley campuses and phase out the Newton campus in order to decrease operational costs and deal with the decrepit conditions. The plan was to add new buildings to the Surrey and Langley campuses. Kwantlen’s administration did a cost analysis and decided it was more cost effective to integrate the Newton campus programs and offerings than to build a replacement campus. Just as quickly as Kwantlen made this announcement, the Ministry of Advanced Education announced that the building freeze has been lifted and Kwantlen will get planning funds for a new campus. The Ministry’s position is that although the programs and offerings at Newton can be integrated into existing campuses, in the long term that will limit growth at Kwantlen due to a lack of physical space. The Ministry is correct, but Kwantlen is not sure how it will cover operational costs of a new campus. Presently, money is allocated to Kwantlen to make plans for a new replacement campus, but operational costs would not be included.

Assessment of the Environmental Factors that Affect Employee Work Life

Since Kwantlen was established in 1981, it has faced issues of space and access. Kwantlen continues discussions with government and other stakeholder groups to increase its resources, both human and physical.
Physical Space

Kwantlen has needed new buildings since 1981 to replace the temporary structures it inherited. All the old decrepit buildings have been replaced over time except for the Newton campus. There have been several plans to replace it but the fact remains that some employees work in buildings that are stuffy and don’t have natural light in offices.

Space continues to be insufficient for a growing region. Recently, the physical structure at the Surrey campus was modified to create more office space for the Faculty. This resulted in some of the Faculty moving from 2 person offices to large open spaces shared by 8-12 Faculty members. Some faculty members no longer have “personal space” and do not spend much time in their office. While the draft of the new strategic plan states that Kwantlen would like to encourage its students and Faculty to spend more time on campus, the reverse is occurring. With lack of personal space and other family responsibilities, some faculty members are choosing to telecommute (work at home). The greatest challenges continue to be physical space and insufficient operational funds. This has placed great stress on the stakeholders. Kwantlen continues to grow and be in a constant state of change.

Intensification of Work

Over the last few years, employees have experienced an increase in the amount of work they do without a change in their job descriptions. Some of this increased work has resulted from a change in status from “college” to “university college” and some from the use of technology in the workplace.
Change in Kwantlen's Mandate

As a result of a change in status from college to university college and from other
government initiatives, Faculty have developed degree programs in addition to their
normal duties. Support staff experienced increased workload resulting from increased
Faculty and students. The Education Council worked hard to establish policies and
processes to define and approve Kwantlen degrees. Administration lobbied government
for approval of new degrees and funding. Increasingly employees are registering in
graduate programs to improve their credentials to be more effective in their positions or
for future employment opportunities that come with expansion. The perception that
Kwantlen is becoming “more university like” is causing Faculty to question whether their
current credentials are adequate or whether a doctoral degree will soon be a requirement.
Most of these employees are juggling multiple roles and taking courses while continuing
to work fulltime.

A recent government announcement enables Kwantlen to offer all types of
bachelor’s degrees and applied master’s degrees. Kwantlen is continuing to develop
bachelor’s degrees, but has not yet developed any master’s degree programs.

Technological Advances

All faculty members have access to personal computers and are expected to
access e-mail, use faxes and photocopiers. In the past, campus typists did the bulk of the
word processing for Faculty, but increasingly more Faculty are word processing their
own workbooks and course materials. Instead of typists word processing conventional
letters, employees are communicating through e-mail. There are fewer face-to-face
interactions and more time is spent on computers keyboarding e-mails. This has resulted
in increased concern regarding ergonomic workstations as some employees are experiencing shoulder, neck and back pain.

Since faxes and photocopiers are easier to use, there are no longer clerical staff available to provide this service so the Faculty perform these duties. In addition, technology is continually changing and employees are constantly learning new applications. Technology has made work more efficient, but it has increased the breadth of work activities that employees are expected to perform.

**Working Conditions**

The collective agreements, having evolved over many negotiations, are comprehensive, and along with other institutional documents and policies, generally create favorable working conditions. Although employees would like to be paid more, employees with bachelor degrees or less are generally paid wages consistent with the private sector except in some areas such as information technology, business and other professional programs. Faculty members with doctoral degrees seem to be underpaid compared to the private sector. Although the benefits and processes seem equitable, there are a few discrepancies in terms of the amount and time of retraining allowance, payment for mileage, flexibility and internal hiring procedures. Sometimes the inequities create rifts between members of both unions. The collective agreements address conflicts between union members through responsibility of the employer to create a harassment free work environment. In other words, if two employees are in conflict, they both file a grievance against the employer. There is no formal mechanism to have the employees address each other directly.
Summary

Since it was established in 1981, Kwantlen has continued to face issues of access due to increasing population in its region and funding that is based on government grants. It is the largest university college in Canada and serves the largest geographic region in BC. It serves a multicultural region and has implemented policies and negotiated contractual agreements to deal with the diversity to ensure equity and fairness.

Considering its size, it still remains relatively unknown in the Lower Mainland and continues to have the second lowest funding per person among the province’s college and university college regions. It continues to increase program offerings, especially in the area of degree programs, and work with government to improve physical space and increase access. Kwantlen is constantly changing as a result of demands from government, a changing educational work environment with a more diversified population, increased use of information technology and a projected decrease in the availability of government grants. These changes have increased the stress on Kwantlen’s employees.

The next chapter is a review of relevant literature. It addresses the process of social auditing; the environmental factors that affect well-being and the definition of well-being.
CHAPTER THREE
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Most public post secondary institutions have traditionally viewed themselves as places of learning and as organizations that are accountable to the public. Increasingly organizations and governments are adopting the language of the global market economy and focusing on accountability. Accountability means efficiency, doing more with fewer financial resources and looking at the value of money spent. With the increased demand for post secondary education and limited increases in government funding, most organizations have to find ways to be more productive without increasing costs. In addition, governments, the funders of public education, are demanding accountability. In fact, the British Columbian government passed Bill 28 (2002) to allow post secondary institutions to override collective agreements and change working conditions in the name of accountability. The provincial government has established an accountability framework for the post secondary system. Two of the goals in the accountability framework are to ensure value to the public (graduates per dollar or financial accountability) and fulfill the skill demands of industry (BC Ministry of Advanced Education, 2003). Should productivity, the rate of graduation or the numbers of graduates per dollar spent and the employability of graduates be the only ways to judge accountability? What about social accountability?

Some business leaders are advancing the notion that organizations need to be concerned not only with the economic or financial factors, but also with environmental and social factors. John Elkington, Chairman of SustainAbility Ltd, stated “Increasingly, we think in terms of a ‘triple bottom line,’ focusing on economic prosperity, environmental quality and the element which business has tended to overlook, social
justice" (Elkington, 1999, p. 19). The economic bottom line is found in the financial statements and in the ways of increasing profits; the environmental bottom line is the company’s effect on the biosphere; and the social bottom line is the impact of the organization on the public, including its stakeholders. In the business literature, it is recognized “that for a company to prosper over the long-term it must continuously meet society’s needs for goods and services without destroying natural and social capital” (Elkington, 1999, p. 19).

The major cost of an organization’s operations is employee salaries and benefits. It therefore makes sense to invest in the employees who operate the organization in a way that promotes their well-being, so that they can function well, both at work and in society.

In this chapter, I argue that organizations need to be concerned about the effect they have on the well-being of employees because healthy employees contribute more to the organization and society. I present my general framework first and then explain how I derived it. I define well-being and explain how environmental factors affect well-being and share my understanding of organizations. In addition, I explain the process of social auditing used to understand the social impact of an organization.

**Conceptualization of Study**

Well-being is one of the results of a person’s interaction with their environment. The environment is physical, social and cultural. Everything in the environment affects the person, although the person may not be totally conscious of it. Since people spend a great deal of time at work, it is important to understand how the polices and practices of an organization might affect well-being. The following model (Figure 2) allowed
Figure 2. The Environment/Well-being Interaction Model
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me to examine the interaction of the employee, the organization, the work environment and a resulting health state, called well-being.

**Understanding Well-being**

Health and well-being have various definitions in the literature (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Health is sometimes defined in terms of physical and psychological symptoms and well-being as overall perceptions or subjective experiences. I accept the broader definition of health and equate the two terms as follows: “Health (well-being) is the continuous balancing of the physical, emotional, social, intellectual (mental) and spiritual components of an individual to produce happiness and a higher quality of life” (Anspaugh, Hamrick & Rosato, 1994, p. 2; Greenberg, Dintiman & Myers Oakes, 1998, p. 3). It is a changing state of being that is experienced in the course of everyday living. When people are at the lowest level of well-being, they see themselves as being ill; when they are at the highest level, they feel very satisfied and a part of life (Leddy & Pepper, 1998). Well-being may be described as a continuum with a feeling of imminent death at one extreme and peak or maximum well-being at the other extreme (Anspaugh et al, 1994; Dunn, 1959). The environment affects this state of well-being. Environment is anything outside of the person that affects the person whether it is physical, social, biological or cultural. A positive environment can negate (reduce or eliminate the expression of) small symptoms such as headaches, while a negative environment can exacerbate small symptoms and make the individual feel ill (Hurwitz & Morgenstern, 2001; Brannon & Feist, 2000). This is consistent with the ancient Chinese philosophy of Taoism that states disease results from a person being out of balance with his or her environment. It is based on a belief that well-being is a result of the interaction of the
Yin—a negative environmental force and the Yang—a positive environmental force. Dunn (1959) described well-being as a grid with interactions between health and the environment (Figure 3). The environmental axis intersects the health axis to create four quadrants:

Quadrant I—poor health which occurs when there is a low level of well-being and a very unfavourable environment;

Quadrant II—protected poor health, which occurs when there is low well-being but a very favourable environment;

Quadrant III—high-level well-being, which occurs when there is a very favourable environment and peak wellness; and

Quadrant IV—emergent high-level well-being, which occurs when there is peak wellness but a very unfavourable environment (Figure 3).

Figure 3. The (Wellness) Health Grid
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Dunn (1959) stated that “our perceptions of the outer world are indissolubly linked with the concepts and emotions fixed in our minds and body tissues”. Thus well-being is the result of the experience of man (woman), the body, the mind and the spirit with the “continually changing physical, biological, social and cultural environment” (Dunn, 1959, p. 789).

According to the Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion (World Health Organization (WHO) 1986), positive health results when a person is able to cope with his or her environment. It also stated that there is an inextricable link between the environment and health. Dunn (1959) and the Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion (WHO, 1986) explained that the total environment is important. The Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion was explicit; it stated that the health impact of environmental changes at work should be assessed. Dunn (1959) did not list organizational factors, but such factors affect the work environment where employees spend much of their time.

There is agreement by some theorists that well-being is a state of health (Anspaugh et al., 1994; Dintiman, & Greenberg, 1986; Dunn, 1959; Greenberg et al., 1998; Leddy, & Pepper, 1998). In this model, health is a condition of the actualization of the person’s potential (Anspaugh et al., 1994; Dugas, 1995; Dunn, 1959; Leddy & Pepper, 1998; Pender, 1996; Smith, 1981, WHO, 1986). Health is high-level well-being at one end and poor health and low-level well-being at the other.

Health, according to the World Health Organization (WHO), is “seen as a resource for everyday life, not the objective of living. Health is not just the absence of disease; it is a positive concept emphasizing social and personal resources, as well as physical capacities. Health is created and lived by people within the settings of their
everyday life; where they learn, work, play and love. Health is created by caring for oneself and others, by being able to make decisions and have control over one’s life circumstances and by ensuring that the society one lives in creates conditions that allow the attainment of health by all its members” (World Health Organization, 1986). Embedded in this definition are the concepts of empowerment and justice (Labonte, 1993).

This definition of health clearly moves beyond the traditional medical model of health as the absence of disease. It clearly emphasizes that humans are social beings who interact with the environment to create their health (Labonte, 1993). Health or well-being is a perception by the individual as the body processes current events in relation to past events or environmental input.

Greenberg et al. (1998) considered five dimensions of health: physical, emotional, social, mental and spiritual. These dimensions are not compartmentalized, but overlap and affect each other. When a person experiences life, all dimensions are engaged to some degree. An individual’s health or well-being requires the functioning of the individual in all five dimensions of health. Each dimension affects the others and the resulting state is the person’s well-being, which is constantly changing as the person interacts with his or her environment.

The five dimensions of health (well-being) are:

1. Physical health—the ability to carry out daily tasks with sufficient energy and strength, with ample reserve available for circumstances that may arise.

2. Emotional health—the ability to express and control emotions appropriately.
3. Social health—the ability to interact well with others and the environment and have positive interpersonal relationships.

4. Mental health—the ability to learn, including cognitive capabilities.

5. Spiritual health—the belief in some unifying force, such as a Supreme Being, nature, or scientific laws (Greenberg et al., 1998, p. 3).

Anspaugh et al. (1994) also believe in the five dimensions of wellness, as a measurement of well-being. They define wellness as “engaging in attitudes and behaviors that enhance (the) quality of life and maximize personal potential” (p. 2). Their dimensions of wellness are: physical, spiritual, social, emotional and intellectual. These dimensions are the same as Greenberg et al. (1998) except they use the term intellectual instead of mental.

The Reports on the Health of Canadians (Federal, Provincial and Territorial Advisory Committee on Population Health, 1996, 1999) stated, “evidence suggests that living and working conditions are perhaps the most powerful influences on health” (p. 3). The Reports stated that health is greatly affected by the social and economic environment, such as having an adequate income, physical safety, learning opportunities and meaningful work. Networks and friendships in our families, workplaces and communities also have an impact on health. In addition, the Reports stated that higher income is positively correlated with health not only because of the ability to buy food, housing and other items, but also because of the ability to make choices and have control. Control is emphasized in the WHO’s definition and in the first and second Reports on the Health of Canadians (Federal, Provincial and Territorial Advisory Committee on Population Health, 1996, 1999).
The Reports on the Health of Canadians (Federal, Provincial and Territorial Advisory Committee on Population Health, 1996, 1999) analyzed data from the Statistics Canada National Population Health Survey and found that education is positively correlated with health. As level of education improves, self-rated health status improves and the number of workdays lost due to illness or injury decrease. In addition, those with less than high school education are twice as likely to have high blood pressure, high blood cholesterol and suffer obesity. This is significant because those with higher levels of education are more likely to have jobs with higher social status and higher social status usually means better working conditions and better health benefits (Federal, Provincial and Territorial Advisory Committee on Population Health, 1996, 1990). The framework for action, part of the report “Strategies for Population Health: Investing in the Health of Canadians,” adopted by federal and provincial health ministers, listed living and working conditions, physical environment and individual capacity and coping skills as major factors that affect health.

**Determinants of Health**

The environment has been identified in the Canadian government literature as a factor that influences health since 1974 (Lalonde, 1974; Epp, 1996; Polanyi et al., 1998; Romanow, 2002). The environment that influences employees can be varied and complex and may include organizational factors, personal factors, policies and practices, ergonomics, stress and feelings of belonging. It can be something in the immediate environment or on the other side of the world. Polanyi et al (1998) provide a useful framework for identifying determinants of health in the workplace. They identified determinants of health in the workplace as “external/societal,” “organizational structure
and environment," “task requirements” and “individual lifestyle” (see Table 6). There are four determinants of health in the framework. The first level is “external or societal,” which includes technology, competition and government policies. There are international, national and provincial policies on human rights and working conditions that affect every organization. There are also those specific to the type of organization and the community it serves. These policies affect the internal environment of the organization and in turn its employees. The second level of determinant is the “structure and environment” of the organization. This I call the internal environment of the organization because it includes terms of employment, including wages, benefits, hours of work, incentives and job security, structures, approach to health and safety, physical environment and on-site facilities such as fitness and daycare centres.

Although I have differentiated the external and internal environment, the divisions are not always clear as is explained later in the chapter. The third level of determinant is the “task requirements.” This includes both the physical and psychosocial demands. Included in this are workload, equipment used, job control and social support from peers. The final level of determinant is “individual lifestyle,” including basic characteristics such as age, gender, marital status, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, health history, education, socioeconomic history, as well as non-work demands of childcare and eldercare, personal resources or coping skills and social support from family and friends.

Polanyi et al.’s framework is used to understand the factors that impact employee well-being. I provide support for the framework by organizing the literature around the category of the determinants of health in the workplace as stated by Polanyi et al., (1998, Table 6) and discuss its application.
# Table 6

## Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Determinant</th>
<th>Sub-level of Determinant</th>
<th>Factors Related to Worker Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External/societal</td>
<td>Sectoral, national, global</td>
<td>Structure of business, technology, government labour and economic policies, economic competition, technological change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure and environment</td>
<td>Terms of employment</td>
<td>Salary, hourly pay or pay by piecework (benefits, shift work), safety incentives for managers and employees, job security (and turnover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making structures, approach to health and safety</td>
<td>Employee participation in decision making, commitment to health and safety factors (structure, support of management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>Lighting, noise level, toxic exposures, air quality, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-site facilities</td>
<td>Fitness, daycare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task requirements</td>
<td>Physical and psychosocial demands</td>
<td>Job content (lifting, turning, repetitive movements), equipment used, pace and load of work, job control, range of skills used, social support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual lifestyle</td>
<td>Basic characteristics</td>
<td>Age, gender, marital status, health and injury history, smoking, obesity, socioeconomic status, education, language ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-work demands</td>
<td>Childcare and eldercare needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal resources</td>
<td>Education, coping skills, family and social support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External/Societal

Organizations do not exist in a vacuum; they have permeable boundaries. They both influence and are influenced by the environment in which they exist. Legislation such as the Human Rights Act, the Public Sector Employers Act and the Labour Code governs organizations in terms of structure and purpose of business, wages and working conditions, human rights, the right to unionize and the conduct of employer-employee relations. These factors influence how organizations are structured and work. For example, the Employment Standards Act requires an employee to have a 30-minute meal break if he/she works more than a five-hour work period (BC Ministry of Skills Development and Labour, 2002).

One external factor that affects organizations is the use of technology, which is constantly evolving. One example is communication and information technology that allows information to be spread across the globe within seconds. For example, most students in my 9:00 a.m. class on September 11, 2001 had watched the explosion that occurred as jets crashed into the twin towers of the World Trade Centre. Some students felt ill and we spent about 45 minutes discussing thoughts, feelings and meanings that students ascribed to this event. These students may have been at the low end of the well-being continuum since they were not able to buffer this negative event.

General societal trends also can affect well-being. A societal trend that should be of concern is increased violence. The first Global Report on Violence (World Health Organization, 2002b) stated violence is a leading issue for public health policy. It explained that violence is the leading cause of death for those 15-44 years of age. Violence accounts for 14% of the deaths for men and 7% of the deaths for women (World
Health Organization, 2002b). Violence against women is identified as a major physical and mental health problem in Canadian society (Government of Canada, 1998). The report contends that 51% of all Canadian women have experienced at least one act of physical, mental or sexual violence by the time they are 16 years of age (Government of Canada, 1998, p. 1). The report also said that 10% of Canadian women are sexually abused in their lifetime. If violence is so prevalent and there are increasingly more women in the workplace, then many employees in organizations have been affected. The violent acts against women will affect their well-being and in turn their work life and their home life.

There are increasingly more women in the workforce (rates between 1977 and 1996 increased from 43% to 57%) than in previous times and more single parent families (rates between 1985 and 1996 increased 33%) (Duxbury, & Higgins, 2001). The 2001 National Work-Life Conflict Study: Report One states that 11% of the 31,571 respondents are single parents (Duxbury, & Higgins, 2001). Childcare is an issue. If employees are worried about their children, their well-being is affected.

Organizational Structure and Environment

Organizational structure and the internal physical and social environment affect employee well-being. Organizational structure includes reporting relationships and terms of employment. In many organizations, there are fulltime, part-time and casual employees. Casual or contract work may cause stress because there is uncertainty about having future work and the amount of work. In a post secondary institution most employees do not work the night shift, but there is evening work and the prospect for weekend work. Employees who supervise practicums such as those in the Community
and Health Studies Division work evenings and have the prospect of working the night shift. Both services and classes continue until 10 p.m. Most of the studies on shift work focus on the night shift. Some of the issues surrounding night shift work are increased problems with physical health; sleep loss, domestic and social disruption, decreased performance and tolerance to shift work (Grimshaw, 1999, pp. 76-78). Although post secondary employees do not work night shifts, I believe the issues around shift tolerance, decreased performance and domestic and social disruption certainly apply. For instance, many working women juggle roles of employee, spouse, housekeeper and primary caregiver for their children and/or aging parents (Harvard Women’s Health Watch, 1999, p. 1). Their domestic life would be disrupted if they were required to work in the evenings, as it is generally women who are responsible for managing the household and preparing meals. If they are working and not home in the evening, they need to make alternate arrangements for cooking and childcare.

Terms of employment are described in collective agreements for unionized employees and by individual contracts for excluded (non-unionized) employees. Generally, public sector collective agreements that have been negotiated over several decades are fair and equitable in some respects. The salary structures have no gender bias because salaries are classified according to the job description. Skill and competence beyond a minimum level are not a factor. Since income is related to health (British Columbia Ministry of Health, 1999; Black, 1980; Hay, 1993 in Townson, 1999; Federal, Provincial and Territorial Advisory Committee on Population Health, 1996, 1999), wage levels are correlated with social status and thus are significant.
A number of studies that have looked at income, social status and health believe it to be interlinked. Income affects social status, which affects health. Hay (1993) did an analysis based on 1977 Canadian health data and found that low-income groups have poorer health status even when adjusted for age and sex. He believed that this was due to the fact that income affects social variables, which affect health (Townson, 1999). In 1996 the "Report on the Health of Canadians" found a relationship between social conditions and health. About 50% of men living in poor neighborhoods live to age 75 years, while about 70% of the men in the richest neighborhoods lived to age 75 years. It may not be income, working or social conditions or genetic disposition directly, but it may be the fact that a higher income allows an individual to meet basic human needs and have choices and feel a sense of control of their situation.

The structure of an organization dictates the hours of work as well as where the work is to be done. Structure also indicates the level of the organization at which particular decisions are made. Polanyi et al. (1998) place decision-making under the determinant organizational structure and the environment and place physical and psychosocial demands under the determinant task requirements. I believe them both to be part of the internal environment of the organization. Psychosocial and physical demand characteristics of the job, control and social support have been examined in several studies.

In 1990, Karasek and Theorell reviewed the literature and developed a job strain model. They found that "the most adverse reactions of psychological strain (fatigue, anxiety, depression and physical illness) occur when psychological demands are high and the worker's decision latitude is low" (Karasek, & Theorell, 1990, pp. 32-33). Basically,
this is a stress model. With recent downsizing, trends of greater competition, longer work hours and decreased job security, it is no wonder that there is so much literature on stress in the workplace. The Statistics Canada Health Reports (2001) stated the sources of work stress are: “physically demanding labour, low-support from co-workers and supervisors, job strain and job insecurity” (p. 22). The same report indicated that 58% of the respondents in the National Population Health survey record low co-worker support.

A number of studies that have looked at decision latitude and health are reviewed here. Engstrom, Johansson, Jonsson, and Medbo (1995) assessed the effect of a “parallel-flow” production system in the Uddevalla Volvo plant in Sweden that was designed to be more cost-effective and improve working conditions. In this parallel-flow system, small teams of workers created the whole car. This had the effect of reducing the repetitive work of a serial-flow assembly line. This new system created better relations between supervisors and employees and increased job control compared to another Swedish Volvo plant. The psychological work stress was actually higher but the ability to influence and control the work created a better psychosocial climate, which increased productivity and the quality of the car. Although this study focused on productivity, it supports the fact that the psychosocial climate affects the employee. In this case, a positive psychosocial climate increased productivity and well-being.

Stansfeld, Head and Ferrie (1999) report the findings of one of the largest and longest epidemiological studies in the world, the Whitehall II study of British civil servants. This study is a follow-up of the first Whitehall study (1967) conducted 20 years earlier that found mortality rates were three times higher in the lower level workers compared to the highest administrative level workers. This longitudinal study showed a
steep inverse correlation between social class, assessed by grade (category of employment ranging from administrator to clerical) of employment and mortality from a wide range of diseases. After about 10 years, it is reported that those in the lowest paying jobs had three times the mortality rate of those in the highest paying jobs. These workers were all white-collar male workers who worked together in the same offices. A major criticism of the first study was that it could not be applied to women because all the subjects were men; therefore, the second longitudinal study included women. In 1985, the second Whitehall study (The Stress and Health Study) included British Government employees who were 35-55 years old at the time to investigate the social gradient in physical and psychological morbidity. This group of researchers studied the association between work characteristics and sickness. In the five-year period between 1985-1990, they found that government employees with high levels of control, low job demands and support at work had lower rates of short and long-term absence from work. Demand when correlated by employment grades (employee category of administrator, professional & executive, clerical and other), correlated high demand for decreased absence with higher grade employees and low level demand and decreased absence with lower grade employees. This is possibly due to the fact that in the higher employment grades the demands of the job are challenging, but also fulfilling, while in the lower employment grades the employees do not have the latitude to deal with the demand (Stansfeld et al, 1999, p. 126). Also, controls over work and social support are negatively correlated with absence from work. It was argued that those in the highest employment grades had more control, thus decreased illness and absence. In addition, using the Whitehall II data, Marmot, Smith, Stansfeld, Patel, North, Head, White, Brunner and Feeny (1991) found a
positive association between low job control and risk of coronary disease. This longitudinal study strongly supports a relationship between well-being and control and social support in the workplace.

Rapert and Wren's (1998) work supports the Whitehall findings. They looked at the relationship between structure and communication on performance in two large service hospitals in the United States. They found that an open more participative structure leads to better performance. They found that when authority is at the level of the lowest level of employee in the organization, employees feel a sense of empowerment that makes them become more involved in the organization. This is consistent with the World Health Organization's "Health Promotion and Actions" literature, which states that individuals who feel empowered feel healthier; therefore it is important to help individuals feel empowered (World Health Organization, 2002a).

A study, which looked at the quality of work life in an Australian university, provides support for inclusion in decision-making. Through an Academic Work Environment Survey, Winter, Taylor and Sarros (2000) assessed the relationship between demographic characteristics (gender, position and discipline area), work environment perceptions (role, work, supervisor, structure and government policies) and work attitudes. They found the positive factors were role clarity, motivating job characteristics and low levels of alienation. On the other hand, the negative characteristics included role overload, low levels of job feedback and limited ability to influence university decisions. This study supports the idea that quality of work life is related to organizational factors including ability to influence decisions. Although the quality of work life may not be the
same as the person’s state of well-being, they certainly do overlap because both are perceptions by the individual of the result of the interaction with their environment.

A recent study found that networks and communication allow individuals to be included in the decision-making process. Manev and Stevenson (2001) studied the relationship between boundary-spanning communication and individual influence in a network with 108 managers in an urban transit authority in the United States. The data were collected through a survey with a 79% response rate. They found that boundary-spanning communication correlates with influence and influence is not correlated with the hierarchical level of the manager. This study supports the fact that an organization can create feelings of influence through boundary spanning and that influence is not directly correlated with the status of the manager, i.e. Vice President, middle manager, or supervisor. This study demonstrates the importance of communication networks both within and outside the organization for employees.

Although communication is not explicitly discussed in Polanyi et al.'s (1998) framework, it is certainly implied through inclusion in decision-making and social support, as neither process should occur without communication.

One of the first studies to link social support to health was the Alameda County Study (Berkman, & Syme, 1979). They found a link between social support and longevity. “This study indicated that lack of social support was as strongly linked to mortality as cigarette smoking and a sedentary lifestyle” (Brannon, & Feist, 2000, p. 204). Berkman and Syme (1979) found that people who lacked social contacts were more likely to die in the follow-up period than those who had extensive social contact. In fact, the age-adjusted risk for the most isolated compared to the most social contacts was
2.3 times for men and 2.8 times for women (p. 186). Since then, other studies have been done that correlated high levels of social support with decreased level of mortality and morbidity (Brannon, & Feist, 2000).

One study that looked at social support and job control and well-being is the work of Cheng, Kawachi, Coakley, Schwartz and Colditz (2000). They examined the relationship between psychosocial work characteristics and changes in health related quality of life over several years in a cohort of working American women from 1992-1996. In 1992 the study started with 75,434 registered nurses. In 1996 there were a total of 31,330 women (69% response rate) who returned the questionnaire. Out of the 31,330 who responded in 1996, almost 10,000 were excluded—1,540 because they had developed heart disease, cancer or stroke, 6,814 because they retired and 1,686 because of missing data. This left 21,290 registered female nurses for the analysis. Of these only 16,287 (76.5%) were working as nurses. They were asked to answer a questionnaire that dealt with seven dimensions of health status: physical functioning, role limitations due to physical health problems, bodily pain, vitality, social functioning, role limitations due to emotional problems and mental health. Overall, it was found that a lack of control over the demands of the job and high psychological job demand, coupled with little social support concerning the job, contributed to a decline in health and functional ability. This study supports the idea that psychosocial work conditions are related to poor functional status and more specifically that high demands and low levels of control lead to health problems. In many of the aforementioned studies, control and decision latitude are related to health. This is related to the concept of empowerment, a feeling that we can manage our environment and feel secure and safe and in control.
Task Requirements

Task requirements refer to the physical and psychosocial demands of the job. The studies on ergonomics lend support to Polanyi et al.'s (1998) view that job content, equipment, pace, load of work and range of skills affect health. Bloswick, Villnave and Joseph (1998) in a chapter titled “Ergonomics” review the relationship of the worker and work environment and resulting health concerns. They claim that a misfit between a worker, the work environment and the task can lead to health concerns. Some ergonomic factors are applicable to employees of a post secondary institution. The authors cite studies that indicate that poor posture is related to injury at the wrist, shoulder, cervical spine and lower back. Also, the repetition of a task is associated with injuries, such as carpal tunnel syndrome. As well, injury is affected by duration, speed and recovery time of repetitive tasks being done. Inadequate lighting can produce vision problems. Over the past two decades, the amount of work accomplished using computers has risen dramatically with the resulting vision problems due to viewing monitors. Rodgers (2000), an ergonomics consultant, explained her framework for assessing ergonomic safety. Rodgers stated "that a person’s risk of making an error (in safety and ergonomics) depends on individual factors (including knowledge, skill and capabilities), on task demands (what the job or equipment requires the person to do), on the environment in which the work is done (the physical environment, such as temperature, lighting, workplace layout) and on the organizational factors present (policies for training, production pressures, shift schedule, communication, etc.)" (Rodgers, 2000, p. 529). It is clear that the work environment, organizational factors, individual factors and task demands are related to well-being.
Individual Lifestyle

Individual lifestyle clearly affects health and is well documented in the health literature. Disease increases with age (Whitman, 1999), certain diseases affect one gender more than another (Annandale, & Hunt, 2000), smoking has been linked to lung cancer and obesity puts the person at risk for numerous diseases including myocardial infarctions. This focus on individual lifestyle agrees with traditional medicine, which assumes that if genetic differences cannot account for disease then disease must be a result of individual environmental exposure.

Polanyi et al.'s (1998) framework also considers socioeconomic status and education factors in determining health. In some studies, discussed earlier, it is well established that education is linked to occupation, which is linked to socioeconomic status. Marmot, Kogevinas and Elston (1991) looked at the relationship between socioeconomic status and disease. They studied data from England and Wales where social class is based on occupation. They discovered that levels of disease vary with social class for both men and women. They also found that mortality rates for immigrants vary across the social scale.

Individual lifestyle often includes two non-work demands, childcare and eldercare needs. In a survey of 5,000 Canadian employees, it was found that 77% had childcare or eldercare responsibilities and that these employees had increased absence rates from work and reported being more stressed (Canadian Aging Research Network in Polanyi et al., 1998). Duxbury and Higgins (2001) reported that most of their respondents had responsibilities outside of work. "Seventy percent are parents, 60% have eldercare, 13% have responsibility for care of a disabled relative and 13% have both childcare and
eldercare demands" (p. xii). Some organizations may think personal demands such as eldercare and childcare are not their responsibility. On the surface they would be correct. However, what is not recognized by these organizations is that employees who have these demands and are not able to deal with them, feel stressed at work. They cannot leave this part of themselves at home when they come to work: their thoughts, feelings and history come with them. Health Reports (2001) provides support for the view that personal stress affects well-being. The data from the National Population Health Survey "shows that feeling personal stress in 1994/1995 was predictive of developing chronic conditions over the next four years" (Statistics Canada, 2001, p. 22).

