



THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

23 May 2001

MEMBERS OF UNIVERSITY STAFF

WORKING LIFE SURVEY 2000

The first Working Life Survey was conducted in 1997 and provided the University with valuable information for planning purposes. In particular it showed that there was great concern about job security. Enterprise bargaining negotiations focused on this issue and together with the introduction of the HECE Award, I am pleased that the 2000 survey results demonstrate a significant decline in concerns about job security.

We have been able to make comparisons with the 1997 data across a number of items although the 2000 Survey included a number of new and amended sections and questions. Some were also comparable with questions from a survey of Australian academic staff conducted by Craig McInnis of the University of Melbourne and these have been noted in the report. I am pleased to say that academic staff at UWA are more satisfied with their jobs (75%) than Australian academics as a whole (67%).

It also appears that general staff are more satisfied with their working lives at UWA than their academic colleagues. The most serious issues for academic staff that emerge from the data relate to workload and time pressures. It is also of concern that some 79% of staff who teach plan to make changes to their teaching in the next three years but 77% believe there is inadequate time and resources to support such changes. Additionally some 45% of academic staff are dissatisfied with the recognition given for effort. Almost half of general staff are concerned with their opportunities for career progression although this still represents a decline on the 1997 figure. At 44% the figure for academic staff is also on the high side.

If the University of Western Australia is to remain at the forefront of quality in the Australian higher education system it is important we address these concerns as a matter of priority. While this is essential to support our current staff we also recognise the importance of a supportive working environment in our ability to continue to recruit and retain the high quality people we have historically been able to attract to UWA. I believe that the planned restructure will free up some resources to assist in this process. These issues will also be addressed as part of our ongoing enterprise bargaining discussions.

On the positive side it is clear that, although the institution is under stress, people believe that UWA is still a good place to work (81%). And some 82% of academic staff (somewhat fewer general staff) believe it attracts the best students. Although over half of the respondents believe UWA attracts the best staff, this is a decline on the 1997 figures and we cannot be complacent about our capacity to continue to do this.

Perhaps one of the most striking findings is that on the twelve key aspects of job satisfaction, where the gender difference was most statistically significant, the difference favoured women staff in each instance. For example, female staff agreed more strongly than males that their job satisfaction had improved over the last five years; they are more satisfied with their jobs than are men. Women are also more satisfied with their salary and benefits and current workloads than their male colleagues. The University has promoted gender equity in recent years and I believe that the results demonstrate evidence of our success in this area.

The survey results contain a mass of useful and interesting information that I hope that all of you, as individuals, and within departments and sections can use to better understand your environment and to plan for change. If you wish to make any comments please address them to Jan Stuart on jstuart@acs.uwa.edu.au or Extension 1729.

I would like to extend my appreciation to the Institutional Research Unit for their very significant efforts in bringing this report together.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Alan Robson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Alan Robson
Deputy Vice Chancellor



THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

WORKING LIFE SURVEY 2000

Report No. 01/10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	4-7
RESULTS	8
SECTION A: General information about you and your job	8
SECTION B: Aspects of your job and your workplace.....	17
SECTION C: Your well-being.....	22
SECTION D: Equity and ethical issues in your workplace	23
SECTION E: Teaching	26
SECTION F: Research.....	27
SECTION G: Consulting	27
SECTION H: Your career opportunities at The University of Western Australia.....	28
SECTION I: Conference attendance and other staff development	29
SECTION J: General comments about working at UWA	31
SECTION K: Final comments	34
GENDER DIFFERENCES	37
COMPARISON WITH 1997 WORKING LIFE SURVEY	38
Comparison of 5 point and 4 point scales	38
Section A - Information about respondents	38
Section B - Aspects of job and workplace	39
Section D - Equity and ethical issues in your workplace.....	41
Section E - Teaching.....	42
Section F - Research	42
Section H - Career opportunities at UWA	43
Section I - Conference attendance and other staff development.....	43
Section J - General comments about working at UWA	44

COMPARISON WITH NATIONAL SURVEY OF McINNIS (1999)..... 47

APPENDIX

SELECTION OF POSITIVE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS 48

SELECTION OF NEGATIVE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS 49-56

INTRODUCTION

The Working Life Survey 2000 was conducted at The University of Western Australia in the second half of 2000 with the goal of understanding the views, perceptions and experiences of UWA staff in relation to their working environment.

The first Working Life Survey was conducted at UWA in 1997. The questionnaire used in 2000 was an enlarged version of the one used in 1997, having received additional input from several interested parties and experts on campus. It was distributed to 3640 staff and 1428 completed forms were returned, a response rate of 39% (non-casual staff 47%, casual staff 19%). A copy of the survey form is attached (Appendix III).

Detailed results are presented in the same order as items in the questionnaire, followed by an analysis of staff members' comments, gender differences, comparisons with the 1997 results and national data, and a selection of comments.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Aspects of your job and your workplace

Overall, 80% of respondents were currently satisfied with their job at UWA (75% of Academic staff, 85% of General staff).

Job security is a major concern for Fixed Term staff.

One-third of all respondents were dissatisfied with their salary and benefits.

Nearly one-half of all respondents were dissatisfied with the opportunities for career progression and promotion.

Nearly one-half of Academic staff were dissatisfied with their current workload, especially Tenured Academic staff. Approximately one-half of Tenured Academic staff were dissatisfied with the time available to carry out their work and with the recognition given for effort and good work.

Staff generally perceived workplace management and the University to value fifteen specific aspects of a positive workplace environment less highly than they did, especially participative decision-making, listening to others, building confidence in staff, care and consideration for others, and resolution of conflict between staff.

With regard to their immediate work environment, between one third and one half of staff felt that management did not acknowledge the concerns of staff, did not devolve decision-making to the appropriate level, made decisions with insufficient consultation, did not inform staff well about goals, priorities and decisions, and did not inform staff well about changes affecting their job.

66% of Academic staff respondents felt that it was not a good time for any young person to aspire to an Academic career. 34% of General staff respondents felt that it was not a good time for a young person to aspire to a career in higher education.

70% of Academics said that, given a choice, they would choose an academic career again. 71% of General staff said that, given a choice, they would choose a career in higher education again.

60% of Academic staff, and about half as many General staff, subordinated most aspects of their lives for their work, reported that their job is a source of considerable personal stress and that their work commitments left them very little time to themselves. 46% of Academic staff and 60% of General staff reported that their job satisfaction had improved over the last five years.

Tenured Academic respondents on average worked 15 extra hours per week, unpaid.

Overall, staff were satisfied with their leave entitlements and the ease of arranging leave, with the exception that about one third of Academics reported a significant level of difficulty arranging long service leave.

Equity and ethical issues in the workplace

Overall, staff felt that workplace behaviour at UWA in relation to disadvantaged and minority groups had improved over the last 3 years. Staff currently do not appear to have major ethical and equity concerns in relation to working at UWA, although concern was expressed regarding the limited amount of protection for whistleblowers. A clear majority of staff felt that senior staff lead by example in ethical behaviour.

Teaching

82% of Academic staff respondents and 14% of General staff respondents said that they were involved in teaching (a total of 612 respondents).

Between one third and one half of this group were dissatisfied with six specific aspects of their workplace in relation to teaching: equipment and technology, availability of appropriate teaching spaces, resources available to support teaching, the number of students in classes or units, the marking load and recognition for teaching performance.

Over 60% of the respondents involved in teaching had made considerable changes to their teaching methods over the last 3 years. Over 75% planned to make changes over the next 3 years, but 75% of respondents felt they did not have access to adequate time and resources, or adequate institutional support to help them in making these changes.

Research

85% of Academic staff respondents and 23% of General staff respondents said they were involved in research, a total of 711 respondents.

More than one half of this group were dissatisfied with the time available for research and the number of travel grants for research purposes. Between one third and one half of the respondents involved in research were dissatisfied with five other specific aspects of their workplace in relation to research : the resources available to support research, the quality of laboratory facilities, computing facilities and other equipment to support research and the University's recognition of research performance.

Career opportunities at UWA

Overall, respondents who had received assistance in relation to career opportunities from various sources at UWA had found them to be moderately valuable.

The major barriers to career progression were perceived to be tight budgets and a lack of relevant vacancies.

Staff development

A clear majority of respondents felt that they had adequate opportunity to attend conferences and adequate access to staff development activities.

General comments about working at UWA

Between 80% and 90% of respondents felt that UWA is a university with fine traditions and a conservative culture, and a good place to work. Between 60% and 80% of respondents felt that UWA attracted the best students and is actively involved in the community. Between 40% and 60% of respondents felt that UWA attracts the best staff and has world class facilities. Thirty-seven percent of respondents felt UWA is out of touch.

40% of Academic staff and 34% of General staff felt that UWA as a place to work had worsened in the last 3 years; 12% of Academic staff and 20% of General staff felt UWA had improved as a place to work.

Academic staff most frequently rated the following as the best aspects about working at UWA: job autonomy, the physical environment, the reputation of the University and interpersonal relations between staff.

General staff most frequently rated the following as the best aspect about working at UWA: the physical environment, interpersonal relations between staff, access to technology, the reputation of the University, job security and job autonomy.

Academic staff most frequently rated the following as the worst aspects about working at UWA: workload, job-related stress, administrative requirements and duties, job security, salary package, and opportunities for career progression or promotion.

General staff most frequently rated the following as the worst aspects about working at UWA: opportunities for career progression or promotion, job-related stress, workload, job security.

Staff were asked in the last section of the survey form to add any further comments relating to a specific section of the survey or to an area not included. 700 of the 1428 respondents added comments, expressing 30 different positive themes and 92 different negative themes.

Gender differences

Male and female staff differed very significantly on 12 aspects of job satisfaction, female staff being more satisfied in each case.

Comparison with 1997 Working Life Survey

Compared with 1997, respondents in 2000 were, more satisfied with their job security, the physical environment in which they worked, the opportunities for career progression or promotion, recognition for teaching performance, the quality of laboratory facilities and the number of travel grants for research purposes.

Respondents in 2000 were less satisfied with the resources available to support teaching, the quality of students in their area and the time available for research.

The proportion of staff who indicated neither conference attendance nor any area of staff development in the previous 3 years fell from about 25% to about 15% between 1997 and 2000.

There was a decline between 1997 and 2000 in the proportion of staff who felt that UWA attracts the best staff, that UWA attracts the best students, and that UWA has facilities which are world class. There was a clear increase in the proportion of staff who thought UWA had become a worse place to work.

Comparison with the national survey of McInnis (1999)

UWA academic staff, especially female academic staff, compare favourably with academics nationally in relation to job satisfaction and stress levels.

