

# UWI Mona Campus Report on Workplace Satisfaction Survey 2005

## Table of Content

	<b>Page</b>
Introduction.....	2
Executive Summary.....	2-5
Respondent Profiles.....	6-7
Survey Findings.....	8-23
<b>Addendum 1:</b> Findings by age, sex, length of service.....	24-45
<b>Addendum 2:</b> Support for Performance-Related Pay by Staff Category.....	46
<b>Addendum 3:</b> Response to Human Resources Management Division to WSS Findings.....	47-51

## INTRODUCTION

The UWI Workplace Satisfaction Survey was commissioned by the Strategic Transformation Team (STT) as an element in the transformation process. The overall objective was to get the views and opinions of the UWI staff on critical aspects of the work-place and on the position of the Mona Campus in Jamaican/external environment. (This is a first for the UWI despite some effort to undertake a survey since 1996 and despite Worker Satisfaction Surveys becoming, since the 90s, a normal instrument of self-study by universities and other institutions). **The survey instrument was designed by specialists in survey methodology on the campus in collaboration with an advisory group composed of representatives of the WIGUT, the MONATS, the UAWU and the Campus' Human Relations Department** which met between April and September 2005. The specific aim was to develop a snapshot (which would be repeated periodically, every one or two years) of staff attitudes of relevance to the transformation process and to the assumptions, agenda and recommendations guiding the work of the Strategic Transformation Team. **The instrument was administered, retrieved, data entered, analyzed and reported on by the Stone Team.**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Workplace opinions and implications for transformation

Responses were elicited from all categories of staff on the Mona Campus under six different headings, viz:

- (1) Staff self-assessment in the UWI context
- (2) Views on UWI leadership
- (3) Career development, promotion and job evaluation
- (4) Collegiality, team work and social conditions
- (5) Opinions on working conditions at UWI
- (6) Mission and future of UWI

The most positive views related to collegiality, teamwork and social conditions. Over three quarters of the staff feel that at the departmental level, colleagues “always or sometimes” work as a team, get along well with a “fair number or with most persons” and “sometimes or always” show respect from the administrative/academic/professional categories to other members of staff.

Positive opinions were also expressed in relation to the Campus leadership at both the top management and departmental levels. A significant one third of staff across all categories were either “hardly or not satisfied” with the leadership. Communication is however a major issue. **Over 40% of respondents believe that the Campus management does not or poorly communicates its vision and policies to the campus community.**

Fair to good levels of motivation and commitment to work were evident with higher levels amongst older, longer serving, male academic and administrative staff.

The most negative levels of work-place satisfaction relate to career development, promotion and job evaluation and, by implication, connected governance issues. For example, in response to the statement “Information/guidelines on what to do to be promoted are clear”, “agreement and strong agreement” came from 21.9% Administrative, 32.5% Academic, 19.7% Technical and 29.2% Services staff. The vast majority i.e. 1001 of 1407 respondents overall, and in each category, “disagreed”, “strongly disagreed” or “did not know” whether promotion guidelines are clear.

Amongst all age cohorts, all categories of length of service and both genders, the “salary package” is the least liked aspect of UWI’s working conditions whilst “employment benefits” is by far regarded as most liked about working at the UWI.

**Regarding performance-related pay/benefit, more employees express “significant support” (341 or 24.2%) than “little or no support” (244 or 17.3%). 36.2% express “some support”.**

In terms of staff opinion regarding UWI Mona’s responsiveness to Jamaica’s development needs, 39% rated the Campus response as very well or excellent, the remainder as fair or not at all. **In this regard there was a considerable gap between Administrative staff , amongst whom a significant majority (64.9%) felt Mona’s response was very good or excellent. This compared to 21.5%, 20.6% and 27.1% amongst Academic, Technical and Service staff respectively.**

Funding was regarded as the main challenge facing UWI amongst respondents with a view on this issue.

There was significant non-response to suggestions as to what the Campus might do to enhance its position. Nevertheless, amongst the main recommendations to improve the Campus’ position locally were “more flexibility in programme design to meet present needs” and “increase active links with local industry”.

Importantly, 40% (564) of staff respondents felt that by being more open to change, by being more of a team player they could assist the Mona Campus in transformation and in repositioning itself to meet the emerging challenges facing Jamaica and the region.

Well over half of respondents (58.9%) believe that the workplace satisfaction survey would have little or no impact or were not sure what the impact of the survey results would be.

## **IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSFORMATION AND REPOSITIONING**

There is a significant fit between the assessment of the Strategic Transformation Team and the Mona Campus leadership on the one hand and the Campus community on the other regarding the urgent need to transform and to reposition the Campus.

Nevertheless transformation shall have to contend with self-satisfaction and complacency which the survey results confirm remains a resilient minority tendency in our community.

Amongst the main points of agreement are:

- (i) Issues relating to Human Resource Management and the transformation of processes relating to career development, promotion, job-evaluation and compensation are the number one priority. This understanding is in keeping with recent decisions by the STT and the Campus Management. Action now being taken needs to be reviewed for its adequacy and, where appropriate, carried forward with greater effectiveness.
- (ii) Where measures are under-developed or non-existent, such as in respect of performance-related compensation, proposals need to be developed, discussed, agreed and implemented as a matter of urgency.
- (iii) Programmes and plans to more effectively respond to Jamaica's development needs are urgently required.
- (iv) Communication within the Campus community needs to be significantly improved.

Levels of commitment, motivation and self-assessment amongst members of staff provide a good foundation for accelerating the transformation drive. Conversely, delay or inaction will feed significant levels of skepticism regarding the likelihood of change.

## **SURVEY METHODOLOGY, SAMPLE SIZE, DURATION**

Having been given sufficient advance information on the Workplace Satisfaction Survey, the interviewing team attempted to administer the survey instrument in a manner which would yield the desired results of:

- Sampling the total population of the Campus
- Providing valid responses
- Completing the study in the time allotted

Because of the relatively small staff/faculty complement (approx. 2000), the sample targeted the total population. Eventually a response rate of 70% (1407) was obtained.

Interviewing began on October 18, 2005 and was completed in the first week of December. The lengthy duration of the interviewing process reflects the difficulty, explained below, in collecting the raw data from the respondents.

Respondents were assured by the interviewing team of the confidentiality of the individual responses and the general importance of the study and the data resulting to informing critical planning to meet the needs of staff and other stakeholders, and to reposition the university for continued growth.

The interviewing process was a most difficult one and the response rate reflected the tenacity, skill and vast experience of the interviewing team.

### **PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN THE INTERVIEWING PROCESS**

Factors which stood out in the interviewing and made the process difficult were:

- Faculty and staff constantly busy in a high work-pressure environment
- The baring of egos among some faculty members
- Fear that department heads would somehow get hold of and identify respondents from completed questionnaires
- Lack of physical space and privacy for interviewing, especially among administrative staff who are mostly pooled in confined spaces.

In the initial stages a large percentage of potential respondents told our interviewing team that time was limited thus the questionnaires were handed to them and a specific time given for collection. It was predictable that that method would prove to be a waste of time. In the end however interviewers were forced to utilize very unconventional interviewing methods, such as herding batches of respondents into a hall with seats, giving each a questionnaire, reading aloud the questions to them, giving them time to answer then collecting the questionnaires when the exercise was completed. In other instances, interviewers visited the nearby Mona Commons residential complex after working hours.

In the data and tables which have 'missing items' as a feature, it is to be read as an attempt by respondents who self-administered the survey instrument to deliberately hide information about themselves, such as age, sex, faculty etc. for fear that such information could be used to identify them.

## 1. Respondent Profiles

Table 1.1  
Sex, Age and Position Profiles (n= 1407)

<b>Sex</b>	Male	(430)	30.6%
	Female	(958)	68.1%
	Missing items	(19)	1.3%
<b>Total</b>			<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Age</b>	20's	(292)	20.8%
	30's	(419)	29.7%
	40's	(399)	28.4%
	50's	(208)	14.8%
	60+	(54)	3.8%
	Missing items	(36)	2.5%
<b>Total</b>			<b>100%</b>
<b>Position</b>	Administrative	(519)	36.9%
	Academic	(381)	27.1%
	Technical	(229)	16.3%
	Services	(270)	19.2%
	Missing items	(8)	0.5%
<b>Total</b>			<b>100%</b>

Table 1.2  
Sex profile of Staff Categories

<b>Administrative</b>	Male	(107)	20.6%
	Female	(405)	78.0%
	Missing items	(7)	1.4%
	Total		<b>100%</b>
<b>Academic</b>	Male	(139)	36.5%
	Female	(239)	62.7%
	Missing items	(3)	0.8%
	Total		<b>100%</b>
<b>Technical</b>	Male	(80)	34.9%
	Female	(147)	64.2%
	Missing items	(2)	0.9%
	Total		<b>100%</b>
<b>Services</b>	Male	(103)	38.1%
	Female	(164)	60.7%
	Missing items	(3)	1.2%
	Total		<b>100%</b>

Table 1.3

Number of years working at UWI and years in present post (n= 1407)