Polanyi et al.'s (1998) framework considers individual differences, such as coping skills and family social support, under the sub-level determinant “personal resources,” and there is much literature that states social support mediates disease. Lara, Leader and Klein (1997) defined social support as a measure of how much help you can count on and tested their hypothesis that depressive symptoms were more likely to decrease with social support. In their study of 59 depressed individuals, they found that those who thought of themselves as having good social support improved on a standard measure of depressive symptoms and fully recovered. This study supports the thesis that the social environment is related to well-being. Increased social support has been linked to decreased depressive symptoms by a number of studies (Cheng et al., 2000; Daniels & Guppy, 1994; Jung, 1997; Karasek, 1979; Karasek & Theorell, 1990; Kasl & Amick, 1995; Lara, 1997; Melamed, Kushnir & Meir, 1991; Reifman, 1995; Smith, Fernengel, Holcroft, Gerald, & Marien, 1994; Snowden, 2001).
Coping skills certainly mediate the affects of stressors. Tartasky (1993) stated some people stay healthy even in the face of stressful life events. She stated this was due to personal characteristics, which she called hardiness. Hardiness includes: a belief that one's actions are important and right, the ability to view change as a challenge and a sense of personal control over one's life. The idea that one's actions are important and right is tied into one's experience of the world. If in interactions at work employees are recognized for their beliefs and actions, and view change as a challenge in which they have an opportunity to shape the future, hardiness may develop. If employees are constantly criticized for speaking up and presenting their views and told which changes must be accepted, then hardiness may not develop. If demand exceeds a person's individual and social resources and the person does not feel in control, then stress may develop.

Polanyi et al.'s (1998) framework has no specific category called stress but it is implicit in the framework categories of physical, psychosocial and nonwork demands. The factors include pace and load of work, social support and coping skills. Psychosocial stress occurs in 30-50% of workers in industrialized countries (World Health Organization, 1999). In the many studies, stress is a state where a person believes that demand placed on them exceeds their ability to cope (Karasek & Theorell, 1990; Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus, 1981). Major life events were accepted as stressors in a person's life but little attention was paid to daily stressors. Lazarus, a social psychologist, studied the effects of daily hassles on a person's health. He believed that the accumulation of daily hassles have a worse affect on the person than major life events.
Biracree and Biracree (1988) discovered the ten most frequent hassles are “concerns about weight, health of a family member, rising prices of common goods, home maintenance, too many things to do, misplacing or losing things, yard work or outside home maintenance, property investment or taxes, crime and physical appearance” (p. 29). Stress results from the accumulation of daily events.

A more recent study examined the relationship between negative social interactions and health symptoms in 206 university students (Edwards, Hershberger, Russell & Markert, 2001). The researchers found that negative social exchange positively correlated with poor health symptoms and the correlation was greater than that between life event stress and daily hassles. This study lends support to the notion that the social environment in an organization contributes to well-being.

The stress response consists of an organized series of events involving the sympathetic nervous system and the endocrine system (Cannon, 1994 in Dugas & Knorr, 1995; Seyle, 1976). These responses are highly adaptive in that they are the body’s way of preparing to deal with the physical and/or psychological challenge.

Dubos hypothesized that even though pathogenic organisms are always present in the environment, people do not normally get sick. They only become ill when their resistance to disease is compromised through emotional states such as anxiety, anger, frustration and fear (Dubos in Rice, 2000). If the stressors are prolonged, they can compromise the immune system, which can affect disease susceptibility and progression across a variety of illnesses (Hurwitz & Morgenstern, 2001; Kiecolt-Glaser & Glaser, 1995; Rice, 2000). Heart problems, stroke, cancer, peptic ulcer, asthma, diabetes, common cold, hypertension, headache, back pain, musculoskeletal pain and arthritis are
some of the illnesses (Brannon & Feist, 2000; Keita & Sauter, 1992; Rice, 2000). Also prolonged exposure to a stressor can cause changes in heart rate, blood pressure, respiratory rates, temperature, sweating, rash, pain, loss of energy, loss of interest and general malaise and even death (Selye, 1976).

Scales have been developed to rate readjustment to major life events. It has been found that too many changes (considered stressors) in a short period of time may lead to major illnesses (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). This is important information because increased stress without support can lead to decreased well-being or illness. There are also factors such as perceived control and social support that are considered to mitigate stress in studies related to stress and coping (Dewe, 1991; Havlovic & Keenan, 1995; Heaney et al, 1995; Latack & Havlovic, 1992; Miller, Brady & Summerton, 1988; Nikelly, 2001).

Lazarus (1998) stated individuals cope by either changing the situation (the environment) or by changing themselves, so that the stress related somatic symptoms do not get out of hand and destroy the individual’s moral or social functioning. Lazarus and other health practitioners over the last 50 plus years have tested this theory and have found that stress affects the individual’s well-being.

Some theorists have approached stress in the workplace using a person-environment fit model (Grimshaw, 1999). They state that stress is created when there is tension between the characteristics of a person and the characteristics of his/her job environment and this can result in decreased well-being (French, Caplan, & van Harrison, 1982). In a review of studies on job strain (high psychological demand and low decision latitude or control) and cardiovascular disease, Karasek and Theorell (1990) found a significant positive correlation between job strain and stress. In some studies, job strain
was positively correlated with increased cholesterol, smoking and high blood pressure, risk factors for coronary heart disease. Sixteen of the 22 studies reviewed showed positive correlations between job strain and cardiovascular morbidity and mortality.

In addition, stress over prolonged time can result in burnout. According to Freudenberger, who coined the term “burnout,” this typically happens after a period of one year of stress; it is an emotional depletion and loss of motivation and commitment, gradually resulting in a variety of mental and physical symptoms (1974). These include fatigue, frequent colds, flu, headaches, gastrointestinal symptoms, sleeplessness, loss of self-esteem and marital and family conflict (Cherniss, 1980). In most of the studies on burnout, the individual perceives the environment to be stressful. The stress may be due to difficulties with clients, patients, students, from organizational policies and practices, workload, or loss of professional autonomy (Cherniss, 1980; Dugas & Knorr, 1995; Freudenberger, 1974; Leiter, 1991; Winnubst, 1993). The literature indicates a direct correlation between stress and burnout. Studies have looked at what decreases stress or burnout and a great number of them cite social support (Cheng et al., 2001; Corrigan, Holmes & Luchins, 1995; Daniels & Guppy, 1994; Lazarus, 1998; Miller, Brady & Summerton, 1998; Reisman, 1995; Smith, Fernengel, Colcroft & Marien, 1994). Some factors that mitigate stress are: “relating well with spouse or lover, relating well with friends, completing a task, feeling healthy, getting enough sleep, eating out, meeting your responsibilities, visiting, phoning or writing someone, spending time with family and engaging in enjoyable activity at home” (Biracree & Biracree, 1988, p. 29). Other factors include meaningful work, personal control, social support, job autonomy and a supportive boss, sharing worries, physical health and stamina, problem-solving skills, moral and

A more recent study (Tepper, 2001) found a relationship between procedural justice (due process), distributive justice (same rewards for same work) and psychological distress. The study concludes that an employee's perception of fairness or social justice in work practices is related to psychological health. When an organization's practices and polices are perceived as fair, it has a mitigating effect on stress. I add this factor of organizational justice to the framework under the determinant "organizational structure" because this is another factor related to employee well-being.

The studies cited support the framework, terms of employment, decision-making structures, approaches to health and safety, physical environment, job demands, equity and fairness and on-site facilities all contribute to employee well-being in the workplace (Polanyi et al., 1998; Tepper, 2001). All these factors are created and mediated by the individuals themselves through their basic characteristics, nonwork demands and personal resources. It might be argued that anytime, for whatever reason, a person perceives that he or she cannot meet the physical and psychological demands placed on him or her, he or she is in stress. Stress has been studied for over 80 years, by a variety of professions. There is support for the view that stress is inevitable and that organizations and individuals might adapt and learn to cope with stress for economic and societal reasons. The studies reviewed indicate that stress affects well-being. Even though there are many articles and books published on the role of stress in physical, mental, social, emotional and spiritual health, most organizations continue to focus on the
economic bottom line (Elkington, 1999). More often than not, the economic resources drive decisions.

**Organization as Organism**

In order for organizations to recognize the need for concern with the internal environment (work environment)—organizational structure and policies and practices that affect employee well-being—organizations must change from a mechanistic view that has dominated organizational theory and management. Organizations have been viewed as machines that produce in closed boundaries. In this view, organizations set goals and objectives, organize work efficiently, provide detailed job descriptions and plan production. This controls the product and the sources of production—people. The emphasis is efficiency, end product and process. The organization's work environment is perceived as stable and is not considered a critical part of the command and control process. In the mechanistic view when organizations are perceived as machines, employees become a cog in that machine. Employees are rewarded for following orders, policies and procedures from higher authorities. The employee is expected to arrive on time, do his or her work efficiently and not ask questions. The emphasis is on regimen and control. In the metaphor organism as machine, the employee is perceived as something that can be switched on and off. The employees are viewed as "interchangeable cogs in a large production machine" (Baker & Green, 1991, p. 5). The employee is expected to compartmentalize, leave his or her personal life at home and not bring it into the workplace. There is also a belief that employees can leave work behind when they go home at the end of the day. The employee is considered, not as a person, but as a part of a productive machine. This closed system with impermeable boundaries
limits itself from interacting with its environment. There is no recognition of the impact of the organization on the environment. It is believed to exist in isolation, not affecting or being affected by the environment or the people that work in it. This mechanistic view is incompatible with Polanyi et al.’s Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework (1998). In order to understand the validity of the framework, we must reject this view of organizations.

What if we apply a systems view of the world and use this view to examine employee well-being? A system is comprised of two or more interconnected parts, which organize to form a whole (Boulding, 1985; von Bertalanffy, 1968). Each system is part of a larger system called a macro system. For example, Kwantlen as a system is part of a macro system called post secondary education. The system is affected by everything inside and outside the system. The parts of a system have boundaries and the system itself has boundaries, which divide it from the external environment. The environment in this definition is outside the organization. I agree with Miles’ (1980, in Shukla, 1996) definition of the external environment, but also wish to include the internal environment, all that is inside the organization (work environment). Both the internal and external environments effect the organization and all its parts; but it is not always easy to differentiate between them.

In an open system, the boundaries are permeable, there is open exchange and thus the system has the potential to affect and be affected by other systems. Thus, a more appropriate metaphor is the organism. The organization is best seen as a living organism that continuously interacts, influences and responds to the environment (Morgan, 1986). Interacts means both influencing and being influenced by the environment, both internal
and external. In this metaphor, the environment is everything that comes in direct and
indirect contact with the organization or any of its parts. There is rapid change and a
need to respond to the ever-changing environment; there is emphasis on communication
and teamwork rather than on clearly defined jobs. There is informal authority that
emerges depending on the task to be done; there is open communication. There are
networks of communication instead of communication through hierarchical authority.
There is commitment to the organization as a whole and not just to the particular job
(Morgan, 1986). In this metaphor, the employees are the centre of an organization, seen
as people with thoughts, feelings, responsibilities and rights. They are seen as whole
individuals that bring their history, culture, values and beliefs and experiences with them
when they become a part of the organization for the duration of their work life or any part
of it. There is no perceived dichotomy between personal life and work life, each
affecting the other; which is why organizations need to be concerned with such issues as
childcare, eldercare and marital relationships, as all these will have an impact on how the
employee feels at work (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Senge (1990) stated that personal
mastery in organizations could not occur without personal mastery in all aspects of life.
“There is a natural connection between a person’s work life and all other aspects of life”
(Senge, 1990, p. 307). A person’s work and personal lives are intertwined, each affecting
the other. The boundaries are blurred with the increase in telecommuting (working at
home). Thus, the employee cannot separate him or herself into compartments of work
and personal life.

The organization has fluid and permeable boundaries between its parts, as
employees are a part of other systems. Because the groups to which an employee belongs
are constantly changing, organizational boundaries are never fixed (Stohl, 1995). In more modern organizations where the boundaries have become highly permeable and the communication across organizations is extensive, the organization is described as a "boundaryless organization" (Dess, Rasheed, McLaughlin & Priem, 1995). These organizations have many "boundary spanners," individuals who belong to other organizations. As well, with information technology, information can be sent around the world in seconds. Most employees in post secondary organizations have access to the computer and Internet. The employees have access to more information than they ever had in history before. This can influence the boundaries by making themselves and the organization more permeable as new ideas are introduced.

A survey done with small and medium size firms in the manufacturing and trading industry sectors in Hong Kong found that information technology had significant impacts on organizational structures such as formalization, specialization, lateral communication, teamworking and learning (Lau et al., 2001). An individual simultaneously belongs to many groups and does not operate in isolation from the environment. A person's attitudes and perceptions affect the individual's social choices and membership in groups. In fact, an employee's membership in multiple networks, especially outside of the organization, may lead to innovation, change, growth and social support. All these networks are established through communication, which is a two way process with the receiver and sender creating meaning from the encoded messages which only make sense in the context of the relationship. When individuals choose to participate in more networks than just the formal, at their workplace, they become more empowered. They become more empowered because they have the social network to
influence decisions, the knowledge base to do their job well and the connections to find a different employer if need be.

Communication with external agents is a key for organizations, because it helps scan the environment for potential influences and permits the organization to influence its environment (Finet, 1993; Tushman & Scanlan, 1983). This is very important because the external environment can have a huge impact on the internal environment and on all employees. Through communication people mediate the internal and external environment.

Employees work as administrators, support staff, faculty, librarians, counselors and facilities workers, creating the work environment to meet the mission of Kwantlen. Employees in post secondary organizations should be given the opportunity to provide feedback.

There are many stimuli in the environment but the decision to react is selective. Incoming stimuli are screened and coded according to the language of the system. Other information is perceived and stored but provokes no response. Again it is the employees who receive the stimuli and decide on the actions that are needed. According to organizational learning theorists (Huber, 1996; Allee, 1995; Senge, 1990; Argyris & Schoen, 1978), employees interpret the information that affects the organization. This interpretation is usually done with the values of the organization in mind, but is screened through the personal values of the employee. Since there are multiple interpretations of the actions or practices of an organization, the best way to assess the organization is by asking its employees. It is the employee who is in the best place to provide the system
feedback on how well it is doing in all aspects of its functioning including the milieu of its internal environment.

Each post secondary organization has legislation, governing its purpose and mandate, and mission and value statements that explain the reason for its existence and influence the policies and practices of the organization. Canadian and provincial legislation on human rights and equity and fairness are entrenched in post secondary institutions' collective agreements, yet little data is collected to ensure compliance. As a good social citizen, every post secondary organization should be concerned about its impact, not only on how well it serves its students, but also on how well it serves its employees and society at large. The organization should know how it is functioning in accordance to its mission and values and how it is contributing to the well-being of its employees through its policies and practices.

In order to develop and survive, the organization as organism has to be aware of its performance. As an open adaptive system, it must be able to respond to the information that it receives from both within and across its boundaries. The organization should evaluate whether its processes are working. The organization needs to be concerned with its employees because it is the people who have powers of communication, consciousness and an ability to produce artifacts (Boulding, 1985, p. 71). The organization should be required to obtain feedback from one of its major components, employees, in order to understand how it is functioning so that it can set benchmarks to improve its functioning.

It has been demonstrated that a supportive environment can have a curative and preventative influence on disease processes as well as increase job satisfaction (Nikelly,
2001; Stanley, 2001). Therefore an organization must collect data from the most costly and most important component in the system, the employee. One sub group of employees, administration, has the formal responsibility to ensure that all aspects of the organization work well. Improving employee well-being contributes to the organization’s goal of improved efficiency and productivity. There is empirical evidence of a connection between the environment and well-being (Berkman & Syme, 1979; Bloswick et al., 1998; Brannon & Feist, 2000; Cheng et al., 2000; Corrigan et al., 1995; Daniels & Guppy, 1994; De Jonge & Schaufeli, 1998; Dewe, 1991; Engstrom et al., 1995; Federal, Provincial and Territorial Advisory Committee on Population Health, 1996, 1999; French et al., 1982; Grimshaw, 1999; Havlovic & Keenan, 1995; Heaney et al., 1995; Karasek, 1979; Karasek & Theorell, 1990; Kasl & Amick, 1995; Latack & Havlovic, 1992; Melamed et al., 1991; Nikelly, 2001; Polanyi et al., 1998; Rodgers, 2000; Winnubst, 1993). One way of understanding the connection is through the process of social auditing.

**Social Auditing**

The term social auditing or social and ethical accounting, auditing and reporting (SEAAR) refers to a range of processes and tools that can be used to link an organization’s mission and values with organizational performance and change (Zadek, 1994). Social auditing is a way to assess and report on the social impact of an organization and to improve its performance (Social Audit New Zealand, no year). At present there is no single internationally accepted approach because there is no consensus about the core expectations and what constitutes appropriate actions and behaviors in an organization. It is generally accepted that social auditing is a way “to understand what
has and is likely to happen, what key people think about it all and what might be done to improve social and ethical performance” (Zadek, Pruzan, & Evans, 1997, p. 5). “Ethical (or ethics) refers to an organization's systems and the behaviour of individuals within the organization and outside the organization, whereas social refers to the impacts of the organization’s behaviour on its stakeholders, both internal and external. For others, the term ethical embraces both system and individual behaviour within an organization and the impacts of the systems and behaviour – on stakeholders, on the environment, on the economy, etc” (AccountAbility, no year).

Social auditing comes out of the corporate social responsibility (CSR) literature. The dimensions of CSR include:

- Human rights.
- Working conditions.
- Equality and diversity.
- Consumer protection.
- Environment and health impacts.
- Economic development.
- Ethical business practices.
- Lobbying and political influence.
- Business’s role in conflict zones. (Swift & Zadek, 2002).

Social auditing has been used by various organizations around the world. In this section, the history of SEAAR is presented along with an in-depth look at one college in British Columbia that used this process.
History of Social Auditing

Social and ethical accounting, auditing and reporting comes from the business and sustainability literature. Some corporations employ a three-pronged approach, using economic, environmental and social responsibility to gauge their performance. To achieve the balance implicit in the ‘triple bottom line’ concept, we not only need new forms of accountability, but also new forms of accounting (Elkington, 1999, p. 19). The social responsibility or the social impact, which is of particular interest to me, can be traced back to the 1900s (Zadek, 1994).

The earliest interest in corporate social responsibility can be traced back to the mid 1920s when “business representatives and executives were beginning to speak of the need for corporate directors to act as trustees for the interests, not just of stockholders, but other social claimants as well” (Frederick, 1994, p. 1). One of the first documented cases of shareholders raising questions on social matters such as executive salaries is in the 1930s (Marx, 92/93).

Theodore J. Kreps, an American academic, records the first use of the term “social audit” in 1940 (Zadek et al., 1997, p. 16). In the 1950s Bowen, an academic, told corporations that they should understand their social impact (Zadek et al., 1997, p. 17). The public concern around the corporate responses to social matters increased in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In the 1960s George Goyder, an academic, wrote about the importance of a social audit. Not only did he argue that a social audit was as important as a financial audit, but he also stated that the audit should include the “area of work and human relations...the company’s dealings with its customers, suppliers and the community” (Zadek et al., 1997, p. 17). He also stated that social auditing could provide...
both management and stakeholders with a way to challenge the system and influence change (Goyder, 1961 in Zadek et al., 1997, p. 109).

Another influential figure of the 1960s was Ralph Nader. His work prompted the Public Interest Research Centre in the UK to create Social Audit Limited. The goal of this company was to publish information about the social and ethical performance of business.

There was also growing concern in the United States in relation to stakeholder concepts and business accountability. By the late 1970s most Fortune 500 companies included a one or two page report on social expenditures. In 1979, the US Department of Commerce published a report on the importance of social and ethical reporting. The report argued that improved social performance would lead to increased long term profits. Social reports were being done in Europe and used to inform negotiations of wages and working conditions, or as management tools. By the 1990s, social audits using the stakeholder approach were initiated. Different approaches to social auditing were being developed. In 1994, at a conference in Dessau, Germany of the European Network for Self-Help and Local Development, there was recognition that many different approaches to social auditing were emerging and that there was a danger of confusion. There was consensus that practitioners should work toward agreed standards. Then in 1995, The New Economics Foundation hosted a conference on social auditing in Edinburgh, Scotland, attended by practitioners from around the world. In 1996, the discussion continued at a meeting of ethical businesses in Tuscany, Italy, where it was approved that there was a need to have an agreed set of standards. At that time, it was
agreed to establish the Institute of Social and Ethical AccountAbility (AccountAbility) to continue the dialogue.

AccountAbility is committed to strengthening the social responsibility and ethical behavior of the business community and non-profit organizations.

It addresses this mission by: promoting best practice social and ethical accounting, auditing and reporting; and developing standards and certification for professionals in the field.

AccountAbility's membership is international, representing the growing interest worldwide in the field of AccountAbility. AccountAbility supports this growth by encouraging international affiliates and developing partnerships with associated organizations. (Institute of Social and Ethical AccountAbility [AccountAbility, 2001]).

Founding members of AccountAbility include The Body Shop, British Telecom and the New Economics Foundation (NEF).

The New Economics Foundation is an independent think tank that is a charitable organization. It was formed to address the new economy of people and the environment. Since 1986, it has lead pioneering studies to establish the process of social and ethical accounting. (New Economics Foundation, 2001).

The Body Shop is an international seller of natural skin and hair products. It operates in 50 countries and has 1500 outlets and sells a product every 0.4 seconds. The Body Shop was voted the second most trusted brand in the United Kingdom in 1999 by the Consumers Association (The Body Shop, 2002). The Body Shop believes that business is about human relationships. The Body Shop worked with the New Economics Foundation in the early 1990s and produced its first social performance statement in 1996.

The third organization, Traidcraft Public limited company (Traidcraft Plc), is committed to promoting fair trade based on fair shares, concern for people and care for the environment (Traidcraft, 2000).
It was started in 1979 to allow poor producers a chance to earn a living with dignity. The company imports products such as handicrafts, fashion goods, stationery, beverages and foods from 100 producers in "third world" countries and distributes them in the United Kingdom. It also sells recycled paper products. Traidcraft's goal is to pay fair prices to the producers and build long-term relationships with them. (Traidcraft, 2000).

Traidcraft was the first company in the United Kingdom to publish social reports.

Social audits done in Europe and North America over the years used a variety of methods and terminologies. The Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability (1998) has defined them in the following manner:

**Ethical Accounting:** A regularly disclosed process, based on shared values that stakeholders develop through ongoing dialogue, aimed at designing future actions.

**Ethical Auditing:** An approach used by the Body Shop: a regular, externally verified process to understand, measure, report on and improve upon its social, environmental and animal testing performance through stakeholder dialogue. The resulting report incorporated three separate social, environmental and animal testing reports.

**Corporate Community Involvement Reporting:** Description, illustration and measurement of community involvement policies and activities through occasional reports. This process may also include benchmarking against other company performances.

**Statement of Principles and Values:** A statement that develops evolves and describes an organization's principles related to meeting its financial, social and environmental responsibilities.

**Social Auditing:** An approach developed by Traidcraft. It is a regular, externally verified process to understand, measure and report on an organization's social performance.

**Social Balance:** A regular reconstruction and aggregation of financial data across stakeholder groups, which specifies financial costs, associated with social activities.

**Social Performance Assessment:** An initial approach to SEAAR, which involved an external party, engaged to form an independent assessment of the social performance of the organization. (pp. 11-15).
AccountAbility has produced standards and guidelines covering issues such as stakeholder dialogue, social and ethical reporting, organizational culture, fair trade, ethical trade, working conditions, human resource management and training, environmental and animal protection, community development and human rights. It has created an accountability process that it calls AccountAbility 1000 (AA1000), which was launched at a conference in Denmark, in 1999. AccountAbility 1000 is a foundation standard for improving the performance of an organization. According to AccountAbility, it can be used to understand various aspects of the organization such as:

- **Management**—stakeholders come together to decide what matters in an organization and measure it.

- **Quality Management**—to understand what matters in social and ethical performance of the organization to better understand and meet the goals of the stakeholders.

- **Recruitment and Retention**—to clarify values and make public the performance of the organization so high quality employees can be recruited and current employees retained.

- **External Stakeholder Engagement**—to recognize how the organizations values mesh with the external stakeholders so the external stakeholders can better articulate their opinions of the organization and the organization can have more accurate information when making its decisions and have a climate of trust to implement it in.

- **Partnership**—it deepens a commitment of working along side with others.

- **Risk Management**—it allows the organization to understand the relationship with its stakeholders and better manage risks to reputation and customer and employee lawsuits.

- **Governance**—it ensures that the behavior of the organization is consistent with its values and strategy.
• Government and regulatory relations—it may be used to encourage governments to acknowledge the self-regulatory process organizations are following (AccountAbility, no year).

The steps of the process model, AA 1000 model that AccountAbility established in 1999 are described.

Planning

Process 1 – Establish commitment and governance procedures
The organization commits itself to the process of social and ethical accounting, auditing and reporting and to the role of stakeholders within this process. It defines governance procedures to ensure the inclusion of stakeholders in the process.

Process 2 – Identify stakeholders
The organization identifies its stakeholders and characterizes its relationship with each group of them.

Process 3 – Define/review values
The organization defines or reviews its current mission and values.

Accounting

Process 4 – Identify issues
The organization identifies issues through engagement with its stakeholders regarding its activities and social and ethical performance.

Process 5 – Determine process scope
The organization determines, based on engagement with its stakeholders, the scope of the current process in terms of the stakeholders, geographical locations, operating units and issues to be included and identifies how it plans to account for the excluded stakeholders, operations, locations or issues in future cycles. It identifies the timing of the current cycle. The organization also identifies the audit method(s), the audit scope and the auditor(s) to provide a high level of quality assurance to all its stakeholders.

Process 6 – Identify indicators
The organization identifies social and ethical indicators through engagement with its stakeholders. The indicators reflect the organization’s performance in relation to: its values and objectives; the values and aspirations of its stakeholders, as determined through a process of consultation with each group of them; and wider societal norms and expectations.
Process 7 – Collect information
The organization collects information about its performance in respect of the identified indicators. The organization engages with stakeholders in the design of the collection methods, which allow stakeholders to accurately and fully express their aspirations and needs.

Process 8 – Analyze information, set targets and develop improvement plan
From the information collected, the organization:

a) Evaluates its performance against values, objectives and targets previously set.
b) Uses this evaluation and engagement with stakeholders to develop or revise objectives and targets for the future, with a focus on improving performance.

Auditing and reporting

Process 9 – Prepare report(s)
The organization prepares a social and ethical report (written or verbal communication) or reports relating to the process undertaken in a specified period. The report(s) clearly and without bias explains the process and demonstrates how the organization’s performance relates to its values, objectives and targets. It includes information about its performance measured against its key social and ethical performance targets. The organization provides comparative information for previous period(s) to help stakeholders understand the current performance in the context of prior period trends and in the context of external benchmarks, if available.

Process 10 – Audit report(s)
The organization arranges and supports the external audit of the process, including the social and ethical report(s). Support is provided to the auditor throughout the planning and accounting processes as appropriate.

Process 11 – Communicate report(s) and obtain feedback
The organization communicates information on the process and the social and ethical performance of the organization to all stakeholder groups. This includes making accessible to all stakeholder groups the social and ethical report(s) together with the independent audit opinion(s). The organization actively seeks feedback from its stakeholder groups in order to further develop its process.

Embedding

Process 12 – Establish and embed systems
The organization establishes systems to support the process and the ongoing achievement of its objectives and targets in line with its values.
The organization should make its decision to support a long-term goal of accountability and disclose this in its social and ethical report(s). (AccountAbility, 2003).

Social auditing is a cycle that includes its stakeholders in the process. The AA1000 does not dictate what a social audit must include, but certainly outlines a general process that has been used in many organizations. In Canada, 57 companies used a form of social reporting in 2001 (Stratos, 2001). Since social reporting is not required like financial reporting, few organizations produce reports. Stratos, Strategies to Sustainability, is a consulting company that helps plan, implement and evaluate strategies for sustainability. Its (2002) report “Stepping Forward Corporate Sustainability Reporting In Canada” states that out of the top 100 Canadian companies by revenue, about one quarter (26%) produce social reports. Compared to the other countries, Canada is about the same level as Netherlands (25%) and Denmark (29%), but well below the leading countries of Germany (36%), Sweden (34%) and the United Kingdom (32%) (p.6). Many of the corporations identified by Stratos were in the energy and forest and paper products business.

Although half of the Global Fortune 100 companies engage in social reporting, there are very few post secondary education organizations that have engaged in this process. One such post secondary institution is North Island College in British Columbia.

North Island College

North Island College conducted a social audit that was narrower in scope than the type conducted by large corporations such as the Body Shop due to time and financial constraints. It tried to connect issues of governance, leadership, change, human resources
and human rights. North Island College’s social audit focused specifically on certain managerial practices, human resource policies and programs and environmental issues related to health and safety. An internal process of consultation and collaboration was used, but there was no external verification process. The social auditing process was also aligned with the strategic planning process in order to evaluate the complementary nature of the two processes (Holden, 2000, p. 12). A questionnaire was developed in consultation with the stakeholders and distributed to the employees. Once the data was collated and analyzed, statements were developed in a number of areas requiring leadership and management action. The process used at North Island involved the following steps:

3. Define Audit Boundaries.
5. Defining Statements.
6. Stakeholder Consultation.
7. Internal Audit and Document Review.
9. Agreement on Commitments and Targets.
10. Final External Verification [actually used an internal process of consultation and collaboration].
North Island College’s approach is cyclical. It is important that an institution commit to do this on an annual or bi-annual basis, as with financial audits, so that the institution can compare its own performance over time. North Island used the social audit process to examine its human resource policies. It will be repeating the social audit in 2004 (J. Holden, personal communication, November 16, 2002).

At North Island College, the general process of the Social Accountability Framework was followed, although the specific ways in which Holden conducted the social audit varied slightly. North Island College did not have agreed standards and performance indicators when they started the process, but established both of these after the survey results were collated. They also established benchmarks for the future.

What is implicit in the process of social auditing is that the information is used to formulate the strategic plan to improve the social impact of the organization on its stakeholders. This occurred at North Island College (2000-2003 North Island College Strategic Plan). This is one reason that Kwantlen agreed to go through the social auditing process.

**Summary of the Literature Review**

Organizations should be concerned about the impact they have on their largest resource, their employees. They also need to be concerned about societal trends and non-work demands that affect the well-being of employees. Some of the determinants that organizations must consider are external and societal factors such as technology, government policy in relation to the type of business and labour, as well as economic competition and work environment. The impact of all these factors needs to be considered in all organizational decisions, for the long-term success of the organization.
and for the good of society in general. The organizational structure and the environment also affect the organization. Of concern are the terms of employment, values and policies, decision-making structure, approaches to health and safety, physical environment and on-site facilities. There are also the task requirements, the physical and psychosocial demands and the associated stress. Consideration needs to be given to individual lifestyle, the basic characteristics of individuals, their non-work demands and their personal resources.

Organizations tend to concern themselves with accountability in terms of productivity, especially when financial resources are scarce. The thesis of social auditing is that for sustainability to occur, the production must include the social cost of conducting business and the social impact of the business on its stakeholders and society.

I have also argued that organizations do not exist in isolation that they do influence and are influenced by their environment and their stakeholders. Organizations need to understand how they contribute to the well-being of their employees so they can ensure that their policies and practices are contributing positively. Since employees construct the policies and practices of the organization, they need to be aware that such process may shape the ability to meet the mission of the organization and contribute positively to employee well-being.

Once the employees, Administration, Faculty and staff, have a clear picture of their perceptions of their work environment that is affecting their well-being, they can plan to change it. The organization does not control the entire environment but it can affect the policies and practices within the organization to create a work environment that
supports employee well-being. The social auditing process can be used to promote healthy policy-making at the organizational level.

The next chapter describes the methodology, the social auditing process used at Kwantlen.
CHAPTER FOUR
METHODOLOGY--THE SOCIAL AUDITING PROCESS

To understand the environmental factors that affect employee well-being, parts of a methodology called social auditing (social and ethical accounting, auditing and reporting) were used. Of the many approaches to social auditing, I chose one that draws on the experience of North Island College in British Columbia while keeping in mind the process recommended by AccountAbility. In this chapter, I describe the process I followed to carry out the research study.