RESULTS

Response rates

<i>Staff category</i>	<i>No. sent</i>	<i>No. received</i>	<i>Response rate</i>
Academic staff - casuals	574	108	19%
Academic staff - non casuals	1132	513	45%
Academic totals	1706	621	36%
General staff - casuals	452	91	20%
General staff - non casuals	1482	709	48%
category unknown		7	
General totals	1934	807	42%
<i>Overall</i>	<i>3640</i>	<i>1428</i>	<i>39%</i>

SECTION A: General information about you and your job

1431 survey forms were received. 3 have been deleted from the analysis - one claimed to be a student only, the other two had less than 25% of the responses completed

Question 2: Type of appointment

<i>Appointment</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Academic	621	43.5
General	799	56.0
ESL teacher	7	0.5
Child care worker	1	0.1
<i>Total</i>	<i>1428</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Since there are so few ESL teachers and only 1 child care worker in order to protect the privacy of their responses they are grouped with general staff for the remainder of the tables

Question 1: The section respondents were mainly employed in

<i>Section</i>	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Faculty of Agriculture	38	6.1	56	7.0
Faculty of Arts	105	16.9	32	4.0
Faculties of Economics & Commerce, Education & Law	93	15.0	45	5.7
Faculty of Engineering & Mathematical Sciences	66	10.6	61	7.7
Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry	155	25.0	149	18.7
Faculty of Science	153	24.6	116	14.6
Library			90	11.3
Office of the Executive Director (Academic Services) and Registrar	2	0.3	96	12.1
Office of the Executive Director, Finance and Resources	3	0.5	117	14.7
Vice Chancellery	6	1.0	33	4.2
Total	621	100.0	795	100.0

Question 3: Type of current appointment

<i>Appointment term</i>	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Casual	108	17.4	91	11.4
Tenured / Ongoing	303	48.8	459	57.4
Fixed term	210	33.8	250	31.3
Total	621	100.0	800	100.0

Question 4: Academic staff roles

<i>Academic role</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Executive Dean or HOD/Section	45	7.3
Director of Centre (Academic)	12	1.9
Academic - casual teaching	100	16.2
Academic - teaching and research	313	50.6
Academic - research only	129	20.9
Other	19	3.1
Total	618	100.0

Question 4: General staff roles

<i>Role</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Clerical	73	9.5
Administrative	317	41.1
Technical	144	18.7
Services (e.g. cleaning, security)	39	5.1
Research	120	15.6
Teaching	17	2.2
Other	61	7.9
Total	771	100.0

Question 5: Academic staff job classifications

<i>Academic level</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Professor	65	10.5
Professorial Fellow	7	1.1
Associate Professor	73	11.8
Senior Lecturer	106	17.1
Lecturer	91	14.7
Associate Lecturer	29	4.7
Senior Principal Research Fellow	1	0.2
Senior Research Fellow	15	2.4
Research Fellow	58	9.3
Research Associate	42	6.8
Tutor/Casual Teacher	97	15.6
Other	33	5.3
Total	617	100.0

Question 5: General staff job classifications

<i>General level</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
HEE 1 to 3	147	19.0
HEE 4 to 6	445	57.6
HEE 7 to 8	85	11.0
HEE 9 or above	58	7.5
Other	37	4.8
Total	772	100.0

Question 6: Current appointment full-time or part-time?

FT/PT	Academic		General	
	No.	%	No.	%
Full time	448	74.5	581	73.6
Part time	153	25.5	208	26.4
Total	601	100.0	789	100.0

Question 7a: Length of time employed in higher education

Higher education time	Academic		General	
	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 1 year	37	6.5	79	13.1
1-2 years	44	7.7	75	12.4
3-5 years	89	15.7	140	23.2
6-10 years	123	21.7	135	22.4
11-20 years	140	24.6	120	19.9
21-30 years	87	15.3	45	7.5
Over 30 years	48	8.5	9	1.5
Total	568	100.0	603	100.0

No response rate academic 8.5%, general 25.3%

Question 7b: Length of time employed at UWA

UWA time	Academic		General	
	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 1 year	75	12.8	115	14.7
1-2 years	88	15.0	121	15.5
3-5 years	137	23.3	179	22.9
6-10 years	96	16.4	163	20.8
11-20 years	105	17.9	151	19.3
21-30 years	61	10.4	46	5.9
Over 30 years	25	4.3	8	1.0
Total	587	100.0	783	100.0

No response rate academic 5.5%

Question 7c: Length of time in current role at UWA

<i>Role time</i>	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Less than 1 year	95	17.4	150	21.6
1-2 years	116	21.2	145	20.9
3-5 years	134	24.5	160	23.1
6-10 years	93	17.0	130	18.8
11-20 years	66	12.1	84	12.1
21-30 years	30	5.5	22	3.2
Over 30 years	13	2.4	2	0.3
Total	547	100.0	693	100.0

No response rate academic 11.9%, general 14.1%

Question 8: Highest level of formal education

<i>Education level</i>	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
School or TAFE	4	0.6	342	43.6
Bachelor's degree	107	17.3	237	30.2
Postgraduate diploma	25	4.1	94	12.0
Master's	88	14.3	75	9.6
Doctorate	393	63.7	36	4.6
Total	617	100.0	784	100.0

Question 9: Gender

<i>Gender</i>	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Male	381	61.6	281	35.2
Female	238	38.4	518	64.8
Total	619	100.0	799	100.0

Question 10: Marital status

<i>Marital</i>	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Single	105	17.0	203	25.6
Living with partner/married	464	75.2	527	66.5
Separated/divorced/widowed	48	7.8	62	7.8
Total	617	100.0	792	100.0

Question 11: Region of birth

<i>Born</i>	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Australia	311	50.3	501	62.6
Asia (East, South, SE Asia and Indian Ocean)	60	9.7	66	8.3
UK, North America, Ireland or New Zealand	163	26.4	160	20.0
Western Europe	43	7.0	25	3.1
South or Central America	1	0.2	1	0.1
Middle East	3	0.5	4	0.5
Africa	17	2.8	19	2.4
Southern or Eastern Europe including the former USSR	15	2.4	19	2.4
Oceania	3	0.5	1	0.1
Other	2	0.3	4	0.5
Total	618	100.0	800	100.0

Question 15: Age group

<i>Age</i>	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Under 20 years	1	0.2	7	0.9
20-29 years	94	15.2	201	25.2
30-39 years	156	25.2	170	21.3
40-49 years	195	31.5	219	27.4
50-59 years	136	22.0	176	22.1
60 years or over	37	6.0	25	3.1
Total	619	100.0	798	100.0

Questions 12, 13, 14, 16, 17: Percentage of staff belonging to each of the following categories

	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
An ethnic or cultural minority	86	13.8	84	10.4
A non-English home language	58	9.3	34	4.2
Are Aboriginal	2	0.3	2	0.2
Have dependents	308	49.6	291	36.1
Have a disability	17	2.7	23	2.9

A note on the results tables in the following sections

The tables in the following sections summarise the views of staff about working at UWA. Academic and General staff responses have been analysed separately.

Contents of the results tables

Many of the items in the survey required an answer in the form of a rating on a numerical scale, e.g., a number between 1 and 4 on a 4-point Satisfaction scale on which :

- 1 = Very Dissatisfied
- 2 = Dissatisfied
- 3 = Satisfied
- 4 = Very Satisfied

The responses to such items are summarised in the tables by

- (1) the average of the numerical ratings, indicating where on the response scale the group's responses are centred, and
- (2) the distribution of the numerical ratings, indicating the percentage of the group that responded with ratings of 1, 2, 3 and 4.

As an example, the ratings of satisfaction with various aspects of research are shown below.

Question 2: Level of satisfaction with various aspects of research

	Academic (%)					General (%)					Significant Lows and Highs
	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	
Time available for research	24	33	33	10	2.3	9	21	52	18	2.8	Tenured Academics 1.9 (Arts 1.6), Fixed term Academics 2.8
Resources available to support research	14	35	44	8	2.5	13	28	46	13	2.6	Tenured Academics 2.3
Quality of laboratory facilities	10	24	51	15	2.7	9	22	56	12	2.7	ECEL 2.5

While a group's satisfaction level can be summarised by its average satisfaction rating, the distribution of responses is also important. For example, the 4-point Satisfaction scale has a mid-point of 2.5, and, overall, groups averaging above this level might be considered *satisfied*, and groups averaging below this level *dissatisfied*. It should be noted, however, that even in groups averaging 2.5 or more, the proportion of the group that is dissatisfied (i.e., dissatisfied or very dissatisfied) may be unacceptably high. For groups averaging 2.5 the proportion is typically about 50%. For groups averaging 2.7, the proportion is still likely to be above 30% (see table above). A useful rule of thumb for the Satisfaction ratings, therefore, is: An average rating of 2.7 or less indicates that at least 30% of the group is dissatisfied.

In addition to analysing the responses of Academic and General staff separately, the responses of many sub-groups were also examined. The main sub-groups examined were defined in terms of: Section (the six faculty groups and the four administrative sections) and type of contract (Casual/Fixed term/Tenured or Ongoing). Analyses of Gender, Level (upper/lower) and Age (younger/older) were also conducted.

Reporting the average ratings of dozens of sub-groups is not practicable so they are reported only when they differ appreciably from the average ratings of the whole group (Academic or General, whichever is appropriate). Noteworthy instances of identifiable sub-groups with extreme responses are presented in the tables as Significant Lows and Highs. The criteria for reporting lows and highs are illustrated below.

Significant Lows and Highs

An example of a significantly *low* response of a sub-group to an item is the average satisfaction rating of *Tenured Academic staff in the Faculty of Arts* in response to the item *Time Available For Research*. Academics as a whole group rated their satisfaction on this item as 2.3 (see table above). Of all the sub-groups analysed, the one with the lowest average response to this item was Tenured Academics in the Faculty of Arts, who rated their satisfaction at 1.6. This is well below the average for all Academics (2.3), so the response of this sub-group is reported as a Significant Low. For this particular item there were several tenured academic sub-groups with low satisfaction ratings so the results table also shows the average response of Tenured Academics across all ten Sections (which was 1.9). This example illustrates one criterion for reporting a Significant Low – the sub-group's average response is the least or near-least of all the sub-groups analysed, and is well below that of the whole group.

A second criterion for reporting a Significant Low that was occasionally applied is that even if the lowest-rating sub-group has an average response not much lower than that of the whole group, it is reported as a Significant Low if it lies on the undesirable side of the scale mid-point. For example, Academics' Satisfaction with the *Number of Research Students* averaged 2.6, and the lowest rating sub-group was Tenured Academics in the Faculty of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences at 2.4, but the latter is reported as a Significant Low because 2.4 is on the dissatisfied side of 2.5, the mid-point of the Satisfaction scale.

The criteria used for reporting significant highs on the Satisfaction scale, and for significant lows and highs on other scales, are similar to those described above.