<b>Time at UWI</b> < 1 year	(109) 7.7%
1 year to 5 years	(468) 33.3%
>5 years to 14 years	(474) 33.7%
>14 years to 24 years	(231) 16.4%
> 24 years	(104) 7.4%
Missing items	(21) 1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Years in post</b> < 1	(136) 9.7%
>1 to 2	(557) 39.6%
>2 to 3	(392) 27.9%
>3 to 4	(96) 6.8%
> 4	(37) 2.6%
Missing items	(189) 13.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

## SURVEY FINDINGS

### 2. Staff Self Assessment in UWI Context

Table 2.1

Knowledge of UWI Mona, Where gained knowledge of UWI Mona, Commitment and Motivation to Work and Satisfaction with personal contribution to Campus Community

<b>Knowledge of UWI Mona</b>	
Know nothing at all	(9) 0.6%
Know very little	(195) 13.9%
Know fair amount	(854) 60.7%
Know a lot	(334) 23.7%
Missing items	(15) 1.1%
Total	100%
<b>Where gained knowledge</b>	
My colleagues	(280) 19.9%
Formal presentations	(315) 22.4%
UWI Publications	(675) 47.9%
Outside UWI	(137) 9.8%
Total	100%
<b>Commitment to work</b>	
Not Committed	(122) 8.7%
Low Commitment	(74) 5.3%
Fairly Committed	(431) 30.6%
Very Committed	(746) 53.0%
Missing items	(34) 2.4%
Total	100%
<b>Motivation to Work</b>	
Not Motivated	(20) 1.4%
Hardly Motivated	(67) 4.8%
Somewhat Motivated	(597) 42.4%
Highly Motivated	(700) 49.8%
Missing items	(23) 1.6%
Total	100%
<b>Satisfaction with contribution</b>	
Never Satisfied	(18) 1.3%
Hardly ever Satisfied	(75) 5.3%
Sometimes Satisfied	(766) 54.4%
Always Satisfied	(514) 36.5%
Missing items	(34) 2.5%
Total	100%

Table 2.2  
Motivation to work among the staff categories

	Not motivated	Hardly motivated	Somewhat motivated	Highly motivated
Administrative	0.2%	2.9%	37.2%	58.6%
Academic	1.8%	6.3%	38.6%	52.8%
Technical	3.5%	7.0%	53.7%	34.5%
Services	1.5%	4.4%	49.3%	41.9%

Table 2.3  
Satisfaction with Contribution to Campus community among the staff categories

	Not satisfied	Hardly ever satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Always satisfied
Administrative	2.1%	6.4%	54.7%	35.3%
Academic	0.5%	5.2%	58.3%	33.3%
Technical	0.4%	4.8%	52.4%	38.4%
Services	1.5%	4.1%	51.5%	41.9%

### 3. Respondents' views on UWI Leadership, Mission, Culture and Policies

Table 3.1

Satisfaction with Mona Leadership/Management, Perception of Leadership's Communication of its vision and policies, Ease in gaining access to Leadership

<b>Satisfaction with management</b>	
Not satisfied	(136) 9.7%
Hardly satisfied	(234) 16.6%
Sometimes satisfied	(742) 52.7%
Always satisfied	(227) 16.1%
Missing items	(68) 4.9%
Total	100%
<b>Perception of management's commitment of its vision and policies to campus team</b>	
Not at all	(88) 6.3%
Poorly	(496) 35.3%
Fairly well	(656) 46.6%
Very well	(100) 7.1%
Missing items	(67) 4.7%
Total	100%
<b>Ever had reason to interface with management</b>	
Yes	(477) 33.9%
No	(638) 45.3%
Missing items	(292) 20.8%
Total	100%
<b>Ease in gaining access to management</b>	
Was not successful	(262) 18.6%
Not at all easy	(329) 23.4%
Fairly easy	(226) 16.1%
Very easy	(84) 6.0%
Missing items/not applicable	(506) 35.9%
Total	100%

Table 3.2  
Satisfaction with executive management leadership among the staff categories

	Not satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Always satisfied
Administrative	2.5%	10.2%	55.3%	29.5%
Academic	12.6%	21.8%	55.6%	5.8%
Technical	16.6%	20.5%	49.3%	4.4%
Services	13.7%	18.5%	47.4%	15.2%

### Respondents' Views on UWI Mona Dept. heads/ Middle management

Table 3.3  
Satisfaction with Dept. Head, Views on how Dept. Head communicates to unit, Views on Availability of Dept Head to discuss matters

<b>Satisfied with Section Head?</b>	
Not satisfied	(96) 6.8%
Not usually satisfied	(170) 12.1%
Sometimes satisfied	(593) 42.1%
Very satisfied	(322) 22.9%
Missing items/Cant say	(226) 16.1%
Total	100%
<b>How well has Section Head communicated his/her visions to section</b>	
Not at all	(100) 7.1%
Poorly	(233) 16.6%
Fairly well	(637) 45.3%
Very well	(387) 27.5%
Missing items	(50) 3.5%
Total	100%
<b>How available is Section Head for discussions</b>	
Never	(43) 3.1%
Hardly ever available	(151) 10.7%
Sometimes available	(560) 39.8%
Always	(604) 42.9%
Missing items	(67) 3.5%
Total	100%

## Respondents' Views on Immediate Supervisor

Table 3.4

Views on the adequacy of Supervisory Guidance, Whether Constructive Feedback is given, Respondent's involvement in decision making process, perception on Supervisory recognition of work

<b>Does Supervisor provide adequate job support and guidance?</b>	
Never	(25) 1.8%
Hardly	(151) 10.7%
Sometimes	(560) 39.8%
Always	(604) 42.9%
Missing items	(67) 4.8%
Total	100%
<b>Does Supervisor provide constructive performance feedback?</b>	
Never	(84) 6.0%
Hardly	(174) 12.4%
Sometimes	(567) 40.3%
Always	(523) 37.2%
Missing items	(59) 4.1%
Total	100%
<b>How often involved in on-job decision making process?</b>	
Never	(119) 8.5%
Hardly	(241) 17.1%
Sometimes	(586) 41.6%
Always	(400) 28.4%
Missing items	(61) 4.4%
Total	100%
<b>Does Supervisor recognize and value work?</b>	
Never	(92) 6.5%
Hardly	(180) 12.8%
Sometimes	(554) 39.4%
Always	(488) 34.7%
Missing items	(93) 6.6%
Total	100%

Table 3.5

Regularity of respondents' involvement in decision making process which affects job among the staff categories

	Never involved	Hardly involved	Involved sometimes	Always involved
Administrative	9.6%	15.4%	40.8%	30.3%
Academic	4.5%	16.0%	41.2%	31.2%
Technical	8.3%	21.4%	43.7%	24.5%
Services	12.2%	18.9%	43.0%	24.1%

Table 3.6

Does supervisor recognize and value my work? (among the staff categories)

	Never	Hardly	Sometimes	Always
Administrative	10.4%	16.0%	46.1%	23.3%
Academic	2.4%	9.7%	38.1%	40.4%
Technical	4.8%	13.1%	34.9%	42.4%
Services	6.7%	11.1%	33.0%	41.9%

**11% of our respondents felt that the UWI Mona Campus was not responding to Jamaica's development needs. 43% rated the response as 'Fairly well,' 25% rated it as 'Very Well' while 14% rated it as excellent.**

Table 3.7

Views on how well UWI Mona is responding to Jamaica's development needs-- among the staff categories

	Not at all	Fairly well	Very well	Excellently
Administrative	8.3%	20.8%	36.8%	28.1%
Academic	12.3%	60.1%	17.8%	3.7%
Technical	13.5%	58.5%	17.5%	3.1%
Services	12.6%	49.3%	19.3%	7.8%

#### 4. Career Development, Promotion and Job Evaluation

The tables in this section gives the responses to the following question, *‘Using the scale of 0-4 where 0= don’t know, 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree, and 4= strongly agree, rate the following aspects of Career Development & Promotion Opportunities at the UWI Mona Campus?’*

Table 4.1  
Rating on ‘Policies regarding staff promotion are Clear’

Don’t know	(247) 17.6%
Strongly disagree	(261) 18.6%
Disagree	(489) 34.8%
Agree	(318) 22.6%
Strongly agree	(44) 3.1%
Missing items	(48) 3.3%
Total	100%

Table 4.2  
Rating on ‘Policies regarding staff promotion are clear’—among the staff categories

	Don’t know	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Administrative	6.0%	13.9%	51.3%	21.4%	3.1%
Academic	18.6%	21.5%	27.3%	27.0%	4.2%
Technical	21.0%	24.9%	27.1%	21.0%	1.4%
Services	35.2%	18.5%	20.7%	20.4%	3.3%

Table 4.3  
Rating of ‘Policies and Procedures related to Job Evaluation & Promotion are fair/just’

Don’t know	(368) 26.2%
Strongly disagree	(288) 20.5%
Disagree	(344) 24.4%
Agree	(324) 23.0%
Strongly agree	(48) 3.4%
Missing items	(35) 2.5%
Total	100%

Table 4.4

Rating of 'The quality of the instruments used for Performance Appraisal is good'

Don't know	(393) 27.9%
Strongly disagree	(254) 18.1%
Disagree	(335) 23.8%
Agree	(341) 24.2%
Strongly agree	(44) 3.1%
Missing items	(40) 2.9%
Total	100%

Table 4.5

Rating of 'Performance Appraisals are carried out in a professional and efficient manner.'