Commitment for Action

Before I planned the study, I approached Kwantlen’s President and both union (KFA and BCGEU) Presidents and discussed my ideas and thoughts about how I would conduct a social audit and the commitment needed from them to consider the findings to improve the social performance of the organization. Having approval from the Senior Leadership Team meant having access to documents and a commitment to consider the results of the social audit. Both union Presidents agreed to consider the results of the social audit in negotiating improved working conditions. After the study was approved by the President and endorsed by both unions, I attended the Deans, directors and managers meeting (Dean’s meeting) and union meetings and obtained support from these groups. As well, I spoke with some members of all employee groups and obtained support for the study.

Define Audit Boundaries

There are many stakeholder groups including government, board of governors, suppliers, students, contractors, taxpayers and employees. The audit was limited to the
employee group because of the limited resources available. The purpose was to collect data that would identify the factors that employees believed were important to their well-being. As well, the data allowed me to understand the impact of the factors on employee well-being. At the same time, it was ensured that the study was manageable and could be completed in a reasonable period of time.

**Stakeholder Dialogue**

The employees had two opportunities to provide input into this research.

1. The employees, through an interview and 11 focus groups, identified the policies and practices that they believed affected their well-being.

2. A random sample of those who participated in the focus groups also participated in the pilot test of the survey. They had the opportunity to comment on the time it took them to complete the survey and the clarity and the comprehensiveness of the survey items. They were asked to ensure that all issues that were brought up in their focus groups and affected their well-being were addressed in the survey.

**Identification of Environmental Factors Affecting the Well-being of Employees**

Eleven focus groups and one interview (with the President) were conducted to identify which environmental factors, including policies and practices, employees of Kwantlen University College perceived as important to well-being. The facilitator script (Appendix C) was followed for the interview and focus groups. The interview followed the script, but the language was modified when speaking with one person and not a group.

The focus group method was selected because it has several strengths:

1. The technique is socially oriented, capturing real-life data in a social environment.

2. It has flexibility.
3. It has high face-validity.
4. It has speedy results.
5. It is low in cost (compared to individual interviews) (Krueger, R, 1988, p. 47).

The intent of the focus groups was to identify the policies and practices of the organization that employees believed affected their well-being.

**Sampling**

Since I used the stakeholder approach, I asked employees to volunteer to participate in the process by sending e-mail to all employees. In addition, I went to a Dean’s meeting and asked them to send out messages to their areas of responsibility. Data was collected from eleven focus groups and one interview with the President of Kwantlen.

The eleven focus groups were drawn from:

1. Senior Leadership Team (SLT).
2. Middle Managers (Deans, associate Deans, Directors and Managers).
3. Excluded Staff (non-unionized employees who are not Managers).
4. Faculty from the Surrey campus.
5. Faculty from the Richmond campus.
6. Faculty from the Langley campus.
7. Faculty from the Newton campus.
8. BCGEU Staff from the Surrey campus.
9. BCGEU Staff from the Richmond campus.
10. BCGEU Staff from the Langley campus.
11. BCGEU Staff from the Newton campus.
The potential participants were sent a letter outlining the purpose of the study and their role (Appendix B). Their written consent was obtained (Appendix C). Since I was trying to include as many differing points of view as possible, I used a stratified sample design.

I asked for eight participants to volunteer from each of the employee group categories. I accepted the first eight individuals from each employee group who responded to the e-mail. The goal within each focus group was to have as diverse a composition as possible and limit the size to a maximum of eight, because I wanted it to be small enough so that each person had the opportunity to share insights, but big enough to reflect a variety of perspectives. Once I had a group of eight volunteers, I sent e-mails and/or made phone calls to obtain their schedules to set up a time for the focus groups. Scheduling proved to be quite difficult and I was not able to accommodate all those who volunteered.

The Senior Leadership Team (SLT) has only eight members. I asked all of them to volunteer. I interviewed the President separately because the SLT reports to him and he makes the decisions for the SLT in terms of salaries, work responsibilities and continued employment. I had five participants from the SLT out of a possible seven. One person was out of the country and the other person chose not to participate. The middle managers group had eight participants, four males and four females. The Excluded Staff group (non-unionized employees) had seven participants, all female, as the group is all female working in the administration offices on Surrey campus. I conducted one focus group for each category for the BCGEU Staff and Faculty categories on each campus, for a total of eight groups. On the Newton campus, I was not able to
find a time when the eight volunteers could get together due to their schedules. The 
Faculty focus group was held with five participants. Scheduling was also an issue for the 
Langley Faculty and Staff groups and the Richmond Staff group. I managed to have six 
participants in the Langley Faculty group, five in the Langley Staff group and five in the 
Richmond Staff group after several attempts at scheduling.

Overall, 72 employees participated in focus groups out of 89 who volunteered 
(see Table 7). Out of the 17 employees who did not attend, 9 stated their absence was 
due to having to attend to other commitments, 1 person stated the weather [snow] 
prevented her from attending and the remainder was unable to attend due to scheduling 
difficulties. Of the 72, 23 were males and 49 females. Table 7 provides the distribution 
by employee category, campus and gender. The sample is representative of all employee 
Table 7

Focus Group Participant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Category</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Leadership Team</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employees</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

categories, but not proportionally representative of the employee population. The SLT 
proportionally has the highest representation for six out of eight individuals were 
included. As well, the Surrey campus is proportionally over represented. Since all
employee groups and all campuses were represented in the focus groups, many different viewpoints were represented.

**Data Collection**

After the consent forms were signed, I, as the focus group facilitator, used a script to guide each session (Appendix D). I started with the introduction of those present. Next, the purpose of the study was stated. The operational definition of well-being was reviewed. An open-ended question was posed first to identify policies and practices that affect well-being, both positive and negative practices. This was followed by a list of questions (Appendix D). The facilitator led the discussion on all 14 questions. The session was audio-recorded. Each focus group was about two hours long.

In focus group research it is suggested that the participants not know the facilitator personally so that the participants will provide honest feedback and not be influenced by their knowledge of the facilitator's views. This was difficult to achieve entirely since I was the facilitator and knew many of the employees. I emphasized to the groups that I was there to collect information about negative and positive factors that affect well-being. I also stated that the process was confidential and that I would use the taped information only to develop the questionnaire. The focus groups appeared to respond honestly and personally.

**Data Analysis**

The tapes and written notes were analyzed in three steps. First, I listened to the tapes and transcribed them. The purpose was to discover what the participants considered important policies and practices of the organization affecting their work-life and in turn their well-being. Second, the transcribed notes and written records (raw data)
were grouped by themes. These were reviewed a few times to ensure the data was
categorized into the most appropriate theme. Third, the themes were juxtaposed into the
Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework developed by Polanyi et al. (1998).
The identified themes were used to construct the social audit survey (Appendix D). I
tried to use similar language in the survey items to that used by participants in the focus
groups. In some cases, if the theme was the same as at North Island College, the item
developed at North Island College was used.

To protect the privacy of the President, the data extracted from the taped
interview was integrated into the responses from other members of the SLT group.
Although, data was collected through one interview the remainder of the chapter uses the
term “focus groups” for ease of writing and anonymity for the interviewee.

As well, relevant documents (agreements, policy documents and policies) that
covered the factors employees identified were reviewed to understand what written
policies and documents were reflected in organizational practices (Chapter 2 Documents
and Policies).

Results

The focus group method yielded a breadth of information and viewpoints. It is
believed that focus groups have high face validity “due in large part to the believability of
comments from participants” (Krueger, 1988, p. 42). This was true for this group of
participants, who appeared to discuss personal issues with ease. The exceptions were two
individuals: one stated he did not want to discuss his personal issues and the other felt it
was unnecessary because she did not bring her personal issues to work nor her work
issues to home and that is how she coped. Consequently, the topics for the survey
generated by these focus groups are very likely representative of the views of Kwantlen's employee group in general. The main findings of the focus groups are summarized in Table 8. The content categories that reflect the perceptions of the employees are the factors identified as affecting well-being. As well as being able to determine the frequency that a topic was mentioned, differences between the topics discussed by all 11 focus groups or different categories of groups such as Administration (Senior Leadership Team, the Middle Managers and Excluded Staff) and the unionized workers (Faculty and Staff) can be gleaned from Table 8. The social support theme was discussed twice by all focus groups: in relation to work and in relation to family. Another theme discussed by all the focus groups was family care issues. The next most common theme was safety and all groups but one discussed it, followed by flexibility, workload, communication and community that were discussed by nine groups. Organizational structure, benefits, evaluation process, support services, multi-campus and the physical environment were the next most frequent topics, which were discussed by eight groups. Job classification, student success, on-site facilities and respect were not discussed by the Administration while they were discussed by some of the unionized workers. Job classification, student success and on-site facilities were discussed by four of the unionized groups. Respect was discussed by three of the unionized groups. The Senior Leadership Team but not the other two Administration groups discussed government legislation. Only the Faculty groups (four) discussed student success. A detailed analysis of the focus groups findings can be found in Appendix D. The data gathered from the focus groups has been
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>SLT</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Newton</th>
<th>Langley</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support (work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure/space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergonomics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support (home)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive/Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SLT = Senior Leadership Team, MM = Middle Managers, EX = Excluded Staff, S = Staff, F = Faculty
organized under headings that represent the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework. There were themes under each of the four determinants of health (external/societal, organizational structure and environment, task requirements and individual lifestyle). The themes initially identified in relation to the external/societal determinant of health were government legislation, funding and technology (Appendix D). These themes for the purpose of the study were reclassified under the determinant organizational structure and environment because the themes identified by the employees were all about Kwantlen’s response and employee perceptions of the effects on Kwantlen’s internal environment that in turn influences employee well-being. The themes identified by the focus groups were used to create the survey.

Survey

The focus group data summary report (Appendix D) was used to construct the survey. The wording of the items was vetted through the thesis committee to ensure clarity of language used and to ensure that the items reflected the data gathered from the focus groups.

The survey had a cover letter, four pages requesting demographic information and the survey items themselves. The survey items were statements about the policies and practices of the organization. The demographic information collected included: type of employee group, employment status, campus, age, gender, ethnic background, educational background and years of service. The items were kept short and simple and made as specific as possible (Appendix E). Since I was not sure if the stratified sample used in the focus groups was reflective of the population, space was left at the end of the
survey to allow the respondents to make comments, add additional factors or elaborate on any item.

By responding to the survey, the employees were evaluating the work environment, the practices of the institution. The survey had 95 items that were answered on a five point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," plus a "not applicable" column.

Pilot Test

To avoid problems with wording and to ensure that the questions covered the social issues identified by the focus groups, the survey was pilot tested with the employees who participated in the original focus groups. Two employees were randomly selected from each employee focus group for a total of 22 employees and given an explanatory letter and feedback sheet, along with the survey. The respondents were asked to make comments on the construction of the questions themselves, to make sure they were not ambiguous and represented the issues identified by the focus groups. All of the 22 employees in the sample obliged after some prompting phone calls. All responses were returned to the researcher via intercampus mail and one was returned through regular postal mail. Most respondents in the sample group reported taking 10-15 minutes to complete the survey.

The pilot allowed me to check if the survey was understandable, covered the issues identified by the employees, check wording and order and the time needed to complete the survey. The pilot also allowed me to assess the general impressions of the respondents as well as check my analysis method. I compared how the respondents answered questions related to the same issue. The changes suggested by the respondents
were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire. A few questions were fine-
tuned but the major change incorporated was to add a "not applicable" column to the
responses. This change was made because several people commented that some items
could only be answered by one or two of the employee groups and did not apply to all
groups. As I wanted to collect a breadth of data that reflected the perception of all
groups, the decision was made to incorporate a "not applicable" response rather than
eliminate a group of items.

The feedback was incorporated into the final survey. Once items were finalized,
the survey was created using the SurveyTracker ® program and posted on the web. The
SurveyTracker ® program allows employees to answer the survey on-line. It codes the
responses and allows them to be imported into other analysis programs.

The Social Audit of Kwantlen University College was conducted during 2002.
Focus groups were conducted in the Spring and the survey was administered in the Fall.

Data Collection

Even though the project was approved by the appropriate committees at Kwantlen
University College and endorsed by the President and the Presidents of the two employee
unions (the KFA & the BCGEU), it was still a voluntary survey. To increase response
rate, I obtained permission for employees to complete this survey on work time. As well,
those who completed the survey were given the opportunity to link to another web site on
the same server and enter a draw. Prizes (Kwantlen memorabilia, hats, bookmarks, key
chains, movie passes, dinner certificates & fitness centre pass) were drawn and
distributed after the response date.
Prior to sending out the Internet link to the survey and cover letter, e-mail was sent to all employees explaining the study and asking for their cooperation. In January 2002, Kwantlen University College’s magazine, “Connections,” published an article explaining the study and asking for everyone’s cooperation.

On November 14, 2002 an Internet link (http://www.hownow.ca) to the survey was e-mailed to each employee. In addition, hard copies of the survey were made available in the employee workrooms, on three campuses and in the employee lounge of the fourth campus for those who did not wish to complete the survey on-line. In this way, all employees were given the opportunity to complete the survey.

On November 21, a follow-up e-mail was sent urging those who had not sent in their completed surveys to do so. On November 26, another e-mail was sent giving the response rate and again encouraging those who had not completed the questionnaire to do so. The follow-ups highlighted the importance of the study and importance of individual contribution to the study. I asked the executives of both unions to send a voice-mail to all unionized employees explaining the importance of the survey. Both unions obliged.

Although employees were asked to respond by November 29, 2002, responses were actually accepted until December 6, 2002. On December 10, the prizewinners were randomly selected from the employees who had entered their names for a draw after completing the questionnaire. A total of 29 items that were donated by the services and departments at Kwantlen were given away. The names of the individuals who won the prizes were released through a Kwantlen e-mail that was sent to all employees. There was also a thank-you sent to all employees for completing the survey as well as an estimated response rate.
Each returned hard copy of the survey was keyed into the survey web page so all data would be collected and coded identically by SurveyTracker ® program. The program gave the respondents identification numbers to maintain confidentiality. I downloaded the electronic data file into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 11.0 (SPSS) and ran descriptive statistics (frequencies, means and standard deviations).

**Internal Verification with Stakeholders and Release of Report**

Typically in a social audit, reports of findings and recommendations are sent to the participants for feedback and suggestions. The feedback is incorporated in a report that is then sent to the entire internal community. The internal community is asked to provide feedback on the follow-up steps. The feedback is incorporated and made available to the entire community. The social audit report then becomes a blue print for future action and evaluation. For the purpose of this thesis this was not done due partly to limitations of time and money, but mainly due to the decreased support from the SLT and my position within the organization. Since the SLT no longer endorses the social audit but is supportive of my use of Kwantlen as my research site, I did not feel I had the support to do this step. I am a leader, but I am not a member of the Senior Leadership Team and do not have the authority to engage the employees in setting benchmarks (targets). Since I do not have authority, I believe I would be setting up false hope that changes would be made if they were identified. Instead, possible actions were suggested to those with formal responsibility. A report containing the findings and recommendations will be provided to both union executives and the Senior Leadership Team. An article will be written for the internal magazine, “Connections.” The article will contain a few highlights of the study and the website address where the report can be
accessed. As well copies of the thesis will be placed in each of the three campus libraries once the thesis is approved.

Description of Respondents

This section describes the respondents and compares their characteristics to those of all Kwantlen employees. Four hundred and fifty employees completed the survey—47 returned print copies and 403 completed it on-line. Although there were 1349 registered employees at Kwantlen for the Fall of 2002, only 1,160 employees were considered active. Therefore, the response rate for the survey from active employees was 39% (38.8%). While I would have liked a higher response rate, a response rate of 39% is comparable to the response rate of 38% (37.7%) obtained by Jennifer Holden at North Island College in a similar study and it is similar to that of other internal surveys at Kwantlen. The following sections will describe the respondents. In the first section the respondents are compared to the population on characteristics that are available for the employee population as a whole.

Employment Status

All but two respondents identified their employee group. Fifty percent (224) were Faculty, 44% (194) BCGEU Staff and 5% (24) Administration with 1% (6) answering other (see Table 9). Based on the total number of active Kwantlen employees (1,160) the best response rate was from BCGEU Staff (46.1%) compared to Faculty (33.3%) and Administration (35.8%). The lowest response was from the Senior Leadership Team so the Administration category was not subdivided. The sample is not proportionally representative of the overall employee group categories but the numbers in each category are large enough to provide a reasonable range of responses.
Table 9

Total Number of Employees and Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Category</th>
<th>Faculty No. %</th>
<th>BCGEU staff No. %</th>
<th>Administration No. %</th>
<th>Totals No. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employees</td>
<td>672 57.9</td>
<td>421 36.3</td>
<td>67 5.8</td>
<td>1,160 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>224 50.7</td>
<td>194 43.9</td>
<td>24 5.4</td>
<td>*450 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two respondents left the item of employee category blank and 6 answered other.

Campus

The last part of the survey asked the respondents to indicate the campus of work, employment status and category, gender, age, years of service and educational qualifications. Table 10 shows a comparison of respondents with the actual number of employees on each campus. The Surrey campus is the largest campus and had the highest response rate (52.1%). The smallest campus, Newton, had the lowest response rate (30.8%).

Table 10

Responses by Campus and Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Campus</th>
<th>Surrey No. %</th>
<th>Richmond No. %</th>
<th>Langley No. %</th>
<th>Newton No. %</th>
<th>No Response No. %</th>
<th>Totals No. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employees</td>
<td>426 36.7</td>
<td>266 22.9</td>
<td>138 11.9</td>
<td>120 10.3</td>
<td>210 18.2</td>
<td>1160 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>222 49.3</td>
<td>119 26.4</td>
<td>68 15.1</td>
<td>37 8.2</td>
<td>4 0.9</td>
<td>450 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although employees were asked to select the campus in which they spend the most time, some administrators have responsibilities across campuses, some Faculty
teach on more than one campus and some BCGEU Staff work across campuses. Those
who are auxiliary staff or contract employees quite often work on more than one campus.

**Age**

The age distribution of the respondents is similar to that of all employees as found
in Table 11. Most of the respondents fall into the 40 and over age groups (73%). The
sample group is representative of the employee population.

**Table 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

All but seven respondents answered the question, “What is your gender?”. Kwantlen employs more women than men (62%: 38%) and the responses reflect this fact (see Table 12). The ratio of female to male respondents is 70.9: 29.1.

**Table 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the respondents the gender division was females (71%) and males (29%). Thus females are somewhat over represented and males under represented in the survey. The response rate for males is 29.5% and for females it is 43.5%.
In the following section there is a description of the respondents on other characteristics, years of service, education level, ethnic origin and minority status. These characteristics could not be compared to all employees because Kwantlen does not publish these characteristics on its employees.

*Years of Service*

Almost an equal number of respondents had worked for Kwantlen for 1-5 years (29.3%) and 6-10 years (28.9%), as seen in Table 13. Also the number of respondents who are long-term employees (>11 years) is 34.4%.

**Table 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Education Level*

Nearly all the respondents have a minimum of a high school diploma (99.8%) (see Table 14). Most respondents have a bachelor’s degrees or higher (66.5%). The majority of the respondents had master’s degrees (34.2%), followed by bachelors’ degrees (18.3%) and doctoral degrees (11.5%) (see Table 14). Those who checked the “other” category (see Table 14) were in school and close to completing master’s or doctoral
degrees, had postgraduate certificates or a professional designation such as teacher, or held post-doctoral positions.

Table 14

Education level of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; High school</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduation</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade certificate or diploma from university</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-university certificate or diploma</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, not listed</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity

Data was collected on the employees' cultural heritage. Although there are affirmative action policies at Kwantlen, this is the first time that information on ethnicity was collected. On this item, "What is your ethnic origin?", respondents were asked to check all the categories that fit. There were 17 categories plus "other" where the respondents could write in their ethnic background if it was not listed. These categories are the same as those listed in the 2001 Canadian Census form for the area that Kwantlen serves. Note that respondents could list more than one category. The frequency for each category is presented in Table 15.
### Table 15

**Ethnic Origin of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Number*</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were able to check multiple categories to represent their ethnicity.

One hundred and eighty-nine employees out of 450 (42%) considered themselves to be Canadian. The most common ethnic background was English (205), followed by Scottish (121) and Irish (101). This is similar to the 2001 Canadian Census; English was the most frequently reported origin in British Columbia in 2001, followed by Canadian, Scottish, Irish and German. Also, Chinese was the sixth most frequent origin in the census, followed by French and South Asian.

Forty-two (42) respondents indicated indirectly that they were visible minorities. The Employment Equity Act defines visible minorities as "persons, other than Aboriginal
peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour" (Government of Canada, 1996). This includes, 18 South Asian, 16 Chinese, 5 Filipino, 1 Korean and 2 individuals who answered other. Of the 53 respondents who answered “other,” two are identifiable as visible minorities: Afro-Canadian and Bajan. There are also 12 respondents who answered “First Nations” and they have not been included in the visible minorities figures. Of the respondents, 9.3% (42) are considered a visible minority. This is lower than the figure for the population in Canada (13.4%), British Columbia (21.6%) and Metropolitan Vancouver (37.5%) (Statistics Canada, 2003). The percentage of the population that self identifies as visible minorities in the municipalities in the Kwantlen region are: Richmond (59%), Surrey (37%) and Delta (23%) (Statistics Canada, 2003). The Statistics Canada Report (2003) lists figures for 25 municipalities that comprise the highest number of visible minorities and Langley was not mentioned. Therefore, visible minorities represent less than 9.6% of its population. The largest visible minority groups are the Chinese (39%) in Richmond, South Asian (22%) in Surrey and South Asian (13%) in Delta (Statistics Canada, 2003).

It is projected that by the year 2011, visible minorities will comprise one-fifth of Canada’s population. The 2001 Canadian Census data states that the most common visible minorities in Canada are Chinese, followed by South Asians and Blacks. These three groups make up two-thirds of the visible minorities in Canada. Chinese comprise 3.5% of the Canadian population, South Asian 3.1% and Blacks 2.2% (Statistics Canada, 2003).

When comparing the respondents to the Canadian Census, the same two groups—South Asian and Chinese are the most common visible minorities but the order is
reversed. The result may be due to the fact that Kwantlen's largest campus is located in Surrey, the Canadian municipality where the largest numbers of South Asians reside. Also the percentage of visible minorities is less than the percentage in Kwantlen's catchment area.

Minority status

In response to the question, "Do you consider yourself to be a member of a minority group?" Most employees answered "yes," 82.4% (371), some said "no," 15.6% (70) and others did not answer the question 2.0% (9). The comments for this varied from "Caucasian male" because he is the only male in the department, to a person's ethnic status, sexual preference, physical ability and affiliation. It appears that many Kwantlen employees feel they are not a part of the majority group.

Limitations of the Study

A partial social audit was undertaken to obtain a snapshot of the organizational factors that affect employee well-being. It was understood that the organizational environment is constantly changing and the results of the audit would provide the employees' perceptions at a particular time. The social audit would increase our understanding but from a limited view. There are limitations of this study.

The social audit used volunteer participants in the focus groups to determine which policies and practices they believed affected their well-being. Because volunteers were used, a disproportionate number of respondents are from the Surrey campus, women and BCGEU members. The data collected was based on employees' perceptions, their experiences, their values and the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework. This data was analyzed using the thematic categories in the Determinants of Health in the
Workplace Framework. The data was transformed into survey items. To ensure that my perceptions did not distort the data collected from the focus groups, the survey was sent to two members in each group to assess the completeness of topics covered, clarity of language used and the appropriateness of the response scale. This process of summarizing the data from the focus groups, creating items and sending the survey to the group members was followed to ensure validity. As well, to assess reliability of the items, Cronbach’s alpha (α = .93) was calculated. The value indicates that the reliability is good.

One of the assumptions in my research is that individuals construct reality as they interact with their environment. As well, the concept of well-being is an individual’s response to their interaction with their environment. The aim of the research was to understand the reality as the employees experience it. The following assumptions were made about the employees:

- The employees would have knowledge about policies and practices.
- The employees would be willing to share their views.

It was assumed that social audit methodology could be used to collect meaningful data about Kwantlen’s internal environment that would help understand how organizational factors affect employee well-being. These specific assumption were made:

- The responses to survey items developed from thematic themes of the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework would yield data about employee perceptions of the work environment.
- Relating survey responses to correlated policies and documents would help determine areas where policy changes may be desirable.
The survey response of 39% is a further limitation. Though I did not do a formal follow-up with non-respondents, a handful of non-respondents have approached me and stated they chose not to participate because they were too busy, could not find the time to respond or thought since I had e-mailed the survey to “everyone” others would return the survey. The response rate is balanced by the respondent profile that suggests that the focus group and survey participants are similar in the following ways to the overall employee group at Kwantlen. In terms of breadth, there were participants from all four campuses. All groups of employees responded and there are a reasonable number of respondents from each of the three employee group categories (Administration, Faculty, BCGEU Staff). The respondents are similar in age to all employees. The respondents are different than all employees on the variables: campus and gender. The respondents could not be compared on the variables: education and years of service since Kwantlen does not publish this data. As well, many different ethnic groups and both genders are represented. Although the respondents are not proportionally representative of the sample on all characteristics, there is a cross section of respondents. Also the number of respondents, 450, is large enough to provide a meaningful data set. The data may not be generalizable to the entire group of employees at Kwantlen but it informs us about the perceptions of 39% of the employees. Having knowledge about the views of 39% of the population will inform policy decision-makers and contract negotiators more than having no knowledge of the views of the population. Also, at Kwantlen, most internal surveys have a similar response rate.

Another limitation of the study is the data collection method. The survey items limit the information that is collected to the items on the survey. To deal with this
limitation, there was a comments section at the end of the survey. Many of the comments are similar to the survey items (Appendix I). The results provide an understanding of the work environment at the time the survey was done but do not provide a full understanding of complex relationships. The information may be used to make general comments about the perceptions of Kwantlen employees.

**Summary**

Focus groups (and one interview) identified factors employees believed to affect their well-being. The focus group data was analyzed by themes and this was used to create the items on the survey. The survey was piloted and the feedback resulted in adding a "not applicable" column to the Likert scale. A hotlink to the on-line survey was sent to all employees. On the server was an explanation of the study, four pages on demographics and 95 items on policies and practices affecting employee well-being. Some hard copies were available at each campus. Of the 1,160 employees, 450 (39%) responded. The respondents were proportionally representative of all employees on the characteristic of age, but not proportionally representative of all employees on the characteristics of gender, campus, employee status and years of service, but there was a cross section of employees. Educational level, ethnicity and minority status were other data collected from respondents but could not be compared to all employees because Kwantlen does not collect this information. Most respondents (66.5%) have a minimum of a bachelor's degree, 82.4% (371) identify themselves as minorities and 9.3% (42) as visible minorities.

The next chapter presents the findings of the survey. The findings are presented using the categories of the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework.
CHAPTER FIVE
FINDINGS

Chapter five presents the findings of the social audit survey completed in 2002 at Kwantlen University College. The chapter is organized into two sections. In the first section I present the results of the survey. The data is presented using the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework (DHWF) of Polanyi et al. (1998). The DHWF consists of four major determinants: “external/societal,” “organizational structure and environment,” “task requirements,” and “individual lifestyle” (see Table 6, p. 70). The data are organized around three determinants of health. Since the focus was a social audit of Kwantlen, there are no items in the “external/societal” determinant. That is not to say that there are no external influences on Kwantlen because there are many, but the focus of the thesis was the result of the interaction between the external factors and the internal environment of the organization. As well, the DHWF was modified slightly and the sub-determinant “organizational policies and practices” was added to the determinant “organizational structure and environment.” Also, considered under the sub-determinant “terms of employment” was the factor “organizational justice” because issues related to equity and fairness were discussed in focus groups. As mentioned earlier, the DHWF was used to organize the items originally generated by focus groups. The categories of the DHWF represent the main clusters of factors that are believed to impact employee well-being in an organizational context.

An overview of the responses to the survey is presented in three categories of the DHWF—“organizational structure and environment,” “task requirements,” and “individual lifestyle.” Each of these determinants has sub-determinants. The purpose of these sub-determinants is to divide the determinant into smaller areas that can be assessed
and analyzed. "Organizational structure and environment" has the sub-determinants: "terms of employment," "decision-making structures," "approach to health and safety," "physical environment," "on-site facilities," and "organizational policies and practices."

The determinant "task requirement" only has one sub-determinant, "physical and psychosocial demands." This sub-determinant is further divided into "workload," "resources and tasks," "trust," "communication," and "social support." The determinant "individual lifestyle" has the sub-determinants: "basic characteristics," "non-work demands," and "personal resources."

In the second section I present the findings analyzed by different employee characteristics. My intent in conducting these analyses was to identify items that resulted in significantly (p<.05) different responses based on employee "campus," "group," "gender," "ethnic background," "education level," "age," and "years of service."

**Survey Responses**

The survey included 95 items related to the work environment that affect employee well-being. Fifty-two (52) items were categorized under the determinant "organizational structure and environment," 31 under "task requirements" and 12 under "individual lifestyle." Responses were on a five-point Likert scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." For the purpose of analyzing the results, "agree" and "strongly agree" responses were both relabeled as "agree" and "disagree" and "strongly disagree" were both relabeled as "disagree." Items that if answered, "agree" would negatively contribute to well-being were recoded in the positive direction. For example, on the survey 76.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the item, "I worked overtime last year." However, because working overtime may have a negative impact on
well-being, this item was recoded to “I (did not) work overtime last year” (17.8% agree).

Also, in the tables, brackets indicate that items have been reworded to reflect recoding of the responses. Therefore, all “agree” responses reflect greater well-being.

The survey items are easily presented with their raw scores (Appendix F), but proved to be difficult to interpret in a manner that would be useful to readers and for the decision makers at Kwantlen who will consider taking action in response to the social audit. I could not find guidelines in the literature to establish analysis categories.

I experimented with labeling responses positive or negative depending on if the “agree” response was below 50% or above 50%. This was problematic since the 95% confidence interval is ±3.5%. I tried using quartiles, but again had similar problems. Then I thought I would be inclusive of all views and only categorize the data in 10% intervals. This proved not to be useful because a decision needed to be made when a response warranted action by the organization. I then asked a convenience sample of employees in my department their views regarding the categories I had devised. There was general agreement for these response categories:

- 0-30% requires urgent action.
- 31-45% requires action.
- 46-54% may require action.
- 55-70% requires less urgent action.
- 71-100% reinforce current practice.

These categories are based on the notion that action should be based on majority opinion. This, too, can be problematic because those with minority views may feel excluded.

Every single person in an organization may never be satisfied with the work environment

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
or "agree" that it positively contributes to his/her well-being but the organization needs to create a work environment that will contribute positively towards well-being for as many employees as possible. Responses to all 95 items were placed into these five response categories using the "agree" percentage even though in a few cases, when the confidence interval is considered, the category could be altered. Table 16 indicates the total number of items in each of the response categories by the determinants of health as well as the total numbers of items in each determinant of health. It can be noted that items were not evenly distributed across the three determinants of health categories because the items were created from issues identified by the employee focus groups. As well, the responses are skewed in the positive direction. There are 31 items from 0-45% and 46 items from 55-100%. For the determinants of health the modal responses are as follows: "organizational structure & environment," 55-70% (by 38% of respondents), "task requirements," 46-54% (by 32% of respondents) and "individual lifestyle," 55-70% (by 42% of respondents).

### Table 16

Number of Items by Response Category and Determinant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Organization Structure &amp; Environment</th>
<th>Task Requirements</th>
<th>Individual Lifestyle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Structure and Environment

Fifty-two items were categorized under the determinant “organizational structure and environment.” In this category the sub-determinants are: “terms of employment,” “decision-making structures,” “physical environment,” “on-site facilities,” and “organizational policies and practices.”