Differences between Sub-groups

The number of sub-groups analysed was large so, in the interests of readability, the statistical significance of differences between sub-groups' average ratings of satisfaction and agreement is not reported. For larger sub-groups (e.g. Tenured Academics v. Fixed Term Academics) differences as small as 0.2 will be statistically significant. When comparing the average ratings of smaller sub-groups (with, say, about 20 respondents in each sub-group) more caution is required: in such cases group differences should be at least 0.5 before statistical significance can be assumed.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations used for Section are as follows:

Agric	Agriculture
Arts	Arts
ECEL	Economics, Commerce, Education and Law
EngMS	Engineering and Mathematical Sciences
Fin & R	Finance and Resources Office
Library	Library
Med & Dent	Medicine and Dentistry
Reg	Registrar's Office
Sci	Science
VC	Vice-Chancellery

SECTION B: Aspects of your job and your workplace

Question 1: Percentage spread of satisfaction with certain elements of respondents' present job

	<i>Academic</i>				<i>General</i>				<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>		
	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>		<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>
Amount of responsibility you are given	1	11	58	30	3.2	1	11	61	27	3.1	
Opportunity to use your abilities	3	19	47	31	3.1	3	18	54	25	3.0	
Freedom to choose your own method of working	1	9	48	41	3.3	2	9	54	35	3.2	Ongoing Agric General staff 3.7, Fixed term ECEL Academics 3.6, Fixed Term VC General staff 3.6
Clarity of definition of your role	4	20	54	23	3.0	5	22	58	15	2.8	
Staff development opportunities to assist with your role	5	21	57	18	2.9	6	24	55	15	2.8	
Amount of variety in your job	1	8	54	37	3.3	2	13	59	26	3.1	
Your job security	20	18	40	22	2.6	12	19	50	19	2.8	Fixed term staff overall 2.1 (Arts 1.6, Agric 1.7, Science 1.9), and Older Casuals 2.1. Tenured/Ongoing staff overall 3.2.
Encouragement to make suggestions	7	14	50	30	3.0	3	13	54	30	3.1	Fixed term VC General staff 3.5
The physical environment in which you work	6	20	49	25	2.9	5	15	51	28	3.0	
Your salary and benefits	9	25	54	12	2.7	4	28	57	11	2.7	Fin & R General Casuals 2.3, EngMS Academics 2.4, Casual Arts Academics 2.4, Fixed term VC General staff 3.3
Your opportunities for career progression or promotion	15	29	45	11	2.5	13	35	46	6	2.5	Fixed term Science Academics 2.1
Your current workload	18	27	49	6	2.4	7	17	68	8	2.8	Tenured Academics 2.1, especially Arts (1.8), EngMS (2.0) and Science (2.0)
The recognition given for effort/good work	14	31	43	12	2.5	9	22	52	17	2.8	Tenured Academics 2.1, EngMS 2.2. Fixed term VC General staff 3.3
Availability of help and support from other staff	7	21	56	17	2.8	4	15	60	21	3.0	Fixed term General staff in VC 3.5 and in Library 3.4
Time available to carry out your work	18	33	42	8	2.4	7	21	61	11	2.8	Tenured Academics 2.0, especially Arts (1.8), Science (1.8), Med & Dent (1.9), EngMS (2.0). Fixed term General staff in VC 3.3 and Library 3.2

Note: 1=Very dissatisfied.....4 = Very satisfied. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale.

Question 2: Percentage spread of respondents' ratings of characteristics of a positive work environment

(i) for academic staff

B2	Extent to which I value				Workplace management				UWA				Significant Lows and Highs
	Low	Med	High	*Mean (MidPt 2.0)	Low	Med	High	*Mean (MidPt 2.0)	Low	Med	High	*Mean (MidPt 2.0)	
Timely decision making	2	24	74	2.7	15	54	32	2.2	22	58	21	2.0	Overall, Academic staff valued the 15 characteristics of a positive work environment more highly (average rating 2.7) than they perceived Workplace management to value them (2.2) or UWA to value them (2.1) Workplace Management In relation to Workplace Management, the characteristics perceived to be valued least were confidence building, conflict resolution and listening to others in Agriculture (1.9), and confidence building and participative decision-making in EngMS (1.9) UWA In relation to UWA, the characteristics perceived to be valued the least were participative decision-making (1.8 across all sections, 1.6 in Arts) and listening to others (1.9 across all sections), timely decision-making in Arts and ECEL (1.9), confidence-building in Arts (1.8), EngMS (1.9) and Science (1.9), care and consideration for others in Arts (1.9), conflict resolution in ECEL (1.9) and devolving responsibility in EngMS (1.9)
Devolving responsibility	3	52	44	2.4	13	57	29	2.2	18	55	27	2.1	
Care and consideration for others	1	9	90	2.9	16	47	37	2.2	22	54	24	2.0	
Building confidence in staff	1	16	83	2.8	22	51	27	2.1	25	54	20	2.0	
Resolution of conflict between staff	2	27	71	2.7	24	47	29	2.1	20	58	22	2.0	
Participative decision-making	2	30	68	2.7	22	48	31	2.1	34	48	18	1.8	
Building a vision for the future	5	38	58	2.5	18	45	37	2.2	14	38	48	2.3	
Being good at the job		4	95	2.9	10	34	56	2.5	12	46	42	2.3	
Listening to others		20	79	2.8	18	51	31	2.1	24	58	18	1.9	
Being creative	1	24	75	2.7	18	48	34	2.2	19	56	25	2.1	
Being adaptable	1	28	72	2.7	10	49	42	2.3	12	57	31	2.2	
High standards of work performance		6	94	2.9	8	36	55	2.5	9	41	51	2.4	
A culture of continuous improvement	3	27	71	2.7	14	51	35	2.2	11	48	40	2.3	
An ethos of continuous learning for staff	1	27	71	2.7	20	50	29	2.1	13	46	41	2.3	
Providing a quality service to students	1	14	85	2.8	10	39	51	2.4	15	43	43	2.3	

(ii) for general staff

	Extent to which I value				Workplace management				UWA				Significant Lows and Highs
	Low	Med	High	*Mean (MidPt 2.0)	Low	Med	High	*Mean (MidPt 2.0)	Low	Med	High	*Mean (MidPt 2.0)	
Timely decision making	1	25	74	2.7	13	53	34	2.2	19	55	25	2.1	Overall, General staff valued the 15 characteristics of a positive work environment more highly (average rating 2.7) than they perceived Workplace management to value them (2.3) or UWA to value them (2.2) Workplace Management In relation to Workplace Management, the characteristics perceived to be valued least were listening to others in ECEL (1.9), conflict resolution in EngMS (1.8), being creative in the Library (1.9) and participative decision-making in Science (1.9). UWA In relation to UWA, the characteristics perceived to be valued least were timely decision-making in Science (1.9), participative decision-making in Science (1.8) and EngMS (1.9), being creative in Science (1.8), Arts (1.8) and ECEL (1.8), listening to others in Science (1.8) and Arts (1.8), confidence building in Science (1.9) and conflict resolution in EngMS (1.9)
Devolving responsibility	5	47	48	2.4	14	57	29	2.1	10	63	27	2.2	
Care and consideration for others		9	91	2.9	15	44	41	2.3	16	55	29	2.1	
Building confidence in staff	1	16	84	2.8	22	45	33	2.1	19	56	25	2.1	
Resolution of conflict between staff	1	22	76	2.8	21	45	35	2.1	18	51	31	2.1	
Participative decision-making	2	31	67	2.6	22	49	29	2.1	21	58	21	2.0	
Building a vision for the future	6	41	53	2.5	13	48	39	2.3	11	38	51	2.4	
Being good at the job		6	94	2.9	7	36	57	2.5	10	48	42	2.3	
Listening to others		15	85	2.8	18	48	33	2.1	20	61	19	2.0	
Being creative	2	36	62	2.6	18	55	27	2.1	21	60	19	2.0	
Being adaptable		18	82	2.8	9	42	49	2.4	13	55	33	2.2	
High standards of work performance		9	91	2.9	5	33	62	2.6	8	40	52	2.4	
A culture of continuous improvement	2	29	69	2.7	12	47	41	2.3	10	49	41	2.3	
An ethos of continuous learning for staff	2	29	69	2.7	18	48	35	2.2	11	46	43	2.3	
Providing a quality service to students	4	18	78	2.7	7	35	58	2.5	9	40	51	2.4	

Note: 1= low....3 = high. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale.

Question 3a: Percentage spread of agreement with each of the following statements

	<i>Academic</i>					<i>General</i>					<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>	
I feel comfortable about voicing my complaints and suggestions	6	25	53	16	2.8	7	22	57	14	2.8	Fixed term Academics in Arts 2.3
Management acknowledges the concerns of staff	10	29	52	9	2.6	9	26	54	12	2.7	Fixed term General staff in Arts 2.3; Tenured Academics in Arts, EngMS and Science 2.4, Fixed term Academics in Arts 2.4
Decision-making is devolved to the appropriate level	11	32	52	6	2.5	6	31	55	9	2.7	Tenured Academics in Arts 2.2 Arts overall 2.4. Tenured Academics 2.4
Staff are generally treated with respect	8	16	60	16	2.9	5	13	65	17	2.9	Fixed term Academics in Arts 2.5, Fixed term VC General staff 3.4
Decisions are made with sufficient consultation	14	36	42	8	2.4	9	39	44	7	2.5	Fixed term Academics in Arts 2.2. Tenured Academics in EngMS 2.2. Ongoing General staff in ECEL 2.2, Fixed term VC General staff 3.0
Staff are well informed by management about goals, priorities and decisions	13	36	44	8	2.5	12	39	41	8	2.5	Fixed term General staff in Science 2.1. Fixed term staff in Agriculture 2.2. Tenured & Ongoing staff in EngMS 2.2. Fixed term staff in Med & Dent 2.2, Fixed term VC General staff 3.0
I am informed about changes affecting my job	10	26	55	9	2.6	8	24	57	12	2.7	Fixed term Academics & Ongoing General staff in Arts 2.4 Fixed term Academics in EngMS 2.4
Management is accessible to staff	6	18	60	15	2.9	4	15	60	22	3.0	Fixed term Academics in Arts 2.5
Generally speaking I am satisfied with my job	7	18	58	16	2.8	4	12	66	19	3.0	Tenured Academics in EngMS 2.4, and in Science 2.5. General staff in ECEL 2.7, Reg 3.2, VC (Fixed term) 3.6

Note: 1= Strongly disagree....4 = Strongly agree. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale.

Question 3b: Academic staff opinions on an academic career (percentages)

	<i>Academic</i>					<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>	
Would choose an academic career again	9	22	46	24	2.8	Tenured EngMS 2.6, Arts 3.1
Not a good time for a young person to aspire to an academic career	7	27	36	30	2.9	Fixed term Arts 3.2, Fixed term & Tenured EngMS 3.1

Note: 1= Strongly disagree....4 = Strongly agree. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale.

Question 3c: General staff opinions on a career in higher education (percentages)

	<i>General</i>					<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>	
Would choose career in higher education again	4	26	56	15	2.8	Fixed term EngMS 2.5, Library 3.0
Not a good time for a young person to aspire to a career in higher education	10	51	29	10	2.4	VC 2.2, Arts 2.9

Note: 1= Strongly disagree....4 = Strongly agree. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale.