Don't know	(431) 30.6%
Strongly disagree	(202) 14.4%
Disagree	(294) 20.9%
Agree	(373) 26.5%
Strongly agree	(67) 4.8%
Missing items	(40) 2.8%
Total	100%

Table 4.6

Rating of 'The benchmark/criteria for assessing my job performance are adequate'

Don't know	(439) 31.2%
Strongly disagree	(231) 16.4%
Disagree	(293) 20.8%
Agree	(340) 24.2%
Strongly agree	(60) 4.3%
Missing items	(44) 3.1%
Total	100%

Table 4.7

Rating of 'Counseling for improving my performance are helpful'

Don't know	(509) 36.2%
Strongly disagree	(200) 14.2%
Disagree	(227) 16.1%
Agree	(344) 24.4%
Strongly agree	(78) 5.5%
Missing items	(49) 3.6%
Total	100%

Table 4.8

Rating of 'There are adequate opportunities for promotion of permanent staff'

Don't know	(395) 28.1%
Strongly disagree	(273) 19.4%
Disagree	(331) 23.5%
Agree	(289) 20.5%
Strongly agree	(73) 5.2%
Missing items	(46) 3.3%
Total	100%

Table 4.9

Rating of 'Information and guidelines on what to do to be promoted are clear'

Don't know	(330) 23.5%
Strongly disagree	(341) 24.2%
Disagree	(330) 23.5%
Agree	(310) 22.0%
Strongly agree	(54) 3.8%
Missing items	(42) 3.0%
Total	100%

Table 4.10

Rating of 'Information/guidelines on what to do to be promoted are clear' – among the staff categories

	Don't know	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Administrative	22.7%	28.5%	24.7%	17.3%	4.6%
Academic	20.7%	19.9%	25.2%	28.3%	4.2%
Technical	18.3%	27.9%	27.1%	17.5%	2.2%
Services	33.3%	19.6%	15.9%	25.9%	3.3%

Table 4.11

Rating of 'There is adequate provision for staff training and development'

Don't know	(273) 19.4%
Strongly disagree	(275) 19.5%
Disagree	(342) 24.3%
Agree	(393) 27.9%
Strongly agree	(84) 6.0%
Missing items	(40) 2.9%
Total	100%

Table 4.12  
Rating of 'The Quality of Staff Training offered is good'

Don't know	(285) 20.3%
Strongly disagree	(201) 14.3%
Disagree	(289) 20.5%
Agree	(462) 32.8%
Strongly agree	(128) 9.1
Missing items	(42) 3.0%
Total	100%

Table 4.13  
Rating of 'There is adequate opportunity for staff to work and pursue study programmes at UWI

Don't know	(246) 17.5%
Strongly disagree	(125) 8.9%
Disagree	(207) 14.7%
Agree	(561) 39.9%
Strongly agree	(230) 16.3%
Missing items	(38) 2.7%
Total	100%

Table 4.14  
Rating of 'In my department, there are adequate opportunities for staff to acquire new skills on the job'

Don't know	(209) 14.9%
Strongly disagree	(164) 11.7%
Disagree	(243) 17.3%
Agree	(537) 38.2%
Strongly agree	(219) 15.6%
Missing items	(35) 2.3%
Total	100%

## 5. Collegiality, Teamwork & Social Working conditions

Table 5.1  
Views on Teamwork in Department

We never work as a team	(97) 6.9%
We hardly work as a team	(188) 13.4%
Sometimes we work as a team	(709) 50.4%
We always work as a team	(346) 24.6%
Missing items	(67) 4.7%
Total	100%

Table 5.2  
Views on how individual differences and diversity are valued/respected in Department

Never valued/respected	(40) 2.8%
Hardly ever valued/respected	(143) 10.2%
Sometimes valued/respected	(807) 57.4%
Always valued/respected	(387) 27.5%
Missing items	(30) 2.1%
Total	100%

Table 5.3  
Views on work relationships with colleagues

I get along with no one	(17) 1.2%
Get along well with a few persons	(136) 9.7%
Get along well with a fair number of persons	(546) 38.8%
Get along well with most persons	(678) 48.2%
Missing items	(29) 2.1%
Total	100%

Table 5.4  
Views on level of respect shown by Academic/Administrative/Professional staff to other staff categories

They never show respect	(10) 0.7%
Hardly show respect	(135) 9.6%
Sometimes they show respect	(804) 57.1%
They always show respect	(421) 29.9%
Missing items	(47) 2.7%
Total	100%

Table 5.5

Views on whether there are adequate facilities on Campus for staff to socialize with co-workers

Facilities are inadequate	(324) 23.0%
They are Fairly adequate	(321) 22.8%
Facilities are adequate	(591) 42.0%
Facilities are very adequate	(112) 8.0%
Missing items	(59) 4.2%
Total	100%

Table 5.6

Views on whether there are ample opportunities for UWI staff to socialize with co-workers

No opportunities	(208) 14.8%
Opportunities occasionally arise	(639) 45.4%
Sometimes there are opportunities	(409) 29.1%
Always	(94) 6.7%
Missing items	(57) 4.0%
Total	100%

## 6. Opinion on Working Conditions at UWI

Table 6.1

What respondents most like about working at the UWI

Employment benefits	(527) 37.5%
Interaction with students	(308) 21.9%
Interaction with co-workers	(95) 6.8%
Physical environment	(87) 6.2%
Opportunity for promotion	(72) 5.1%
Other	(90) 6.4%
Missing items/cant say	(228) 16.1%
Total	100%

Table 6.2

What respondents most like about working at the UWI among the staff categories

	Employment benefits	Interaction with students	Interaction with coworkers	Physical environment	Opportunity for promotion
Administrative	6.9%	1.9%	1.2%	4.2%	2.3%
Academic	16.5%	33.9%	4.7%	6.0%	3.7%
Technical	38.4%	23.7%	13.1%	9.2%	5.2%
Services	34.4%	11.5%	15.2%	7.8%	6.7%

Table 6.3

What respondents least like about working at the UWI

Salary package	(394) 28.0%
Employment benefits	(197) 14.0%
Promotion opportunities	(180) 12.8%
Physical environment	(110) 7.8%
Student interaction	(94) 6.7%
The campus' low response to urgent needs	(78) 5.5%
Interaction with co-workers	(61) 4.3%
Lack of respect from senior staff	(33) 2.3%
Inability of campus to create challenges	(16) 1.1%
Missing items/cant say	(244) 17.5%
Total	100%

Table 6.4

Extent to which respondents support the idea of performance-related pay/benefit at UWI

Little or no support	(244) 17.3%
Some support	(509) 36.2%
Significant support	(341) 24.2%
Missing items/cant say	(313) 22.3%
Total	100%

## 7. Respondents' Opinion on the Mission and Future of UWI

Table 7.1

What respondents think should be main focus of UWI Mona's Mission &amp; Future development. (1= highest priority)

Teaching	1.8
Publication	2.9
Staff Development	3.0
Research	2.3
Income Generation	3.3
Public Service	3.6

Table 7.2

What respondents see as main challenges facing the UWI now

Funding for programmes/future development	(308) 21.9%
Global advancement/competition	(187) 13.3%
Problems of management	(96) 6.8%
Problems of staff	(73) 5.2%
Problems of students such as quality and course affordability	(66) 4.7%
Irrelevancy/loss of prestige	(27) 1.9%
Dealing with pressing internal problems	(25) 1.8%
Missing items/cant say	(625) 44.4%
Total	100%

Table 7.3

Respondents assessment of Mona Campus' policy measures/major challenges identified

Mediocre/unresponsive	(337) 24.0%
Fair attention being paid	(240) 17.1%
Too much complacency/only meetings, surveys, inaction	(148) 10.5%
UWI product is watered down	(122) 8.7%
Excellent plans are in place	(35) 2.5%
Missing items/cant say	(525) 37.3%
Total	100%

Table 7.4

Respondents main suggestions for how Mona Campus might enhance its position locally

Design programmes to meet present needs/ be flexible	(348) 24.7%
Increase active links to local industry	(207) 14.7%
Focus on staff development	(116) 8.2%
Deal with the affordability problem	(53) 3.8%
Student body consensus must be had	(53) 3.8%
More funding needed	(20) 1.4%
Missing items/cant say	(610) 43.4%
Total	100%

Table 7.5

Respondents main suggestions for how Mona Campus might enhance its position in the Caribbean

More interaction with regional bodies needed	(319) 22.7%
Campus needs to be more market driven	(267) 19.0%
Jamaica needs to create economic atmosphere to retain graduates	(61) 4.3%
It should consider building another campus	(53) 3.8%
Missing items/cant say	(707) 50.2%
Total	100%

Table 7.6

Respondents main suggestion for how Mona Campus might enhance its position Internationally

Leadership must get serious about modernizing its thought structure/Physical infrastructure needs radical upgrading	(218) 15.5%
Needs to upgrade to attract more foreign students	(190) 13.5%
Salaries must be increased	(108) 7.7%
Hold international symposiums/get serious about student exchange	(74) 5.3%
Campus needs to be more student friendly	(51) 3.6%
Missing items/cant say	(766) 54.4%
Total	100%

Table 7.7

Views on how respondents can assist Mona Campus in transformation and repositioning to meet emerging challenges in Jamaica and the region

I can be more open to change, accommodating, be more of a team-player	(452) 32.1%
I can make myself available to joining committees	(112) 8.0%
Encourage students more	(105) 7.5%
Can offer no assistance	(50) 3.6%
Need self transformation	(44) 3.1%
Missing items/cant say	(644) 45.7%
Total	100%

Table 7.8

Extent to which respondents believe the result of this survey will impact on changes at UWI Mona

Not sure	(512) 36.4%
Little or none	(316) 22.5%
To some extent	(343) 24.4%
Significantly	(90) 6.4%
Missing items	(146) 10.3%
Total	100%

Refer to Addenda 1 & 2 for further breakout of data.