Terms of Employment

There were 15 items related to “terms of employment” (see Table 17). In the tables, to categorize the responses, the percentages of responses have been rounded to whole numbers. The items in this sub-determinant were related to benefits, salary and rewards, promotion, flexibility and technology. The lowest level of agreement was with the item, “I (did not work) overtime last year*” (17.8% agree). Since 17.8% of the workers agreed that they did not work overtime that means that many did work overtime, but there is no clear definition of overtime at Kwantlen. The BCGEU Staff have a set number of hours they are required to work per week as do some counselors and librarians, but many of the employees, the teaching faculty and administrators, do not have a prescribed number of hours of work. Generally it is accepted that hourly employees work 37.5 hours per week. I am not clear if all those who responded that they worked overtime meant they worked more than 37.5 hours per week or if they used a different criterion. Some faculty and administrators spend 50 hours per week working and consider this a normal workload. This item on overtime worked needs to be looked at in conjunction with the other item, “I was compensated for the overtime worked last

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Table 17

Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant “Terms of Employment”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (did not work) overtime last year</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I perform well, I am rewarded in ways that are meaningful to me</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was compensated for the overtime worked last year</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the bereavement leave benefit</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the employee assistance program benefit</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay reflects the responsibilities of my position</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay is comparable to that of others in similar positions</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am secure in my position</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn the new technology during work</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the dental coverage benefit</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology has increased the quality of my work</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefits plan meets my needs</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
year" (42.5% agree). The data suggests there are many employees who work overtime without receiving compensation. The second lowest level of agreement was with the item, “I have opportunities for promotion” (26.4%). The third lowest level of agreement was with the item, “When I perform well, I am rewarded in ways that are meaningful to me” (32.2%). These two items related to rewards and promotions suggest that those employees who perform well and those who wish to be promoted are not recognized by the organization. The other item with agreement below 46% is “I am satisfied with the bereavement leave benefit” (43.5% agree). There were three other items related to benefits but only the item, “I am satisfied with the employee assistance program benefit” (45.8% agree) had a similar level of agreement. The dental plan benefits had higher agreement (59.1% agree) and the item, “My benefits plan meets my needs” had a higher level of agreement (68.0% agree). The lowest level of agreement is with items related to overtime, promotion, rewards, compensation and the bereavement leave. This data suggests that employees are not satisfied with these items. The item that received the highest level of agreement is “Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently” (74.3% agree). This item suggests that Kwantlen has acquired appropriate technology to improve efficiency. As well, the item that received the second highest agreement is “I have flexible work arrangements” (68.5% agree).

Decision-making Structures

There were 14 items related to the sub-determinant “decision-making structure” (see Table 18). The lowest level of agreement was with the item, “Problem employees are dealt with promptly” (10.4% agree). The second lowest level of agreement was with the
Table 18
Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant “Decision-making Structure”

| Item | Responses | Disagree | | | | | | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | | | | | | Agree | | |
|------|-----------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-30% Agree | | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Problem employees are dealt with promptly | | 241 | 58.6 | 129 | 31.0 | 43 | 10.4 |
| There are clear consequences for poor performance | | 252 | 56.8 | 115 | 25.9 | 77 | 17.3 |
| Technology is (not) adopted before its impact is assessed | | 170 | 39.2 | 170 | 39.2 | 94 | 21.7 |
| 31-45% Agree | | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Planning at Kwantlen considers the long-term impact of decisions | | 132 | 30.6 | 135 | 31.3 | 165 | 36.7 |
| I am clear on how decisions are made | | 157 | 35.3 | 111 | 24.9 | 177 | 39.8 |
| 46-54% Agree | | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| I am provided assistance to improve my performance, when necessary | | 90 | 21.1 | 116 | 27.2 | 220 | 51.6 |
| The person responsible for my evaluation has first hand knowledge of my performance | | 136 | 31.2 | 67 | 15.3 | 235 | 53.7 |
| 55-70% Agree | | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| My input influences decisions | | 72 | 16.4 | 97 | 22.0 | 271 | 61.6 |
| I feel supported when I enroll in further education for career advancement | | 50 | 13.7 | 89 | 24.5 | 225 | 61.8 |
| The process by which I am evaluated is clear | | 79 | 18.1 | 79 | 18.1 | 278 | 63.8 |
| The appropriate person evaluates me | | 71 | 16.5 | 82 | 19.1 | 277 | 64.4 |
| I am given the opportunity to provide input to decisions that affect my work | | 89 | 20.0 | 68 | 15.3 | 287 | 64.6 |
| I am satisfied with the responses of my manager/dean/supervisor to issues related to my personal life | | 48 | 13.8 | 72 | 20.6 | 229 | 65.6 |
| 71-100% Agree | | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| I am given the responsibility to make decisions in my job | | 34 | 7.6 | 42 | 9.4 | 373 | 83.1 |

item, “There are clear consequences for poor performance” (17.3% agree). These two items together suggest that decisions about action for those who do not perform well are

*Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
not made in a timely manner and there is no consistent action. These items considered with the two items in the sub-determinant “terms of employment” regarding promotions and rewards suggest those employees who either are outstanding or perform poorly are not dealt with appropriately. The comments from the social audit survey that support the low level of agreement with these items are “decreased job incentive (performance and advancement) due to the BCGEU,” and “destructive and harmful way staff members are terminated” (Appendix I). The third lowest level of agreement is with the item, “Technology is (not) adopted before its impact is assessed*” (21.7% agree). In the sub-determinant “terms of employment” I reported high agreement in relation to efficiency resulting from technology, but in this sub-determinant there is concern about consideration of the long-term affect of the technology. As an “insider” researcher one of the issues I have heard expressed is towards the selection of equipment and more specifically photocopiers. Employees have stated that photocopiers break down too often and perhaps the high usage of these machines was not considered in purchase decisions. Closely related to this issue are the two items on decision-making that received the fourth and fifth lowest level of agreement: “Planning at Kwantlen considers the long-term impact of decisions” (36.7% agree) and “I am clear on how decisions are made” (39.8% agree). This data suggests that many employees do not understand how decisions are made at the institutional level and what information is considered in reaching decisions. The highest level of agreement was with the item “I am given the responsibility to make decisions in my job” (83.1%). This item suggests that in the employee’s immediate work environment, the employee believes he or she can make the decisions, thus job autonomy and control are high.

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Physical Environment

There were seven items related to the sub-determinant “physical environment” (see Table 19). The lowest level of agreement was with the item “The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems” (27.6% agree). There were two respondents who commented on “poor ergonomics as pertaining to computer/desk/chair” in the survey (Appendix I). The second lowest level of agreement was with the item “There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards” (48.3% agree).

Table 19

Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant “Physical Environment”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% Agree</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54% Agree</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70% Agree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in a comfortable physical environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) feel physically isolated at work</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sufficient space to do my work</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100% Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen is a good place to work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Three respondents commented about the "dirty environment" and one respondent "requested shower facilities at the Richmond campus." Although there is only one comment related to showers, the only campus that has shower facilities is the Surrey campus. The highest level of agreement is with the item, "Kwantlen is a good place to work" (89.9% agree). Although respondents have responded with low agreement for several items, most employees generally agree, "Kwantlen is a good place to work." This should be kept in mind when reviewing all the responses with lower levels of agreement. The second highest level of agreement is with the item, "My campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals" (82.5% agree). There is a high level of agreement for this item but the responses are mainly from the able bodied perspective. Only one respondent self-identified as physically challenged.

**On-site Facilities**

There were three items related to the sub-determinant "on-site facilities" and the "agree" responses are all between 28.2-47.1% (see Table 20). This indicates lower

**Table 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant &quot;On-site Facilities&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-30% Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a variety of healthy food choices in the cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31-45% Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hours of operation of the support areas (cafeteria, library, counseling, admissions) meet student and employee needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46-54% Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to access the resources of the Wellness Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55-70%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>71-100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agreement with the items related to "on-site facilities." The lowest "agree" response was
with the item, "There are a variety of healthy food choices in the cafeteria (28.2% agree).
There was one request on the survey for "healthier food in the cafeteria" and three
comments about not having a cafeteria (Appendix I). There is no cafeteria on the Newton
campus. The next lowest level of agreement was with the item, "The operation of the
support areas (cafeteria, library, counseling and admissions) meet student and employee
needs (44.5% agree). Nine respondents commented about these issues, three comments
were in relation to poor facilities at the Newton campus and six comments were about the
decreased availability of services and requests for longer hours of operation (Appendix I).
The data indicate that the hours of operation and the lack of healthy food choices are an
issue for the employees.

Organizational Policies and Practices

There were thirteen items related to "organizational policies and practices," two
were related to economics, one to offerings and the others to employees and students (see
Table 21). The lowest level of agreement was with the item, "Financial resources (do
not) drive decisions at Kwantlen*" (4.7% agree). From an administrative perspective,
this might be interpreted as positive since Kwantlen needs to be fiscally prudent, but from
a health perspective it may be seen as contributing negatively to well-being, as employees
may feel that not enough emphasis is given to human or educational concerns. The
second lowest level of agreement was with the item, "The needs of local students take

* Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being.
Table 21

Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant "Organizational Policies and Practices"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>0-30% Agree</th>
<th>31-45% Agree</th>
<th>46-54% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources (do not) drive decisions at Kwantlen</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The needs of local students take priority over the needs of</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international students</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs (do not) receive too much emphasis</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen (does not operate) more like a corporation than a public</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slanderous remarks directed at me</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department's hiring practices are fair</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are policies at Kwantlen to help diverse students be</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work environment is harassment free</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practices at Kwantlen reflect diverse cultural values</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support Kwantlen's open access policy that allows admission to</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every type of student</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practices at Kwantlen are aimed at helping students be</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am treated fairly at work</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work environment is free from racial discrimination</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being.
priority over the needs of international students" (25.9% agree). As an “insider” researcher I am privy to the conversations of some employees. Some employees believe the administrators set spaces in English sections for international students and disagree with this practice because local students require these courses, yet are not able to register for them due to lack of space. The third and fourth lowest levels of agreement are with items related to “organizational policies and practices” that are responses to external policy documents: “Degree programs (do not) receive too much emphasis*” (37.5% agree) and “Kwantlen (does not operate) more like a corporation than a public institution*” (43.2% agree). Since Kwantlen became a university college resources have been stretched to develop new degree programs. Employees who are not in degree programs commented that they feared that resources would be diverted from their areas to develop the new degrees. Also, there seems to be the opinion that Kwantlen has forgotten its college roots and the administrators are changing their titles to reflect private organizations and are becoming more concerned with balancing the books than providing education. The data suggest an overall view that administrators are more focused on business matters rather than the mission and policies of the institution.

The highest level of agreement was with the item, “My work environment is free from racial discrimination” (77.0% agree), followed with “I am treated fairly at work” (76.1% agree). The data suggest an overall positive view that the work environment is fair and free from racial discrimination. The third highest level of agreement was with the item, “The practices at Kwantlen are aimed at helping students be successful” (74.3% agree). This suggests that employees agree that their actions are aimed at helping

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
students reach their goals. The fourth highest level of agreement was with the item, "I support Kwantlen's open access policy that allows admission to every type of student" (71.6% agree). This item confirms that respondents support the values of a community college, providing everyone an opportunity to pursue higher education and not just the academic elite.

Task Requirements

There were 31 items related to the determinant “task requirements.” There was only one sub-determinant, “physical and psychosocial demands.”

Physical and Psychosocial Demands

Items related to the sub-determinant “physical and psychosocial demands” are discussed in this section. For ease of analysis, the sub-determinant “physical and psychosocial demands” was further subdivided into the categories: “workload,” “resources and tasks,” “trust,” “communication,” and “social support.”

Workload. There were six items related to “workload” (see Table 22). The lowest level of agreement was with the item “My workload has (not) increased over the last year*” (10.3% agree). This needs to be considered together with the item “My work related stress has (not) increased in the last year*” (26.5% agree). Both these items together suggest workload and stress have increased over the last year. The item with the second lowest level of agreement is also related to “workload” “Poor student performance (does not increase) my workload*” (17.6% agree). These three items

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Table 22

Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant “Physical and Psychosocial Demands” and Factor “Workload”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% Agree</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload has (not) increased over the last year</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student performance (does not increase) my workload</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work related stress has (not) increased in the last year</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When an employee is off work, the remaining employees are given additional support to deal with the workload</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45%</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54%</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70% Agree</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload is reasonable</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100% Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to adjust to the pace of change at work</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

coupled with the comments, “An increase in workload is leading to stress” from 12 respondents and comments related to “Disappointment of losing the photocopy clerk which increased workload, therefore stress” by three respondents on the social audit survey (Appendix I) suggest that the increased workload over the year is leading to increased stress. The highest level of agreement is with the item “I am able to adjust to the pace of change at work” (70.9% agree). This data suggest that there is change in the workplace but it is at an appropriate pace. Although, employees are able to cope with the

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
increased workload, this may be an issue in the long term, for increased pace overtime may lead to burnout.

*Resources and tasks.* There were six items related to tasks and resources (see Table 23). The lowest level of agreement was with the item, “Overall, there is a balance between the number of managers and other employees” (30.9% agree). This suggests that the employee mix may not be optimal. The second lowest level of agreement is with the item, “The orientation, to my work related duties, was very useful” (39.1% agree). This item suggests that employee orientation is useful for some employees but there

Table 23
Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant “Physical and Psychosocial Demands” and Factor “Resources and Tasks”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45% Agree</td>
<td>140 (32.0)</td>
<td>162 (37.1)</td>
<td>135 (30.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, there is a balance between the number of managers and other employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The orientation, to my work related duties, was very useful</td>
<td>18 (34.1)</td>
<td>92 (26.7)</td>
<td>135 (39.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-64% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70% Agree</td>
<td>111 (25.1)</td>
<td>48 (10.8)</td>
<td>284 (64.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is appropriate IET (information and educational technology) support for my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100% Agree</td>
<td>85 (18.9)</td>
<td>41 (9.1)</td>
<td>323 (71.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to carry out my job responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of my work related responsibilities</td>
<td>30 (6.7)</td>
<td>25 (5.6)</td>
<td>390 (87.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are some departments that do not have orientations. The highest level of agreement was with the item, “I have a clear understanding of my work related responsibilities (87.6%
agree). The data suggests that most employees know their responsibilities at work. The second highest level of agreement was with the item, "I have the resources to carry out my job responsibilities" (71.9% agree). One respondent’s comment, “He/She was impressed with the resources” (Appendix I) is congruent with the item related to resources. Since the social audit was done, the mechanism for obtaining some day-to-day resources has changed. Employees in the Division of Community and Health Studies have been informed that only the program assistants and coordinators are able to charge supplies from the bookstore and others must go through the program assistants to obtain supplies. This new policy may change employee perceptions of this item in the future.

**Trust.** There were four items related to “trust” (see Table 24). All the responses for trust fall between 15.0-51.0%. The lowest level of agreement was with the item, “I

**Table 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30% Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident this survey will influence decisions by management</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45% Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54% Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the union to consider the best interests of the union members in its decisions</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can speak openly without fear of retribution</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
am confident this survey will influence decisions by management” (15.0% agree). As an "insider" researcher responsible for the study, this result troubled me because it suggests that employees are generally skeptical that management will be responsive to their views.

The second lowest level of agreement was with the item, “I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions” (31.5% agree). When taken together, both these responses suggest an overall negative view of the prospect that management will take action to improve employee well-being.

**Communication.** There were five items related to “communication (see Table 25).

Overall, communication was not very good. The lowest level of agreement was

**Table 25**

Responses to Items in Sub-determinant “Physical and Psychosocial Demands” and Factor “Communication”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, there is clear communication between the institution and its employees</td>
<td>147 33.0</td>
<td>105 23.5</td>
<td>194 43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any change or news about Kwantlen is communicated to the internal community before it is communicated to the external community</td>
<td>118 26.8</td>
<td>128 29.0</td>
<td>195 44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union and myself</td>
<td>90 21.1</td>
<td>136 31.9</td>
<td>200 47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union(s) and its members</td>
<td>102 23.7</td>
<td>107 24.8</td>
<td>222 51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the management and myself</td>
<td>115 26.0</td>
<td>92 20.8</td>
<td>235 53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100%</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the item “Overall, there is clear communication between the institution and its employees” (43.5% agree) followed closely with the item, “Any change or news about Kwantlen is communicated to the internal community before it is communicated to the external community” (44.2% agree). It is of note that, overall, employees did not feel there was clear communication between the institution (meaning the Senior Leadership Team) and themselves, “Overall, there is clear communication between the institution and its employees” (43.5% agree) but more employees felt, “There is clear communication between management and myself” (52.2% agree). Also, there was a slight difference in response between communication between the union and members, “There is clear communication between the union(s) and its members” (51.5% agree) and the union and themselves, “There is clear communication between the union and myself” (47.0% agree).” The “agree” responses to all five items fell between 44-53%, which suggests that employees perceive there is room for improvement in organizational communication.

**Social support.** Ten items were related to “social support” (see Table 26). The three items with the lowest agreement were related to the physical space and opportunity for gatherings, “It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses” (22.9% agree), “There is comfortable space for employees to get together for social events and meetings on my campus” (47.7% agree) and “Employees are provided with opportunities to get together socially” (48.3% agree). Some of these issues may be related to the distance between the campuses, the availability of physical space and the number of social events that are planned for employees and the lack of a common
Table 26

Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant “Physical and Psychosocial Demands” and Factor “Social Support”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-30% Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31-45% Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46-54% Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is comfortable space for employees to get together for social events and meetings on my campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are provided with opportunities to get together socially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone in my work area gets along well with one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have (not) experienced an increasing frequency of negative interactions at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55-70% Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use daily &quot;social chit chat&quot; to cope with stress at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I am a part of the Kwantlen community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>71-100% Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find fellow employees are caring, respectful and trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of belonging in my department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognize everyone in my department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

meeting time for the institution. The Faculty's collective agreement does specify that there be two three-hour blocks per week without scheduled classes to allow employees to meet, but this does not always occur. The highest level of responses, over 70% in which

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
the institution was doing well were “I find fellow employees are caring, respectful and trustworthy” (74.4% agree), “I feel a sense of belonging in my department” (80.4% agree) and “I can recognize everyone in my department” (80.8% agree). These three items are related to sense of belonging in the department and the attitudes of fellow employees. The data suggests general relationships amongst most employees in the department are good.

Individual Lifestyle

There were three sub-determinants under the individual lifestyle determinant: basic characteristics, non-work demands and personal resources.

Basic Characteristics

The basic characteristics of the employees – age, gender and education – have been covered in Chapter Four under demographics so they will not be repeated here. Another employee characteristic is “health” status. There are five items related to health status (see Table 27). All five items in the characteristic “health” received agreement greater than 59% and the highest level of agreement on the survey was with the item in this sub-determinant “I am in good mental health” (91.9% agree) followed with “I am in good physical health” (89.1% agree) and “I am in good spiritual health” (82.6% agree). Generally, the data suggests that there are high levels of agreement for the items in the characteristic “health.”
Table 27

Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant “Basic Characteristics” and Factor “Health”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) feel emotionally isolated at work</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am (not) affected by a chronic health condition</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in good spiritual health</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in good physical health</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in good mental health</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Work Demands

There were only two items in the sub-determinant non-work demands (see Table 28).

Table 28

Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant “Non Work Demands”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45% Agree</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70% Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for care of an adult family member</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
These two items on childcare and elderscare were inserted in the survey to obtain a sense of other employee obligations. About 51% of the employees responded that these items were not applicable. For the item, “I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare,” N = 233 and for the item, “I (do not) have primary responsibility for care of an adult family member,” N = 231. From a health framework perspective, the responses to both of these items indicate that childcare and elderscare are not stressors for a majority of employees. For the employees that answered the item, childcare is an issue. In fact, 55.3% of those who answered the item on childcare, 119 employees, have primary responsibility for childcare. Since many employees are close to retirement age, childcare may become a major concern as younger employees are hired to replace retiring employees.

Personal Resources

There were five items under the sub-determinant “personal resources” (see Table 29). The lowest level of agreement was with the items, “I have opportunities to include exercise in my workday” (37.7% agree) and “Shift work interferes with my personal life” (42.0% agree). As the institution moves toward better space utilization and chooses to offer more classes in the evenings and weekends, this topic could become a greater concern. Also, the low level of agreement for including exercise in a workday may be related to lack of facilities on three of the four Kwantlen campuses.

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Table 29

Responses to Items in the Sub-determinant “Personal Resources”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to include exercise in my workday</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift work (does not interfere) with my personal life</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relationships (outside work) (do not) cause stress in my life</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70% Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep my personal life and my work life separate</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100% Agree</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Results by Employee Characteristics

In Chapter Two, Context, the physical differences between the campuses, the differences in the employee groups as well as ethnic background and gender were discussed. In this section the employee responses are compared using the characteristics: “campus,” “employee group,” “gender,” “ethnic background,” “educational level,” “employee age,” and “years of service.”

Campus

Kwantlen is comprised of four different campuses. Each campus varies in types of programs offered, number of employees and students and work environment. The three campuses, Surrey, Richmond and Langley, have been built since 1990 and one

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
campus is housed in old temporary warehouses. The Newton campus has had problems with leaky roofs and moldy carpets. As well, there are no passenger elevators; there is only one service elevator that can be used by physically challenged individuals. Since the work environment on each campus is different, an analysis was conducted to determine if the differences in the work environment of the campuses result in different responses. Lower agreement on some items could be expected from those on the Newton campus due to its poor physical condition and uncertain status at Kwantlen.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to see if there were significant differences in the way employees on different campuses answered survey items. Using $p \leq 0.05$ as a criterion, a significant difference was found on 24 of the 95 items. A post hoc analysis was conducted to assess which group responses were significantly different from the others. The items and the percentage of respondents who agreed with the items by campus can be found in Table 30. Table 30 also identifies which campus' responses were significantly different from the others using superscript lower case letters “a,” “b” and “c.” When there is a superscript beside the response it means that the post hoc analysis identified it as significantly different from the other group(s). If the same superscript letter appears beside two or more responses, it means that those responses were not significantly different from each other but were significantly different from a response that has a different superscript letter. For example, in Table 30 the first item, “My pay is comparable to that of others in similar positions,” the Surrey campus’ responses are significantly different from the Richmond and Langley campuses’ responses, but the Richmond and Langley campuses’ responses are not significantly different from each other. Also in Table 30, for the second item, “I am secure in my
Table 30

Items with Significant Differences in Responses by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Items</th>
<th>Surrey N=222 (%Agree)</th>
<th>Richmond N=119 (%Agree)</th>
<th>Langley N=68 (%Agree)</th>
<th>Newton N=37 (%Agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure and Environment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Terms of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay is comparable to that of others in similar positions</td>
<td>54.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48.3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>42.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am secure in my position</td>
<td>62.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60.3&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45.6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29.7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am clear on how decisions are made</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>44.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning at Kwantlen considers the long-term consequences of decisions</td>
<td>41.6&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>43.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22.7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.6&lt;sup&gt;ac&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am given the responsibility to make decisions in my job</td>
<td>82.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>89.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>69.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>89.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards</td>
<td>61.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>36.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>38.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals</td>
<td>88.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>79.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>89.7&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48.6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in a comfortable physical environment</td>
<td>68.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>58.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>70.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sufficient space to do my work</td>
<td>72.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>56.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>70.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) feel physically isolated at work*</td>
<td>71.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>55.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel supported when I enroll in further education for career advancement</td>
<td>65.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>63.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-site Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hours of operation of the support areas (cafeteria, library, counseling, admissions) meet student and employee needs</td>
<td>46.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41.8&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a variety of healthy food choices in the cafeteria</td>
<td>29.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>38.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to access the resources of the Wellness Centre</td>
<td>52.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45.6&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22.2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
### Table 30

**Items with Significant Differences in Responses by Campus (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Items</th>
<th>Surrey N=222 (%Agree)</th>
<th>Richmond N=119 (%Agree)</th>
<th>Langley N=68 (%Agree)</th>
<th>Newton N=37 (%Agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure and Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Policies and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs (do not) receive too much emphasis</td>
<td>38.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8.1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen (does not operate) more like a corporation than a public institution</td>
<td>48.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24.3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me</td>
<td>62.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>65.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department’s hiring practices are fair</td>
<td>61.6&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72.2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>42.9&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practices at Kwantlen are aimed at helping students be successful</td>
<td>78.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>56.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources and Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of my work related responsibilities</td>
<td>90.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>91.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>75.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any change or news about Kwantlen is communicated to the internal community before it is communicated to the external community</td>
<td>40.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>58.3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>39.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>27.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of belonging in my department</td>
<td>81.4&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>82.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>67.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>91.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is comfortable space for employees to get together for social events and meetings on my campus</td>
<td>52.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Lifestyle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to include exercise in my workday</td>
<td>50.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24.6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>31.3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
position,” the Surrey campus’ responses are significantly different from the Langley and Newton campuses’ responses but not from the Richmond campus’ responses. As well, the Richmond campus’ responses are significantly different from the Newton campus’ responses but not from the Surrey and Langley campuses’ responses. It is also noted that Langley campus’ responses are significantly different from the Surrey and Newton campuses’ responses but not from the Richmond campus’ and that Newton campus’ responses are significantly different from the Surrey, Richmond and Langley campus’ responses.

Generally, Surrey campus employees had higher “agree responses” and the other campuses vary with the lowest “agree responses” from the Newton campus. Surrey and Richmond campuses have similar responses and Langley and Newton campuses have similar responses. The similarities and differences between the campuses may be due to the physical facility differences or the types of programs offered.

The Newton Campus

The Newton campus employees had lower levels of agreement on items. The two items that received the lowest levels of agreement from Newton were; “The hours of operation of the support areas (cafeteria, library, counseling, admissions) meet student and employee needs” (6.2%) and “There are a variety of healthy food choices in the cafeteria” (6.5%). Many of these responses may be related to the physical environment at the Newton campus and the apparent lack of communication about the future of the Newton campus. The items that received significantly higher levels of agreement from Newton campus compared to the others are:

- I feel a sense of belonging in my department.
• I have a clear understanding of my work related responsibilities.

• I am given the responsibility to make decisions in my job.

The higher level of agreement indicates that although Newton campus employees have the worst facilities compared to the other campuses, they still feel a sense of belonging, are very clear of their job duties and feel they can make decisions related to their immediate job. The Newton campus had the highest level of agreement with the item “I feel a sense of belonging in my department” (91.9%).

The Surrey Campus

The Surrey campus had the highest level of agreement with most items but there were three items that had significantly lower levels of agreement than the other campuses:

• There is policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me.

• Any change or news about Kwantlen is communicated to the internal community before it is communicated to the external community.

• My departments hiring practices are fair.

The low level of agreement on these items indicates that equity and communication issues are more of a concern for those on the Surrey campus than those on other campuses.

The Richmond Campus

The Richmond campus’ responses were generally not significantly different from Surrey campus except for four items. Richmond’s agree responses that were significantly lower than Surrey’s are:

• There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards.

• I have opportunities to include exercise in my workday.
These responses are explained by the fact that the Surrey campus has a gym and showers and the Richmond campus is overcrowded and does not have equivalent facilities. Although the Richmond campus has generally higher agreement on items than the Langley campus, it has significantly lower agreement on two items:

- I work in a comfortable physical space.
- I have sufficient space to do my work.

Both of these responses are likely due to the overcrowding experienced at the Richmond campus.

*The Langley Campus*

The Langley campus' responses are similar to the Newton campus except in a few areas. The Langley campus has significantly higher levels of agreement than the Newton campus on the following items:

- I am secure in my position.
- My campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals.
- I work in a comfortable physical environment.
- The hours of operation of the support areas (cafeteria, library, counseling, admissions) meet student and employee needs.
- There are a variety of healthy food choices in the cafeteria.
- Degree programs (do not) receive too much emphasis.

These differences are due to the lack of facilities at the Newton campus, the uncertainty of the future of the Newton campus and the elimination of cafeteria, library and admissions office services that occurred prior to the administration of the survey.

The Langley campus' responses has significantly lower agreement than the Newton campus on the following two items:
• I am given the responsibility to make decisions in my job.
• I feel a sense of belonging in my department.

These two items may have lower level of agreement because in one of the programs at Langley, the Dean's position was eliminated and there were issues between staff around the time the survey was administered. The Langley campus' responses are generally lower than the Surrey and Richmond campuses'. The one item that had significantly higher level of agreement by the Langley campus compared to Surrey campus is: "There is policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me."

The Newton and Langley campuses may be alike because they both have similar certificate programs and general trades programs. The differences are due primarily to the physical environment.

**Responses by Employee Group**

There are three distinct employee groups at Kwantlen. The Administration group is all those employees who do not belong to either of the two unions, the Kwantlen Faculty Association (KFA) and the British Columbia Government and Service Employees Union (BCGEU). The Faculty group consists of faculty, librarians, counselors, coordinators, conveners and chairpersons of programs. The BCGEU Staff consist of all unionized support staff in the institution. The Faculty and Administration group are salaried employees and the BCGEU Staff are paid hourly wages. As well, the Faculty group, on the average, is slighter older and more educated than the BCGEU Staff. The "employee groups" were compared to determine if the job classification of the groups results in different responses. The "Administration" group, which consists of all the non-union staff, had the highest "agree
responses." The five items that received the highest agree responses (greater than 80% "agree" by all employees) were:

- I am in good mental health.
- Kwantlen is a good place to work.
- I am in good physical health.
- I am in good spiritual health.
- I have a clear understanding of my work related responsibilities.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to assess if there were significant differences in responses by the “employee group” (see Table 31). Using p ≤ .05 as a criterion, there were 36 items, which were significantly different. A post hoc analysis was conducted to assess which groups significantly differed from others. Table 31 provides the “agree” responses for items and identifies which employee group responded significantly differently from each other by using the superscript “a,” “b,” and “c.” If there is no superscript, it means the response was not significantly different from the other groups.

**Administration Group**

Generally the highest level of agreement on items is by the Administration group, the non-unionized employees, but on the following three items the “Administration” group had significantly lower levels of agreement than other employee groups:

- I was compensated for the overtime worked last year.
- The process by which I am evaluated is fair.
- Kwantlen (does not operate) more like a corporation than a public institution.

*Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being*
Table 31

Items with Significant Differences in Responses by Employee Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Items</th>
<th>Administration N=24 (%) Agree</th>
<th>Faculty N=224 (%) Agree</th>
<th>BCGEU Staff N=194 (%) Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure and Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the employee assistance program benefit</td>
<td>85.0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>46.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>59.8\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the dental coverage benefit</td>
<td>100.0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>53.1\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>61.2\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay reflects the responsibilities of my position</td>
<td>62.5\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>70.5\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>29.5\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn the new technology during work</td>
<td>79.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>45.4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>69.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay is comparable to that of others in similar positions</td>
<td>75.0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>69.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>31.9\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently</td>
<td>91.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>68.8\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>79.6\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was compensated for the overtime worked last year</td>
<td>25.0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>19.9\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>67.9\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My input influences decisions</td>
<td>87.5\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>63.8\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>57.1\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process by which I am evaluated is clear</td>
<td>33.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>74.1\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>54.6\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems</td>
<td>50.0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>17.1\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>36.4\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sufficient space to do my work</td>
<td>95.8\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>57.4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>75.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in a comfortable physical environment</td>
<td>91.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>57.1\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>67.4\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards</td>
<td>75.0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>39.7\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>54.9\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Policies and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen (does not operate) more like a corporation than a public institution</td>
<td>8.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>47.7\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>35.9\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support Kwantlen’s open access policy that allows admission to every type of student</td>
<td>79.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>61.8\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>82.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The needs of local students take priority over the needs of international students</td>
<td>50.0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>29.3\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>18.7\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being
### Table 31

**Items with Significant Differences in Responses by Employee Group (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Items</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>BCGEU Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=24 ( Agree)</td>
<td>N=224 ( Agree)</td>
<td>N=194 ( Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure and Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Policies and Practices (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me</td>
<td>75.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am treated fairly at work</td>
<td>87.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>80.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>70.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department's hiring practices are fair</td>
<td>87.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>65.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>53.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-site Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to access the resources of the Wellness Centre</td>
<td>79.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical and Psychosocial Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student performance (does not increase) my workload</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload has (not) increased over the last year</td>
<td>11.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When an employee is off work, the remaining employees are given additional support to deal with the workload</td>
<td>58.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources and Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to carry out my job responsibilities</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>60.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>83.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is appropriate IET (instruction and educational technology) support for my job</td>
<td>91.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>36.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>76.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union and myself</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>61.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>31.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union(s) and its members</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>65.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>37.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions</td>
<td>75.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the union to consider the best interests of the union members in its decision</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>60.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognize everyone in my department</td>
<td>95.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>73.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>88.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is comfortable space for employees to get together for social events and meetings on my campus</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Table 31

Items with Significant Differences by in Responses Employee Group (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Items</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>BCGEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=24 (% Agree)</td>
<td>N=224 (% Agree)</td>
<td>N=194 (% Agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Requirements (Continued)**

**Physical and Psychosocial Demands**

**Social Support (Continued)**

It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>BCGEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>15.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>32.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Resources**

I keep my personal life and my work life separate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>BCGEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>56.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>68.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shift work (does not interfere) with my personal life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>BCGEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>38.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>42.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>BCGEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>68.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Lifestyle**

**Non Work Demands**

I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>BCGEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>19.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two items are about compensation and fairness. There is no provision for overtime for Administration since they are salaried employees and the evaluation process may not seem fair because all the Administration positions are unique so too may be the evaluation process. The low level of agreement with the third item above may be due to the fact that administration has the responsibility for producing a balanced budget and with increased operational costs, the focus has been on efficiency and doing more with less.