Question 4: Percentage spread of agreement with each of the following statements

	<i>Academic</i>					<i>General</i>					<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>	
I am more motivated by intrinsic interests in my work than by material rewards	1	11	54	34	3.2	1	27	60	12	2.8	Fixed term General staff Arts 2.5
My overall satisfaction with my job has improved over the last five years	19	35	35	10	2.4	7	33	50	10	2.6	Tenured Academic staff 2.1, especially Arts & Science (1.9) Fixed-term General staff in ECEL 2.2, Arts & EngMS 2.3
I subordinate most aspects of my life for my work	5	36	41	18	2.7	14	57	25	4	2.2	Agreement generally greater in Full-time staff and Upper level staff. Tenured Academics in EngMS & Science 3.1 and Arts 3.0 Fixed term General staff in Fin & R 2.5 and EngMS 2.5
My job is a source of considerable personal stress	5	35	40	20	2.8	9	54	28	9	2.4	Tenured Academics in Science 3.1, Fixed term & Tenured Academics in EngMS 3.0 and Fixed Term Academics in Arts 3.0. Ongoing General staff in Arts 3.0
My work commitments leave me very little time to Myself	3	34	39	23	2.8	11	61	21	7	2.2	Tenured Academics in Science 3.4, Arts & EngMS 3.2 and Med & Dent 3.1. Fixed term General staff in EngMS 2.7, and ongoing General staff in Arts 2.6 and Science 2.5
I am actively seeking a change of job at the moment	28	49	14	10	2.1	28	51	15	6	2.0	Fixed-term General staff in Arts 2.6 and EngMS 2.4

Note: 1= Strongly disagree....4 = Strongly agree. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

Question 5a, 5b and 5c: Hours of work and additional hours worked

(i) for staff who indicated they were full-time

	<i>Academic</i>				<i>General</i>				<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Std Dev</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Std Dev</i>	
Hours in working week*	42.5	40	40	8.2	38.2	37.5	37.5	3.7	
Extra hours worked per week	13.9	12.5	10	10.0	4.5	3		5.8	Tenured Academics 15 extra hours per week
Extra hours which were unpaid	14.3	12.5	10	8.8	5.5	4	5	5.8	Tenured Academics 15 unpaid hours per week

(ii) for staff who indicated they were part-time

	<i>Academic</i>				<i>General</i>				<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Std Dev</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Std Dev</i>	
Hours in working week*	19.4	10	40	16.1	21.4	20	30	9.6	
Extra hours worked per week	6.1	4		7.0	3.2	1		6.0	
Extra hours which were unpaid	6.8	5	10	6.9	3.5	2		6.1	

*For general staff, the award hours; for academic staff what was considered a 'fair' working week.

It was apparent that some staff in each category interpreted questions 5a, 5b and 5c in the wrong way. For example, although question 5a asked for either award hours or what was considered a 'fair' working week, it was obvious some respondents entered their total hours per week. Also numerous respondents had larger figures for 5c than 5b, i.e. they claimed to be working more unpaid extra hours per week than their total of extra hours per week.

Question 6 : Satisfaction with certain leave entitlements

	Academic (%)					General (%)					Significant Lows and Highs
	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	
Sick leave for illness or injury/caring for others	4	6	63	27	3.1	2	4	56	38	3.3	Library 2.6
Parental leave (including maternity leave)	3	8	64	25	3.1	1	6	61	32	3.2	
Leave without pay or secondment	2	6	67	24	3.1	2	7	65	26	3.1	
Study leave	8	12	46	34	3.1	8	17	57	18	2.9	
Long service leave	6	9	56	29	3.1	3	9	56	31	3.2	

Note: 1 = Very dissatisfied....4 = Very satisfied. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale.

These percentages were calculated using the 'applicable' responses, so the number of responses used are in some cases less than half the total number of respondents to the survey.

Question 7: Level of difficulty of arranging certain types of leave

	Academic (%)						General (%)						Significant Lows and Highs
	Not at all	Just a little	Moderate amount	Quite a lot	A great deal	Mean* (MidPt 3.0)	Not at all	Just a little	Moderate amount	Quite a lot	A great deal	Mean* (MidPt 3.0)	
Sick leave for illness or injury/caring for others	69	16	10	2	3	1.5	78	11	8	2	1	1.4	Library 2.8 Agric 3.0, VC 2.8, Med & Dent 2.7 Agric 2.9
Parental leave (including maternity leave)	70	11	10	3	6	1.6	65	16	9	6	3	1.6	
Leave without pay or secondment	57	13	12	9	8	2.0	61	13	13	7	6	1.8	
Study leave	38	19	22	8	12	2.4	46	23	14	5	12	2.2	
Long service leave	44	12	12	14	18	2.5	56	16	9	12	8	2.0	

Note: 1 = Not at all....5 = A great deal. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

These percentages were calculated using only the 'applicable' responses, so the number of responses used are in some cases less than half the total number of respondents to the survey.

SECTION C: Your well-being

Question 1: The frequency of specific feelings respondents have as a result of their job in the last few weeks

	Academic (%)							General (%)						Significant Lows and Highs	
	Never	Occasion-ally	Some of the time	Much of the time	Most of the time	All of the time	Mean* (MidPt 3.5)	Never	Occasion-ally	Some of the time	Much of the time	Most of the time	All of the time		Mean* (MidPt 3.5)
Gloomy	25	36	21	10	6	1	2.4	34	36	20	7	3		2.1	Reg 1.8, Tenured Academics 2.6
Calm	18	23	27	18	13	2	2.9	9	22	25	24	18	2	3.3	Tenured Academics 2.7, VC 3.8
Uneasy	18	33	29	11	7	2	2.6	27	39	23	7	3		2.2	Tenured Agric Academics 2.0
Enthusiastic	2	15	30	27	22	4	3.6	4	19	29	26	19	4	3.5	EngMS, Library 3.4, Casuals 3.9, VC 4.0
Cheerful	11	34	28	16	8	3	3.4	16	42	27	11	4	1	3.7	EngMS 3.1, VC 4.1
Worried	12	24	28	18	15	2	2.8	9	18	29	22	19	3	2.5	Fin & R 2.3, Library 2.3, Tenured Academics 3.1 (Sci 3.4)
Contented	9	34	26	17	11	3	3.1	17	39	27	9	6	1	3.3	Tenured Academics 2.8 (EngMS 2.4). Fixed term ECEL General staff 2.5, Ongoing Arts General staff 2.7. VC overall 3.8, Library Fixed term staff 4.1 (c.f. Library Ongoing staff 3.0)
Tense	9	34	26	17	11	3	3.0	17	39	27	9	6	1	2.5	Tenured Academics 3.2 (Science 3.6, Arts 3.4). Library 2.3, Ongoing Arts General staff 3.5
Depressed	38	35	15	7	4	1	2.1	51	27	16	3	2		1.8	
Optimistic	12	25	27	17	14	4	3.1	10	24	30	18	16	2	3.1	Tenured Arts Academics 2.6, Tenured Sci Academics 2.6 (c.f. Fixed term 3.5), Tenured EngMS Academics 2.7. VC overall 3.7
Relaxed	23	28	26	14	8	1	2.6	15	26	25	20	12	2	2.9	Tenured Arts Academics 2.1, Fixed term Arts Academics 2.2, Fixed term EngMS Academics 2.2. Ongoing Arts General staff 2.1, Fixed term Arts General staff 2.3
Miserable	55	26	11	4	2	1	1.8	62	24	10	2	2		1.6	

Note: 1 = Never....6 = All of the time. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

Question 2: Frequency of absences from work due to illness in the last 6 months

Number of times absent	Academic (%)	General (%)	Number of days illness	Academic (%)	General (%)	Significant Lows and Highs
0	76	44	0	76	44	
1	13	21	1	7	12	
2	6	16	2	6	14	
3	2	8	3	3	9	
4		4	4	2	7	
5 or 6	1	2	5	1	4	
7 or more		1	6	2	1	
unknown	1	3	7 to 10	1	4	
			11 or more	1	2	
			unknown	1	3	
Total	100	100		100	100	

Question 3: Awareness, use of and satisfaction with the EAP (Employees Assistance Program)

	Academic (%)	General (%)
Yes, was aware of the UWA EAP	33	43
Of those aware of the program, yes have used it	11	12
Of those who have used the program, yes were satisfied with it.	77	88

Note that the total number of responses to the last question were quite small (22 for academic staff and 40 for general staff)

SECTION D: Equity and ethical issues in your workplace

Question 1: Frequency with which respondents have noticed offensive comments or gestures concerning the following

	Academic (%)					General (%)				
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)
Gender	46	31	19	3	1.8	55	27	15	4	1.7
Sexual orientation	61	25	12	2	1.5	62	23	12	3	1.6
Race, nationality/indigenous status/culture or ethnic background	53	30	14	3	1.7	56	25	15	4	1.7
Pregnancy	81	15	4		1.2	83	13	4	1	1.2
Disability	85	12	2		1.2	82	14	3		1.2
Family responsibilities	63	24	12	2	1.5	66	17	14	2	1.5
Age	58	26	15	2	1.6	62	23	13	2	1.6

Note: 1 = Never....4 = Often. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

Question 2: Respondents' opinions on the extent to which workplace management discourage discriminatory behaviour concerning the following

	Academic (%)				General (%)			
	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Mean* (MidPt 2.0)	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Mean* (MidPt 2.0)
Gender	12	30	58	2.5	19	28	53	2.3
Sexual orientation	18	30	52	2.3	25	25	51	2.3
Race, nationality/indigenous status/culture or ethnic background	14	26	60	2.5	20	26	54	2.3
Pregnancy	16	29	55	2.4	22	24	53	2.3
Disability	15	26	59	2.4	21	23	57	2.4
Family responsibilities	20	31	50	2.3	23	29	49	2.3
Age	19	33	48	2.3	23	28	49	2.3

Note: 1 = Not at all....3 = To a great extent. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale.

Note that the above percentages are based only on the 'applicable' responses.

Up to 25% of respondents marked Not Applicable for these items.

Question 3: Equity and discrimination concerns

	<i>Academic % yes</i>	<i>General % yes</i>
Have you sought advice in relation to equity concerns?	10	8
Have you ever been sexually harassed at UWA?	6	5
Have you ever been racially harassed at UWA?	3	2
Have you experienced other forms of discrimination?	14	13
Are you aware of the University's policy on Equal Opportunity?	84	83
Are you aware of the grievance / dispute settling procedure?	59	55
If aware of grievance procedure, have you used it?	8	7
If grievance procedure used, were you issued resolved equitably?	39	50

Note that the total number of responses to the last question were quite small (24 for academic staff and 28 for general staff)

Question 4: Respondents' opinions on how workplace behaviour has changed in the last 3 years in relation to the following groups.

	<i>Academic (%)</i>						<i>General (%)</i>						<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>		
	<i>Much worse</i>	<i>Worse</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Better</i>	<i>Much better</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 3.0)</i>	<i>Much worse</i>	<i>Worse</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Better</i>	<i>Much better</i>		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 3.0)</i>
Women		2	35	28	9	24	3.6		2	37	28	8	25	3.6	
Disabled		1	31	24	7	37	3.6		1	26	30	9	35	3.7	
Aboriginal			1	29	21	8	41	3.6		1	28	19	7	44	3.6
Younger	1	9	38	17	2	33	3.2		4	37	16	3	39	3.3	
Older	1	10	44	8	2	36	3.0	1	7	41	10	2	39	3.1	
Family resp.	1	7	38	20	3	31	3.2		4	31	27	4	33	3.5	
Cultural b/ground		3	36	23	5	34	3.4		2	30	26	5	38	3.5	
Gay		1	34	13	2	49	3.3		1	32	15	3	49	3.4	

Note: 1 = Much worse....5 = Much better. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

Question 5: Awareness of and reporting of ethical behaviour

	<i>Academic (%)</i>			<i>General (%)</i>		
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Are you aware of the University's Code of Ethics and Code of conduct?	78	22		80	20	
Does UWA actively encourage ethical behaviour by all of its employees?	79	21		82	18	
Have you reported an occurrence of unethical behaviour?	11	78	11	7	83	9
Have you been aware of an occurrence of unethical behaviour which you did not report?	25	75		22	78	
Are people who report unethical behaviour or disclose wrongdoing in your workplace protected from victimisation and harassment?	24	33	44	27	25	48
Do you know what course of action is available to report unethical behaviour?	44	56		40	60	

Question 6: Types of improper, corrupt or illegal behaviour observed by respondents - as a percentage of all respondents

	<i>Academic (%)</i>	<i>General (%)</i>	<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
None	49	56	47% Arts, 74% Library
Bribes	1	1	
Conferring benefits	14	13	Library 2%, Science 18%
Queue jumping	9	10	Reg 5%, ECEL 13%
Stealing	7	9	ECEL 4%, Science 13%
Conflict of interest	30	23	Library 8%, Science 33%, VC 33%
Other	10	9	

Note percentages do not total 100 as respondents could nominate more than one

Question 7: Frequency of the following behaviours in the workplace

	<i>Academic (%)</i>						<i>General (%)</i>						<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>	<i>*Mean (MidPt 3.0)</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>	<i>*Mean (MidPt 3.0)</i>	
Senior staff lead by example in ethical behaviour	4	9	28	43	16	3.6	2	10	25	40	23	3.7	EngMS 3.4, Library 4.0
Staff accept personal responsibility for their actions	2	7	28	46	16	3.7	1	8	28	42	21	3.7	Reg 4.0

Note: 1 = Never....5 = Always *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

SECTION E: Teaching

82% of the academic staff respondents and 14% of the general staff respondents said they were involved in teaching (a total of 612 respondents)
The tables in section E apply only to these respondents. The percentages in this section are based only on the 'applicable' responses.