## Addendum 1

March 2006

In this section of the survey, we focus on key questions as they relate to

- Age
- Sex
- Length of time working at UWI

The questions are:

- How committed are you to your work at the Mona Campus of the UWI?
- How motivated are you to work in the Mona Campus of the UWI environment?
- Given your years of service at UWI, how satisfied are you with your contribution to the Mona Campus?
- How satisfied are you with the leadership of the Mona Campus Management Team (principal, deputy principal, bursar, registrar, director of student services etc.)?
- How well has the Mona Campus Management team communicated its vision & policies to the Mona Campus community?
- How satisfied are you with the leadership of your Head of Section/Department/Unit?
- How well do you think the Mona Campus of the UWI is responding to Jamaica's development needs in various areas?
- How would you rate : Policies regarding staff promotion are clear (using scale Strongly disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly agree, don't know)
- How would you rate: Policies and procedures related to job evaluation & promotion are fair/just? (using the above scale)
- How would you rate: Information and guidelines on what to do to be promoted are clear?
- Using scale (never, hardly ever, sometimes, always), rate Academic/Administrative/Professional staff show respect to other categories of staff on the campus.
- What do you least like about working at the University of the West Indies?
- To what extent do you support the idea of performance-related pay or benefit at UWI?
- How do you assess the Mona campus' policy measures or responses to the major challenges identified?
- To what extent do you think the result of this survey will impact on changes at the Mona Campus of the UWI?

## 1. Commitment to work

Table 1.1  
Commitment to Work by Age -%

Age	Not committed	Low commitment	Fairly committed	Very committed	Missing items	Totals
20's	13.7	5.8	30.8	47.6	2.1	100
30's	9.1	5.0	34.9	49.0	3.7	100
40's	7.5	6.5	30.6	53.1	2.3	100
50's	3.4	3.8	23.6	66.3	2.9	100
60+	9.3	1.9	18.5	68.5	1.8	100

It is not entirely unexpected that those in the 60+ age grouping have indicated **44%** more **very committed** than those workers in the 20's age grouping. Indeed, the table indicates a very smooth, consistent incline in **very committed** as we move from the younger age groupings to the older age cohorts.

In the 50's age grouping, there is a **39%** more **very committed** than those in the 20's age cohort.

When we examine the younger age groupings (20's to 40's) only **12%** separates the lowest and the highest in the **very committed** category.

Table 1.2  
Commitment to Work by Sex- %

Sex	Not committed	Low commitment	Fairly committed	Very committed	Missing items	Totals
Male	6.5	4.9	27.7	58.8	2.1	100
Female	9.6	5.3	32.2	50.6	2.3	100

Females are showing 48% more **not committed** than males and this is also slightly reflected in the level of high commitment rankings where the male **very committed** is 16% higher than that for the females.

Although the numbers of those in the **not committed** rankings are relatively low when compared with those in the **very committed**, this is a surprising finding especially where it relates to the enormous strides women have been making in the society, e.g., the corporate world and the UWI where their numbers as a percentage of the whole have been expanding rapidly over the last 15 years.

One guesstimate is that there is still a societal and institutional predisposition which more easily admit men into a sort of ‘old boys club’ at lower and higher levels of organizational authority. The synergy which occurs when men in an institution burnish each other egos and successes in a male-focused society can be accepted as a positive but it is probably seen and felt by the women who may form the impression that they are not fully accepted even where their numbers exceed those of the men and their professionalism is beyond question.

Table 1.3  
Commitment to Work by Time working at the UWI

Years	Not committed	Low commitment	Fairly committed	Very committed	Missing items	Totals
< 1	1.8	2.8	38.5	53.2	3.7	100
1 to 5	2.4	3.8	44.7	47.6	1.5	100
>5 to 14	0.8	5.9	44.9	47.0	1.4	100
>14 to 24	1.3	6.1	39.4	52.8	0.4	100
> 24	0	3.8	36.5	58.7	1.0	100

Table 1.3 above records small and somewhat haphazard variations in the **very committed** ratings across the age groupings. Those with 5 years and less service have 11% less **very committed** ratings than those having more than 14 years service.

## 2. Motivation to work

Table 2.1  
Motivation to work by Age

Age	Not motivated	Hardly motivated	Somewhat motivated	Highly motivated	Missing items	Totals
20's	2.4	4.8	44.5	46.2	2.1	100
30's	1.2	4.3	51.4	42.3	0.8	100
40's	1.0	6.5	39.5	51.4	1.5	100
50's	1.4	3.8	31.7	62.0	1.1	100
60+	0	1.9	27.8	68.5	1.8	100

Again it is seen that there is an almost seamless increase in the **highly motivated** ratings as one moves up the age scale. When the 30's age cohort (the largest in the survey-29.7%) is compared with the 40's age cohort (the second largest-28.4%), we see an approximate 22% increase in the **highly motivated** designation. The increase in **highly motivated** from the youngest - 20's age cohort to the oldest - 60's is a significant 48%; not an unexpected finding.

Table 2.2  
Motivation to work by Sex- %

Sex	Not motivated	Hardly motivated	Somewhat motivated	Highly motivated	Missing items	Totals
Male	1.4	4.0	38.8	54.2	1.6	100
Female	1.5	5.1	44.4	47.7	1.3	100

As indicated in the table on commitment by sex which showed that males registered 16% more higher commitment than females, Table 2.2 is showing that females are 14% less **highly motivated** than their male colleagues.

Table 2.3  
Motivation to work by Time working at the UWI- %

Years	Not motivated	Hardly motivated	Somewhat motivated	Highly motivated	Missing items	Totals
< 1	1.8	2.8	38.5	53.2	3.7	100
1 to 5	2.4	3.8	44.7	47.6	1.5	100
>5 to 14	0.8	5.9	44.9	47.0	1.4	100
>14 to 24	1.3	6.1	39.4	52.8	0.4	100
> 24	0	3.8	36.5	58.7	1.0	100

As we examine the **somewhat motivated** rating we find that the >5 to 14 year cohort scored highest, 23% higher than the lowest ; the > 24 year cohort.

In the **highly motivated** rating, those in the > 24 year cohort scored 23% higher than the lowest; those in the > 5 to 14 year cohort.

### 3. Satisfaction with personal contribution to UWI Mona

Table 3.1

Ratings of satisfaction with contribution to UWI Mona by Age - %

	Never satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Always satisfied	Missing items	Totals
20's	1.4	5.1	53.1	36.0	4.4	100
30's	1.0	6.5	61.2	30.1	1.2	100
40's	1.5	6.3	51.4	38.8	2.0	100
50's	1.4	2.9	49.5	45.2	1.0	100
60+	0	1.9	53.7	42.6	1.8	100

Table 3.1 is self explanatory. In the younger age cohorts- 20's and 30's- there are lower levels of **always satisfied** than in the older age cohorts of 40's, 50's and 60's.

In the **sometimes satisfied** ratings, those in the 30's age cohort scored highest, doing so 24% higher than the lowest; those in the 50's age cohort.

Table 3.2

Ratings of satisfaction with contribution to UWI Mona by Sex - %

	Never satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Always satisfied	Missing items	Totals
Male	0.7	3.7	54.4	39.5	1.7	100
Female	1.6	6.2	54.8	35.0	0.8	100

Where the male and female **sometimes satisfied** are similar, the male **always satisfied** is approximately 13% more than the female rating.

Table 3.3

Ratings of satisfaction with contribution to UWI Mona by Time working at the UWI

Years	Never satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Always satisfied	Missing items	Totals
< 1	1.8	2.8	45.0	37.6	12.8	100
1 to 5	0.9	5.8	56.2	35.9	1.2	100
>5 to 14	1.7	6.3	57.8	33.1	3.1	100
>14 to 24	0.9	5.2	50.6	41.6	1.7	100
> 24	1.9	2.9	52.9	42.3	0	100

In the **sometimes satisfied** ratings, those in the >5 to 14 years cohort scored highest, doing so 29% higher than the lowest; those in the <1 year cohort.