**Faculty Group**

The “Faculty” is a highly educated group of unionized workers. They have some commonalities with the other unionized workers and some with the Administration. The following responses with low levels of agreement appear to be a concern:

- I was compensated for overtime worked last year.

<sup>* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being. </sup>
• The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems.

• Poor student performance (does not increase) my workload.

• When an employee is off work, the remaining employees are given additional support to deal with the workload.

• I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions.

• It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses.

Compensation had low agreement by the “Administration” and by the “Faculty.” Both groups are salaried employees who do not have provisions for overtime worked. The response on the item on ergonomics has a low level of agreement because administration chose to focus on those areas where employees spend all their time and not some of their time. When students perform poorly, most Faculty spend more time documenting the performance as well as providing extra tutorials and this is reflected by the low level of agreement with the item on “poor student performance and workload.”

The issue of trust in the management is a concern both for the “Faculty” and the “BCGEU staff.” Both groups had a low level of agreement with the item. Also the low level of agreement with the item “It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses” is related to the varying schedules and the fact that there are four campuses.

The “Faculty” had the highest levels of agreement for the following seven items:

• Kwantlen (does not operate) more like a corporation than a public institution.

• The process by which I am evaluated is fair.

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
• I am treated fairly at work.
• My department's hiring practices are fair.
• My workload has (not) increased over the last year*.
• There is clear communication between the union and myself.
• There is clear communication between the unions and its members.

The first and fifth items may have the highest level of agreement by the Faculty or are tied for the highest level of agreement because in tight budget times, the administration chose to maintain direct instruction levels and make cuts in support services. The two items on "being treated fairly" and "fair hiring practices" are rated high because there is equity language in the collective agreement and two faculty members from each department are members of the department's search committees. As well, there has been a faculty evaluation committee over the last several years that has worked with the faculty members and administration to develop an evaluation process that is meaningful for both groups. The data indicates that the "Faculty" agree that they have good communication with their union.

The BCGEU Staff

The following five items had significantly lower levels of agreement by the "BCGEU staff:"

• My pay reflects the responsibilities of my position.
• My pay is comparable to that of other in similar positions.
• The needs of local students take priority over the needs of international students.
• My workload has (not) increased over the last year*

• When an employee is off work, the remaining employees are given additional support to deal with the workload.

The two items on pay were a concern. As well, since the support staff positions were those affected by budget constraints, it is not surprising that there is very low agreement (6.7%) by BCGEU Staff with the item, “My workload has (not) increased.” As well, when employees are absent, they are not replaced and this is reflected by the low agreement with the item “When an employee is off work, the remaining employees are given additional support to deal with the workload.” Both the “BCGEU staff” and the “Faculty” had low levels of agreement with the item, “The needs of local students take priority over the needs of international students.” It appears both unionized groups have similar perceptions.

Despite the lower levels of agreement with the items dealing with workload, the “BCGEU staff” had high level of agreement with the item, “I have the resources to carry out my job responsibilities.” This may possibly mean the material resources are adequate, but not the personnel. Five other items that the BCGEU Staff had high levels of agreement with were:

• Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently.

• I have sufficient space to do my work.

• I can recognize everyone in my department.

• I support Kwantlen’s open access policy that allows admission to every type of student.

• There is appropriate IET (instruction and educational technology) support for my job.

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
These high "agree" responses are similar to the "Administration." Both groups work mainly during daytime hours and have adequate IET support and the ability to close their areas for set hours to have meetings.

Responses by Gender

There are many more women employed by Kwantlen than men. There were more women in each employee group. An ANOVA was conducted to see if there was a difference in specific items on the way men and women answered items. A significant difference (p≤.05) was found on 12 items. These items are organized by the DHWF. Table 32 lists the determinant of health and the items that had significantly different "agree" responses by gender and the percentage of the "agree" response. The items mostly have a higher level of agreement by women compared with men. Most of the differences in responses may be due to role differences between men and women.

Traditionally, care taking has been socially constructed as a female role. On first glance, the response to childcare responsibility appears contradictory. For the item, "I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare*," most respondents indicate not applicable, but of those who respond, more (67.3% agree) women stated they do not have primary responsibility for childcare compared to the men (25.8% agree). This is consistent with the 2001 National Work-Life Study. Duxbury and Higgins (2001) state more working men have dependent care responsibilities than women because women with dependent care responsibilities tend to leave the work force (p. 15).

* Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being.
### Table 32

**Items with Significant Differences in Responses by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Items</th>
<th>Women (N=314)</th>
<th>Men (N=129)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure and Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Decision-making Structure</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the responses of my manager/dean/supervisor to issues related to my personal life</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear consequences for poor performance</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Policies and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen (does not operate) more like a corporation than a public institution</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support Kwantlen’s open access policy that allows admission to every type of student</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The needs of local students take priority over the needs of international students</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practices at Kwantlen reflect diverse cultural values</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical and Psychosocial Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Workload</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload (has not) increased in the last year</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use daily “social chit chat” to cope with stress at work</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of belonging in my department</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Lifestyle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) feel emotionally isolated at work</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in good physical health</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) feel physically isolated at work</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non work Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Ethnic Background

Kwantlen University College is located in the Vancouver Lower Mainland where Canadian census figures show that 45% of the population is born outside the country. Kwantlen has affirmative action and equity policies as well as language in union contracts in relation to affirmative action and equity. A question on the survey, “What is your ethnic background?” was asked to assess, firstly, the employee mix and secondly, if respondents would answer items differently based on their ethnic background. The data was collected using the eighteen categories of ethnicity that are used on the Canadian Census: English, Canadian, Scottish, German, Irish, Chinese, Ukrainian, Dutch, French, Italian, Norwegian, Korean, South Asian (East Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Tamil, Sri Lankan, Bengali), Polish, Filipino, Swedish, First Nations and other. The respondents were asked to check all categories that applied. For analysis, the responses were recoded into “Canadian Only” (all those who checked Canadian only), “European and/or Canadian” (those who checked any European background but not First Nations and/or Visible Minorities), “First Nations and/or Canadian” (all those who checked ‘First Nations and or anything else), “Visible Minorities” (all those who checked any of the following: Chinese, Korean, South Asian, Filipino) and “Other” (all those who checked other or did not answer the question). Using these response categories, an ANOVA was performed to determine if the ethnic backgrounds of the groups would result in significantly different responses on items using p≤0.5 as the criterion. Significantly different responses were found on 14 items (see Table 33). Table 33 identifies the significantly different “agree” responses by the superscripts “a,” “b,” and “c.”
Table 33

Items With Significant Differences in Responses by Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Item</th>
<th>Other N= 37 (% Agree)</th>
<th>Canadian N= 48 (% Agree)</th>
<th>European N=313 (% Agree)</th>
<th>First Nation N=12 (% Agree)</th>
<th>Visible Minority N=39 (% Agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure and Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was compensated for the overtime worked last year</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>37.4\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>71.4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person responsible for my evaluation has first hand knowledge of my performance</td>
<td>65.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>54.6\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>16.7\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>61.1\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am clear on how decisions are made</td>
<td>54.4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>35.5\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>57.9\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning at Kwantlen considers the long-term consequences of decisions</td>
<td>63.6\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>36.4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>34.3\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Policies and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work environment is free from racial discrimination</td>
<td>79.4\textsuperscript{bc}</td>
<td>75.0\textsuperscript{bc}</td>
<td>79.2\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>58.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>69.2\textsuperscript{bc}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department's hiring practices are fair</td>
<td>76.5\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>62.7\textsuperscript{bc}</td>
<td>33.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>54.1\textsuperscript{ab}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources (do not) drive decisions at Kwantlen</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.1\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>3.6\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.8\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being
Table 33

Items With Significant Differences in Responses by Ethnic Background  (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Item</th>
<th>Ethnic Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other N=37 (% Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Psychosocial Demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions</td>
<td>45.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can speak openly without fear of retribution</td>
<td>65.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident this survey will influence decisions by management</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses</td>
<td>28.6\textsuperscript{d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in good physical health</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-work Demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for care of an adult family member</td>
<td>56.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life</td>
<td>70.6\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there is no superscript, it means the response was not significantly different from the other groups.

Of the 14 items that had significantly different responses using the variable "ethnic background," a few patterns are noteworthy. These are presented using the group categories.

* Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being.
First Nations

Six items had the lowest level of agreement by "First Nations" and the highest level of agreement with one item. The lowest levels of agreement are for the following six items:

- The person responsible for my evaluation has first hand knowledge of my performance.
- My work environment is free from racial discrimination.
- My department's hiring practices are fair.
- I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions.
- I can speak openly without fear of retribution.
- I am confident this survey will influence decisions by management.

The first item about performance is rated low because the "BCGEU staff" identifies this issue and many of the "First Nations" respondents may fall into that category of employee. The remainder of the items that received low levels of agreement were in relation to equity and trust. "First Nations," historically, have not been treated fairly by mainstream society and whether this has carried through to the institutional processes to cause this result is difficult to assess. The other issue identified by the organization is trust, but it is even more of an issue for "First Nations" on one item, "I am confident this survey will influence decisions by management," the level of agreement was zero percent.

The two items that received high levels of agreement from "First Nations" were "I was compensated for the overtime worked" and "I (do not) have primary responsibility
for care of an adult family member*.” These results may be due to the number of “First Nations” who are BCGEU employees and have compensation language in their agreement. Adult care may not be an issue because they may not have adult family members living with them or in close proximity.

**European**

The “European” group had lowest levels of agreement compared to the other groups on five items:

- I was compensated for the overtime worked last year.
- I am clear on how decisions are made.
- Planning at Kwantlen considers the long-term consequences of decisions.
- It is easy to get together for meetings.
- I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life.

The compensation is more of an issue for salaried employees. More of the “European” group may hold salaried positions. As well, this group may have more of a need to be informed compared to the “Visible Minority” group and the “Other” group who may believe these issues are the responsibility of management. The last item, balancing personal and work life, had the lowest agreement of the groups (56.7%). The highest level of agreement was for the item, “My work environment is free from racial discrimination.” This may be because most systems in organizations, historically, are based on European traditions.

---

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Visible Minority

The one item that received the lowest level of agreement by “Visible Minority” is “I am in good physical health” (76.9%). It is still a high level of agreement, but may be lower out of the groups because it may reflect an adjustment period of new immigrants or the phenomena of living between two cultures. Often psychological issues present themselves as physical symptoms because psychological illnesses are still not accepted as legitimate illnesses in some cultures. The following two items that “Visible Minority” had the lowest agreement with are not significantly different from “First Nation” are related to equity issues:

- My work environment is free from racial discrimination.
- My department’s hiring practices are fair.

The data supports that there is a higher concern of inequity for those who look different.

Canadian

The “Canadian” group had lowest levels of agreement on the following two items that were not significantly different from the “European” group:

- Financial resources (do not) drive decisions at Kwantlen*.
- It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses.

Both these results may be because the “Canadian” group may be aware of budget concerns and these may be Faculty who have difficulty meeting across campuses. These concerns are consistent with the concerns identified by all employees. The “Canadian” group has the highest level of agreement on the three items related to individual lifestyle and work environment being free from racial discrimination. This may be because many

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
of the processes we identify as Canadian are mainstream and are ingrained into our organization.

Other

The “other” group had high agreement with the following three items:

- My work environment is free from racial discrimination
- My department’s hiring practices are fair
- I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life.

These levels of agreement are consistent with the “European” and/or “Canadian” group. The lowest level of agreement for the “other” group was with the following two items:

- It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses.
- I (do not) have primary responsibility for care of an adult family member*.

All employees also rate these items low.

Education Level

There is variation in the academic requirements for employees at Kwantlen depending on the position. The academic requirement for support staff is generally “high school” or “college certificate” with some lab instructor positions requiring a “bachelor’s degree.” Most Faculty positions require a minimum of a “master’s degree” with a “doctoral degree preferred” while some areas require trade certification. Only the Administration varies from requiring a minimum of a “high school” diploma to a “master’s degrees” with a “doctoral degrees” preferred for some positions.

A question, “What is your highest education level?” was asked on the survey. The information was used to describe the respondents and assess if employees with

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
different "education levels" responded differently (p<.05) to the survey items. There were ten possible responses to the survey. For ease of analysis the responses were recoded into five categories in the following manner: “less than high school” and “high school” became “high school or less;” “trade certificate or diploma;” “non-university certificate or diploma,” and “university certificate or diploma less than a bachelor’s degree” became “certificate;” “bachelor’s degree,” “post graduate certificate or diploma,” and “master’s degree” became “bachelor’s/master’s degree;” “doctorate degree” remained as “doctorate degree;” and “other” remained “other.” Of the 95 survey items, significant differences in responses were found on 27 items. Table 34 lists the “determinant of health,” the “item,” the “agree” responses and uses the superscripts: “a,” “b,” and “c” to denote which groups are significantly different from each other. If there is no superscript, it means the response was not significantly different from the other groups. Of the 27 items that were answered significantly differently by the variable “education level,” the “doctoral degree” group answered with either the lowest level of agreement or the highest level of agreement on 25 items. The lowest level of agreement was with 19 items. The following six items that had an agreement level of 30% or less:

- I was compensated for the overtime worked.
- I have opportunities for promotion.
- The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems.
- Poor student performance (does not) increase my workload*.
- The orientation to my work related duties was very useful.
- It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses.

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Table 34

Items with Significant Difference in Responses by Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Item</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(% Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure and Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn the new technology during work</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently</td>
<td>63.6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was compensated for the overtime worked last year</td>
<td>66.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay reflects the responsibilities of my position</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology has increased the quality of my work</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process by which I am evaluated is clear</td>
<td>81.8abc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen is a good place to work</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards</td>
<td>72.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34

Items with Significant Difference in Responses by Education Level (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Item</th>
<th>Other N=11 (% Agree)</th>
<th>High School Or Less N=31 (% Agree)</th>
<th>Certificate N=115 (% Agree)</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Master’s Degrees N=228 (% Agree)</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree N=50 (% Agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure and Environment</strong> <em>(Continued)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Policies and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support Kwantlen’s open access policy that allows admission to every type of student</td>
<td>81.8&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>86.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>64.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>68.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>42.9&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practices at Kwantlen reflect diverse cultural values</td>
<td>36.4&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>80.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>68.9&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>57.1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>77.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>63.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>53.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>34.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical &amp; Psychosocial Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload has (not) increased over the last year&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student performance (does not) increases my workload</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>52.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11.8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10.5&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources and Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is appropriate IET (instruction, educational and technology support for my job)</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>83.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>44.9&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The orientation to my work related duties was very useful</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>35.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>47.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Table 34
Items with Significant Difference in Responses by Education Level (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Item</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's Master's Doctoral Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical &amp; Psychosocial Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any change or news about Kwantlen is communicated to the internal community before it is communicated to the external community</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union and myself</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union(s) and its members</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are provided with opportunities to get together socially</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognize everyone in my department</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses</td>
<td>40.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is comfortable space for employees to get together for social events and meetings</td>
<td>72.7&lt;sup&gt;ac&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Lifestyle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non work Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep my personal life and my work life separate</td>
<td>45.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life</td>
<td>81.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being.
The "Faculty" group also identified these items as concerns. This may be because many of those employees who have doctoral degrees may be faculty members since it is only some of the departments in this employee group who require doctoral degrees for employment.

The highest levels of agreement by the "doctoral degree" group were for six items. Of these items, only one item had agreement greater than 70%, "The process by which I am evaluated is clear." This response is probably due to the "doctoral degree" group being mainly faculty members who have clarified the process of evaluation over the last few years by having a specific faculty evaluation committee. Many of the significant differences seen in the "doctoral degree" were a result of the responses of the "certificate" and "high school or less" groups.

Certificate

The "certificate" group had the highest level of agreement on ten items. Of these, the following five items had agreement over 70%:

- I can learn the new technology during work time.
- Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently.
- Technology has increased the quality of my work.
- I support Kwantlen's open access policy that allows admission to every type of student.
- The practices at Kwantlen reflect diverse cultural values.

Three items are related to technology, one to access and the other to diversity. These responses are consistent with the overall responses of the BCGEU Staff and this is because some of the BCGEU Staff positions require a certificate for employment. The "certificate" group may be employed in support services that use information technology.
The "certificate" group had the lowest level of agreement with six items, of these there was one item with agreement less than 30% "I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare." This group either does not have children, or because they work during the day, their significant other has the responsibility for childcare.

*High School or Less*

The "high school or less" group had either the lowest or highest levels of agreement with 22 items. Of these, highest level of agreement was for 18 items. One of the item items received 100% agreement (Kwantlen is a good place too work) and the following seven items had agreement higher than 70%:

- I support Kwantlen's open access policy that allows admission to every type of student.
- The practices at Kwantlen reflect diverse cultural values.
- There is policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me.
- There is appropriate IET (instruction, educational and technology) support for my job.
- I can recognize everyone in my department.
- I keep my personal and work life separate.
- I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life.

The data indicates the "high school or less" group had the highest agreement on equity and balancing personal and work life and is the only group that stated 100% that Kwantlen is a good place to work. This group has the lowest level of agreement on five items. Of these, one item has agreement at 30%, "There is clear communication between the union and myself" and one item has less than 30% agreement, "My workload has
(not) increased over the last year.” Most likely, all of these members belong to the BCGEU and that particular union was having internal conflicts around the time of the survey and the response may be a result of the circumstances. The workload increase can be explained by the fact that the administration chose to delete support staff positions or not increase those areas at times of expansion and shrinking budgets.

*Bachelor’s Master’s Degrees*

The “bachelor’s master’s degrees” had responses that were similar to some responses of the “doctoral degree” group and some responses of the “certificate” group. It had the highest or lowest level of agreement on two items though it had significantly similar high or low results on more items. The highest level of agreement with the item was not above 70% and the lowest level of agreement with the item was not below 30%.

*Other*

The other group had the lowest level of agreement on two items and the highest level of agreement on six items. Of the two items with the lowest level of agreement, neither was less than 30%. The following three items had the highest level of agreement greater than 70%:

- There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards.
- There is comfortable space for employees to get together for social events and meetings.
- I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life.

These results are difficult to explain because it is unclear who is the “other.”
Employee Age

The employees are at various life stages. Some employees are straight out of high school and others are close to retirement. On the survey was the question “What is your age?” There were nine response categories. These were collapsed into three data clusters: “younger than 25,” “25-29,” and “30-34” became “≤34;” “35-39,” and “40-44” became “35-49;” and “50-54,” “55-59,” and “older than 59” became “≥50.” The data were used to describe the respondents and assess if the employees in the different age categories responded differently to the 95 survey items. Significant differences were found in 16 items. These have been presented in the DHWF (see Table 35). The “determinants of health,” “item,” and “agree” responses are presented in Table 35. Also, “agree” responses that differ significantly by group are denoted by the superscript “a,” “b,” and “c.” If there is no superscript, it means the response was not significantly different from the other groups.

On all 16 items, there are significant differences between the “≤34 years” and the “≥50 years.” The items with significant differences that are not within the same response categories and have agreement levels over 70%, or less than 30% are highlighted. The following five items with agree responses greater than 70% are all in the “≤34 years” group are:

- Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently.
- I was compensated for the overtime worked last year.
- I support Kwantlen’s open access policy that allows admission to every type of student.
- I am (not) affected by a chronic health condition.
Table 35

Items with Significant Differences in Responses by Employee Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Item</th>
<th>≤34</th>
<th>35-49</th>
<th>≥50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=65</td>
<td>N=209</td>
<td>N=170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(% Agree)</td>
<td>(% Agree)</td>
<td>(% Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure &amp; Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently</td>
<td>84.6\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>76.2\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>68.5\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was compensated for the overtime worked last year</td>
<td>76.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>39.7\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>34.2\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am secure in my position</td>
<td>50.8\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>51.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>64.7\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn the new technology during work</td>
<td>69.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>51.5\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen is a good place to work</td>
<td>86.6\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>93.8\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>86.5\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Policies and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support Kwantlen's open access policy that allows admission to every type of student</td>
<td>89.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>67.5\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>69.5\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The needs of local students take priority over the needs of international students</td>
<td>14.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>27.8\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>27.6\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs (do not) receive too much emphasis\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>50.8\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>35.3\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>35.6\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources (do not) drive decisions at Kwantlen\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>8.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>5.8\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>2.4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical and Psychosocial Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student performance (does not increase) my workload\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>30.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>15.2\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>14.8\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union and myself</td>
<td>25.4\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>49.5\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>51.2\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union(s) and its members</td>
<td>38.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>51.8\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>55.4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses</td>
<td>37.9\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>22.7\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>17.4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being.
Table 35

Items with Significant Differences in Responses by Employee Age
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Item</th>
<th>≤34 (% Agree)</th>
<th>35-49 (% Agree)</th>
<th>≥50 (% Agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Lifestyle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am (not) affected by a chronic health condition*</td>
<td>80.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>73.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>61.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non work Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare*</td>
<td>31.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for care of an adult family member</td>
<td>71.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>42.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I do (not) have primary responsibility for care of an adult family member*.

The two last items have agreement over 70% by the “35-49 years” group. The data indicates the younger employees are more positive.

The lowest level of agreement less than 30% by the “≤34 years” is for the item “There is clear communication between the union and myself.” The item “It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses” has agreement less than 30% by the “35-49 year” group and the “≥50 years” group. The one item “I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare*” has agreement lower than 30% by the “35-49 year” group.

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
The data reflects that job security increases with "employee age" and opinions about Kwantlen’s policies and practices become less favourable with "employee age."

**Years of Service**

Kwantlen has many long-term employees, but over the last few years with the development of degree programs, some new employees were hired so there is considerable variation in the length of service of employees. The question, “How many years have you worked at Kwantlen?” was asked on the survey to collect data in order to describe the respondents and to assess if employees responded to items differently due to the number of years they had worked at Kwantlen. There were six response categories on the survey and these were collapsed into the following three data clusters: “less than 1” and “1-5” became “≤5”, “6-10” and “11-15” became “6-15” and “16-20 and “more than 20” became “≥16.” ANOVA revealed significant differences on 16 of the 95 survey items (see Table 36). The significant differences were a result of the responses between the “≤5” and “≥16” year employees. The responses are organized around the determinants in the DHWF. Table 36 provides the items that had significantly different responses by employees’ “years of service.” It also denotes which “years of service” categories are significantly different from each other by the superscript “a,” “b,” or “c.” If there is no superscript, it means the response was not significantly different from the other groups.

The 16 items with significant differences by “years of service” are identical to the items with significant differences by “age.” The “≤5 years” group has the highest agreement above 70% on the two items, “I support Kwantlen’s open access policy that allows admission to every type of student” and “I am (not) affected by a chronic health
condition*. The other two groups have responses within 14% and the agreement decreases with “years of service.” The “6-15 years” group had the lowest level of agreement with the item, “I do not have primary responsibility for childcare” and the “≤5

Table 36
Items with Significant Differences in Responses by Employee Years of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Item</th>
<th>≤5 Years (% Agree)</th>
<th>6-15 Years (% Agree)</th>
<th>≥16 Years (% Agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure and Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn the new technology during work</td>
<td>57.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>54.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am secure in my position</td>
<td>43.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>61.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>73.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently</td>
<td>77.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>72.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was compensated for the overtime worked last year</td>
<td>46.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>39.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen is a good place to work</td>
<td>93.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>89.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>81.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Policies and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support Kwantlen’s open access policy that allows admission to every type of student</td>
<td>76.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>70.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>62.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The needs of local students take priority over the needs of international students</td>
<td>24.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25.6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs (do not) receive too much emphasis*</td>
<td>45.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>36.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources (do not) drive decisions at Kwantlen*</td>
<td>7.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.  
* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Table 36

Items with Significant Differences in Responses by Employee Years of Service (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant and Item</th>
<th>≤5 Years N=164 (% Agree)</th>
<th>6-15 Years N=217 (% Agree)</th>
<th>≥16 Years N=63 (% Agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Psychosocial Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student performance (does not) increase my workload</td>
<td>21.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union and myself</td>
<td>40.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>55.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union(s) and its members</td>
<td>47.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>52.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses</td>
<td>28.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am (not) affected by a chronic health condition&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>75.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>62.3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non work Demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for care of an adult family member</td>
<td>66.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

years” group did not have a significantly higher agreement but the “≥16 years” group had significantly higher agreement. The “≥16 years” had one response over 70% that was the highest agree response for the item, “I am secure in my position” and the lowest agree response less than 30% on the item, “The needs of local students take priority over the needs of international students.” The data supports that security increases with “years of service” but makes employees more skeptical over time.

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being.
Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the findings of the social audit survey conducted at Kwantlen in the Fall of 2002. The responses of the ninety-five-item survey were presented in the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework (Polanyi et al., 1998) as well as by the employee variables “campus,” “employee group,” “gender,” “ethnic background,” “education level,” “age,” and “years of service.”

Generally the employees believe that Kwantlen is a good place of work and that they are in good health. As well, employees feel in control of their immediate work environment, have a sense of community and belonging and are treated fairly. The employees think their wages and benefits are satisfactory. The Administration judges their benefits as needing no improvement. Employees feel they can adjust to the pace of change and can balance their personal and professional life. Elder and childcare are not issues for a majority of employees but childcare is more of an issue for men than women. Overall, one quarter of the employees have primary childcare responsibilities.

Employees identified concerns around two key areas of the organization: trust and communication. There seems to be a low level of trust between the Administration and the unions. In addition, the BCGEU members indicated a low level of trust in the union. First Nations employees seemed very skeptical that the management would make any changes in response to the social audit survey. In terms of communication, transparency in decision-making was the major concern.

Employees were also concerned about not having the same facilities on each campus such as a gym, showers and Wellness Centre. As well, the Newton campus employees were concerned about the elimination of the support services on their campus.
and about the physical condition of the buildings. Employees also identified the need for more ergonomic work areas.

Employees indicated that workload and stress had both increased over the last year and that they were not happy with performance evaluations and rewards, orientation, the way dysfunctional employees are handled and the ratio between workers and managers is not appropriate. The Faculty believes some of their increased stress results from poor student performance. Two other major concerns are that financial considerations drive decisions and decision-making is not transparent.

In the next chapter I will discuss some of the more noteworthy results. The intent of the discussion is to come to a broader understanding of the issues identified by Kwantlen employees, why these concerns exist and what might be done to improve the workplace in areas where improvement seems warranted.
CHAPTER SIX
DISCUSSION

Chapter Six discusses the results of the social audit survey in the broader context of organizational life. It is generally believed that a positive work environment contributes to employee well-being (Anspaugh et al., 1994; Brannon & Feist, 2000; Dunn, 1959; Endelman & Mandle, 1994; Greenberg et al., 1998; Hurwitz & Morgenstern, 2001; Polanyi et al., 1998). Employees generally believe that Kwantlen is a good place to work and that they are healthy. Employees seemed satisfied on most items in the following sub-determinants and/or factors: “terms of employment,” “physical environment,” “organizational policies and practices,” “physical and psychosocial demands,” “social support,” “basic characteristics,” “health,” “non-work demands,” and “personal resources.” Employees agreed that many of Kwantlen’s policies and practices contribute positively to well-being. Most employees believe they are in good spiritual, emotional, physical and mental health. On the sub-determinant “social support” employees believe they can recognize fellow employees, have a sense of belonging and community and use social “chit chat” to deal with stress. These positive perceptions are due to the fact that there are many long-term employees and the institution has a history of being a small community college that cares about its community.

The survey results indicated that change may be desirable in some policies and practices. There were concerns in relation to “on-site facilities,” “workload,” “trust” and “communication.” The concern with “on-site facilities” is due to the fact that shower facilities, the gym and the Wellness Centre are only located on the Surrey campus. As well, the Newton campus had student, cafeteria, library and admission services closed on that campus. Some employees were concerned about working overtime without
compensation and increased workload in the last year. At the same time, employees agreed that their stress has increased but stated that their workload is manageable and they are able to adjust to the pace of change at work. If the pace of change and increases in workload continue, it may negatively affect well-being. Employees indicated that trust and communication are a concern. Because both of these factors are essential to the functioning of organizations, this should be a concern for Kwantlen. From the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework lack of trust and miscommunication are a concern because it may decrease a person’s ability to form supportive relationships and social support mitigates many of the effects of stress. Some items related to “resources and tasks” are a concern and others are not. The employees believe the balance between the number of managers and other employees is not appropriate and the orientation they were provided is not useful. Employees believe they have a clear understanding of job-related responsibilities and have adequate information and educational technology support. As well there were some specific concerns:

- employees indicate shift work interferes with personal lives.
- there are few opportunities to include exercise in a work day.
- financial resources drive decisions.
- local students do not receive priority over international students.
- Kwantlen operates more like a corporation than a public institution.
- it is difficult to get together with others across campuses.
- work stations are not ergonomic.

Although there are many positive policies and practices at Kwantlen there is room for improvement.
Employees have been through many changes such as decreased operational budgets, an identity change from college to university college, expansion of campuses, technological advances and intensification of work; yet they believe they are able to cope with the pace of change and the increased stress and workload. This may partly be due to the autonomy and collegial support evident at Kwantlen. The members of the organization should be pleased that generally there is a work environment that contributes positively to well-being.

The focus of this study was to understand how policies and practices impact employee well-being in order to be able to make changes to improve the policies and practices. The issues raised by employees are very complex. After carefully considering the results, I found that issues raised by most employees could be understood through the concepts of organizational justice, trust, communication and stress. The purpose of this section is to discuss the findings in terms of organizational justice, trust, communication and stress and their relationship to well-being.

Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is about fairness in the work place, the fairness of the outcome and fairness of the process (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng; 2001). It can be traced back to Plato and Socrates when the term “justice” was used to mean “oughtness” or “righteousness” (Frost, 1972; Ryan, 1993, Colquitt et al., 2001). Organizational justice theory is concerned with perceptions of justice on the part of employees within an organization and the resultant behavioral outcomes (Elovainio, Kivimäki & Helkama, 2001) and impact on organizational functioning (Greenberg, 1990). Organizational theorists are interested in justice because perceptions of fairness
"lead to important consequences such as employee behavior and attitudes" (Konovosky, 2000, p. 491). From the health perspective, it is important to have an organization where employees perceive the organization to be fair since perceptions of injustice can lead to decreased employee well-being. There is some evidence that perceptions of injustice are directly correlated with stress (Elovainio et al., 2001; Tepper, 2001) and stress can have ill effects upon well-being (Cheng et al., 2000; Daniels & Guppy, 1994; French et al., 1982; Freudenberger, 1974; Grimshw, 1999; Karasek, 1979; Lazerus, 1998; McShane & Von Glinow, 2000; Rice, 2000; Seyle, 1976).

Perceptions of justice are formed in relation to context and context may vary due to an employee’s or an organization’s history, thus there are no hard and fast rules that apply to all organizations. However, the literature does provide some useful principles to guide leadership behavior.

It is not my intent to enter the debate in the literature on organizational justice but rather to apply the results of Colquitt et al.’s (2001) meta analytic review of 25 years of organizational research, which states “researchers can explain outcome variance by including multiple justice dimensions.” Therefore the four dimensions of organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice) are used to better understand employee responses.

Distributive justice was the first dimension of organizational justice studied. It is traced back to Adams’ (1965) equity theory that stated people were concerned about fairness of outcomes (Colquitt et al., 2001). One way individuals define distributive justice is by comparing themselves against others, as example, when we compare how we are rewarded against how others are rewarded. Employees assign values to the effort
they put into a job (input) and the rewards they get out of a job (output) (Oritz, 1999). Employees use these values to calculate an input/output ratio and then compare their input/output ratio to another employee with similar characteristics (position, seniority, etc.). If the employee feels the ratio (the mathematical calculation) is similar to the other employee, then the treatment of employees is perceived as equitable but if the ratio is not similar then there is perceived inequity. This appears "objective" but this process is subjective because it is the employee who assigns values.