Question 2: Level of satisfaction with various aspects of teaching

	Academic (%)					General (%)					Significant Lows and Highs
	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	
Equipment and technology	7	28	51	13	2.7	6	45	44	6	2.5	
Availability of appropriate teaching spaces	6	36	52	6	2.6	6	29	56	9	2.6	Library 1.5
Resources available to support teaching	9	35	51	6	2.5	5	38	51	6	2.6	
Number of students in your classes/units	9	25	58	8	2.6	4	11	74	10	2.9	
Quality of students in your area	5	22	53	20	2.9	3	16	65	15	2.9	Agric Academics 2.4, Arts Academics 3.1
Amount of contact time with students	5	20	66	9	2.8	1	15	73	11	2.9	
Your marking load	12	26	56	6	2.5	2	9	82	7	2.9	Tenured and Fixed term EngMS Academics 2.1 Tenured Arts Academics 2.2, Tenured Sci Academics 2.3
Use of student feedback to improve teaching	3	16	65	15	2.9	5	19	64	12	2.8	
Recognition for teaching performance	11	31	52	6	2.5	14	34	46	6	2.4	
Teaching beyond your area of expertise	4	14	75	7	2.9	2	13	81	4	2.9	
Timetabling arrangements for your courses	11	18	63	8	2.7	8	15	70	7	2.8	Agric Academics 2.2

Note: 1 = Very dissatisfied4 = Very satisfied. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

Question 3: Opinions on changes to teaching methods

	Academic (%)					General (%)					Significant Lows and Highs	
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)		
I have made considerable changes to my teaching methods over the last three years		4	32	50	14	2.7	3	39	51	7	2.6	
I plan to make changes over the next three years		3	18	64	15	2.9	2	24	65	9	2.8	
I have access to adequate time and resources to help me in making these changes		28	49	22	1	2.0	17	47	36		2.2	Tenured Academics overall 1.8 (Sci 1.6, Arts 1.7, EngMS 1.7)
I believe there is adequate institutional support to assist me to make changes I see as important to improve my teaching		19	41	39	2	2.2	12	35	53		2.4	Tenured Science Academics 1.9, Tenured Arts and EngMS Academics 2.0

Note: 1 = Strongly disagree4 = Strongly agree. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

SECTION F: Research

85% of the academic staff respondents and 23% of the general staff respondents said they were involved in research (a total of 711 respondents)

The tables in section F apply only to these respondents. Note that the percentages in this section are based only on the 'applicable' responses.

Question 2: Level of satisfaction with various aspects of research

	<i>Academic (%)</i>					<i>General (%)</i>					<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.5)</i>	
Time available for research	24	33	33	10	2.3	9	21	52	18	2.8	Tenured Academics 1.9 (Arts 1.6, Science 1.7) Fixed term Academics 2.8
Resources available to support research	14	35	44	8	2.5	13	28	46	13	2.6	Tenured Academics 2.3 (Med & Dent 2.1)
Quality of laboratory facilities	10	24	51	15	2.7	9	22	56	12	2.7	ECEL 2.5
Quality of library holdings and support	10	23	53	14	2.7	4	13	63	20	3.0	Tenured Science Academics 2.1
Number of travel grants for research purposes	15	37	43	5	2.4	14	44	36	6	2.3	Reg 1.5. Med & Dent 2.1
Number of research students	7	29	58	7	2.6	6	22	64	8	2.7	Tenured EngMS Academics 2.4
Quality of research students	2	19	61	18	2.9	4	15	68	13	2.9	Agric Academics 2.6
Supervision of research students	4	15	68	13	2.9	4	28	57	11	2.7	
Computing facilities and other equipment to support research	6	24	54	16	2.8	8	25	51	16	2.8	
The University's recognition of research performance	9	25	54	12	2.7	9	29	53	9	2.6	Fixed term Science Academics 2.2, Fixed term Med & Dent Academics 2.4

Note: 1 = Very dissatisfied4 = Very satisfied. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

SECTION G: Consulting

Question 1: Consulting work

	<i>Academic Yes %</i>	<i>General Yes %</i>	<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
Do you do any professional or consultative work external to the university?	41	9	ECEL Academics 52% Med & D Academics 55%
If you do consulting work, are you satisfied with the amount you are able to do within the restriction of other work commitments?	79	78	Arts 70%, EngMS Academics 70%
If you do consulting work, are you satisfied with the amount you are allowed to do under University policy?	87	81	

SECTION H: Your career opportunities at The University of Western Australia

Question 1: The sources and value of assistance received in relation to career opportunities

	<i>Academic</i>					<i>General</i>					<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
	<i>% who used</i>	<i>% spread across ratings</i>			<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.0)</i>	<i>% who used</i>	<i>% spread across ratings</i>			<i>Mean* (MidPt 2.0)</i>	
		<i>Not valuable</i>	<i>Moderately valuable</i>	<i>Very valuable</i>			<i>Not valuable</i>	<i>Moderately valuable</i>	<i>Very valuable</i>		
None	34					34					
HR	26	29	52	18	1.9	27	22	56	22	2.0	Agric overall 1.6
Faculty	25	34	43	23	1.9	15	37	44	20	1.8	EngMS General staff 1.3,
Support Centre	16	41	39	20	1.8	11	33	40	27	1.9	Agric, EngMS 1.5
Supervisor	51	15	42	43	2.3	45	14	40	45	2.3	
CSD	30	25	50	25	2.0	25	17	53	31	2.1	
P&T committee	19	39	38	23	1.8	6	63	23	13	1.5	Fixed term staff 1.3
Reviewer	19	45	45	11	1.7	26	27	45	28	2.0	
Colleagues	47	7	43	50	2.4	37	7	51	41	2.3	

Note: 1 = Not valuable.....3 = Very valuable. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

The percentages in the 2nd and 7th column show the percentage of all academic and general staff respondents respectively who used that particular source. Those who have used that source are then taken as 100% and the spread of their ratings shown in the following 3 columns.

Question 2: 64% of academic staff respondents and 60% of general staff respondents felt there were barriers to career progression (Arts Academics 79%)

Question 3: Perceived barriers to career progression - as a percentage of all respondents

	<i>Academic (%)</i>	<i>General (%)</i>	<i>Significant Lows and Highs</i>
Difficult and time-consuming application process	27	21	Library 12%, Arts Academics 36%
Lack of development opportunities (including non approval of secondments or other temporary placements)	10	24	
Insufficient number of tenured or ongoing positions	29	19	Agric Academics 39%
Tight budgets	38	36	ECEL, VC 23%, Arts Academics 58%
Short-term funded position	25	19	Agric 40%
Gender bias	10	6	
Bias based on race, nationality/indigenous status/culture or ethnic background	3	1	
Other biases including disability, age, and sexual orientation	3	5	
Unconventional research area	12	2	Arts Academics 21%
Too little time for research	27	3	Arts Academics 41%, EngMS Academics 36%
Lack of relevant vacancies for which to apply	24	39	Library 48%, Arts Academics 36%
Other	10	9	

Note percentages do not total 100 as respondents could nominate more than one

SECTION I: Conference attendance and other staff development

Questions 1-3: Settling into work and conference attendance

	Academic (%)			General (%)		
	Yes	No	Not sure/can't remember	Yes	No	Not sure/can't remember
When you first arrived at UWA, were you given sufficient assistance to settle into your job quickly?	63	27	9	69	21	10
Do you have adequate opportunity to attend conferences?	66	25	9	47	32	21
If applicable, have you ever had a request to attend a conference refused?	12	88		17	83	

Question 4: Number of conferences attended in the last 3 years

No. Conferences	Academic (%)	General (%)
None	15	53
1 or 2	32	36
3 to 5	39	9
6 to 10	12	1
11 or more	3	
Total	100	100

Question 5: Sources of funding for conferences attended in last 3 years

	Academic (%)	General (%)
Fully funded by UWA	21	58
Partially funded by UWA	53	21
Fully externally-funded	19	10
Partially externally-funded	26	9
Fully self-funded	20	10
Partially self-funded	41	16
Other	4	6

Note percentages do not total 100 as respondents could nominate more than one
Percentages are of those who had attended conferences

Questions 6 and 10: Staff development activities

	Academic (%)			General (%)		
	Yes	No	Not sure	Yes	No	Not sure
Do you believe that you have adequate access to staff development opportunities?	57	22	21	54	27	19
If applicable, have you ever had a request to attend staff development activities refused?	3	97		12	88	

Question 7: Staff development activities undertaken

Staff Development activities	Academic (%)	General (%)	Significant Lows and Highs
None	31	27	
Occupational Health and Safety	8	21	
Information Technology	18	33	
Recruitment & Selection	14	7	
Student supervision	13	2	
Research	14	4	
Teaching and Learning	35	5	ECEL Academics 49%, Arts Academics 41%
Management and Leadership	19	17	Agric Academics 34%, Fin & R General Staff 32%
Equal Opportunity	7	8	
Career Development	4	11	
Communication	10	22	
Other	3	7	

Note percentages do not total 100 as respondents could nominate more than one

Percentages in the 2 tables below are of those who had indicated a Staff Development activity had been undertaken.