In the **always satisfied** ratings, those in the > 24 year cohort scored highest, doing so 28% higher than the lowest; those in the >5 to 14 year cohort.

#### 4. Satisfaction with Executive Management of UWI Mona

Table 4.1  
Satisfaction with Mona Campus Management by Age - %

Age	Not satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Always satisfied	Missing items	Totals
20's	6.8	15.4	55.1	17.1	5.6	100
30's	12.0	19.6	51.0	13.9	3.5	100
40's	10.0	16.0	53.4	17.0	3.6	100
50's	10.6	16.8	52.4	14.4	5.8	100
60+	3.7	7.4	53.7	25.9	9.2	100

In the **sometimes satisfied** rating where the majority of ratings fall, there is shown fairly similar percentages across the respective age cohorts. In the **not satisfied** rating, the 30's 50's and 50's age cohorts are fairly similar (between 10% and 12%) while in the youngest (20's) and oldest (60+) cohorts, the **not satisfied** are lower.

At the extremes of age we find higher **always satisfied** in the 60+ cohort when compared to the youngest (20's) cohort.

Table 4.2  
Satisfaction with Mona Campus Management by Sex - %

	Not satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Always satisfied	Missing items	Totals
Male	10.9	17.2	55.8	13.0	3.1	100
Female	9.2	16.4	51.4	17.6	5.4	100

Table 4.3

Satisfaction with Mona Campus Management by Time working at UWI - %

Years	Not satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Always satisfied	Missing items	Totals
< 1	5.5	11.0	55.0	11.9	16.6	100
1 to 5	7.9	17.9	55.1	15.4	3.7	100
>5 to 14	10.5	17.5	52.1	17.3	2.6	100
>14 to 24	15.2	13.9	46.8	19.9	4.2	100
> 24	6.7	20.2	60.6	7.7	4.8	100

Among those at the UWI >5 to 24 years there are higher levels of **not satisfied** when compared to the other groupings while interestingly this same grouping is showing highest levels of **always satisfied**.

## 5. Views as to how Mona Campus Executive Management communicates to Mona Campus community

Table 5.1

Views on Mona Campus' Management communication, by Age - %

Age	Not at all	Poorly	Fairly well	Very well	Missing items	Totals
20's	6.5	39.4	40.4	6.2	7.5	100
30's	7.7	38.0	46.4	5.3	2.6	100
40's	5.5	36.3	47.1	7.5	3.6	100
50's	6.3	29.3	50.0	9.6	4.8	100
60+	0	18.5	57.4	14.8	9.3	100

From the oldest age cohort to the 20's age cohort there is a sharp (from 60+ to 50's) then steady increase (from 50's to 20's) in the views of those who believe that the Mona Campus management has done poorly in communicating its broad vision to the Mona community.

More than twice the number (2.1) of those in the 20's age cohort believe that management has done poorly in this regard when compared with those in the 60+ age cohort.

Table 5.2  
Views on Mona Campus's Management communication, by Sex - %

	Not at all	Poorly	Fairly well	Very well	Missing items	Totals
Male	4.7	39.1	45.6	7.7	2.9	100
Female	7.0	33.8	47.2	6.9	5.1	100

Table 5.3  
Views on Mona Campus's Management communication, by time working at the UWI- %

Years	Not at all	Poorly	Fairly well	Very well	Missing items	Totals
< 1	4.6	31.2	42.2	7.3	14.7	100
1 to 5	6.0	35.5	46.8	7.3	4.4	100
>5 to 14	6.1	36.5	47.7	6.5	3.2	100
>14 to 24	8.2	39.4	43.3	8.2	0.9	100
> 24	6.7	27.9	51.9	6.7	6.8	100

There are no significant differences in the **poorly** ratings when those with 1 to 5 years and >14 to 24 years experience are examined. The same holds true for a comparison between the < 1 year and those with >24 years service.

In terms of the **fairly well** rating, those with the longest service rate management's communication 23% better than those with < 1 year's service.

## 6. Satisfaction with Section Head

Table 6.1  
Satisfaction with Section Head, by Age - %

	Not satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Very satisfied	Missing items	Totals
20's	4.5	13.0	38.7	19.9	23.9	100
30's	7.2	14.4	42.6	20.1	15.7	100
40's	9.0	12.3	41.9	24.8	12.0	100
50's	5.3	7.7	46.6	28.4	12.0	100
60+	3.7	5.6	51.9	27.8	11.0	100

Those in the 60+ age cohort have reported 65% more **very satisfied** than those in the youngest (20's) age cohort. Not surprisingly therefore, those in the 20's age cohort are showing over twice the level of **hardly satisfied** than those in the oldest age cohort.

Table 6.2  
Satisfaction with Section Head, by Sex - %

	Not satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Very satisfied	Missing items	Totals
Male	6.7	9.3	46.5	26.7	10.8	100
Female	7.0	13.4	40.3	21.3	18.0	100

In table 6.2 females are showing 44% more **hardly satisfied** than males while in the **very satisfied** ratings, males are showing 25% more **very satisfied** than females.

Table 6.3  
Satisfaction with Section Head, by Time working at UWI - %

Years	Not satisfied	Hardly satisfied	Sometimes satisfied	Very satisfied	Missing items	Totals
< 1	1.8	6.4	38.5	27.5	25.8	100
1 to 5	4.7	12.8	42.7	23.5	16.3	100
>5 to 14	8.9	13.9	40.9	20.3	16.0	100
>14 to 24	7.8	11.7	43.7	24.2	12.6	100
> 24	10.6	8.7	47.1	22.1	11.5	100

Those having 1 to 5, >5 to 14 and >14 to 24 years service are showing fairly similar ratings in the **hardly satisfied** ratings. A similar situation obtains in the **very satisfied** ratings. Those with less than 1 year's service are showing 24% more **very satisfied** than those with more than 24 year's service.

## 7. Rating on how well Mona Campus is responding to Jamaica's development needs in various areas

Table 7.1  
Rating on how UWI Mona Campus responds to Jamaica's Development needs, by Age - %

Age	Not at all	Fairly well	Very well	Excellent	Missing items	Totals
20's	9.6	39.0	28.4	16.4	6.6	100
30's	14.1	43.5	24.2	11.7	6.5	100
40's	11.3	43.4	24.6	14.3	6.4	100
50's	8.2	48.6	20.2	13.0	10.0	100
60+	5.6	44.4	27.8	11.1	11.1	100

Outside of the **fairly well** ratings which tend to follow a somewhat predictable (increasing) path as we move from the younger age cohorts to the older ones, the other ratings such as **very well** and **excellent** do not vary much neither do they indicate any correlations between age and ratings. In the **not at all** ratings, the ratings in the various cohorts range from a high in the 30's cohort to its lowest in the 60+ age cohort. One suspects that enough thought was not given to the responses to the particular question.

Table 7.2

Rating on how UWI Mona Campus responds to Jamaica's development needs, by Sex  
%

	Not at all	Fairly well	Very well	Excellent	Missing items	Totals
Male	10.5	48.5	24.2	12.3	4.5	100
Female	11.4	41.0	25.1	14.2	8.3	100

Table 7.3

Rating on how UWI Mona Campus responds to Jamaica's development needs, by Time working at UWI  
%

Years	Not at all	Fairly well	Very well	Excellent	Missing items	Totals
< 1	9.2	40.4	25.7	17.4	7.3	100
1 to 5	12.2	44.0	24.4	12.6	6.8	100
>5 to 14	11.0	42.4	27.2	13.5	5.9	100
>14 to 24	12.1	41.6	21.2	15.2	9.9	100
> 24	7.7	53.8	22.1	8.7	7.7	100

Again, in the responses to the particular question, there seems to be some inconsistencies. Those with >1 year's service gives the UWI Mona the highest **excellent** ratings while those with > 24 years service gives it the lowest **excellent** rating and the highest **fairly well** ratings.

In the **very well** ratings, those with >5 to 14 years service gives the highest rating while those with >24 years service gives it the lowest rating.

**8. Ratings on 'Policies regarding staff promotion are clear,' 'Policies and procedures relating to job evaluation and promotion are fair/just' and, 'Information and guidelines on what to do to be promoted are clear.'**

Table 8.1

Rating on 'Policies regarding staff promotion are clear,' by Age - %

Age	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Missing items	Totals
20's	15.4	36.0	19.2	2.1	24.0	3.3	100
30's	19.1	26.1	22.5	2.4	15.8	4.1	100
40's	20.3	34.1	23.6	2.3	17.5	2.2	100
50's	17.8	34.6	25.0	5.8	14.9	1.9	100
60+	20.4	27.8	24.1	11.1	13.0	3.6	100

The 20's, 30's and 40's age cohorts account for close to 80% of the sample population. In the **agree** ratings, those in the 40's age cohort give a 23% higher rating than those in the 20's cohort.