The second dimension, procedural justice, deals with the fairness of the process that is used to reach decisions (Greenberg, 1990). The literature on procedural justice is traced to 1975 when Thibaut and Walker published their work on dispute resolution (Collquitt et al., 2001). They found that "disputants viewed the process as fair if they perceived that they had process control" (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 426). Both participation in decision-making and job control are "factors" that affect employee well-being (Polanyi et al, 1998). Leventhal (1980) introduced this idea of process control into the organizational context and created six criteria to judge procedural justice:

1. Consistency—across people and time.
2. Bias free—no personal bias.
3. Accuracy—decision based on accurate information.
4. Correctability—a way to correct decisions.
5. Ethicality—conforms to ethical standards.
6. Representation—opinions of various groups affected by decisions are considered. (Colquitt, 2001)

Bies and Moag are credited with the next two dimensions of justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice, which are related to the way people are treated in the
process (Colquitt et al., 2001). Interpersonal justice refers to personal treatment such as politeness, dignity and respect, while informational justice refers to the adequacy and clarity of the explanations provided about why certain procedures were followed (Colquitt, 2001). There is debate among researchers on whether interactional justice is a separate construct or a component of procedural justice and if interactional justice should be divided into interpersonal and informational justice (Greenberg, 1990). There is also debate in the justice literature about the independence of procedural and distributive justice. Although there is continuous debate about whether there are one, two, three or four distinct dimensions of justice, I have decided to use the four dimensions of justice described by Colquitt et al. (2001) who found that variance could be explained better by multiple justice dimensions. Thus, by using multiple dimensions, understandings on how to improve organizational justice may be improved. Future research may show that the dimensions are not independent, but in a meta-analysis Colquitt et al. (2002) found that interpersonal justice and informational justice are correlated, but not enough to combine under an interactional justice umbrella. They also found that distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justices are distinct constructs.

The items on the survey were not organized using the factor “organizational justice,” but integrated into the other factors in the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework (Polanyi et al., 1998). After reviewing the results of the study, I found that some items of concern on the survey could be reorganized under the factor “organizational justice”:

- At Kwantlen most employees were satisfied with their wages but were concerned that they were not compensated for the overtime worked. These employees may
be concerned about consistency if some employees receive compensation for overtime and others do not.

- Employees feel they are not given additional support when other employees are off work. Employees may feel that support is given to the person who is absent but that there is no concern for them.

- Employees were concerned that they were not rewarded in meaningful ways when they performed well. Some employees may feel that they perform beyond their job expectations and are not rewarded for their greater effort.

- There is policy that states local students should be given priority to register for courses at Kwantlen but many employees perceived this not to be the case. Employees believed consistency is lacking between policy and practice.

- Employees were concerned that degree programs receive too much emphasis and this may be a perception of unfairness by those in non degree programs.

- Results related to decision-making were of concern: employees believe problem employees are not dealt with promptly, consequences for poor performance are not clear, technology is adopted before its impact is considered, planning at Kwantlen does not consider the long-term impact of decisions and employees are not clear on how decisions are made. All these survey results indicate a justice concern in relation to information regarding the decision-making process.

It is difficult to have all employees perceive practices to be fair because the judgement about fairness is not only based on the outcome of an action and control of the process used but also on the treatment of the person during the act and the information communicated about the process and the decision.
When the "First Nations" group is concerned that there are not enough First
Nations employees, they are concerned about justice. Kwantlen has "equity policies" and
equity language in provincial and local collective agreements. Affirmative action
policies are designed to promote justice. For example, if a First Nation's person and a
Caucasian person applied for a position at Kwantlen and the education and experience of
both were similar, then the First Nation's person should be hired if First Nations are
under represented at Kwantlen. As well, collective agreements are ways of ensuring
justice for unionized workers. They contain rules for wages, employment equity and
harassment language, benefits and job security, for example. Despite collective
agreements and equity policies, there are concerns about justice.

Organizational justice is a complex concept. Not only is fairness influenced by
relationships and communication processes, but it is also influenced by trust. Fairness
evaluations are based on employee's trust in those who make the decisions (Elovainio et
al., 2001). This is one relationship between justice and trust.

Trust

Trust is central to the functioning of any organization because it affects an
organization's ability to develop and sustain relationships with stakeholders (Fryer &
Lovas, 1990). These relationships impact both communication and organizational justice
(Greenberg 1990). Brockner and Siegel (1996) state trust is about belief in the future
action of another (p. 401). "Trust occurs in relationships when we have a positive
expectation about another person's or group's actions and intentions toward us in risky
situations" (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000, p. 528). When individuals decide if a person
is trustworthy they recall information about the other. One piece of information that may
be recalled by the other is decision-making procedures. If current or past decisions are fair, then it is reasonable to believe future decisions will be fair (Brockner & Siegel, 1996). Dirks and Ferrin (2002) state that the trustworthiness of an authority is influenced by the fairness of the authority’s decisions or practices. In a meta-analysis informational justice was correlated with trust (.43) (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Trust occurs as a result of interactions and relationships with another and so do justice and communication. Trust is a complex, dynamic multifaceted process based on communication processes and interpretative behaviors (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis & Winograd, 2000). Mishra (1996) included four dimensions of trust: openness and honesty, concern for employees, reliability, competence. Shockley-Zalabek et al. added a fifth dimension “identification” (Shockley-Zalabak et al., 2000). Shockley-Zalabek et al. (2000) explain trust in individuals and trust in organizations.

Individual trust refers to expectations about individual relationships and behaviors. Organizational trust refers to expectations individuals have about networks of organizational relationships and behaviors. As such, individuals in organizations simultaneously form perceptions of both individual and organizational trust. In this current work, organizational trust is viewed as positive expectations individuals have about the intent and behaviors of multiple organizational members based on organizational roles, relationships, experiences and interdependencies. Trust in an organization can be experienced differentially by employees with different networks and experiences (p. 37).

Although individuals may be completely trustworthy, trust of groups is not necessarily based on individual interactions but interpreted through multiple networks of relationships and events (Shockley-Zalabek et al., 2000). The decision to trust is not purely based on positive expectations. “Individuals seldom respond to such situations purely as they are given, instead they respond in terms of how they subjectively interpret or construe those situations” (Kramer, Brewer & Hanna, 1996, p. 365). If the individuals
identify with the member that may be providing information that is doubtful, they may disregard that information and still trust the group to keep the group intact (Kramer et al., 1996). In addition, if individuals have a social bond with the community, they identify with others and have increased trust because "trust behavior in situations requiring collective action is tied to the salience and strength of their identification with an organization and its members" (Kramer, Brewer & Hanna, 1996, p. 358). Trust is important in establishing relationships and relationships are linked to well-being.

One aspect of trust is reliability or congruence between policy and practice. An institution's mission and policies reflect the values of the institution's leadership and provide direction to the employees in terms of behavior. Policies are important because they help make practices more consistent with the mission and values of the institution. The survey item responses were compared to the values and policies of the institution to delineate if practices were consistent with espoused values and policies (Appendix H).

Some policies that address issues that may contribute to well-being were reviewed in Chapter Two. Two practices that may not be consistent with Kwantlen's historically strong community roots are making decisions based on financial considerations and not giving local students priority to register for courses. As a college, its mandate is to provide access and opportunities to all students in Kwantlen's catchment area. Some employees interpret this to mean to serve those who are underprivileged or challenged. In the past, students who attended Kwantlen were primarily those who did not meet the admissions requirements for the two local universities, those who could not afford the higher university tuition and those who may have never completed high school. Kwantlen campuses were smaller as were its departments. With the change of status
from college to university college, local students are increasingly seeing the institution as a post secondary institution of choice. Because Kwantlen has developed several degree programs in the last few years, some employees believe these are being developed at the expense of other program offerings. On the other hand, more students who may have attended the local universities in the past are registering because of the degree programs. As well, in recent years programs for high-risk individuals have been eliminated and now tuition fees are comparable to other universities in the province. As the local communities that Kwantlen serves have grown, the administration has been challenged to expand Kwantlen’s capacity with decreasing net government funds. Programs such as Early Childhood Education (ECE) and Institutional Based Training (IBT) were eliminated. As well, enrollments in Horticulture and Applied Business Technology (ABT) were reduced. Due to the net decrease in the college budget, the administration also introduced tuition for Adult Basic Education (ABE) that previously was free. The Kwantlen Faculty Association indicated there was a gender bias in the elimination of programs because it affected mainly female employees.

Through trust comes a feeling that others care for me which affects my sense of well-being. Kwantlen has the value “Respect and Trust” which states, “Trust is the foundation for effective and lasting relationships.” For an organization to function well the administration needs to trust the unions and the unions need to trust each other as well as the administration. As reported in Chapter Five, most employees do not trust the organization and its processes. Employees were skeptical that the results of the survey would influence decisions made by management and the “First Nations” group was the most skeptical. In fact, when I was conducting the social audit, I was told by a few
people (unsolicited) that nothing ever changes; no one listens to the workers, they (management) ask for input, but only do what they want. Many of the unionized workers do not trust management. In November 2001, the External Evaluation team agreed with the employee relations working group's recommendation that an employee relations committee be created to deal with recommendations made by the working group. These recommendations included setting goals and objectives and completing an in-depth analysis of employee relations defined as the relationship of the employees with the institution and includes those policies, procedures and practices that have been developed and implemented to manage and support employees (Standing Committee on Evaluation and Accountability, 2001). With several memos from the unions to the administration, this committee was finally established. It met twice (April 30/03 & May 20/03) did not come to any agreements on goals and objectives and has become dormant. It is incidents such as this that have contributed to the skepticism and lack of trust in management by unionized workers.

Within the BCGEU Staff there was doubt that the union would act in the best interests of its members. This belief may be of concern to the BCGEU executive who has the responsibility to act on behalf of its members. The low trust within the union may be due to political tensions created by members competing for executive positions within the BCGEU. There may also be concerns of competence and reliability because the BCGEU members have been without a contract for almost three years.

"Where there is trust people will give each other the benefit of the doubt" and focus on the issues (Fryer, & Lovas, 1990, p. 115). Lack of trust may lead to interpersonal conflicts and negatively affect well-being. Trust is central for employee
well-being and the operations of the organization. Trust is fostered by transparent decision-making and practice that is consistent with expressed values and policies.

Trust affects an organization's ability to develop and sustain relationships (Gillis, 2001). It is affected by communication. According to the International Association of Business Communicator (IABC) Trust Model, trust is measured by the following five factors:

- **Competence.** How competent is the organization? Is the organization effective - will it survive and be able to compete? Signs of competence include adaptation to technology and confidence in the organization's leaders as perceived by factors such as intelligence; clarity of thinking; communication skills; and problem solving, crisis management and decision-making.

- **Openness/Honesty.** Openness and honesty are characterized not by the information itself, but (the perception of) how it is delivered, referent power, practiced self-awareness and social deftness.

- **Concern.** Self-interest on the part of the organization is balanced with others' interest. Concern is demonstrated through experience and perceived sincerity, caring and empathy, reliability and congruency between words and actions.

- **Identification.** This is the common ground of shared goals, values, norms and beliefs. Identification results from communication behaviors and interpretive processes, much of which is culturally rooted in organizations and society.

- **Reliability.** Being reliable is defined as having "consistent and dependable actions. (Gillis, 2001).

This model is consistent with the work of Shockley-Zalabek et al. (2000). Gilles (2001) and Shockley-Zalabek et al. (2000) agree that trust does not occur in isolation but is a result of communication behaviors. Trust and communication, I believe are not a one-way relationship, but a two-way relationship because communication would also be difficult without trust. When a person is giving information, the receiver has to be reasonably certain that the information is accurate and true in order to make meaning. Since there are concerns around trust, the Senior Leadership Team may want to find ways to improve trust in the organization. The trust model identifies factors that can increase
trust and this may be useful for leaders at Kwantlen to consider. The trust model indicates that open and honest communication can increase trust. It is important to remember that trust is increased if people have affiliation with the group so relationships are also important in building trust.

Communication

Effective communication is essential in the operation of complex organizations. The flow of information is critical to an open system (Scott, 2003, p. 93). The ability to communicate effectively is one of the most important attributes of all employees but especially those in leadership positions because it is the leadership who perceives and interprets information from the environment (Lant, 2002). Organizational communication is defined by Stohl (1995) as the collective and interactive process of generating and interpreting messages (p. 4) and according to Adler, Rosenfeld and Towne, (1995) all behavior has the potential to communicate. Interpersonal communication can be formal or informal, intentional or unintentional, is pervasive and unavoidable and has both a relational and content dimension that is influenced by the attributes of the person and the social context (Adler et al., 1995). Communication affects personal health, identity needs and practical needs (Adler et al., 1995). Communication is needed for forming social relationships and social relationships are linked to health. Given the complexities of communication, it is easy to understand how multiple interpretations of messages occur.

Communication interactions, both formal and informal, may support joint problem solving, coordination, social bonding and social learning -- all of which are essential for the kind of collaboration required in complex organizations. Informal
communication generally occurs through face-to-face interactions but increasingly it is occurring through e-mail. In face-to-face communication, parties have the opportunity to use visual clues to check understandings while in e-mails there are no secondary clues to assess understanding so the opportunity for misinterpretation is increased.

The social audit survey data indicates that communication is an issue at Kwantlen even though Kwantlen has some values that relate to teamwork, openness and timely communication. At the time the survey was done, the organization was dealing with operational budget deficits and “on again--off again” responses from government to fund a replacement campus for Newton. Initially, Kwantlen was informed that funding would not be provided from government to build a replacement campus. The Senior Leadership Team made plans to relocate the Newton programs to the Surrey and Langley campuses and expand the Surrey campus to deal with the space requirements. Almost at the same time as this plan was communicated to the internal community, the Minister of Advanced Education announced that money would be given to Kwantlen to build a replacement campus. Before Kwantlen’s President was able to communicate the new plans of the Minister, the local papers had printed the news. This may contribute to employees’ feelings around communication, trust and long term planning and that they are the “last to know” what is going on. In Spring 2002, the provincial government passed Bill 28, which stated, “Despite any other Act or a collective agreement, an institution has the right to:

1. Establish class size, the number of students enrolled in a class and the total number of students assigned to a faculty member in a semester, term, or academic year.

2. Assign faculty to courses that use distributed learning and distance education.
3. Determine the institution’s hours of operation and the number and duration of its terms or semesters.

4. Schedule professional development and vacation time.

5. Provide instructional support to faculty. (Government of British Columbia, 2002)

Following this legislative change, the President of Kwantlen sent out e-mail to inform all employees of the legislation. He stated the above five elements had been removed from collective agreements. Included in the same memo was that Kwantlen is facing budget shortfalls and could possibly use this new legislation to increase class sizes. Many employees understood this memo to be an announcement to the Kwantlen community that class size increases would be inevitable. This confusion was so great that the KFA (faculty union) had to have meetings for the membership to provide their understanding of the administration’s e-mail. Also, the President sent multiple follow up e-mails to clarify his previous e-mail. He reiterated the legislative changes in the second e-mail but also stated that the administration would not suddenly impose increased class sizes without consultations with employees. This example demonstrates how miscommunication sometimes occurs at Kwantlen and the affect it has on employees. While the memo did not state that class sizes would increase, employees interpreted the memo this way. Leaders need to select their words carefully when communicating with employees to avoid multiple interpretations and confusion. Group meetings may also be more effective than e-mail for major announcements because they provide an opportunity for immediate clarification. All employees need to address communication processes to ensure there is transparency and inclusion in decision-making. Accurate information needs to be provided in a timely manner and in an open friendly tone.
Communication is closely related to trust. Trust is key to communication because it is necessary if people are to be open about what has gone wrong and accurate about what is right (Shaw, 1997) and to believe that the information being communicated is accurate. Communication would be difficult without trust because lack of trust would lead to many interpretations. Accurate information is also important to organizational justice because if the information communicated is not accurate, it is difficult to assess organizational justice because perceptions of fairness are based, in part, on accurate information and relationships. As well, "participation in decision-making" and "social support" are part of the Determinants of Health Framework and both of these require communication.

Stress

Job stress is a world wide epidemic because it affects over 50% of the work force in industrialized countries (WHO, 1999). Stress costs 16 billion dollars in lost productivity to organizations annually in Canada (Chrysalis Performance Strategies Inc., 2001). Over the last decade, ongoing change, mergers and organizational downsizing have resulted in employees who are working harder, less able to balance work and home and more insecure about their future.

Stress is an adaptive response to a situation that is perceived as threatening to the person's well-being (Rice, 2000). When people interpret a situation as threatening, it can lead to physical and psychological reactions such as increased heart beat, respirations, blood pressure, insomnia, ulcers, depression and burnout. Employees who experience stress increase their risk of health problems (Kiecolt-Glaser & Glaser, 1995).

According to the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework, stress can result from environmental conditions that place a physical or emotional demand on the
person that exceeds the person’s resources to deal with the demand (Polanyi et al., 1998). Stressors, the causes of stress, include the following sources: “imbalance between tasks and lack of resources to complete the tasks, low support from co-workers and supervisors, lack of benefits, low income, job insecurity, lack of control (Statistics Canada, 2001) and increased demand of electronic communication (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000, p. 133). Stress can result when individuals are not sure how their colleagues will react to their decisions and actions, when there is uncertainty or lack of control and when there is interpersonal conflict (McShane, & Von Glinow, 2000, p. 138; Polanyi et al. 1998, Rice, 2000). As discussed earlier, ways that employees react to decisions may be based on their interpersonal relations with the person and their perception of fairness or justice, trust and communication. As well, stress can affect trust, communication and perceptions of fairness because stress can affect a person’s ability to interact with the environment. Stress is a response to the environment and an area of concern for employees at Kwantlen.

Kwantlen employees believe overall stress and workload have increased due to the expansion of program offerings and declining resources, but most believe they have the ability to handle the stress. They are able to balance their personal and work life. Most employees do not have personal stress resulting from primary responsibility for child and eldercare. Fifty percent (50%) of university faculty and 40% of college staff will be eligible for retirement in the next ten years (Statistics Canada, 2000) which may result in the hiring of younger employees in which case childcare may become more of a concern. It is currently a concern for about one quarter of Kwantlen’s employees.
Physical stress appears to be a concern for Faculty who do not have ergonomic workstations. Over the last several years, employees have become aware of the impact of ergonomics on health. Ergonomics is about the task to be done, the equipment used and environmental design. “Ergonomics seeks to reduce overload, through simplicity rather than complexity, in equipment and information design (directions for equipment use) and through provisions of aids to workers” (Rodgers, 2000, p. 529). Administration has focused on making some employee workstations ergonomic but has not yet focused on the Faculty because their workstations vary from laboratories, classrooms, reality environments and offices.

When workload increases or employees work overtime, stress may increase. When employees are off sick or absent, the employees left behind are not provided additional support. In some of the areas such as accounting, someone is always on vacation so employees left behind work short-handed. As well, workload increases until new workers become proficient at their new jobs.

At Kwantlen, employees did not believe their orientation was useful. New employees may feel increased stress due to not having the knowledge required to function in their positions. As well, it may increase the stress on more senior employees while they answer questions of new employees while still performing all the duties of their own position.

Each organization or group of employees has its own comfort zone with respect to pace and amount of work and rate of change (Jansen, 1996, p. 286). Kwantlen employees state they are able to adjust to the rate of change. What keeps the employees’ stress manageable at Kwantlen may be the strong sense of community, sense of
belonging and support from their fellow colleagues and supervisors. To continue to keep 
this strong social support, it may be important to consider the fact that there are four 
campuses, it can take 90 minutes of driving time between campuses and varying 
schedules of employees make it difficult to get together with others on different 
campuses. Social support can mitigate the effects of stress and I believe that is one of the 
reasons the employees do not feel stressed even though their workload has increased. 
The other reason that employees may have manageable stress is control of their 
employment situation because most employees are clear of the job responsibilities and 
are given responsibility to make decisions directly related to their jobs.

The employees did state that their stress and workload had increased. They may 
not be aware of the impact it is having on their well-being because the effects may be 
gradual and thus go unnoticed. Employees may need to perform a stress assessment to 
obtain an understanding of the impact of stress on their well-being because they may not 
be aware of some early stress symptoms such as irritability, cold chills, grimaces and 
twitches.

Summary

Stress, communication, trust and organizational justice all impact the person's 
health or well-being (Adler et al., 1995; Elovaainio, Kivimäki, & Hikama, 2001; 
McShane, & Von Glinow, 2000; Rice, 2000; Tepper, 2001). Issues in any of these areas 
can create a work environment that does not support employees to function at the 
optimum level. Although some of the issues at Kwantlen are related to the physical 
facilities, most of the issues originate in the social environment. The factors trust, 
communication, stress and workload, and organizational justice all contribute to the
social environment. They are some of the factors that form the mesh of the determinants of health. Therefore, organizational justice needs to be added to the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework. As well, the data indicated that congruence between organizational policies and values, and practice is important in trust and thus should be included in the framework.

The goal of the study was to identify policies and practices that influence well-being in order to improve the work environment for employees. Through a health promotion lens, one way to improve health or well-being is through empowerment. "Empowerment is the term used to describe processes through which internal feelings of powerlessness (helplessness/hopelessness) are transformed and actions initiated to change the physical and social conditions that create or reinforce inequalities in power" (Labonte, 1993.) Empowerment does not occur in isolation. It is not something that you can do to others and it is not purely from within. It is an intentional effort to create more equitable resources and relationships. That is why the concept of organizational justice was added to the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework. That is why a stakeholder approach was used for the study. It was the employees who identified which policies and practices they felt impacted their well-being. Now the results will be available to all employees so that they may choose to take actions to improve their work environment. Employees may choose to work on improving communication, trust, organizational justice and monitoring workload so the stress levels do not exceed employee capacity.
The next chapter summarizes the study and makes specific recommendations to ensure that Kwantlen’s environment helps employees’ function at their optimum level of well-being.
CHAPTER SEVEN
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this research was to study the effects of the environment, especially the work environment, on the employee’s health. In particular, three questions were answered through this study:

1. What environmental factors do employees of Kwantlen University College identify as having an impact on their well-being?
2. What impact do employees believe these identified factors have on their well-being?
3. What implications do these beliefs have for policies and procedures at Kwantlen University College?

In this chapter, I provide a summary of the study and make recommendations.

Summary

Through 11 focus groups and one interview, employees of Kwantlen identified environmental factors, both internal and external to the organization that they perceive as affecting their well-being. There was one interview with the President of Kwantlen and there were 11 focus groups with the other categories of employees including:

- The Senior Leadership Team.
- Middle Managers (Dean, Director, Manager).
- Excluded Staff (employees who are not administrators and who are not unionized workers).
- Faculty (four groups, one on each campus).
- BCGEU Staff (four groups, one on each campus).

The interview and the focus groups were conducted on one of the four campuses. The focus groups were lead by a facilitator, the researcher. Each session was about 1 1/2 to 2
hours in length. The groups were asked a series of questions to identify policies and practices that they believed impact their well-being. The discussions were transcribed and themes were organized and categorized into the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework created by Polanyi et al. (1998). These factors were organized by the level of determinant: external/societal, organizational structure and environment, task requirements and individual lifestyle.

Using themes identified by the focus groups, survey items were developed and piloted. The social audit consisted of 95 items based on the themes identified by the focus groups plus several demographic questions. The 95 items were statements that required a response on a Likert scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” As well, a “not applicable” column was added after the social audit survey was pilot tested. Employees were sent e-mail and asked to access a website to complete the social audit. As well, paper copies were made available on each of the four campuses of Kwantlen. The social audit survey was administered in the fall of 2002.

Four hundred and fifty (450) respondents for a response rate of 39% completed the social audit. The respondents could only be compared to four employee variables because the institution only makes information available on these variables. The respondents varied by employee group (Administration, Faculty and Staff), campus (Surrey, Richmond, Langley, Newton), employee age and gender. They were not proportionally representative of the employee population on most variables but there were enough respondents from each employee category to provide breadth of responses.

A social audit informs the institution about what is occurring at that particular time. An important finding is that employees consider Kwantlen a good place to work. Kwantlen
employees have a sense of autonomy and control in relation to their work environment. Kwantlen employees have a feeling of belonging and being cared for which comes from its history as a small community college. Employees feel they have social support, which has allowed them to remain in good health and balance their professional and home life even though there have been many changes at Kwantlen that have lead to increased workload and stress. Stress may result in low levels of well-being if it continues. Two ways of reducing stress are increased social supports and increased physical activity. The employees feel they cannot fit exercise into their daily routines and have difficulty getting together across campuses.

The biggest change facing employees has been the transition from a college to a university college that has resulted in expansion of program offerings. As well, the net decrease in government funding and an increased demand for post secondary programs in the region and a decrepit and aging Newton campus has challenged the institution.

The lobbying efforts of stakeholders have resulted in a commitment from government for funds to replace the Newton campus over the next several years. Some of the ways administration has chosen to deal with decreased funding is by focusing on fundraising through its foundation, tuition from international students and elimination of some services and programs. Due to the pace of change, decision-making has not always been transparent and has resulted in employees feeling there is a lack of communication and trust. As well, some employees have felt that greater emphasis is being placed on the university and not the college. Some employees felt international students are being given preference over other students in registering in some courses. Since services and some program offerings were
eliminated, some employees believe that decisions at Kwantlen are based more on financial criteria than educational criteria.

Along with expansion came new employees. The new employees stated, in focus groups, that they were shown their desks and where the washrooms were but had not received useful orientations. As well, the creation of two associate dean positions around the time several programs were eliminated has led employees to question the wisdom of adding more managers. Most employees are unionized and covered by collective agreements that try to ensure just treatment. Those employees who are not unionized have contracts that have similar benefits to those included in collective agreements. Generally employees feel there is equity in wages and benefits with two exceptions: many employees have worked overtime without compensation and some feel that the bereavement leave benefit is not adequate. In addition, there is concern that those who do not perform well are not dealt with appropriately and those who give more to the institution than required are not rewarded appropriately. As well, First Nations question the use of the equity policy in hiring practices. Another inequity noted by employees is the availability and quality of services or facilities at various campuses. The Newton campus, as well as being old warehouses, no longer has an admissions office, library or cafeteria. Surrey is the only campus that has a gym, showers and Wellness Centre. Also, the Richmond campus is overcrowded and the Langley cafeteria seems to have the best food although there is concern about lack of healthy food choices.

Kwantlen has been through many changes that have increased stress on its employees. Kwantlen employees strongly believe Kwantlen is a good place to work but agree there is room for improvement. In Chapter Six, the concepts of organizational justice, trust, communication and stress were discussed to understand the complexities of function in an
organization. There are no easy solutions to improving the work environment because each employee is unique and comes with their own history that is a part of the context of the environment.

In the final section of this chapter, I present a wide range of recommendations that I believe flow from the results of the social audit and, if implemented, will improve Kwantlen as a workplace. However, the literature on social auditing discussed the importance of directly involving stakeholders in developing recommendations and setting priorities for action. The recommendations I make below are meant to both draw the thesis to a close and to open up a conversation at Kwantlen about next steps. It is possible that with the active involvement of stakeholders, a somewhat different set of recommendations may emerge.

The recommendations presented in this chapter are my best effort to reflect the voices of Kwantlen employees as “heard” through the social audit process. In each case, I have identified the specific person or group to which the recommendation is addressed.

**Recommendations**

Most of the recommendations that follow concern policies and procedures at Kwantlen, but some are also directed to others who may wish to conduct a social audit in their own institution, yet others are directed towards theorists and researchers.

*For the Board of Governors*

The Board of Governors is responsible for approving the strategic plan and broad policies that guide the institution. It has an important role to play in communicating the mission and values of Kwantlen to all stakeholders, including employees.
Recommended Actions

1) That the Board adds to Kwantlen’s “Values Statement” the value “employee well-being.” This action will demonstrate to all Kwantlen’s stakeholders that the institution places a high value on and is committed to helping employees’ function at their optimum level of well-being or health.

2) That the Board reviews the results of the social audit and implements strategies to increase organizational justice. This may include open board meetings, which allow all stakeholders to present their ideas, providing rationales for controversial decisions and allowing open access to all policy-related materials. These actions will demonstrate to stakeholders that the Board intends to make its practices consistent with its written policies.

3) That the Board establishes a process that communicates all information to internal stakeholders prior to its release to external stakeholders. This action will signal to the internal stakeholders that they are valued members thereby leading to an increased sense of trust.

4) That the Board embeds the process of social auditing into the institution’s evaluation processes. Social audits should be done periodically so responses can be compared over time. This would indicate to employees that the Board is concerned about their work environment and values their input. This may increase the trust in the organization.

5) That the Board establishes a committee to deal with the changing identity of Kwantlen to decrease tensions between employees with commitments to either the degree-granting (university) or non-degree-granting (college) programs. This
would indicate to employees that the Board is concerned about the work environment and stress.

For the Senior Leadership Team

The Senior Leadership Team is responsible for establishing policies for the operations of the institution. Written policy does not always reflect practice. Some policies overlap with collective agreements so some of the recommendations are for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and some are for the SLT to work with other stakeholders including the unions.

Recommended Actions

1) That the SLT ensures decisions are consistent with policy. There is a perception that practice is not consistent with policy. This action will allow the SLT to show concern, which increases trust and organizational justice.

2) That the SLT establishes a process for budget decisions that is inclusive of all stakeholder views. If the SLT consults different stakeholder groups and explains the process, it will increase organizational justice and communication and demonstrate transparency in decision-making that may lead to increased trust.

3) That the SLT forms joint committees with interested stakeholders (unions) to establish performance standards and rewards (This needs to be negotiated in collective bargaining). There is a perception that there is inequity. Setting standards for performance and rewarding employees in meaningful ways should result in a more consistent and equitable process that may increase trust.

4) That the SLT forms a committee of all interested stakeholders to review the physical environment including on-site facilities with the goal of creating a plan
to improve the work environment. Employees are concerned about the work environment and this will indicate concern for the employees that can increase trust, communication and organizational justice and decrease stress.

5) That the SLT works with stakeholders to review practices in relation to wages and working conditions when the contracts are renegotiated. This action will show employees the SLT is serious about dealing with employee issues and may increase trust and organizational justice.

6) That the SLT works with the Wellness Centre staff to administer a stress self-assessment. This action will allow employees to accurately assess the components of their stress and consider actions to lower their stress levels.

Many employees were skeptical that any actions would result from their feedback through the social audit. Actions by the SLT would demonstrate that the results of the audit were carefully considered.

*For the Union Leadership*

The union leadership has the responsibility of negotiating agreements; interpreting contracts and ensuring practices are consistent with contracts and labour laws. They need to ensure their members are aware of their rights and responsibilities. The union leadership is elected to represent the interests of the union members and to deal with labour relations. Much of the union work deals with organizational justice issues.

*Recommended Actions*

1) That the unions work with administration to create performance standards and rewards for their members’ positions (This needs to be negotiated in collective
bargaining). The employees believe there is inequity in performance and rewards. This action will demonstrate a desire to create more equity in this process.

2) That the unions work with administration to improve working conditions. For example, establish processes for allowing greater flexibility for employees' work. Many employees stated their stress and workload has increased. They also stated they could not exercise on work time. One way of handling stress is by increasing control. This action may provide greater control in relation to work hours, time of breaks, etc.

3) That the unions use the results of the survey to inform the negotiating process. Several items on the survey reflect topics covered by collective agreements such as wages, benefits and working conditions. Using the employees' perceptions of their work environment will increase trust between the union and the employees for many are skeptical that the social audit survey results will produce meaningful action.

For the Kwantlen Faculty Association

The Kwantlen Faculty Association (KFA) is the union that represents all faculty members, librarians, counselors, coordinators, program chairs and convenors. The KFA was established to:

- Protect the welfare, professional interests and working conditions of its members.
- Assist in protecting and enhancing the freedom and quality of teaching, thought and enquiry within the University College.
- Cooperate with other bodies whose interests are similar, in particular with provincial, national and international federations and faculty associations of colleges, university colleges and universities.
• Deal with other matters considered to be in the interests of the Associations or its members.

• Regulate labour relations between the Kwantlen University College Board and members of the Association. (Kwantlen Faculty Association, 2003).

Recommended Actions

1) That the KFA identifies specifics in relation to lack of sufficient workspace and work with and on members’ behalf to meet the need. About 40% of the members indicated a lack of sufficient workspace. Action by the KFA to address this issue will demonstrate concern for members working conditions and this should contribute to increased trust in the union by its members.

2) That the KFA identify what other resources members feel they need to better perform work related duties and work with members and on their behalf to meet the need. Some faculty members believe they do not have adequate resources to meet their job responsibilities. Action by the union will demonstrate concern to identify ways to improve working conditions and may lead to decreased stress and increased equity and trust in the union by its members.