Question 8: Reasons for staff development activities

Reason	Academic (%)	General (%)
Develop skill	82	80
Personal interest	48	52
Peer suggestion	8	9
Referral by supervisor	13	27
Other	6	3

Note percentages do not total 100 as respondents could nominate more than one

Question 9: Sources of staff development

Source	Academic (%)	General (%)
Centre for Staff Development	77	66
External provider	16	36
Department/Faculty/staff development activities	30	29
Conference attendance	25	21
Other	4	7

Note percentages do not total 100 as respondents could nominate more than one

SECTION J: General comments about working at UWA

Question 1: Levels of agreement to statements about The University of Western Australia

	Academic (%)					General (%)					Significant Lows and Highs
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean* (MidPt 2.5)	
Fine traditions	2	8	68	22	3.1	1	9	67	23	3.1	Arts General Staff 2.6 ECEL 2.4, VC 2.8
Out of touch	7	57	30	7	2.4	6	56	32	6	2.4	
Best staff	5	39	50	6	2.6	4	41	52	3	2.5	
Best students	1	17	60	22	3.0	1	23	63	13	2.9	
Conservative culture	1	14	60	26	3.1	1	11	67	20	3.1	
Facilities world class	9	45	42	4	2.4	5	37	54	5	2.6	
Involved with community	3	26	64	6	2.7	3	26	65	6	2.7	
Good place to work	4	14	65	16	2.9	2	10	67	22	3.1	

Note: 1 = Strongly disagree.....4 = Strongly agree. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale

Question 2: Perceptions of how the University has changed as a place to work in the last 3 years

Note that only respondents who indicated that they'd worked at UWA for 3 or more years (section A, question 7b) have answered this question

	Academic (%)					General (%)					Significant Lows and Highs		
	Much worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much better	Mean* (MidPt 3.0)	Much worse	Worse	Same	Better		Much better	Mean* (MidPt 3.0)
How UWA has changed	10	40	37	12		2.6	3	31	46	19	1	2.9	Tenured Academics 2.4 (EngMS 2.2, Arts 2.2, Sci 2.3), Fixed term Arts Academics 2.3

Note: 1 = Much worse 5 = Much better. *Mean is the average of the ratings. The value in brackets is the mid-point of the rating scale.

Question 4: The three best aspects about working at UWA

Academic staff respondents

<i>Best aspects (up to 3 per respondent)</i>	<i>Full-time (%)</i>	<i>Part-time (%)</i>
Job autonomy	49	35
Physical environment	47	39
Reputation of the university	40	51
Interpersonal relations between staff	31	44
Access to technology	18	24
Facilities	14	10
Job security	14	3
Personal recognition	10	13
Opportunities for career progression or promotion	9	7
Professional support	7	10
Access to training and development	7	9
Salary package	6	6
Understanding family responsibilities of staff	5	7
Workload	3	11
Equity	2	3
Administrative requirements / duties	2	1
Job-related stress	1	1
Other	18	14

General staff respondents

<i>Best aspects (up to 3 per respondent)</i>	<i>Full-time (%)</i>	<i>Part-time (%)</i>
Physical environment	45	39
Interpersonal relations between staff	37	40
Access to technology	29	25
Reputation of the university	28	26
Job security	26	15
Job autonomy	25	33
Access to training and development	15	12
Salary package	13	14
Facilities	12	9
Understanding family responsibilities of staff	8	16
Workload	8	14
Personal recognition	8	9
Opportunities for career progression or promotion	7	6
Administrative requirements / duties	6	4
Professional support	4	4
Equity	4	4
Job-related stress	3	7
Other	8	10

Question 5: The three worst aspects about working at UWA

Academic staff respondents

<i>Worst aspects (up to 3 per respondent)</i>	<i>Full-time (%)</i>	<i>Part-time (%)</i>
Workload	46	23
Job-related stress	40	21
Administrative requirements / duties	32	13
Job security	27	39
Salary package	25	27
Opportunities for career progression or promotion	23	34
Interpersonal relations between staff	17	11
Personal recognition	15	15
Facilities	9	16
Access to technology	6	8
Professional support	6	6
Understanding family responsibilities of staff	5	5
Physical environment	3	10
Equity	2	3
Access to training and development	2	8
Job autonomy	2	5
Reputation of the university	1	
Other	16	8

General staff respondents

<i>Worst aspects (up to 3 per respondent)</i>	<i>Full-time (%)</i>	<i>Part-time (%)</i>
Opportunities for career progression or promotion	37	34
Job-related stress	37	24
Workload	31	21
Job security	29	37
Salary package	22	23
Personal recognition	22	19
Interpersonal relations between staff	15	11
Administrative requirements / duties	11	9
Access to training and development	8	12
Physical environment	7	10
Access to technology	6	8
Facilities	6	10
Professional support	6	5
Job autonomy	4	3
Understanding family responsibilities of staff	3	4
Equity	2	4
Reputation of the university	1	0
Other	10	10

SECTION K: Final Comments

The comments made by respondents in Section J (after the question about how UWA has changed as a place to work) contained similar themes to those in Section K, and in some cases the same point was repeated in both sections. Therefore the comments from both sections have been combined.

Below are tables with a count of the number of comments made by respondents which fit a certain theme or category. Many of the comments were quite lengthy, so one respondent's comment was allowed up to 12 categories. 704 of the 1428 respondents made additional comments in either section J or K, or both.

<i>Positive comments</i>	<i>Academic</i>	<i>General</i>	<i>Total</i>
Like working at UWA	15	30	45
Good / better employment conditions: eg family responsibilities, salary	5	16	21
Have a satisfying / fulfilling / stimulating job	9	12	21
Very good colleagues / team; good support from colleagues	5	13	18
Good / improved facilities or working environment	5	8	13
UWA has become less conservative; open to new ideas; enlightened	3	9	12
Good opportunities for staff development / participation in staff activities	5	6	11
Great physical environment / surroundings (UWA)	1	10	11
Better information about directions, planning etc; more aware of need for consultation	5	6	11
Good / improved on equity issues	3	8	11
Support / acknowledgement of staff	3	7	10
Good support or encouragement from senior staff	3	5	8
Positive comments about DVC	7	1	8
Immediate workplace has improved because of change of staff or change of department	2	5	7
Survey comments (positive)	2	5	7
UWA better than other university(ies) I have worked at	3	2	5
Improvement in technology / computing / IT support	1	4	5
Positive comments about VC, leadership	4	1	5
Better job security (have become ongoing / tenured)	2	2	4
Don't let working conditions deteriorate		4	4
More recognition of teaching; striving to improve teaching	3	1	4
Salary progression good; better career opportunities for general staff		3	3
Support for research	2	1	3
Non-specific comments about university being better	2	1	3
Improvement in health & safety issues		3	3
Improved productivity		2	2
Staff complain without seeing benefits; problems are general		2	2
Positive comments about map librarian	1	1	2
Benefits from restructuring	1	1	2
Miscellaneous positive comments	12	14	26

In the negative comments below, comments about high workload include the effects this has, such as lack of time for family, personal development, thinking, planning ahead and the reduction in the quality of service or work. Lack of time for research has been categorised separately, as has lack of time for professional development.

<i>Negative comments / suggestions for improvement</i>	<i>Academic</i>	<i>General</i>	<i>Total</i>
Increased or very large workload; not enough time to complete everything; not enough staff/resources to do the work	78	61	139
Budget cuts; funding shortages (general comments)	56	48	104
Comments about the survey	45	29	74
More demands, pressure or stress; results of stress : ill health / irritability / less collegiality / etc	35	33	68
Concerns, anxiety about job security / retrenchments / staff on short-term contracts / increasing casualisation	26	40	66
Greater administrative load; increase in paperwork / bureaucracy / appraisals	47	11	58
Facilities, infrastructure, resources: inadequate / old / fewer	34	22	56
Lack of appreciation for staff / their efforts / their skills (e.g. excellence not rewarded, staff undervalued etc)	18	35	53
Salaries low/inadequate (especially compared to industry); not remunerated for increased workload/responsibilities	22	29	51
Low / declining morale; climate of fear; general dissatisfaction	19	23	42
Not enough support for / money being spent on research and /or development	27	13	40
Larger teaching loads; larger class sizes; less staff more students	37	1	38
Falling quality - of programmes, students; quality of teaching suffering	23	11	34
Management at faculty/ departmental level: inadequate / inflexible / autocratic / non-supportive etc	22	11	33
Undervaluing the real purpose of a university; more concerned about money than educating; scholarship / creativity is dying	22	11	33
Fewer / lack of opportunities for career change or advancement (fewer appropriate positions)	12	19	31
Funding: inadequate or inequitable funding (to departments, to core activities); being used inefficiently	20	8	28
Changes which are unsettling; uncertainty surrounding them; not enough information or not informed quickly enough about changes	13	14	27
Decreased time for research	21	3	24
Lack of understanding / recognition of problems / activities in the university	13	10	23
Comments about leadership of university (other than lack direction / understanding)	13	9	22
Change(s) implemented poorly (e.g. without appropriate support or training); stress / problems caused by change(s)	5	17	22
Change for the sake of change, with no real commitment or follow-through; too many changes	14	7	21
Lack of training or professional development: not enough time / not enough money / lack of availability	8	12	20
UWA too conservative; complacent; slow to change (systems which encourage this)	9	11	20
Senior staff / academics with too much power; using power inappropriately	6	14	20
General staff / academic staff divisions; not enough recognition of GS contribution		19	19
More control and direction needed; unclear directions; no cohesive plan; disorganised	7	12	19
Unsatisfactory work performance; unproductive staff	8	10	18
Lack of support staff (clerical, technical); difficult to attract funding for this	11	6	17
Over-management: Too many managers / high-level positions; too much power in management	12	5	17
Insufficient consultation; too much interference in departmental affairs	9	5	14
Physical working conditions poor (air-conditioning, space, showers)	5	8	13
Unrealistic nature of UWA's goals; too much rhetoric; gap between rhetoric and reality	10	3	13
Promotion application difficulties / inequities e.g. not based on merit; time consuming	8	4	12
Government under-funding universities; not valuing higher education	11	1	12
Inappropriate behaviour towards other staff (bullying etc); not dealt with adequately	4	7	11
Personal job dissatisfaction (not stimulating enough, not enjoyable)	5	6	11
Difficulties caused by divisions: lack of communication between departments; no cohesiveness; devolved nature of academic planning restricts progress	3	7	10
Good teaching not given sufficient recognition / encouragement; too much emphasis on research (including promotion)	9	1	10
Lack of confidence in / complaints about financial department / financial services	5	4	9
IT concerns (other than need for staff training): overall plan / broader vision / centralised body / more support or input	1	8	9
Want to leave UWA / was bad decision to come here	7	2	9
Problems with being casual or part-time: not treated as part of the staff; lack of information,	7	2	9
Parking - fees too high; lack of, access has declined; public transport problems; parking for casual staff	4	4	8
Some disciplines not being supported; emphasis on money endangering basic disciplines (particularly arts)	6	2	8
Problems associated with working off campus: lack of interaction, exchange of ideas	1	7	8