In the **strongly disagree** rating, those in the 40's age cohort give a 32% higher rating than those in the 20's cohort.

Table 8.2

Rating on 'Policies regarding staff promotion are clear,' by Sex - %

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Missing items	Totals
Male	21.4	32.8	22.8	3.7	16.0	3.3	100
Female	17.4	35.5	22.7	2.8	18.4	3.2	100

The rating occupying the highest rating is **disagree**. Only 2.7% points (8%) separates the male and female ratings. While the **agree** ratings shows similar ratings for males and females, in the **strongly disagree** ratings, males show 23% higher ratings than that for females.

Table 8.3

Rating on 'Policies regarding staff promotion are clear,' by time working at UWI- %

Years	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Missing items	Totals
< 1	11.9	25.7	22.9	3.7	29.4	6.4	100
1 to 5	15.6	36.3	21.2	1.9	22.4	2.6	100
>5 to 14	20.7	36.7	25.5	2.3	11.6	3.2	100
>14 to 24	24.2	32.5	18.2	4.3	16.9	3.9	100
> 24	19.2	33.7	25.0	9.6	11.5	1.0	100

If we are to assume that those having the longest service are those most likely to have been through the ‘rigours’ of promotion and are more likely than others to have information on policies regarding staff promotion, then their views ought to be taken seriously. In terms of disagreement, the >24 years score third highest out of the 5 separate work-duration cohorts (**strongly disagree** and **disagree**).

They score highest in the **strongly agree** rating, doing so 5 times as high as the weakest (1 to 5 years) while scoring second highest in the **agree** rating.

The 1 to 5, > 5 to 14 and >14 to 24 years cohort represent 83% of the sample/population. Utilising comparisons within this grouping shows the >14 to 24 years cohort having the highest rating in the **strongly disagree** rating, scoring 55% more than those in the lowest rating (1 to 5 years) of that category, lowest in the **disagree** rating, scoring 12% less than the highest in the category (>5 to 24 years), lowest in the **agree** rating, scoring 40% less than the highest in the category (>5 to 14 years) and highest in the **strongly agree** rating, scoring over 1.3 times the score of the lowest in the rating (1 to 5 years).

Table 8.4

Rating on ‘Policies and Procedures related to Job Evaluation and Promotion are clear,’ by Age - %

Age	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Missing items	Totals
20's	14.4	24.0	22.6	3.1	33.6	2.3	100
30's	27.0	21.5	20.1	3.8	25.1	2.5	100
40's	21.1	24.6	24.1	3.0	25.8	1.4	100
50's	18.3	32.7	26.0	2.9	17.8	2.3	100
60+	11.1	24.1	29.6	9.3	22.2	3.7	100

The 60+ age cohort scores both the weakest disagreement and the strongest agreement, a somewhat logical rating. When the largest age cohort (30's) is compared with the second largest (40's), the 40's age cohort scores 28% higher in the **strongly disagree** rating, 14% less in the **disagree** rating and 20% higher in the **agree** rating.

Table 8.5

Rating on ‘Policies and Procedures related to Job Evaluation and Promotion are clear,’ by Sex - %

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Missing items	Totals
Male	21.9	28.1	24.7	3.7	19.1	2.5	100
Female	20.0	23.0	22.5	3.1	29.1	2.3	100

While females have recorded only a slight 10% higher **strongly disagree**, in the **disagree** rating males score 22% more than females.

Males score 10% higher in the **agree** rating and 19% higher in the **strongly agree** rating.

Of significance is the 52% higher scoring in the **don't know** rating for females.

Table 8.6

Rating on 'Policies and Procedures related to Job Evaluation and Promotion are clear,' by Time working at the UWI - %

Years	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Missing items	Totals
< 1	8.3	8.3	27.5	4.6	45.0	6.3	100
1 to 5	17.7	22.9	20.5	2.6	34.6	1.7	100
>5 to 14	25.5	27.4	22.8	3.8	18.6	1.9	100
>14 to 24	23.8	24.7	26.4	2.2	20.3	2.6	100
> 24	18.3	34.6	25.0	5.8	16.3	0	100

In the 3 cohorts which together constitute the vast majority of the sample population, the >5 to 14 years cohort scores highest in the **strongly disagree** and in the **disagree** rating, that same cohort scores highest of those in the other two.

In the **agree** rating, the >5 to 14 years cohort scores highest than the other two while in an overall comparison among all cohorts in this rating, the < 1 year cohort scores highest, 34% more than the lowest rating, those in the 1 to 5 years cohort.

A significant 45% of those in the < 1 year cohort scored highest in the **don't know** rating in comparison to those who scored lowest in that rating; the >24 years' cohort.

Table 8.7

Rating on 'Information and guidelines on what to do to be promoted are clear,' by Age-%

Age	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Missing items	Totals
20's	25.0	18.8	19.2	4.5	30.1	2.4	100
30's	27.0	25.8	20.8	2.2	20.6	3.6	100
40's	25.3	23.6	21.1	3.5	24.6	1.9	100
50's	20.2	24.5	30.8	5.8	16.3	2.4	100
60+	5.6	31.5	24.1	11.1	24.1	3.6	100

The highest in the **strongly disagree** rating is the 30's age cohort, which scores nearly five times that of those scoring least (the 60+ cohort). In the **disagree** rating, the 60+ age cohort surprisingly scores the highest, doing so 67% higher than the lowest (20's) in this rating.

The 50's age cohort scores highest in the **agree** rating, doing so 60% more than those scoring lowest, the 20's age cohort. In the **strongly agree** rating, the 60+ cohort scores highest, doing so 5 times higher than the lowest age cohort, the 30's.

Table 8.8

Rating on 'Information and guidelines on what to do to be promoted are clear,' by Sex - %

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Missing items	Totals
Males	23.0	25.3	25.6	5.1	17.7	3.3	100
Females	25.2	22.3	20.6	3.1	26.2	2.6	100

Females score about 10% more than males in the **strongly disagree** rating, 13% lower than males in the **disagree** rating, 24% lower than males in the **agree** rating and 65% lower than males in the **strongly agree** rating.

Table 8.9

Rating on 'Information and guidelines on what to do to be promoted are clear,' by Time working at the UWI - %

Years	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Missing items	Totals
< 1	16.5	9.2	20.2	2.8	45.0	6.3	100
1 to 5	22.0	22.6	20.5	4.1	29.1	1.7	100
>5 to 14	28.9	26.8	20.5	3.0	17.9	2.9	100
>14 to 24	26.8	21.6	24.7	3.5	19.9	3.5	100
> 24	17.3	32.7	30.8	9.6	9.6	0	100

In the **strongly disagree** rating the >5 to 14 cohort scores the highest; 75% more than the lowest in the rating, the <1 year cohort. In the **disagree** rating, the >24 year cohort scores highest, doing so 3 ½ times the rating of the lowest (<1 year) cohort.

In the **agree** rating, the >24 cohort somehow scores highest in this rating; 53% more than the lowest rating; the < year cohort. In the **strongly agree** rating, the >24 year cohort scores highest, doing so close to 3 ½ times the rating of the lowest (<1 year) cohort.

Close to half (45%) of the <1 year cohort have reported a **don't know** rating.

### 9. Rating of ‘Academic/Administrative/Professional staff show respect to other categories of staff on the campus.’

It is a common feature in the industrial relations climate for staff at the extremes of the employment spectrum to harbour misgivings about each other. Those at the bottom often consider themselves to be constantly sidelined while it is sometimes common for those enjoying more privileges like higher income levels and psychic benefits such as ‘respect,’ to demonstrate it openly, thus opening the door for charges of ‘discrimination’ and disrespect towards those on the lower rungs of the employment ladder.

In the case of the UWI where those at the top often enjoy a higher than usual national profile as academics and highly skilled professionals, the perception of ‘disrespect’ emanating from those on the lower rungs may be flawed, imagined, or it may have some basis in how these sometimes problematic relationships are played out. The three tables below attempt to disaggregate the viewpoints of the various players involved.

Table 9.1

Rating of ‘Academic/Administrative/Professional staff show respect to other categories of staff on the campus,’ by Age - %

	Never	Hardly ever	Sometimes	Always	Missing items	Totals
20’s	0.7	9.9	55.5	32.5	1.4	100
30’s	1.2	9.6	60.3	26.8	2.1	100
40’s	0.3	10.5	56.4	30.8	2.0	100
50’s	1.0	8.2	58.7	29.3	2.8	100
60+	0	7.4	46.3	38.9	7.4	100

Overall, the ratings percentage for **never** and **hardly ever** are relatively low in comparison with the other more positive ratings.

In the **sometimes** rating, the 30’s age cohort scores highest; doing so 30% higher than the lowest; the 60+ age cohort. The irony is, the 60+ age cohort scores highest in the **always** rating, doing so 45% more than the lowest; the 30’s age cohort.