For the British Columbia Government Employees Union

The British Columbia Government Employees Union (BCGEU) is a diverse union that represents over 60,000 workers. The Kwantlen local represents all the unionized workers at Kwantlen except those who are members of the KFA. The BCGEU was established to:

• To unite all employees in the Province of British Columbia, both in the public and private sector, in a democratic organization capable of acting on their behalf.
• To obtain for all such employees who become members of the Union the best possible standards of compensation and other conditions of employment and working life.

• To act as the representative of the employees of the Government of British Columbia and other employers, for the purposes of negotiating with those employers, the general welfare of the employees and conditions of their employment.

• To promote and further the interests of the members and of working people everywhere, directly or indirectly, through social, cultural, economic, financial and educational activities.

• Have locals of the union affiliate with labour councils where such labour councils are established. (BCGEU, 2000).

**Recommended Actions**

1) That the BCGEU, Kwantlen local, examine issues related to communication with members. This action will uncover the communication issues and allow the union an opportunity to establish appropriate processes to deal with this issue.

2) That the BCGEU, Kwantlen local, make decision-making more transparent. This action will allow interested members access to information and lead to increased trust and communication.

3) The BCGEU, Kwantlen local, together with the Vice President of Human Resources reassesses the process used for reclassification. This action will acknowledge that the reclassification process did not result in equity and lead to ideas on solving this issue for Staff and thereby increase trust in the union and administration.

**For the Social Auditing Process at Kwantlen**

Social auditing is one way of assessing how well an institution is doing in relation to the quality of the work environment for employees. It helps the organization engage
with its stakeholders to understand their perspective on the policies and practices of the organization. This social audit process helped reveal policies and practices at Kwantlen University College that influence employee well-being. It would be advantageous for Kwantlen’s administration to incorporate the social audit process into the strategic planning process at Kwantlen. The social audit will provide a more complete assessment of Kwantlen’s work environment from which may follow actions to be included the strategic plan. As well, a periodic evaluation will allow Kwantlen to compare the work environment over time.

**Recommended Actions**

1) That the employees be provided an opportunity to establish benchmarks for items included in the social audit. This action will allow the employees to be involved in decision-making.

2) That a process for including items from all stakeholder groups (i.e. board members, contract service workers, students) needs to be defined. This action will allow all stakeholder groups to be included.

3) That a method for receiving feedback and communicating results of the social audit needs to be established. Communication and decision-making are identified as issues. Planning inclusive processes will lead to increased communication.

4) A social audit needs to be conducted periodically to coincide with the strategic planning process. Aligning the social audit process with an existing process will be less costly and may not be seen as another evaluation that infringes on employee time.
For Those who Theorize about Well-being.

It is generally accepted that the work environment affects well-being. Therefore, this study sought to understand the factors in the workplace environment and their impact on well-being. Many themes such as fairness in outcome, fairness in process (consistency of decisions), the way employees are treated during the decision-making process and how decisions are communicated were identified as having an impact on sense of well-being. These themes together represent the concept of justice (both organizational and social). In an organization, decisions are made on a routine basis. This routine process contributes to employee’s perceptions of justice and in turn their sense of well-being. Therefore, those who theorize about well-being and about factors that contribute to well-being should incorporate the concept of justice into their theories and frameworks to avoid leaving out what seems to be an important factor in employee well-being.

For Further Research

This study drew from the socioenvironmental framework of health which states well-being is affected by the environment at work and home. It is important to assess the factors at work that impact well-being because healthy employees can contribute to work and society. Following are suggestions for further research based on my experience with this particular form of social auditing.

1) That further research is needed to better understand the contributions of each determinant of health in the Determinants of Health in the Workplace Framework in order to prioritize actions. It is not understood if each determinant contributes equally to well-being are if some determinants contribute more than others.
2) Further research is needed to understand if flexibility and social support, which mitigate effects of stress, are correlated with employee absenteeism and use of employee assistance programs at Kwantlen.

**Concluding Remarks**

Agreement to be used as a research site for a social audit requires courage from the leadership of an institution; it is a sign of positive, progressive and confident leadership. Asking questions opens the institution to a negative evaluation. Many organizations and stakeholders are acknowledging that “social performance” is an important component of overall organizational assessment and accountability. The act of initiating a social audit that focuses on employee well-being may increase employee awareness, increase understanding of the process of social auditing and increase employee and employer commitment to well-being.

This study focused on using the process of social auditing to identify policies and practices that employees believed have an impact on their well-being at one university college. The process highlighted the resources that are required to do a complete and thorough audit and how maintaining support for the process can be challenging. It may be easy to obtain support initially. Resistance can be encountered when specific questions are formulated which may reveal negative practices. It is important to keep the process highly collaborative and not allow political interests of one group to drive the process. It is also important to do this evaluation process on a regular cycle that coincides with the strategic planning process of the organization. The social audit should be done every two to three years so the social performance of the organization can be
compared over time to assess if actions aimed at improving social performance are successful.

Contribution to Higher Education Scholarship

This study has demonstrated one application of social auditing. Although the study was "local" and looked at Kwantlen at a single point in time, it is my hope that this work may be useful to others in similar situations. Other institutions may use parts of the social audit process to collect information particular to their institution to improve "social" aspects of institutional performance. As the workforce ages, it is going to be important to find ways to retain current employees and attract new employees. If an organization does not provide some kind of social assessment, an important opportunity will be missed to identify ways to improve the workplace for both current and future employees.
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APPENDIX C: Facilitator Script

Opening preamble

Before we begin, I want to thank you all for coming here. We appreciate your taking time to come and talk with us today. We understand that your perceptions are a private matter and want to reassure you that what you tell us today will be kept confidential. We will use the information to design a questionnaire. No one’s name or other identifying information will be reported. We would like for you to respect the privacy of each other and do not discuss names or other identifying information outside of this room today. By respecting confidentiality and privacy and by speaking openly, each of you will be contributing to the contents of the questionnaire that will be given to all the employees at Kwantlen. Will everyone agree to this?

I want to remind you why we have asked all of you to come here today. Basically I want us to identify the environmental factors including policies and practices of Kwantlen University College you believe impact your well-being.

I will explain what I mean by some of the terms. By policy and practice I mean anything that happens or does not happen in the organization that you believe impacts your work-life and well-being. By well-being I mean anything that impacts your health. It may be physical, social, spiritual, mental and emotional. So I mean health in the broadest since.

I want to hear from everyone about your experiences at Kwantlen. There is no right or wrong—I simply want to understand what you believe to be the policies and practices that impact your well-being from your point of view. Our discussion today will be recorded because we don’t want to lose any information that you give us. Is this ok with everyone? ------ I will be taking notes and the tape is on.

1] Please introduce yourself. State name, what you job is and how long you have been at Kwantlen?

2] Tell me what policies and practices affect your well-being, both positive and negative?

3] What at Kwantlen, helps or hinders your ability?

4] What at Kwantlen impacts your well-being?

5] How do you feel about the work that you do?

6] How do you feel about the wages and benefits?

7] How do feel about communication?

8] How do you feel about the way Kwantlen is organized, the structure?
9] Are there any safety issues for you: physical or emotional?
10] Are you concerned about workload?
11] Do you experience stress?
12] Do you feel you are treated fairly?
13] Do you feel you are provided with adequate training to deal with changes in the workplace?
14] Do you have any personal demands that affect your work-life and well-being?

The above questions are only to be used if the group is quiet and does not dialogue.
Appendix D: Focus Group Report

External/Societal

The external factors that the employees identified as affecting their well-being were government legislation, particularly Bill 22 and Bill 28, funding and technology. Bill 22 was discussed in terms of the changes that have occurred at Kwantlen since it became a university college and Bill 28 was discussed in terms of potential workload increases. Funding was another factor that was mentioned, specifically the impact of operating grants from government that do not cover operational expenditures.

Government Legislation

There was much discussion of changes resulting from provincial legislation, particularly Bill 28 and its possible impact on the work environment. There was some fear that class sizes might increase and working conditions may worsen. Also mentioned were the changes that had occurred in the last few years resulting from Kwantlen becoming a university college. It was acknowledged by all employees that a great deal of effort has gone into degree development. While degree offerings were seen as positive for students, there was anxiety expressed by faculty teaching in the non-degree programs. They feared that their programs would receive less support due to the future emphasis on degrees.

"There has been lots of changes but the university title has greatly affected us. The trades have become second class since we got university status."

"Due to Bill 28, our program may be cut."

"The change is too quick, especially in government. I am concerned with what is happening to women especially those with children and disabilities and those looking after their elders." (This comment was made based on funding figures from government and the decision by Kwantlen to cut the IBT programs).
Technology

There was also a lot of discussion about the use of technology. While some people stated it made their life easier, others stated that it greatly increased their workload. Also, it was mentioned that when the technology fails, there is very little support in the evenings and weekends. Some questioned the acceptance of technologies.

"There is so much change that it is sometimes overwhelming. We need to assess the technologies and see if we really need them."

"We are dealing with the Internet, we are dealing with complex systems. We are dealing with different ways of doing things, entrepreneurial, things are happening here."

"Learning new things and technology and staying in the loop are very hard on top of regular work. Trying to balance workload and learning."

Funding

The freeze on government funding for the next 3 years has resulted in tension because decisions have been made to cut certain programs. One group expressed real concern about the decision to cut the institutional based training [IBT] programs.

"They (administration) put the message out that the Ministry made the decision but they did. Why didn’t they just say that? IBT and English as a second language (ESL) students were cut. I expected them to have more of a commitment."

"So having had IBT cut in the budget (provincial) yesterday it was unfortunate, it’s been a really good place to implement a program like that (This person’s position was deleted)."

Organizational Structure and Environment

All groups discussed organizational structure and environment. The conversation covered: growth and direction of the organization, terms of employment, structures, safety, physical environment and on-site facilities.
Growth and Direction of Organization

Most groups attributed the changes in the organization to growth. Concern was also expressed about the general direction of the organization, perceived as operating more like a business than as a government organization, focused on finances and efficiency. As well, others were concerned about the increasing focus on the university mandate as opposed to the community college mandate.

“Our President is now a CEO. If we are to operate like a business then we should be Kwantlen Inc. or act like a university college.”

“The educational institution is planning around bean counting rather than what is best for the community.”

“I am worried about the vision of the college. We have become a university college and I don’t know what it means and where we are going with that. We seem to be forgetting about the community.”

“There’s just a lot more programs being offered, a larger campus, more employees, employees with different backgrounds different perspectives.”

Terms of Employment

Most of the time in the focus groups was spent on terms of employment. Most employees started by saying they liked work because most were long-term employees. They were generally satisfied with the terms of employment. The main themes discussed were: wages and benefits, flexibility, evaluations, orientation, student success and a lack of support services on weekends and evenings. The mission and values, as well as policies including harassment, equity and access were discussed in terms of inconsistent applications. One person discussed lack of confidentiality and one group discussed shift work. Regarding the access policy, concern was expressed about having inadequate resources for ensuring success for diverse students, as well as having most courses being
offered during daytime hours. One group was concerned about not getting employment contracts “till the last minute or after course started.”

Wages and benefits. Most groups discussed wages and benefits and most people were generally satisfied. Two groups believed Faculty and Administration were paid under market value and four groups spent a great deal of time discussing the inappropriate job classification of BCGEU employees. There was some concern about having to pay for eye exams since this service was deleted from the Medical Services Plan by the provincial government. Some stated there needs to be better dental coverage while others believed bereavement leave to be too short. Some groups stated that the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), in general, is not effective. Some groups felt there is support for the person on disability, but not for colleagues expected to cover for the person’s absence. In some areas of the college there is no replacement for employees on leave so those left behind are required to work harder. Two groups commented that Faculty and Administration are paid under market value and there is very limited upward mobility.

“Generally good, need better dental and now will need to get eye exam coverage.”

“Bereavement leave not long enough when dealing with immediate family.”

“Faculty and Administration are paid under market.”

“No upward mobility, I am maxed out.”

“For instance all the people that were left around me last year they have to do a lot of extra work to cover and was there any support for them, I think all the support goes to the negative person not that I’m saying sick leave is negative.”

Flexibility. All groups brought up flexibility or lack of it. Some groups agreed there was flexibility and others thought there was not. One group made a remark that the
collective agreements restrict flexibility. Those who could either work from home or change their hours of work believed the flexibility was great.

“...[Flexibility is] very restricted by collective agreements.”

“Some of our programs are not flexible.”

“It’s great to be able to work at home.”

“I have the flexibility to start at nine and if children are sick I can just go home. This is a real positive working here.”

*Shift work.* Shift work was discussed by those who start early before 0900 and those who work past 1700. These individuals stated that they could not get the children ready or be home to make dinner or help with children’s activities. The issue of physical safety, walking alone at night was also brought up in relation to shift work.

“I find working till 5:30 a stress. I have kids to tutor, dinner to make and I want to be home in the light.”

“The back parking lot is pitch black when we come out at 9 pm.”

*Evaluation.* Most groups discussed evaluation and agreed that it is done inconsistently. Some stated that individuals who never see them perform their jobs evaluate them. Many agreed that problem employees are not dealt with. In some areas evaluation is seen as punishment and not a process for growth. Many were resentful of the fact that there are no consequences for poor performance and that others are left to pick up the pieces. Others felt there was no recognition for their work. The groups that discussed evaluation spent a good portion of time discussing this issue.

“We don’t have a process. There is some stuff written down. There are 3 different forms and none are congruent with the collective agreement.”

“What are the evaluation standards? There is no consistency.”

“If an employee is incompetent, no one will say it and the person is there forever.
There is no minimum that people must do.”

“I had someone working in my division that is harassing other people and is hurting other people’s feelings and making their lives miserable for years. There has to be a point when we have to have the power to say this is wrong.”

**Orientation.** Five groups discussed orientation and all agreed it was inadequate.

New people are not told about the processes or the resource people. As well, employees agreed that in-services are not regularly offered about changes in their areas.

“As a new person I have been given no orientation. I don’t know who to call for what; I can’t even get my e-mail set up. There is no orientation book.”

“If employees change positions, then they are not oriented in terms of process. Need someone who goes around and shows everyone how to do things and what is new.”

“In orientation we were told just pick up the phone and call and I know someone who did that, they got raked over the coals.”

“When someone gets here they hit the ground running. You get told where the washroom is and that’s it.”

**Mission, values, policies.** Kwantlen’s mission and values and the institutional policies that deal with: equity, harassment and access were discussed by about half of the groups. Comments were made that the institution does not practice its mission and that the equity and harassment policies aren’t followed. In terms of access, there was some tension. The open access policy was seen as positive but it was concluded that the resources are not in place to deal with diverse students. One group felt that international students get preference over local students.

1) Mission

“There should be a thread back to the mission statement.”

“We have our lifelong learning mission but it is learning not just students but for employees. We need to practice what we preach.”

“We have to emphasize that these are the values we live by.”
2) Equity and Fairness

"Treated fairly in union position but not in current job."

"Even on search, I found it wasn’t a democratic process, the dean knew who he wanted to hire and we were rubber stamping. Now I don’t sit on the committees."

"Some faculty negotiate their own contracts with deans, unfair."

3) Human Rights

"I have seen their eyes roll and make fun of people’s names and I wonder what they say about me behind by back."

"Grievances of BCGEU against BCGEU. Faculty against Faculty."

"Slanderous remarks against management, we have no recourse."

"The harassment policy is a stressful process. It should be completely investigated by an outside person."

4) Access

"A physically challenged student was placed in my laboratory, but no support was given to help him succeed. He was in physical danger."

"Inclusion is good, but we need to look at resources."

5) International Students

"International students get priority over our own for English. It isn’t right, we need a policy."

**Student success.** All four-Faculty groups discussed student success. The Faculty stated they get stressed from marking or when students are in jeopardy of failing.

"There are practices that stop the flow or success of students, I feel shitty then."

"When students feel awful, I feel awful."

**Support services.** Most groups discussed the support services. There was concern that the hours of operation do not meet the needs of the Faculty and Staff. It was also
mentioned two campuses had no female counselors. The specific services discussed were: cafeteria, library, counseling, admissions and technology support.

"I am trying to teach the Web and so forth, but I can't get IET to turn on the Web in the classroom to teach the students."

"They don't have support in the evening for computers."

"My class starts at 4 pm and sometimes the cafeteria closes at 2 or 2:30."

**Decision-making Structures, Approach to Health and Safety**

Most groups talked about and support for the decision as well as the process of decision-making itself. Most individuals felt supported in their decisions where others thought there were too many steps to get anything approved. Some individuals stated that their dean being on a different campus hinders the decision-making process. Some individuals questioned the process of decision-making, stating that the Education Council just "rubber stamps" subcommittee reports. Others felt that management consults too long and does not take decisive action, while some felt that input was ignored and never considered, others felt decisions were made without consideration of their long-term impact and without consulting those directly affected. Some people stated that they do not know how decisions are made. A couple of focus groups stated that the organizational structure should be reviewed and a consistent decision-making process should be created. Others felt there was too much consultation.

"I feel supported in my decisions."

"Decisions made without understanding impact on the department being affected."

"Education council has too much material that it rubber stamps committee work, committees can be biased, they are not always representative because they are volunteers with an agenda."
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Another issue in relation to structure is where decisions are made. Some decisions made unilaterally and others go through a large amount of consultation. Some decisions are made and no one takes responsibility. There is no real consistency in terms of decision-making.

**Physical Environment**

Most groups discussed the physical environment and groups acknowledged that there were major structural issues with Newton campus as well as design issues on the other campuses. There were statements around lack of office and classroom spaces, ease of mobility for the physically challenged and safety factors.

**Multi-campus.** In terms of the physical environment, all focus groups mentioned that being multi-campus was an issue. They discussed the physical differences between the different campuses. Some groups thought that Surrey campus had an advantage because it was the only campus with a gym, a Wellness Center and a courtyard, while one group thought Surrey campus was a disadvantage because most of Administration is located there. Many negatives were attributed to the fact that Kwantlen has multi-campuses, from communication to increased workload to the lack of a supervisor on-site to the lack of sense of community.

“Difficulty getting department together for a meeting”. (This is in relation to the multi-campus as well as timetabling).

“If teaching on two campuses or more it is more work, on paper it looks the same.”

“Can’t always walk over and talk to someone, it is voice-mail, e-mail and days to hear back.”

“Culture different on each culture and people don’t see themselves as part of the department.”

**Structure and space.** There was general agreement that the Newton campus had structural problems evidenced by the presence of buckets to catch rain and moldy carpets. Other comments about the limitations of Newton campus were that it is not designed for
physically challenged individuals and the campus has poor ventilation and air quality and no place for socialization. Concern was also expressed regarding the decision to close the Newton library and bookstore. Two groups mentioned that the Surrey campus is dirty. Most groups agreed that the temperature in the rooms is not optimal and that there is a shortage of space, especially in terms of offices. Some groups felt that natural light is important. As well, some groups stated that they felt isolated and disconnected.

Ventilation also came up as an issue on a different campus in relation to laboratory work. It was also mentioned that there is a lack of office and meeting space. It was also suggested that each building should have an employee lounge. One group spent a great deal of time discussing the lack of creativity in design and the rigidity in structure and usage.

“The focus is students and learning and the campuses are not designed as places of employment. Look at how many Faculty get shoved into one office.”

“...Our library and bookstore are closing. Our students who are bussing, this is a real hardship for.”

“There is no safety around evacuation for this building. There is asbestos and mold.”

“Buildings are not accessible to people with disability. The doors on the different campuses are quite heavy and that the buildings were not accessible to physically challenged individuals.”

“I consider the fact that Surrey campus has no covered parking when choosing courses.”

Safety factors. There was also concern expressed about the high rate of car theft on Surrey campus. Other groups expressed concerns about safety when working in the evenings and weekends due to the design of the buildings. A couple of groups expressed concern regarding the increase in angry students and parents. There was also discussion
about the food differences on each campus with some groups identifying a lack of healthy food choices and a lack of showers.

“There is no Faculty lunchroom or sink or shower to get cleaned up. We are in a dirty greasy area; no change room or shower and I will go to meetings all dirty and greasy. There is no place to hang dirty clothes.”

“We are seeing more and more violent students and third parties (parents).”

“Students complain about the cars being broken into.”

“There are no healthy food choices for a vegetarian.”

On-site Facilities

The five groups that discussed facilities thought it was wonderful that Kwantlen had a gym and fitness centre as well as a Wellness Centre, but there was concern that it was only on one campus. There was also discussion around Kwantlen closing its daycares at the Langley and Richmond campuses but no one in the groups was affected.

“The gym and showers are excellent” (at Surrey campus).

“I am concerned with what is happening to women especially those with children....”

“We have just closed two daycares.”

Task Requirements

All groups discussed some aspect of task requirements. Statements were made about physical and psychosocial demands.

Physical and Psychosocial Demands

There was vigorous discussion by all groups in relation to physical and psychosocial demands. The topics covered were: ergonomics diffuse boundaries between work and personal life, workload, social support, autonomy and control, community and sense of belonging, communication and trust. A few groups also talked about respect and expressed a need for respect.
Ergonomics. Half the groups talked about ergonomics. Generally the Administration groups stated their workstations were set up ergonomically, while most of the other groups had mixed responses.

“Need better chairs for amount of time on computers, shouldn’t need doctor’s note.”

“Need better workstations, don’t even know who to call.”

“I don’t think that anything else can help my backache that I don’t have, human is not made for sitting all day.”

“If you voice it as a concern you can have your workstation adjusted.”

Diffuse boundaries. There was a lot of discussion in just over half of the groups about psychosocial demands and blurring of boundaries between work demands and non-work demands.

“When both worlds fall apart, you are stressed otherwise you can escape to the other for support.”

“Manager has stress at home and that is affecting her ability to deal with the problem employee. She has social issues at home to deal with. Everyone has problems at home that carries into the work place.”

“We work hard and lose boundaries of what is reasonable in that job. We need to tell people not to work so hard and put in 60 hours a week.”

“We take on a lot and work weekends and then we grumble. In a program area with the same students for 2-3 years you develop a life with them. You spend a lot of time counseling.”

Workload. Half the groups discussed workload. Of these, all stated that the work has increased over the years. Some felt that it is a result of growth and others felt it is from degree development. The employees felt stressed as a result of too much work or negative interactions with others. Faculty stated their most negative aspect of work is failing students.
"We can never finish work there is always residue from the day before. Sometimes we stay late and finish things to feel like something accomplished."

"Workload has increased over the last 10 years, there has been a steady climb since its beginnings. We didn’t recognize that with growth would be more students and employees."

"People can set me off, interactions. Some days I will let a call go to voice-mail when I know it is a certain person that is going to set me off and make it a bad day."

"I wish I didn’t have to evaluate students and give them the bad news. I had a crying student."

**Social support.** The themes that emerged were in relation to support from employees and supervisor. Every group discussed social support or interpersonal relations. There were mixed responses. Some employees felt very supported by their colleagues and supervisors and others did not. Some of the lack of social support is attributed to the size of Kwantlen.

"We also have a culture that is very supportive to you. If you are going through any emotional crisis we are oriented towards wellness."

"Some faculty talk to you if you were nothing because you don’t have a piece of paper."

"Some people are dysfunctional and they create triangles at work. It is using one or two people causing havoc in the program area."

"There are some conflicts in our departments. Some faculty go beyond and others don’t do much, just their work."

"What has really gotten me upset over the years are conversations of people around me. Often people say racist things."

**Autonomy and control.** There was also discussion around control and autonomy by most groups. Some individuals felt that they had a great deal of control and others stated that they did not.

"As Faculty we shut the door and do whatever in the classroom."

"Our work situation is created by Deans and we can’t do anything about it."
"I have full control over the physical environment but not the workload and the people."

"It's great not to have a supervisor breathing down my neck."

Community, sense of belonging. There was discussion around a sense of belonging and community by every group and all groups identified it as an issue for the Kwantlen community. Some groups felt they had a feeling of belongingness in their department or on their site but not to the other campuses. The number of campuses, the size of the institution, the design of buildings and a lack of physical space were cited as sources for these feelings.

“When the college first started, we were a very social group. We were much smaller. Now it is not the same. We are much less social. We had association dances. Now we are larger. When I retire, I will miss the people. Now we never get together. We don’t even take lunch. Sometimes I try to go for coffee.”

“If we had a staff lounge in each building it would really help. There is no place to socialize. I don’t walk over to the building with the staff lounge.”

“The other campuses don’t feel as connected (as Surrey) for they don’t hear as much.”

“Need socials, we don’t even know everyone in our department never mind other campuses.”

Communication. Most groups discussed communication. Most agreed that communication could be improved between all the employees. There were comments around the process as well.

“To me there is lack of consultation with stakeholders, lack of knowledge, lack of proper effective communication.”

“Our notice board doesn’t work, “Connections” is a marketing tool and it should be used to inform us.”

“Talking with people is the best way to communicate. Need opportunity to hear and respond. People can voice their concerns without threat. You need to regularize informal communication.”
"Communication is an issue for management as well as union."

"Sometimes incidents happened at campus and I read about it in the local paper before I read about it on campus, especially when it's something exciting."

**Trust.** Most groups discussed the issue of trust. Some felt they could trust their colleagues and others felt they could not. Trust was also mentioned in relation to immediate supervisors.

"We are having peer issues. There are problems with instructors, technicians and work managers and that is affecting the quality of education. There is no trust."

"We can't trust the decisions of management. I used to, but now I don't. I have had my knuckles wrapped."

"(You) need to trust people around you to deal with issues."

"I remember when years ago, the President used to come to the shop and chat. We felt comfortable and we had an issue, the President will say yes or no right away. We had trust. Now we don't see the Senior Leadership Team. The roles have changed."

**Individual Lifestyle**

All groups discussed individual lifestyle. The groups did not mention basic characteristics such as age, gender and educational status but instructed me to obtain these from their personnel files, but I was unable to obtain information from files because I did not have written consent, only verbal consent. All groups identified social support and most groups mentioned non-work demands and resources in terms of coping skills.

**Basic Characteristics**

Several groups mentioned different chronic illnesses, which they believe, are prevalent in the employee population. Back pain, repetitive strain injury, cancer, diabetes and depression were mentioned. As well it was felt that menopause would be a concern because of the large number of female employees.
"I have a bad neck and back because I sit a lot in front of the computer. I would like to see a massage therapist on campus."

"There are a lot of people living with chronic illnesses, cancer, diabetes, depression, repetitive strain injury."

"Post menopause should be a good topic for the Wellness Centre."

Non-work Demands

The three non-work demands that recurred were child and eldercare and family issues. Care issues were discussed in relation to flexibility as well as policy. Some individuals felt very supported by their immediate supervisor when they needed to bring their children to work because of unforeseen circumstances and others just had to phone in sick or use their personal time. Some employees mentioned the amount of time that is sometimes spent on the phone dealing with family issues.

"Need to acknowledge the fact that Faculty are parents and that children sometimes need to come to class."

"When my kids were young, I got up at 4 AM to do preparation so I could be at home in the evening with my kids."

"[I] needed stress leave to deal with parent’s illness. My mother calls me quite often at work."

"I can’t fall asleep due to personal stress. My dad is ill and I am stressed. I have brought my dog to work with me.

Personal Resources

The two personal resources mentioned by all the groups were social supports and coping skills.

Social supports. Most groups identified co-workers and family as social supports. Several groups stated they were able to cope as long as at least one place, work or home, was not in crisis. While many employees felt they had support at work some groups felt
that their work environment was not supportive. Some stated that they lacked trust in other colleagues and management.

_Coping skills._ Exercise, humor, thinking positively, being flexible and socializing was identified as coping skills.

“Key for me has been exercise, running on lunch hours or going to the gym and we have showers. I make an appointment with myself to go running and I am more productive in the afternoon.”

“I try not to see negatives as negatives.”

“Also a sense of humor helps. Reasonable social chit chats. “

“Wellness center is doing some stress reduction and the programs in the gym are good for stress. Gym should be free for employees.”
### Part One
**Beliefs about Factors Related to Employee Well-being**

**Instructions:** The following statements are about working at Kwantlen. Please circle the response that best represents your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kwantlen is a good place to work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel a sense of belonging in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have primary responsibility for childcare.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can learn the new technology during work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am in good physical health.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I find it easy to keep my personal life and my work life separate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kwantlen operates more like a corporation than a public institution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employees are provided with many opportunities to get together socially.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I support Kwantlen's open access policy that allows every type of student admission.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My workload has increased over the last year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am able to adjust to the pace of change at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My pay is comparable to that of others in similar positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel like I am a part of the Kwantlen community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The benefits plan meets my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The hours of operation of the support areas (cafeteria, library, counseling, admissions) meet student &amp; employee needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am given the opportunity to provide input to decisions that affect my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I find fellow employees are caring, respectful and trustworthy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When an employee is off work, the remaining employees are given additional support to deal with the workload.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When I perform well, I am rewarded in ways that are meaningful to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I have flexible work arrangements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel emotionally isolated at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Shift work interferes with my personal life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My input influences decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Any change or news about Kwantlen is communicated to the internal community before it is communicated to the external community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. There is clear communication between the union and myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The person responsible for my evaluation has first hand knowledge of my performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My work environment is harassment free.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The practices at Kwantlen are aimed at helping students be successful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The needs of local students take priority over the needs of international students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Problem employees are dealt with promptly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I have a clear understanding of my work related responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Degree programs receive too much emphasis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am provided assistance to improve my performance, when necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I can recognize everyone in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The practices at Kwantlen reflect diverse cultural values.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. My work environment is free from racial discrimination.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Overall, there is clear communication between the institution and its employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Overall, there is balance between the number of managers and other employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I feel supported when I enroll in further education for career advancement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I have opportunities to include exercise in my workday.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I can speak openly without fear of retribution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I am secure in my position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. There is a policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I have primary responsibility for care of an adult family member.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. There are policies at Kwantlen to help diverse students be successful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. There is appropriate IET (instruction and educational technology) support for my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I am treated fairly at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I am clear on how decisions are made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Planning at Kwantlen considers the long-term consequences of decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. There are clear consequences for poor performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Interpersonal relationships (outside work) cause stress in my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. My department’s hiring practices are fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I experience an increasing frequency of negative interactions at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. There is clear communication between management and myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. The appropriate person evaluates me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. I am satisfied with the bereavement leave benefit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. There are a variety of healthy food choices in the cafeteria.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I trust the union to consider the best interests of the union members in its decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. My workload is reasonable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. I am given the responsibility to make decisions in my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. I have sufficient space to do my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. I use daily “social chit chat” to cope with stress at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. The process by which I am evaluated is clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. My department has the appropriate mix of regular and non-regular [auxiliary] employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. I have the resources to carry out my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. I feel physically isolated at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. I worked overtime last year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. I was compensated for the overtime worked last year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. I work in a comfortable physical environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. There is clear communication between the union and its members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Technology has increased the quality of my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. My campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. The orientation, to my work related duties, was very useful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. My work related stress has increased in the last year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. I am able to access the resources of the Wellness Centre.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Poor student performance increases my workload.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. I am satisfied with the responses of my manager/dean/supervisor to issues related to my personal life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Everyone in my work area gets along well with one another.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. I am satisfied with the employee assistance program benefit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Technology is adopted before its impact is assessed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. There are opportunities for promotion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. I am satisfied with the dental coverage benefit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. There is comfortable space for employees to get together for social events and meetings on my campus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. I am affected by a chronic health condition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. I am in excellent mental health.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. My pay reflects the responsibilities of my position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. I am in excellent spiritual health.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Financial resources drive decisions at Kwantlen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. I am confident this survey will influence decisions by management.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acknowledgement: Some of the questions are taken directly or adapted from the social audit done at North Island University College as a part of Dr. Jennifer Holden’s doctoral thesis. Written permission was obtained from Dr. Holden, Human Resources Director at North Island College and developer of the questions.
Thank-you for completing part A. If you think there are policies and practices that have not been included, please list them in the space below.

Please continue and complete part two of the social audit starting on the next page.
Part II
Demographic Data

This section contains demographic questions and questions about your role at Kwantlen that will assist in the analysis of data from Part I. All responses will be treated with strict confidence. Only Dr. Tom Sork, my research supervisor and I will have access to the raw data. All data will be reported in aggregate groups to ensure confidentiality.

Please check the best response to each question.

1. At which campus do you do most of your work? □ Surrey  □ Richmond  □ Langley  □ Newton

2. What is your gender? □ Male  □ Female

3. How many years have you worked at Kwantlen? □ less than 1  □ 1-5  □ 6-10  □ 11-15  □ 16-20  □ more than 20

Part Two Demographic Data Continued.