<i>Negative comments / suggestions for improvement....Cont'd</i>	<i>Academic</i>	<i>General</i>	<i>Total</i>
Inability to take leave: too busy / no suitable replacement staff / supervisor refusals	2	6	8
Inefficiencies in getting things done (e.g. committees) / red tape	5	3	8
Good quality research not effectively monitored / encouraged / recognised; emphasis on quantity rather than quality	7	1	8
Women disadvantaged ; conditions for women not improving	3	4	7
Difficulties associated with raising concerns: being discredited, retribution, senior staff difficult to deal with	3	4	7
Negative comments about campus: too much building, less greenery	2	5	7
Lack of personal recognition	2	5	7
Acadaemia less attractive - difficult to continue; have no more to give	7		7
More IT training needed for staff	1	5	6
Politics influencing decisions / activities	4	2	6
Negative comments about HR	4	2	6
Workplace conflicts - affecting work environment, not resolved	3	3	6
Employment conditions: more flexibility needed; more short leave; have deteriorated		6	6
More support for staff with self-education / studying		5	5
Inexperienced staff: temporary staff or changes in duties	1	4	5
Feelings of isolation (because of level of position, casual status, employed on grant money)	4	1	5
Hierarchical; snobby	1	4	5
Lack of teamwork	2	3	5
Staff resistant to change (insular attitudes)	3	1	4
Staff leaving or wanting to leave UWA (because of dissatisfaction); high turnover of staff		4	4
Other contributions not properly recognised (eg editorship of journals,	3	1	4
Drawbacks of IT advances: too many e-mails, reports expected more quickly	1	3	4
Divisions between central administration and faculties	1	3	4
Inefficiencies in Central Admin (area not specified)		4	4
Lack of information regarding work conditions / entitlements	2	2	4
Concerns about current or future structures / amalgamations	2	2	4
Deterioration in services (eg cleaning, bookshop)		3	3
Staff could be more helpful to students; more client oriented		3	3
Gender bias towards females; males left out	2	1	3
Timetabling problems	2	1	3
Concerns about CELT: not being valued, uncertain future		3	3
Physical separation of department / discipline	1	2	3
People / students of other cultures not treated well	2	1	3
Policies not being implemented (eg family responsibilities)		3	3
Lack of guidance / clarity re job expectation	1	2	3
Low quality of some UWA extension programmes	3		3
Delays in departmental budget allocation	1	2	3
Difficulties with salary progression / reclassification		3	3
UWA needs to promote itself overseas better	1	1	2
Fewer postgraduate students; going elsewhere	2		2
Not enough funds / support for travel / conferences	2		2
Leave Shenton Park bushland alone	1	1	2
Qualifications aren't everything; experience should count		2	2
Concerns about using IT as a tool for teaching	1	1	2
Students not as interested in learning	2		2
Miscellaneous comments and suggestions	53	44	97

GENDER DIFFERENCES

Significant gender differences in numerical ratings were observed but were never numerically greater than 0.4. The differences tended to be slightly greater for Academic staff than for General staff. Listed below are the main survey items for which the overall gender differences were highly statistically significant (p equal to or less than 0.001).

Section B - Aspects of your job and your workplace

Female staff were more satisfied than male staff with

- Salary and benefits
- Current workload
- Recognition given for effort/good work
- Time available to carry out their work

Female staff valued conflict resolution and listening to others more highly than male staff. Male staff valued being creative more highly than female staff.

Female staff agreed more strongly than male staff with the statements

- My overall satisfaction with my job has improved over the last five years.
- Generally speaking I am satisfied with my job

Male staff agreed more strongly than female staff with the statements

- I subordinate most aspects of my life for my work
- My job is a source of considerable personal stress
- My work commitments leave me very little time to myself

Section H - Your career opportunities at The University of Western Australia

Female staff valued more highly than male staff the assistance received from the Support Centre and the CSD.

Section J - General comments about working at UWA

Female staff felt more strongly than male staff that The University of Western Australia is a good place to work.

Male staff felt more strongly than female staff that UWA had become a worse place to work over the last 3 years.

COMPARISON WITH 1997 WORKING LIFE SURVEY

As with the survey results, academic respondents and general staff respondents have been examined separately. The 1997 questionnaire was changed considerably for the 2000 survey but many questions remained the same so, where possible, comparisons have been made. The sections below follow the layout of the 2000 survey form.

Comparison of 5 point and 4 point scales

Direct comparisons between some of the items in the two surveys were difficult because a 5 point satisfaction scale and a 5 point agreement scale were used in 1997. The middle category was not used for the satisfaction or the agreement scale in 2000 because of the difficulty of interpreting the meaning of this category. So that comparisons could be made between the two surveys, the middle category in 1997 was ignored and the remaining 4 percentages redistributed proportionately to total 100%. An example is given in the table below.

<i>1997 survey example</i>	<i>Very</i>			<i>Very</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>Satisfied %</i>	<i>Satisfied %</i>	<i>neutral %</i>	<i>Dissatisfied %</i>	<i>Dissatisfied %</i>	
% distribution	10	40	20	20	10	100
% distribution, excluding middle category	12.5	50		25	12.5	100

Where comparable items were available, the 1997 total of ‘Very satisfied %’ and ‘Satisfied %’ (after re-distribution) was subtracted from the corresponding total in the 2000 survey. This difference is used as the comparative measure for all items where 5 and 4 point scales were compared and is referred to in tables as ‘% Satisfaction change’ (or where applicable, % Agreement change). A negative figure indicates that the level of satisfaction is estimated to have fallen in the 2000 survey compared to the 1997 survey.

Section A – Information about respondents

The most noticeable difference was the increase in the percentage of tenured or ongoing respondents in the 2000 survey compared to 1997, for both academic and general staff, and a corresponding drop in the percentage of fixed term respondents.

<i>Type of appointment</i>	<i>Academic</i>		<i>General</i>	
	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>
Casual	16	17	13	11
Tenured / tenurable / ongoing	40	49	43	57
Fixed term	44	34	44	31

Other differences in the demographics of respondents were:

- Higher percentage of part-time workers: Academic 17% (1997), 25% (2000); General 21% (1997), 26% (2000).
- Slightly higher percentage in the 50-59 age group: Academic 17% (1997), 22% (2000); General 18% (1997), 22% (2000).
- Lower percentage of academic respondents from the faculty of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences – 16% (1997), 11% (2000).
- Lower percentage of academic respondents who had been in their current role from 21-30 years – 10% (1997), 5% (2000).

Section B – Aspects of job and workplace

Question 1 – satisfaction with elements of present position

<i>Item</i>	<i>% Satisfaction change</i>	
	<i>Academic</i>	<i>General</i>
Amount of responsibility you are given	-1	-1
Opportunity to use your abilities	-6	-2
Freedom to choose your own method of working	-2	0
*Clarity of definition of your role	-4	-3
Staff development opportunities to assist with your role	7	12
Amount of variety in your job	1	-1
Your job security	12	12
*Encouragement to make suggestions	3	7
*Availability of help and support from other staff	6	-1
Physical Environment in which you work	13	14
Opportunities for career progression or promotion	16	31
*The recognition given for effort/good work	-1	14

*These four items were worded differently in 1997 as follows: Clear definition of your role; The way you are encouraged to make suggestions; Support which staff provide for each other; Recognition given for effort (respectively).

The higher proportion of tenured/ongoing respondents in 2000 would have had an impact on, for example, the items job security and opportunities for career progression or promotion.

Question 2

The same scale (low, medium, high) was used in both surveys. The two tables below use the following keys for comparing the percentage spread of respondents in 2000 and 1997 across the low, medium and high ratings.

<i>key</i>	<i>2000% - 1997%</i>
+++	An increase of more than 10%
++	An increase of 7-10%
+	An increase of 4-6%
--	A decrease of 7-10%
-	A decrease of 4-6%

(i) Academic respondents

<i>Item</i>	<i>Extent to which I value</i>			<i>Extent UWA values</i>		
	<i>Low</i>	<i>Med</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Med</i>	<i>High</i>
Timely decision making						
Devolving responsibility				+		-
Care and consideration for others						
Building confidence in staff				-	+	
Participative decision-making				+	-	
Building a vision for the future		+	-		--	+++
Being good at the job						
Listening to others						
Being creative		+		-		
Being adaptable		++	--	-		+
High standards of work performance						
A culture of continuous improvement						
An ethos of continuous learning for staff						
Providing a quality service to students	-					

(ii) General staff respondents

<i>Item</i>	<i>Extent to which I value</i>			<i>Extent UWA values</i>		
	<i>Low</i>	<i>Med</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Med</i>	<i>High</i>
Timely decision making			+			+
Devolving responsibility					+	
Care and consideration for others			+	-		+
Building confidence in staff			+	--		+
Participative decision-making				--	+	
Building a vision for the future		+		-		+
Being good at the job				-	++	
Listening to others						
Being creative		+	-		+	-
Being adaptable						
High standards of work performance						
A culture of continuous improvement				-	+	
An ethos of continuous learning for staff				-		
Providing a quality service to students			-			

Question 3a

Most of the items in this question could not be compared because in 1997 respondents were asked to consider UWA as a whole, whereas in 2000 they were asked to consider their immediate work environment.

The results of the general question about how respondents felt about their job as a whole, (although worded differently in each survey) are presented below.

<i>Feelings about job</i>	<i>Academic (%)</i>		<i>General (%)</i>	
	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>
Satisfied	59	75	61	85
Neutral	24	N/A	27	N/A
Dissatisfied	17	25	12	15
% Satisfaction change*		-3		1

*After taking 'neutral' percentage into account

Question 5a and 5b – hours of work

Only full-time respondents were compared for this question because part-time hours can vary for many reasons. The total hours from the 2000 survey were obtained by the addition of the answers to two separate questions, whereas in 1997 they were obtained from one question. In both surveys it was clear that some respondents did not answer as was intended. Because of the different methods by which these hours have been obtained and the fact that some respondents gave answers which seemed incorrect, it is uncertain how reliable the following comparisons are.

<i>Full-time respondents Hours of work</i>	<i>Academic(%)*</i>		<i>General (%)*</i>	
	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>
31-40	11	7	66	47
41-50	38	35	29	43
51-60	35	37	2	7
More than 60	14	20	1	2

*A small percentage of respondents indicated that they were full-time but quoted hours per week less than 31

Question 6 – work entitlements

There was either no change or very little change in the dissatisfaction levels with sick leave, parental leave and study leave. There was a slight decrease in the percentage of academic respondents dissatisfied with long service leave.

Section D – Equity and ethical issues in your workplace

Question 3 – discrimination and equity concerns

The percentage of respondents claiming to have been sexually harassed or racially harassed was similar in 1997 and 2000.

A greater percentage of respondents were unaware of the University's policy on Equal Opportunity (7% of academic and 10% of general staff respondents in 1997; 14% of both groups in 2000).

Question 4 – change of workplace behaviour in relation to certain groups

The percentage of academic respondents who thought workplace behaviour towards women had improved fell from 37% to 28%, while those who thought it was the same rose from 30% to 35%.

The percentage of academic respondents who thought workplace behaviour towards people with disabilities had improved fell from 31% to 24%, while those who thought it was the same rose from 26% to 31%.

The percentage of general staff respondents who thought workplace behaviour towards older employees had worsened fell from 15% to 8%.

Section E – Teaching

There was a slightly lower percentage of general staff respondents who indicated an involvement in teaching (18% in 1997, 14% in 2000).

<i>Item</i>	<i>% Satisfaction change</i>	
	<i>Academic</i>	<i>General*</i>
Resources available to support teaching	-2	-11
Number of students in your classes/units	-2	15
Quality of students in your area	-6	-7
Amount of contact time with students	1	3
Your marking load	1	13
Use of student feedback to improve teaching	1	7
Recognition for teaching performance	10	3

*Note that the number of general staff respondents for some of these items was quite small (<100)

Section F – Research

<i>Item</i>	<i>% Satisfaction change</i>	
	<i>Academic</i>	<i>General</i>
Time available for research	-2	-16
Resources available to support research	-1	-9
Quality of laboratory facilities	2	13
Quality of library holdings and support	-5	0
Number of travel grants for research purposes	6	16
Number of research students	5	6
Quality of research students	4	3
Supervision of research students	0	-3
Computing facilities and other equipment to support research*	-4	2
The University's recognition of research performance	5	0

*1997 item was: Computing facilities to support research

Section H – Career opportunities at UWA

There was an increase in the percentage of respondents who perceived barriers to their career progression at UWA (Academic: 51% 1997, 64% 2000; General: 51% 1997, 60% 2000). This increase may have partly been because the respondents in 2000 were supplied with a list of possible barriers (after the question about barriers to career progression), which may have acted as a prompt. In 1997 there was only an open-ended question.