Table 9.2

Rating of 'Academic/Administrative/Professional staff show respect to other categories of staff on the campus,' by Sex - %

	Never	Hardly ever	Sometimes	Always	Missing items	Totals
Males	0.9	11.2	57.9	27.7	2.3	100
Females	0.6	8.9	57.1	30.9	2.5	100

Males score 26% higher than females in the **hardly ever** rating while in the **sometimes rating**, the scores are almost even. In the **always** rating, females score 12% higher than males.

Table 9.3

Rating of 'Academic/Administrative/Professional staff show respect to other categories of staff on the campus,' by Time working at the UWI - %

Years	Never	Hardly ever	Sometimes	Always	Missing items	Totals
< 1	0.9	6.4	55.0	32.1	5.6	100
1 to 5	0	10.5	58.8	28.6	2.1	100
>5 to 14	1.1	9.5	57.6	30.2	1.6	100
>14 to 24	1.3	8.2	55.0	32.5	3.0	100
> 24	1.0	12.5	57.7	26.9	2.6	100

Those in the >24 years cohort score highest in the **hardly ever** rating, doing so 95% more than the lowest in this rating; those in the <1 year cohort. The scores in the **sometimes** rating are pretty similar while in the **always** rating, 21% separates the highest, the >14 to 24 year cohort and the lowest, the > 24 year cohort.

## 10. What employees least like about working at the UWI

Table 10.1

What respondents least like about working at UWI, by Age- %

Age	Salary package	Employment benefits	Student interaction	Promotion opportunities	Physical environment	Co-worker interaction	Inability to create challenges	UWI's low response to urgent needs	Lack of respect from senior staff	Missing items	Totals
20's	20.2	14.8	7.8	11.0	6.4	3.7	2.1	5.1	2.1	26.8	100
30's	30.9	15.9	5.2	10.5	5.6	5.9	0.5	4.4	1.0	20.1	100
40's	27.3	13.3	4.8	16.8	8.5	5.3	0.8	6.3	3.5	13.4	100
50's	33.7	11.4	5.4	13.0	9.8	3.5	1.4	7.3	4.4	11.1	100
60+	11.1	10.4	7.7	9.3	14.3	9.7	0	2.0	3.7	31.8	100

Table 10.2

What respondents least like about working at UWI, by Sex- %

	Salary package	Employment benefits	Student interaction	Promotion opportunities	Physical environment	Co-worker interaction	Inability to create challenges	UWI's low response to urgent needs	Lack of respect from senior staff	Missing items	Totals
Males	33.0	16.3	6.6	15.6	7.3	4.6	1.4	3.7	3.0	8.5	100
Females	25.6	11.0	6.3	12.5	8.5	4.1	1.8	5.1	3.5	21.6	100

Table 10.3

What respondents least like about working at UWI, by Time working at the UWI- %

	Salary package	Employment benefits	Student interaction	Promotion opportunities	Physical environment	Co-worker interaction	Inability to create challenges	UWI's low response to urgent needs	Lack of respect from senior staff	Missing items	Totals
A	23.9	17.4	7.8	6.4	9.5	3.9	2.8	4.8	0.9	22.6	100
B	30.2	15.1	7.1	11.8	7.4	4.7	1.1	5.4	2.6	14.6	100
C	30.4	14.4	6.3	13.9	7.6	4.9	0.2	5.2	1.7	15.4	100
D	25.1	12.7	6.7	13.0	9.2	5.2	2.2	5.9	3.0	17.0	100
E	26.9	15.8	6.0	19.2	9.8	6.8	0	3.8	4.8	6.9	100

In Table 10.3, please read A= < 1 year, B= 1 to 5 years, C= >5 to 14 years, D= >14 to 24 years, E= >24 years.

In Tables 10.1, 10.2, and 10.3, please read items highlighted in red as highest in category, and items highlighted in yellow as lowest in category.

### 11. Extent to which performance-related pay is supported

Table 11.1

How respondents support Performance-related pay, by Age - %

	Little support	Some support	Significant support	Missing items	Totals
20's	16.8	37.0	20.2	26.0	100
30's	19.1	35.6	21.5	23.8	100
40's	17.3	37.8	25.6	19.3	100
50's	15.9	36.5	31.7	15.9	100
60+	11.1	27.8	33.3	27.8	100

In the **little support** rating, the 30's age cohort scores highest, doing so 72% more than the lowest rating, those in the 60+ cohort. In the **some support** rating The 40's age cohort scores 36% more than those in the lowest rating, the 60+ cohort.

In the **significant support** rating, the 60+ age cohort scores highest, doing so 65% higher than those scoring lowest; the 20's age cohort.

Table 11.2

How respondents support Performance-related pay, by Sex - %

	Little support	Some support	Significant support	Missing items	Totals
Males	14.9	37.9	34.2	5.8	100
Females	18.5	35.5	19.7	11.7	100

Females scores 24% higher than males in the **little support** rating, are within less than 7% of males in the **some support** rating and are 74% lower than males in the **significant support** rating.

Table 11.3

How respondents support Performance-related pay, by Time working at UWI - %

Years	Little support	Some support	Significant support	Missing items	Totals
< 1	18.3	44.0	16.5	21.2	100
1 to 5	16.5	38.7	22.0	22.8	100
>5 to 14	20.5	34.8	22.6	22.1	100
>14 to 24	12.6	34.2	29.9	23.3	100
> 24	15.4	28.8	39.4	16.4	100

In the **little support** rating, the 5 to 14 cohort scores highest, doing so by 63% more than the lowest rating, the >14 to 24 cohort. In the **some support** rating, the >1 year cohort-- quite probably the most eager of all the cohorts—scores highest doing so 53% higher than the lowest rating, those in the >24 year cohort.

In the **significant support** rating, there is a steady increase in ratings from the < 1 year cohort to the >24 year cohort. The >24 year cohort scores highest, doing so 138% higher than the < 1 year cohort.

## 12. Assessment of Mona campus' policy measures or responses to the major challenges

Table 12.1

How respondents assess UWI Mona's policy measures or responses to major challenges identified, by Age - %

Age	Too much complacency	Mediocre/unresponsive	UWI product is watered down	Fair attention being paid	Excellent plans are in place	Missing items	totals
20's	10.6	18.5	6.5	13.4	2.4	48.6	100
30's	11.3	24.6	9.6	16.7	1.5	36.3	100
40's	11.8	25.3	9.0	16.3	3.1	34.5	100
50's	7.2	27.9	5.8	23.1	3.8	32.2	100
60+	7.4	7.4	4.8	31.5	2.2	46.7	100

More of those in the 40's age cohort than in others believe that there is **too much complacency** in Mona's responses to challenges identified . More of those in the 50's age cohort than in others feel that the response is **mediocre**. More of those in the 60+ age cohort than in others believe **fair attention is being paid** in terms of how they see the UWI Mona's response to certain challenges.

Table 12.2

How respondents assess UWI Mona's policy measures or responses to major challenges identified, by Sex - %

	Too much complacency	Mediocre/unresponsive	UWI product is watered down	Fair attention being paid	Excellent plans are in place	Missing items	Totals
Males	8.4	30.4	4.9	20.9	2.8	32.6	100
Females	11.6	21.0	10.5	15.5	2.3	39.1	100

In terms of those who have responded by saying that there is **too much complacency** in UWI Mona's response to certain challenges identified, females share this view 38% more than males.

45% more females than males believe that Mona's response can best be described as **mediocre/unresponsive**.

114% more females than males believe that Mona's response to major challenges identified can be described by saying the **UWI product is watered down**.

35% more males than females believe that **fair attention is being paid** as far as Mona's response to major challenges is concerned.

Table 12.3

How respondents assess UWI Mona's policy measures or responses to major challenges identified, by Time working at the UWI - %

Years	Too much complacency	Mediocre/unresponsive	UWI product is watered down	Fair attention being paid	Excellent plans are in place	Missing items	Totals
< 1	7.4	15.6	4.6	13.8	4.6	54.0	100
1 to 5	9.4	26.7	7.0	15.4	2.5	39.0	100
>5 to 14	12.5	23.7	10.2	16.6	1.9	35.1	100
>14 to 24	10.8	24.7	11.3	21.7	3.5	28.0	100
> 24	9.6	24.0	8.7	23.1	1.0	33.6	100

Those in the >5 to 14 cohort score 69% more than those in <1 cohort in terms of believing that Mona's response can best be described as **too much complacency**.

Those in the 1 to 5 year cohort score highest in believing that the campus community's response to major challenges can be described as **mediocre/unresponsive**. 71% more of them than the lowest in the rating (the <1 year cohort) gave this description.

Those in the >14 to 24 cohort scored highest in believing that Mona's response can be described as the **UWI product is watered down**. That cohort scored 146% more than the lowest in that section of the table, the <1 year cohort.

Those in the >24 year cohort scored highest in believing that **fair attention is being paid**. That cohort scored 67% more than the lowest in that rating; those in the <1 year cohort.