5. What is your employment status?

☐ Faculty  ☐ Regular Fulltime Faculty
☐ Regular Part-time Faculty
☐ Non-regular Type 1 Faculty
☐ Non-regular Type 2 Faculty
☐ Other __________________

☐ BCGEU Staff  ☐ Staff Regular
☐ Staff Repeating Term
☐ Staff Posted Auxiliary >6 months
☐ Staff Posted Auxiliary < 6 months
☐ Staff On-call Auxiliary
☐ Student Assistant
☐ Other __________________

☐ Excluded Positions  ☐ Fulltime
☐ Part-time
☐ Other __________________

6. What is your employee category?
☐ Faculty

Check all formal roles in which you spend at least 25% of your time.

☐ Instructor
☐ Coordinator
☐ Advisor
☐ Counselor
☐ Librarian
☐ Other __________________

BCGEU Staff and Excluded Staff, your choices are on the next page.
Part Two Demographic Data Continued. Question 6 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCGEU staff</th>
<th>Instructional support</th>
<th>Secretarial support</th>
<th>Supervisor/ Administrative assistant</th>
<th>Clerk typist</th>
<th>Library staff</th>
<th>Bookstore clerk</th>
<th>Admissions &amp; records assistants</th>
<th>Program assistant</th>
<th>Materials management support</th>
<th>Continuing education support</th>
<th>Facility support generalist</th>
<th>Financial Awards assistant</th>
<th>Information, Education &amp; Technology</th>
<th>Other ______________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excluded staff</th>
<th>Senior Leadership Team</th>
<th>Dean or Associate Dean</th>
<th>Director or Manager</th>
<th>Administrative Support</th>
<th>Other ______________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. What is your highest level of education completed?

- Less than high school
- High school graduation
- Trade certificate or diploma
- Non-university certificate or diploma (obtained at a college, university college or technical institute)
- University certificate or diploma less than a bachelor's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Post graduate certificate or diploma
- Master's degree
- Doctorate degree
- Other ______________________
Part Two Demographic Data Continued

8. Many Kwantlen employees consider themselves to be Canadian. In order to understand the diversity of the employee population, we are asking about your ancestry. What is your ethnic origin? Check all that apply.

☐ English  
☐ Canadian  
☐ Scottish  
☐ German  
☐ Irish  
☐ Chinese  
☐ Ukrainian  
☐ Dutch  
☐ French  
☐ Italian  
☐ Norwegian  
☐ Korean  
☐ South Asian (East Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Tamil, Sri Lankan, Bengali)  
☐ Polish  
☐ Filipino  
☐ Swedish  
☐ First Nations  
☐ Other____________________

9. Do you consider yourself to be member of a minority group?

☐ Yes  
☐ No

If yes, please specify__________________________________________

Thank you for the time you have devoted to completing this questionnaire.
Please return the questionnaire and Social Audit Feedback form to Balbir Gurm, Nursing Faculty, Surrey Campus via intercampus mail.
## Appendix F: Responses to Survey All Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in good mental health</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen is a good place to work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in good physical health</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of my work related responsibilities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am given the responsibility to make decisions in my job</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in good spiritual health</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognize everyone in my department</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of belonging in my department</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work environment is free from racial discrimination</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am treated fairly at work</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find fellow employees are caring, respectful and trustworthy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practices at Kwantlen are aimed at helping students be successful</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources to carry out my job responsibilities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support Kwantlen's open access policy that allows admission to every type of student</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to adjust to the pace of change at work</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F: Responses to Survey All Employees Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am (not) affected by a chronic health condition*</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practices at Kwantlen reflect diverse cultural values</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefits plan meets my needs</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology has increased the quality of my work</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sufficient space to do my work</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the responses of my manager/dean/supervisor to</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues related to my personal life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I am a part of the Kwantlen community</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work environment is harassment free</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) feel physically isolated at work*</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am given the opportunity to provide input to decisions that</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affect my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are policies at Kwantlen to help diverse students be</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appropriate person evaluates me</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is appropriate IET (instruction, education and technology)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(support for my job)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process by which I am evaluated is clear</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being*
## Appendix F: Responses to Survey All Employees Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree #</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Neutral #</th>
<th>Neutral %</th>
<th>Agree #</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work in a comfortable physical environment</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep my personal life and my work life separate</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel supported when I enroll in further education for career advancement</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My input influences decisions</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department's hiring practices are fair</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for care of an adult family member</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to balance my personal life and work life</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) feel emotionally isolated at work'</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the dental coverage benefit</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn the new technology during work</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use daily &quot;social chit chat&quot; to cope with stress at work</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am secure in my position</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload is reasonable</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the employee assistance program benefit</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone in my work area gets along well with one another</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relationships (outside work) (do not) cause stress in</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my life</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person responsible for my evaluation has first hand knowledge of</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my performance</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay is comparable to that of others in similar positions</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between management and myself</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay reflects the responsibilities of my position</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am provided assistance to improve my performance, when necessary</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union(s) and its members</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can speak openly without fear of retribution</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the union to consider the best interests of the union members</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in its decisions</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are provided with opportunities to get together socially</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is comfortable space for employees to get together for social</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events and meetings on my campus</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being
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### Appendix F: Responses to Survey All Employees Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree #</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Neutral #</th>
<th>Neutral %</th>
<th>Agree #</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to access the resources of the Wellness Centre</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clear communication between the union and myself</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department has the appropriate balance of regular and non-regular [auxiliary] employees</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hours of operation of the support areas (cafeteria, library, counseling, admissions) meet student and employee needs</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any change or news about Kwantlen is communicated to the internal community before it is communicated to the external community</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I perform well, I am rewarded in ways that are meaningful to me</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over all, there is clear communication between the institution and its employees</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the bereavement leave benefit</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen (does not) operate more like a corporation than a public institution</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was compensated for the overtime worked last year</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift work (does not) interfere with my personal*</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am clear on how decisions are made</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being
### Appendix F: Responses to Survey All Employees Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The orientation, to my work related duties was very useful</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning at Kwantlen considers the long-term consequences of decisions</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to include exercise in my workday</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs (do not) receive too much emphasis</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (do not) have primary responsibility for childcare</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, there is a balance between the number of managers and other employees</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have (not) experienced an increasing frequency of negative interactions at work</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When an employee is off work, the remaining employees are given additional support to deal with the workload</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a variety of healthy food choices in the cafeteria</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses were recoded so "agreement" indicates greater well-being*
### Appendix F: Responses to Survey All Employees Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work related stress has (not) increased in the last year*</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities for promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses</td>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology is (not) adopted before its impact is assessed*</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (have not) worked overtime last year*</td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student performance (does not) increase my workload*</td>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear consequences for poor performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident this survey will influence decisions by management</td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem employees are dealt with promptly</td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload has (not) increased over the last year*</td>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources (do not) drive decisions at Kwantlen</td>
<td></td>
<td>351</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being
Appendix G: Comments from Social Audit Survey

1. External/societal Sectoral, national, global (These were later reclassified under Organizational Structure and Environment since they are perceptions of responses of the internal environment)

- Not wanting to become university status only
- Want lower entrance for student marks (give placement to more students)
- Government cutback have lead to stress
- Increase in technological change
- Bill C28 (leads to increase workload)
- Financial focus instead of a student/educational focus
- Hefty increase in pay to the President (people laid off to accommodate)
- General change in the environment

2a. Organizational structure and environment/Terms of employment

- No replacement of staff when on vacation/sick (need consistency and policy)
- Reduction in job security because of cutbacks
- Little or no support or decision-making powers from management
- Too large of a pay discrepancy between instructors and instructor assist.
- No employee evaluations given by managers
- Joint Job evaluations were not fair which reflected in pay and resources
- Pay raise discrepancies and unfair practice between BCGEU and Faculty and management
- Benefits: - increase coverage for teeth cleaning
- better severance package (at least 6 mos.)
- can’t choose own EAP company
- parking fees reimbursement for Faculty when visiting students off campus
- good vacation package
- mileage rebate inequality between instructors and instructional assistants
- need more opportunities to advance own education
- Decrease job incentive (performance and advancement) due to BCGEU
- Pay disproportionately high
- Destructive and harmful way staff members are terminated
- Nepotism by management
- Loss of government funding physio and massage
- Unsuitability of mentally challenged students attending KUC
- Double booked classes at start of semester
- Want more in-house hiring instead of from the outside (give staff that is already on board to have a chance at a posted position and give chance to obtain all requirements before they are said ‘no’ to)
- Liking of the new KUC management – runs KUC as a company
- Would like exit interviews performed
- Would like job search workshops for employees
- More guidance and support from HR
- Competition for jobs among contract workers creates adverse working relations
Appendix G: Comments from Social Audit Survey Continued

2b. Organizational structure and environment / Decision-making structures

- Receive appreciation and support from managers/supervisors/dean: 8
- Statement of low morale and trust in general: 4
- Statement of little or no support of employees from manager: 4
- Statement of poor relations between Staff and Faculty: 2
- Statement of good relations between Staff and Faculty: 2
- Statement of stress felt when dealing with student appeals and the dean gets involved (instead of leaving it up to the individual instructor): 1
- Unaware of other staff knowing the policies of Kwantlen: 1
- Better communication needed between faculties & staff on other campuses: 1
- Request for management to make an occasional appearance in the classroom: 1

2c. Organizational structure and environment / Physical environment

- Dislike of shared office space (no secure place for personal articles): 1
- Lack of office space: 5
- Good space in classrooms/library, foyers: 1
- Noisy office as it is close to a copier machine: 1
- Dirty environment (floors not cleaned, vacuumed and washed), garbage not being picked up in offices and classrooms, toilets not clean, food not picked up off floors in hallways and cafeteria, unsanitary washrooms): 3
- Poor ergonomics as pertaining to computer/desk/chair: 2
- No windows in office: 1
- Heating/air conditioning not comfortable or appropriate for weather: 1
- Stuffy Air: 1

2d. Organizational structure and environment / On-site facilities

- A request for exercise facilities at the Richmond campus: 1
- A request for shower facilities at the Richmond campus: 1
- A request for healthier food in the cafeteria: 1
- Lack of covered parking at the Surrey and Langley campuses: 1
- Poor facilities and resources for students at the Newton Campus (absence of library, exercise and recreation facilities, book store, cafeteria and admissions office): 3
- Decreased availability of service areas (bookstore, cafeteria, admissions office) and request for longer hours especially on the weekends and evenings: 6
Appendix G: Comments from Social Audit Survey Continued

3. Task requirements /Physical and psychosocial demands
   - An increase in workload which is leading to increased stress (due to committee work, cutbacks, movement to a university) 12
   - Faculty not getting along with each other (feeling unsafe to say anything) 2
   - Disappointment of losing the photocopy clerk which increases workload therefore stress 3
   - Impressed with the resources and technological support 1
   - The need for better IET support 4
   - No support from co-workers (feeling of isolation) 3
   - Perception of incongruency of department funding from management 1
   - Statement of ‘love of job’ 3
   - Statement of ‘depressing work environment…can hardly wait to leave’ 1
   - Work place mobbing – education around so it won’t happen 1
   - The suggestion of installing a ‘smart card’ for instructors to use for photocopying so that it would decrease the time spent in the Learning Centre using up precious resources that students could be utilizing (time and paper) and to cut down on time wasted by the instructors 1

4a. Individual lifestyle /Basic characteristics
   - Lack of acknowledgement and support for gay staff (personal experience) 1
   - Lack of support and discrimination of females (personal experience) 1
   - Lack of support and discrimination of male (personal experience) 1
   - Statement of a chronic health condition 1

4b. Individual lifestyle /Non–work demands
   - Incidence of increase care giving responsibilities to a family member 1

4c. Individual lifestyle /Personal resources
   - Have good family support 2
   - Have good coping skills 1
Appendix H

The mission and values are part of the strategic plan. The mission of Kwantlen is “we create lifelong learning opportunities for people to achieve personal, social and career success.” The mission has embedded within it the value of creating an environment for personal, social and career success for employees and students. There are several items that align directly with the values of creating an environment for success for employees as embedded in the mission statement. The following are the items categorized under the value of caring environment.

- My campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals (82.6%).
- I have the resources to carry out my job responsibilities (65.6%).
- I am satisfied with the responses of my manager/dean/supervisor to issues related to my personal life (64.9%).
- I (do not) feel physically isolated at work* (64.8%).
- There is appropriate IET (instruction and educational technology) support for my job (64.1%).
- I work in a comfortable physical environment (63.5%).
- I feel supported when I enroll in further education for career advancement (61.8%).
- I (do not) feel emotionally isolated at work* (59.3%).
- I can learn the new technology during work (57.6%).
- My workload is reasonable (56.6%).
- I have (not) experienced an increasing frequency of negative interactions at work* (54.5%).
- I am provided assistance to improve my performance, when necessary (51.6%).
- There are adequate facilities to maintain personal health standards (48.3%).
- Employees are provided with opportunities to get together socially (48.3%).
- There is comfortable space for employees to get together for social events and meetings on my campus (47.7%).
- I am able to access the resources of the Wellness Centre (47.1%).
- The hours of operation of the support areas (cafeteria, library, counseling, admissions) meet student and employee needs (44.5%).
- I have opportunities to include exercise in my workday (37.7%).
- When an employee is off work, the remaining employees are given additional support to deal with the workload (28.5%).

*Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being
• I have (not) experienced an increasing frequency of negative interactions at work* (28.8%).
• There are a variety of healthy food choices in the cafeteria (28.2%).
• The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems (27.6%).
• My work related stress has (not) increased over the last year* (26.3%).
• I have opportunities for promotion (26.4%).
• It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses (22.9%).
• There are clear consequences for poor performance (17.3%).
• Problem employees are dealt with promptly (10.4%).
• My workload has (not) increased over the last year* (10.3%).

Kwantlen's strategic plan also describes fourteen values. These values and therefore the items categorized that reflect these values overlap with the mission.

Of the fourteen values identified to carry out the mission nine values can be aligned with some of the items included in the social audit.

**Learning:** “We value learning as the core of everything we do. We value our students and colleagues and are committed to their education, learning and personal growth.”

There are two items that are related to learning.

• The practices at Kwantlen are aimed at helping students be successful (74.3%).
• There is appropriate IET (instruction and educational technology) support for my job (64.1%).

The first item impacts employees because employees stated that poor student performance increases their work. Practice appears congruent with policy. There is significant (.000) difference in response between the employee groups to the second item (Faculty 50%, Staff 76.4%, Administration 91.7%). The differences may be due to the fact that there is limited IET coverage on weekends and late evenings when Faculty members are working.

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being
Quality: "We are committed to excellence and continuous improvement in all program and service areas. We believe “quality” is measured in relation to the needs and expectations of those we serve and to established quality standards. We strive to enable students and colleagues to excel, take pride in and enjoy their work and learning."

There are several items that are related to quality and enjoyment in relation to work. These items all contribute to the work environment and, in turn, impact quality and then well-being. The responses to the twelve items related to quality, the responses range from 22.9% to 82.1%.

- It is easy to get together for meetings with others on different campuses (22.9%).
- The ergonomic features of my workstation reduce or prevent health problems (27.6%).
- There are a variety of healthy food choices in the cafeteria (28.2%).
- I have (not) experienced an increasing frequency of negative interactions at work* (28.8%).
- I feel supported when I enroll in further education for career advancement (61.8%).
- My work environment is harassment free (64.9%).
- I (do not) feel physically isolated at work* (64.8%).
- I have sufficient space to do my work (67.0%).
- Technology has increased the quality of my work (67.8%).
- Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently (74.3%).
- I have the resources to carry out my job responsibilities (71.9%).
- I am treated fairly at work (71.1%).
- My campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals (82.1%).
- Kwantlen is a good place to work (89.8%).

Responsiveness: "We value the ability to respond quickly to meet the needs of our students, colleagues, college region and society."

The value of responsiveness deals with the operations of the college and its ability to respond quickly. Three items that can be categorized under this value received responses from 65.6% to 70.9%.

- I have flexible work arrangements (68.5%).
- I am able to adjust to the pace of change at work (70.9%).

* Responses were recoded so “agreement” indicates greater well-being
• I am satisfied with the responses of my manager/dean/supervisor to issues related to my personal life (65.6%).

Diversity: "We value the diversity of individuals and cultures which comprise our communities because it enriches our lives and learning."

There are four items that are categorized under the value diversity. The responses to the items range from 64.6% to 77.0%.

• I support Kwantlen's open access policy that allows admission to every type of student (71.6%).
• The practices at Kwantlen reflect diverse cultural values (68.1%).
• There are policies at Kwantlen to help diverse students be successful (64.6%).
• My work environment is free from racial discrimination (77.0%).

Respect and Trust: "We believe mutual trust is the foundation for effective and lasting relationships. We are committed to building relationships based on honesty, integrity and competence. We demonstrate respect for all people through the development and protection of a caring and supportive environment."

There are six items that are categorized under the value respect and trust.

• I find fellow employees are caring, respectful and trustworthy (74.4%).
• I can speak openly without fear of retribution (51.0%).
• I trust the union to consider the best interests of the union members in its decisions (48.4%).
• I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions (31.5%).
• There are clear consequences for poor performance (17.3%).
• Problem employees are dealt with promptly (10.4%).

Openness and communication: "We strive to listen and understand first and then to express ourselves and to be understood. We share information widely on a timely basis within the College."

There are six items that can be categorized under the value openness and communication.

There are two responses above 50%.

• The process by which I am evaluated is clear (63.8%).
• There is clear communication between the union(s) and its members (51.6%).
• There is clear communication between the union and myself (47.0%).
• Any change or news about Kwantlen is communicated to the internal community before it is communicated to the external community (44.2%).
• Overall, there is clear communication between the institution and its employees (43.5%).
• I am clear on how decisions are made (39.8%).

For the first item, the Faculty group was positive (61.4%) but the Administration (33.3%) and BCGEU Staff (31.7%) was negative. The overall response to the second item was negative and Newton campus was negative (27.0%) but Richmond campus was positive (58.3%). Newton campus may be negative because in the past year there has been lots of information on Newton’s relocation in the local papers. Also for the last item, the responses of Newton and Langley campuses are more than 10% lower.

Teamwork: “We are one team, with a common mission. We are interdependent for our individual and collective success. We believe more can be accomplished through collaboration and co-operation than competition.”

The value of teamwork is about working together and seeing each other as part of a larger whole. Five items can be categorized into this value.

• I can recognize everyone in my department (80.8%).
• I feel a sense of belonging in my department (80.4%).
• I feel like I am a part of the Kwantlen community (65.1).
• I use daily "social chit chat" to cope with stress at work (56.7%).
• Everyone in my work area gets along well with one another (54.2%).

Participative: “We are committed to participative and consultative processes which involve the people affected by decisions and which are considerate of individual and group roles and responsibilities. We value accurate information as a basis for decision-making throughout the College.”

The value of participative is about using accurate information to make decisions and involving employees. There are four items that can be categorized into the value of participative decision-making.

• I am given the opportunity to provide input to decisions that affect my work (64.6%).
• My input influences decisions (61.6%).
Planning at Kwantlen considers the long-term consequences of decisions (38.2%).
I am confident this survey will influence decisions by management (15.0).

Kwantlen policy numbers are used here so that readers may access policies on-line (http://www.kwantlen.ca/policies/) and read them in entirety. The policies are presented in the order that they appear on the website. Only those policies for which data was available through the social audit are listed.

**Policy 1.2 The People:** Kwantlen University College exists primarily to serve and respond to the needs of the local community but is open to individuals from both the national and international community as well. There is one item directly related to this.

- “The needs of local students take priority over the needs of international students” (25.9%). Although the overall agree response is low the Administration’s agree response is higher (Administration 50%, Faculty 29.3%, BCGEU Staff 18.7%).

**Policy 1.4 The Cost:** Kwantlen University College is committed to the provision of quality learning opportunities that result in outcomes that are considered by governments, individuals and communities to be cost effective and economically justifiable.

There is one item directly related to cost “Financial resources drive decisions at Kwantlen” (79.8%). This can be said to be consistent with Kwantlen’s policy around cost. Employees believe that financial cost drives decisions, not that cost is merely considered. This was my understanding of the comments made in focus groups. There appears to be a general trend in society to be efficient and this policy is consistent with this trend.

**Policy 1.6 Cultural:** Kwantlen University College promotes a positive view on cultural diversity and is committed to prepare graduates suited for employment and success in a multicultural world with global perspectives. To achieve this aim, Kwantlen endeavours to develop cultural competency within its community with desirable characteristics in
1. policies:
   o to take into consideration cultural implications in all policy and value statements, principles and guidelines

2. attitude:
   o to encourage continual self-assessment on understanding of cultural diversity;
   o to foster recognition, appreciation and acceptance of diverse cultures found within Kwantlen and Canada;
   o and to develop and promote intercultural activities and programs.

3. structure:
   o to provide and promote equal opportunities in student enrolment, employment and advancement for employees;
   o to promote full and equitable participation in Kwantlen's affairs by all members of its community; and
   o to constantly review and monitor procedures for complaints and appeals dealing with racial discrimination.

4. practice:
   o to encourage culturally inclusive curriculum in individual programs;
   o to develop cross-cultural information and reference resources;
   o to support cultural studies and research;
   o to increase intake of aboriginal students;
   o to increase intake of international students; and
   o to promote overseas exchange programs for students and employees.

There are four items related to culture as well as demographic data on employee ethnic backgrounds.

- My work environment is free from racial discrimination (77.0).
- I support Kwantlen's open access policy that allows admission to every type of student (71.6%)
- There are policies at Kwantlen to help diverse students be successful 64.6%.
- My department's hiring practices are fair (61.2).

This policy also addresses curricula but no specific items addressed this issue.

Implementing curriculum is a complex issue that involves many players: Faculty, Staff, Administration, education council as well as availability of resources. Diverse curriculum is more readily implemented in single courses (if there is the will of the instructor), but much more difficult in programs. From my experience on Kwantlen's Committee for Diversity Inclusion and Action, I am not aware of any program at Kwantlen that has integrated multiple cultural perspectives in curricula. The program
content remains Euro centric for most if not all programs. This may not be a result of the lack of will on part of the employees but a scarcity of resources. In my own attempts to diversify courses that I teach, I am unable to locate literature from different perspectives.

**Policy C18 Admission to the College:** Kwantlen University College's primary purpose is to provide post secondary educational opportunities to the communities of Delta, Langley, Richmond, Surrey and White Rock. Canadian citizens or permanent residents (landed immigrants) are eligible for admission.

The one item that addressed this policy is “I support Kwantlen’s open access policy that allows admission to every type of student” (71.6%). Most concern is raised by Faculty members who had the lowest agreement (61.8%). As a faculty member I believe this is due to the fact that students with varying abilities increase Faculty workload. It takes more resources to teach students with mixed and lower levels of abilities than those with high academic standing. Providing opportunity for higher education to all is a goal for the colleges but may not be a personal goal for some employees. They may feel that post secondary opportunities should be limited to those with high academic standing.

**Policy C35 Cultural Diversity and Inclusiveness:** Kwantlen University College endeavors to provide a learning and working environment that is supportive of fair treatment of all members of the University College community. The basis for interaction among all members of Kwantlen is mutual respect, co-operation and understanding. Kwantlen supports and encourages policies, practices and behaviour that reinforce the dignity, self-esteem, success and productivity of its employees and students.

Every Kwantlen University College Employee has an obligation to report any information that is important to the safety and security of Kwantlen University College and/or its students and employees.

Objectives

1. To foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures within the University College and promote the evolving expressions of those cultures.
2. To promote the full and equitable participation of individuals of all origins in the continual evolution and shaping of the University College and assist them in the elimination of barriers to such participation.
3. To recognize and promote the understanding that cultural diversity is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity and that it provides a valuable resource in shaping the University College, its curriculum and its androgy.

4. To ensure that individuals of all origins receive equitable treatment and protection under University College policies and practices.

5. To ensure that people of all origins have an equal opportunity to obtain employment and advancement within the University College.

6. To ensure that people of all origins have equal opportunity to enroll in the University College, at an appropriate level.

7. To encourage people to be sensitive to and accepting of the multicultural reality of the University College.

8. To collect information to assist in the development of policies, programs and practices which are sensitive and responsive to the cultural diversity of the University College. These areas include:
   - Support for Inter-cultural Activities
   - Internationalizing the Curriculum
   - Recruitment of Students
   - Retention of Students
   - Employment Equity
   - Racial Discrimination

There are fifteen items that reflect these values.

- Kwantlen is a good place to work (89.8%).
- My work environment is free from racial discrimination (77.0%).
- I am treated fairly at work (76.1%).
- I find fellow employees are caring, respectful and trustworthy (74.4%).
- The practices at Kwantlen are aimed at helping students be successful (74.3%).
- The practices at Kwantlen reflect diverse cultural values (68.1%).
- I am satisfied with the responses of my manager/dean/supervisor to issues related to my personal life (65.6%).
- My department's hiring practices are fair (61.2%).
- When I perform well, I am rewarded in ways that are meaningful to me (43.7%).
- There is a policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me (55.2%).
- There are clear consequences for poor performance (17.3%).
- Problem employees are dealt with promptly (10.4%).
- I trust the union to consider the best interests of the union members in its decisions (48.4%).
- I trust the management to consider the best interests of employees in its decisions (31.5%).
- I am confident this survey will influence decisions by management (15.0%).
**Policy G2 Human Rights:** Kwantlen University College ("Kwantlen") affirms the right of every member of its constituencies to work and study in an environment that is free from discrimination. The University College does not condone and will not tolerate behaviour that may undermine the dignity, self-esteem and productivity of any student or employee. Kwantlen has a legal responsibility to provide an environment free of discrimination (this includes prevention, correction and action).

All members of the Kwantlen community (including employees, students, clients and contractors) are responsible for treating each other with dignity and respect. Kwantlen considers any form of discrimination of an individual involved in University College activities to be a serious violation of that individual's fundamental rights. Such a violation is a serious offence, which may be subject to a range of disciplinary measures up to and including dismissal or expulsion.

There are four items that address this policy:

- My work environment is free from racial discrimination (77.0%).
- I am treated fairly at work (76.1%).
- My department's hiring practices are fair (61.2%).
- There is a policy at Kwantlen that provides for ways to handle slanderous remarks directed at me (55.2%).

**Policy G7 Faculty Recruitment:** The K.F.A. Collective Agreement, Article 4.02, governs the search process for regular and temporary.

**Policy G18 Recruitment/Support Staff:** To meet its staffing needs the college strives to attract the best qualified candidates through the consistent application of the selection procedures outlined in this document and the BCGEU Collective Agreement.

**Policy G20 Administrative Recruitment:** To meet its staffing needs, the University College strives to attract the best qualified candidates through the consistent application of the selection procedures outlined in this document.

The above three recruitment policies all include language from the Human Rights Act and policies for Faculty and BCGEU Staff recruitment refer to the collective agreements.

1. The Human Rights Act forbids employment-related discrimination based on:

- age (19 through 64 only).
- race, colour, ancestry, place of origin.
- criminal or summary conviction offence that is unrelated to employment.
- family status.
• mental or physical disability (disability is relevant to the job only if it prevents that person.
• from effectively carrying out the essential components of the job).
• political belief.
• religion.
• sex (including pregnancy). This also covers sexual harassment.
• marital status.
• sexual orientation

All three recruitment policies describe the selection process and includes the Human Rights Act provisions that there be no discrimination in hiring processes. My department’s hiring practices are fair (61.2%) may relate to this policy. However, perceived lack of fairness may be unrelated to discrimination in the sense of the Human Rights Act. To accurately assess this policy, applicants would need to be compared to those hired and this information is not easily accessible.

Policy G7e Candidate Interview Assessment: is an attachment to the Faculty Recruitment Policy that indicates diversity of the candidate should be weighted positively in the assessment of the candidate. There is no item related to this but the demographics on the employees indicate that our employee ethnicity especially in terms of Chinese Canadians and Indo-Canadians is not reflective of the community that Kwantlen serves. This policy relates to current hiring whereas the demographics are a result of many years of hiring. Information is needed on the applicant pool to fully assess the practice.

Policy C37 Services for Students with Disabilities: Kwantlen University College recognizes its moral and legal duty to provide accommodation. The University College must remove barriers and provide opportunities to students with a disability enabling them to access University College services, programs and facilities and to be welcomed as participating members of the University College community. The University College's goal is to ensure fair and consistent treatment of all students, including students with a disability in accordance with their distinct needs and in a manner consistent with academic principles.

There are two items directly related to this policy.
• The practices at Kwantlen are aimed at helping students be successful (74.3%).
• My campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals (82.6%).

Both these items are positive over 70%. However, one may question whether able-bodied employees are the best judges of such matters since only one person with a physical disability was amongst the respondents.

Policy D3 Information and Educational Technology Resources: Information and educational technology resources are the property of the entire University College and these resources are considered as tools to be used effectively.

Objectives of access:

• students will have access to appropriate technologies on campus to meet approved course requirements;
• employees will have access to suitable technology resources in order to perform their job duties;
• employees are responsible to undertake appropriate ongoing computing skills development as required and provided by the University College;
• access to technology resources from off-campus locations will be the responsibility of the user in most cases.

The three items indirectly related are:

• Technology has enabled me to work more efficiently (74.3%).
• Technology has increased the quality of my work (67.8%).
• There is appropriate IET (information and educational technology) support for my job (64.1%).

Policy F7 Normal Operations: The University College is committed to providing reasonable opportunities to utilize University College facilities within financial, security and operational constraints. Therefore, the following directions apply to all campuses:

Hours of access will be Monday through Friday 7:30 am to 10:30 pm

NOTE: Saturday hours may vary by campus. Contact the appropriate Facilities Manager to verify.
**Exception:**

Areas which are not secured by an electronic card lock system and which contain specialized equipment and/or materials such as labs, studios, shops, library will be open only when supervised by an authorized University College employee.

There is one item related to hours of operations. "The hours of operation of the support areas (cafeteria, library, counseling, admissions) meet student and employee needs" (44.5%). At Newton campus the support areas, library and admission services have closed. As well, during summer semester, support areas are not open until 10:30 pm on weekdays. In this situation, administration has selected to balance the budget over the value of having support services available at all hours.

**Policy G8 Reclassification Requests/BCGEU Staff JOB RECLASSIFICATION:**

The Management Team will review all changes in job classification before any changes are implemented.

**RECLASSIFICATION REQUESTS**

Reclassification requests usually take the form of one of the following (per Article 30 of the B.C.G.E.U. Collective Agreement).

Focus group members stated they went through a process of documenting their responsibilities in their positions for the sole purpose of being reclassified appropriately. They felt that this process did not work well. The item "My pay reflects the responsibilities of my position" (disagree, 58.0%) and "My pay is comparable to that of others in similar positions" (disagree 52.4%) are reflective of appropriate job classification. It appears that even after the reclassification process last year, the BCGEU Staff are not happy with the results.

**Policy G.21 Employment Equity:** The term "employment equity" was first introduced in the 1984 Royal Commission report on Equality in Employment. It covers a wide range of measures to improve the employment status of designated groups: women, people with disabilities, aboriginal persons and people of visible minorities. The intent is to achieve
equality in the work place so that no person shall be denied employment opportunities or benefits for reasons unrelated to ability.

Kwantlen University College believes in and will apply, a broader definition of equity and fairness that includes the prevention of discrimination as defined by the *British Columbia Human Rights Act*.

It is an affirmative action policy for hiring those historically underrepresented in the workforce such as women, people with disabilities, aboriginals and visible minorities.

Kwantlen was not able to supply data on all these groups when it was requested. There is data for gender that is available and through the social audit I was able to collect data on people with disabilities, aboriginal and visible minorities. In terms of gender, women are generally over represented at Kwantlen (71:29). When you break this down by position, this trend continues for Faculty and BCGEU Staff. The Administration group that is non-union but who do not hold management positions are all women. The Senior Leadership Team has more positions held by men than women. With the retirement of one Vice President in the last few months and the re-organization at that level, the Senior Leadership Team consists of 2 women and 5 men. Of these 7 positions, one is held by an aboriginal and one by a visible minority (Chinese-Canadian). Using the entire social audit data, it was found that the percentages of visible minority employees at Kwantlen are well below the visible minority population present in its locality. Visible minorities represent 21.6% of British Columbia's population and 9.3% of the employees at Kwantlen. The practices for hiring administrators may not be consistent with the policy because several were hired in recent years. To be certain, information is needed about the applicant pool. The other positions are an accumulation of twenty plus years of hiring, so it is not possible to assess whether current practices are consistent with the policy given the available data.