### 13. Rating of Survey Impact

Table 13.1

Respondents rating of impact survey will have on changes at UWI Mona, by Age- %

	Not sure	Little or none	To some extent	Significantly	Missing items	Totals
20's	33.2	22.6	22.3	5.8	16.1	100
30's	26.3	24.9	23.0	6.2	19.6	100
40's	30.6	21.6	26.8	6.8	14.2	100
50's	33.2	20.2	26.4	8.2	12.0	100
60+	38.9	18.5	25.9	1.9	14.8	100

Those in the 60+ age cohort scored highest in the **not sure** rating, doing so 48% more than the lowest in the rating; the 30's age cohort.

Those in the 30's age cohort scored highest in the cynical **little or none** rating, doing so 35% higher than those in the lowest rating; the 60+ age cohort.

More of those in the 40's age cohort than the others believe that impact will be there **to some extent**. That cohort scored 20% higher than those in the lowest; the 20's age cohort.

Table 13.2

Respondents rating of impact survey will have on changes at UWI Mona, by Sex- %

Age	Not sure	Little or none	To some extent	Significantly	Missing items	Totals
Males	29.5	23.7	29.5	7.9	9.4	100
Females	31.5	21.9	22.1	5.7	18.8	100

Almost similar percentages of males and females gave the **not sure** rating while in the **little or none** rating, males and females are within less than 10% of each other. 33% more males than females gave the **to some extent** rating.

Table 13.3

Respondents rating of impact survey will have on changes at UWI Mona, by Sex- %

Years	Not sure	Little or none	To some extent	Significantly	Missing items	Totals
< 1	30.3	27.5	23.9	2.8	15.5	100
1 to 5	32.5	24.4	22.6	6.4	6.2	100
>5 to 14	30.2	20.3	25.5	6.1	17.9	100
>14 to 24	29.9	22.9	21.6	8.7	16.9	100
> 24	29.8	20.2	31.7	7.7	10.6	100

All the cohorts are lined up close to the 30% rating in the **not sure** rating. Those in the <1 year cohort scored highest in the **little or none rating**, doing so 36% more than the lowest; those in the >24 year cohort.

Those in the > 24 year cohort scored highest in the **to some extent** rating, doing so 47% more than the lowest; the >14 to 24 year cohort.

**Addendum 2**

April 2006

Table 1- Extent to which performance related pay/benefit supported, by Staff category %

Staff category	Little or no support	Some support	Significant support	Don't know/missing items	Totals
Administrative	25.8	16.2	8.5	49.5	100
Academic	11.5	46.7	36.2	5.6	100
Technical	7.0	53.7	35.8	3.5	100
Services	18.1	45.6	28.5	7.8	100

Technical, administrative and the services categories have given varying degrees of support to the idea of Performance-related pay and benefits. In contrast, in the Administrative category where the measurement of 'performance' is more often than not problematic due to the sometime rote nature of the jobs, support for this idea is at its lowest.

### Addendum 3

**UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES**  
**WORKPLACE SATISFACTION SURVEY – 2005**  
**HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DIVISION**  
**FINDINGS/ACTIONS MATRIX**

<b>Main Heading</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>4.CAREER DEVELOPMENT, PROMOTION AND JOB EVALUATION</b>	Generally negative assessment of career development, promotion and job evaluation process at UWI, Mona	In the newly restructured HRMD units have been set up to focus on staff training and development. With in this functional area units have been set up and personnel designated to focus on Performance Management, Training, and Career Path Development. Steering Committees have been set up to complement these functional areas.
<b>4.1 Staff Promotion</b>	52.4% disagree i.e. "strongly disagree" plus disagree that policies regarding staff promotion are clear.	There are clearly established guidelines through policies and bargaining agreements regarding staff promotion. ATS Staff: 1. Do not enjoy promotion in their own right however 2. Equal opportunity exists where vacancies arise. 3. As part of the collective agreement between the University and the Unions all vacancies that arise in these categories are publicized internally and in some cases externally and internally.
<b>4.2 Job Evaluation</b>	44.9% of staff disagree or strongly disagree that Policies and Procedures related to job evaluation and	1. Current Job Evaluation/ Classification Committee exist. 2. The guidelines for

	<p>promotion are fair/just. Significantly higher percentage males than females, younger than older staff are in 'strongly disagree' category. However, relatively high percentages of females, younger and recently appointed staff indicated 'don't know' as their response.</p>	<p>conducting evaluations/classifications are based on recommendations from the Consulting firm of Price Waterhouse Coopers.</p> <p>3. A committee comprising representatives from Human Resource, MONATS, UAWU, and Technical group.</p>
<p><b>4.3 Performance Appraisal instruments</b></p>	<p>41.9% of staff disagree or strongly disagree that the quality of performance appraisal instruments are good 27.9% 'don't know'</p>	<p>1. The Campus Administration has just re-launched the Performance Management System for the ATS Group.</p> <p>2. The existing instruments will be used initially with a few changes to enhance their effectiveness.</p> <p>3. The instruments will be reviewed at the end of the first year</p> <p>4. The Performance Appraisal instruments for the ASAP group was reviewed and re-launched in 2003. An exercise is currently underway to train Heads of departments in the use of the instruments.</p>
<p><b>4.4 Professionalism of performance appraisals</b></p>	<p>35.3% of staff disagree or strongly disagree that performance appraisals are carried out "in a professional and efficient manner". 30.6% 'don't know'.</p>	<p>1. Prior to the re-launch of the Performance Appraisal System, for the ATS group, workshops were held for all appraisers on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. conducting appraisals</li> <li>b. objective setting</li> </ol> <p>2. sensitization sessions were held for the employees</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. to acquaint them with</li> </ol>

		<p>the instruments</p> <p>b. inform them of different stakeholders responsibilities</p> <p>c. what to expect from the appraiser</p>
<b>4.5 Benchmark/criteria for assessing job performance are adequate</b>	37.2% of staff disagree or strongly disagree that criteria are adequate. 31.2% 'don't know'	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to the re-launch of the PA system JDs were distributed to at least 90% of the staff.</li> <li>2. Plans are being made to make the existing generic JDs available to staff on the Pipeline via the HR website.</li> <li>3. The JDs as well as department objectives and unit objectives, University wide objectives will be used as the basis of the objective setting exercise for each employee at the beginning of the PA period.</li> <li>4. The objectives set at the beginning of the exercise will be used as the benchmark for evaluating each employ at the end of the evaluation period.</li> </ol>
<b>4.6 Counseling for performance improvement helpful</b>	30.3% of staff disagree or strongly disagree 36.2%. 'don't know'	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently no formal system exists to counsel employees who exhibit low or poor on the job performance.</li> <li>2. An Employee Assistance Programme is currently being formulated by the HRMD and will aim to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Early identify troubled employees</li> <li>b. Offer counseling to employees' immediate family whose actions or behaviour are affecting an</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

		employee's on the job performance.
<b>4.7 Adequacy of opportunities for promotion of permanent staff</b>	43.4% of staff disagree or strongly disagree 28.1% of Staff 'don't know'.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opportunities for promotion of permanent staff will depend greatly on the availability of jobs</li> <li>2. Educational background skill sets and experience of the employee</li> <li>3. Where vacancies exist all employees who qualify are free to apply.</li> </ol>
<b>4.8 Information and guidelines on what to do to be promoted are clear</b>	47.7% disagree or strongly disagree; 23.5% 'don't know'.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For Staff in the ATS Group promotion is realized where <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a vacancy exist at a higher level</li> <li>b. out of the Job Evaluation and Classification exercise</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Qualified employees are free to apply where positions become available.</li> </ol>
<b>4.9 There is adequate provision for staff training and development</b>	43.8% disagree or strongly agree while 19.4% don't know. 33.9% agreed or strongly agreed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Within the newly restructured HRMD a training unit has been established</li> <li>2. There is a training and development taskforce</li> <li>3. All employees are now able to apply for assistance from the training and development fund.</li> <li>4. There are plans to establish certification for employees especially in the technical areas</li> </ol>
<b>4.10 Quality of staff training offered is good</b>	41.9% agree or strongly agree while 34.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed with 20.3 'don't know'	
<b>4.11 Adequate</b>	56.2% agreed or strongly	1. Staff in MONATS

<p><b>opportunity for staff to work and pursue study programmes</b></p>	<p>agreed while 23.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed with 17.5% 'don't know'</p>	<p>groups receive the</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. time off to attend classes</li> <li>b. day release</li> <li>c. study leave</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Staff in the UAWU group Are allowed time off to attend classes</li> <li>3. Staff in the WIGUT group <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Study Leave</li> <li>b. Study and Travel Grant</li> <li>c. Sabbatical Leave</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. All regular staff, once qualified are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. eligible for free tuition up to the 1<sup>st</sup> degree and government sponsored masters programme</li> <li>b. receive time off to sit exams</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<p><b>4.12 In my department, there are adequate opportunities for staff to acquire new skills on the job.</b></p>	<p>53.8% agree or strongly agree while 29% disagree or strongly disagree. 14.9% 'don't know'.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. job rotation and enrichment are encouraged by the HRMD.</li> <li>b. no policy regarding job rotation</li> </ol>