The table below shows the percentage of all respondents who used a particular source in relation to career options, promotions, appeals or other job related matters at UWA.

<i>Source of assistance</i>	<i>Academic %</i>		<i>General %</i>	
	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>
Supervisor	51	51	49	45
Colleagues	51	47	39	37
CSD	27	30	20	25
Human Resources	19	26	28	27
Faculty administration	14	25	8	15
Support Centre	5	16	3	11
Staff development reviewer	8	19	N/A	26
Promotions & Tenure committee	6	19	N/A	6

Section I – Conference attendance and other staff development

The following table assumes that non-respondents to the question in both surveys had attended zero conferences – a reasonable assumption given the way the question was asked in 1997. It makes only a slight difference to the 2000 percentages which were calculated for the main report.

<i>Number of conferences</i>	<i>Academic %</i>		<i>General %</i>	
	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>
0	16	16	68	55
1-2	30	31	22	34
3-5	35	38	8	9
6-10	14	11	2	1
11 or more	4	3	0	0

The questions about self-funding and external funding of conferences were asked differently in 1997 and 2000 (2000 question distinguished between partial and full funding whereas 1997 did not), so only the results of funding by UWA are included here. The percentages in the following three tables are of all respondents.

<i>Funding of conferences</i>	<i>Academic %</i>		<i>General %</i>	
	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>
Fully funded by UWA	30	18	17	26
Partially funded by UWA	38	45	8	10

Information Technology (IT) does not appear in the following table because there was no comparable item in 1997.

<i>Area of staff development</i>	<i>Academic %</i>		<i>General %</i>	
	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>
Occupational Health and Safety	4	8	13	21
Recruitment and Selection	21	14	6	7
Student supervision	8	13	1	2
Research	12	14	4	4
Teaching and Learning	30	35	6	5
Management and Leadership	16	19	12	17
Equal Opportunity	5	7	3	8
Career development	4	4	7	11
Communication	8	10	18	22

<i>Source of staff development</i>	<i>Academic %</i>		<i>General %</i>	
	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>
Centre for staff development	43	52	34	46
External provider	10	11	18	25
Department/Faculty activities	11	20	10	20
Conference attendance	15	17	10	15

The percentage of general staff respondents who indicated neither conference attendance nor any area of staff development in the previous three years dropped from 35% in 1997 to 21% in 2000. (Academic staff respondents - 11% in 1997 and 8% in 2000.)

Section J – General comments about working at UWA

Question 1 – perceptions of UWA

<i>The University of Western Australia:</i>	<i>% Agreement change</i>	
	<i>Academic</i>	<i>General</i>
is a university with fine traditions	-1	-4
is out of touch with modern day needs	4	-6
attracts the best staff	-13	-8
attracts the best students in the State	-10	-8
has a conservative culture	-4	-2
has facilities which are world class	-13	-8
is actively involved with the community	6	5
is a good place to work	-1	0

Question 2 – How UWA has changed as a place to work

<i>How UWA has changed</i>	<i>Academic (%)</i>		<i>General (%)</i>	
	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>2000</i>
Much worse	9	10	3	3
Worse	32	40	23	31
Same	40	37	49	46
Better	17	12	22	19
Much better	1	0	2	1

Question 4 – Three best aspects of working at UWA

Respondents were asked to choose three items from a list of seventeen as being the 3 best aspects of working at UWA. Many items in 2000 retained a similar ranking and percentage vote as they had in 1997. Those in the table below are the only items which had a fairly substantial change in either their popularity ranking or the percentage of all respondents who voted for that item. As with the main report, full-time and part-time (and casual in 1997) staff have been compared separately.

Two new items, job security and opportunities for career progression or promotion, were introduced in 2000. Even though these items were not one of the most popular best aspects (14% and 9% respectively of full-time academic staff), it may have reduced the percentage vote for some of the other items. Note that there were fewer part-time/casual staff than full-time staff, which may have been one of the reasons for more variable results.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Rank 1997</i>	<i>% 1997</i>	<i>Rank 2000</i>	<i>% 2000</i>
<i>(a) Full-time academic staff</i>				
Interpersonal relations between staff	4th	25	4th	31
Facilities	5th	21	6th	14
<i>(b) Part-time academic staff</i>				
Job autonomy	1st	50	4th	35
Reputation of the university	3rd	36	1st	51
Interpersonal relations between staff	4th	27	2nd	44
Facilities	6th	20	8th	10
<i>(c) Full-time general staff</i>				
Physical environment	1st	57	1st	45
Facilities	6th	22	9th	12
<i>(d) Part-time general staff</i>				
Interpersonal relations between staff	2nd	34	1st	40
Facilities	6th	16	12th	9
Salary package	11th	9	8th	14

Question 5 – Three worst aspects of working at UWA

The two new items attracted a substantial proportion of the vote in all 4 groups. They were the two top-ranked items for both groups of part-time/casual staff and in the top 6 for full-time staff. Therefore the effect of these two new items on many of the other items was to reduce their percentage vote or to displace them to a lower ranking. In general, the most notable items were those which retained or increased their percentage vote or ranking.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Rank 1997</i>	<i>% 1997</i>	<i>Rank 2000</i>	<i>% 2000</i>
<i>(a) Full-time academic staff</i>				
Workload	2nd	33	1st	46
Administrative requirements	4th	30	3rd	32
Job-related stress	1st	40	2nd	40
<i>(b) Part-time academic staff</i>				
Salary package	3rd	28	3rd	27
Facilities	6th	17	6th	16
<i>(c) Full-time general staff</i>				
Workload	4th	30	3rd	31
<i>(d) Part-time general staff</i>				
Job-related stress	3rd	27	3rd	24
Workload	4th	21	5th	21
Personal recognition	1st	31	6th	19

COMPARISON WITH THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF McINNIS (1999)

A survey of 2600 academic staff at 15 Australian universities was conducted by McInnis in 1999*. Seven key items in McInnis' national survey that related to job satisfaction were employed in the Working Life Survey 2000. After adjustments to McInnis' data (which were on a 5-point agreement scale), it can be seen that UWA academic staff compared favourably with academic staff nationally:

	% Agreement	
	Working Life Survey 2000	National Survey 1999
I am more motivated by intrinsic interests in my work than by material rewards	88	91
My overall satisfaction with my job has improved over the last five years	46	38
I subordinate most aspects of my life for my work	58	67
My job is a source of considerable personal stress	60	73
My work commitments leave me very little time to myself	62	77
I am actively seeking a change of job at the moment	24	23
Generally speaking I am satisfied with my job	75	67

UWA academic staff also reported greater satisfaction with study leave entitlements (80% v 63% satisfied).

McInnis found that early career academics (up to seven years experience, median age 37 years) were much more satisfied with their jobs and less stressed than older academic staff. These findings are consistent with the pattern seen in the present survey where fixed term staff (who tend to be younger) are more satisfied and less stressed than tenured staff.

The finding in the present survey that female academic staff felt significantly more than male academic staff that their overall job satisfaction had improved in the last 5 years was also observed in McInnis' national survey. A marked difference between the national study and the UWA Working Life Survey, however, was that whereas McInnis found nationally that female academic staff felt significantly more than male academic staff that they subordinated most aspects of their lives for their work, that their work commitments left them little time for themselves, and that their jobs were a source of considerable stress, at UWA the gender differences on these items were significant but in the opposite direction, that is, male academic staff agreed with these items more strongly than female academic staff.

*McInnis, Craig (1999). The work roles of academics in Australian universities. Evaluations and Investigations Programme, Higher Education Division, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs. [www.detya.gov.au/highered/eippubs.htm]

SELECTION OF POSITIVE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS**Like working at UWA****(45)**

I've really enjoyed working at UWA to date, and hope to continue to do so for many years. There are things that could be improved, but there is no such thing as a perfect world. Thanks for letting me be here.

Working at UWA has made a substantial difference to my life - it's so stimulating and rewarding. Thanks for the opportunity.

The University is a great place to work (however....)

Despite all this, the university remains a good place to work in many ways.

Overall, my view is that UWA is a good employer.

As someone committed to a career in research and teaching - and having worked at several universities, I have no regrets about coming to UWA.

Good / better employment conditions: eg family responsibilities, salary**(21)**

Employment conditions have definitely improved from good to better than good!

Recent work place agreement is good

Attitudes to flexibility of hours and working part time have improved. Time off for care of children is easier to arrange.

UWA has developed strategies to assist staff with their career development flexible work arrangement,

Have a satisfying / fulfilling / stimulating job**(21)**

I don't know much about the culture but I do enjoy my job!

However there have been many exciting developments in my area which have made the job interesting.

The job satisfaction I experience working with my team and our students balances with the negatives. In fact it outweighs them.

It's a great privilege being an academic.

Very good colleagues / team; good support from colleagues**(18)**

I like it mainly because of the people I work with – they are nice people and do care.

What makes my experience of working at UWA a pleasure is the support and friendliness of my colleagues - and some members of the main stream UWA staff.

Great work environment and people to work with. ... it is great to work with some really energetic and brilliant people, making work more of a hobby!

SELECTION OF NEGATIVE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Below are samples of respondents' comments from each of the categories where 15 or more respondents made similar comments. The number alongside the heading indicates the total number of respondents who made a comment of that type. A bracketed portion of a comment indicates that it was also included in another category.

Increased or very large workload; not enough time to complete everything; not enough staff/resources to do the work

(139)

Many simply commented on the increased workloads while some connected it to other causes or effects. Causes or effects of a large workload which have also been put into another category are bracketed.

After almost 30 years at UWA I am now concerned that workloads are too high (and that this is causing dangerous levels of stress to our younger academic staff.)

Too much work Not enough time My job is exhausting and not sustainable

(budget cuts and changes in funding) provide fewer workers - the overload is becoming crushing..

The workload for most academics is far too high in our area. Lack of time is a major problem

Increasing workloads are a worry too, for people who value quality teaching highly. The "doing more with less" adage sits in my head some days,

Fewer staff to do the work. Everyone is running around like lab rats.

devolution of duties not matched by increased staff

redundancies leading to very heavy workloads of remaining staff, constant devolving of responsibilities (and costs) to the coal-face,....., advice that workloads for academics, and by default for technical and administrative staff, must continue to increase

Time (and finances) have become increasingly under pressure, limiting the time available to enable me to perform to the level I expect of myself.

Some depts have had such a large reduction of staff, it badly affects the service provided to other departments.

Academics/Researchers are in survival mode and have no more to give to ensure growth....The lack of time to make good decisions & to plan for improvement in all areas is a major problem. Academics need time to think to function properly.

I am in on a Sunday doing this, months late because I can't fit my work into the proper hours. Staffing levels are a big factor. I need help at a reasonable level, but nobody will consider allowing me extra staff at any level. I am having to be quite unethical to get any relief, and over-working the staff I do have.

The staff seem to be more strapped for time than ever. They have difficulty just keeping up (with their own research) and lecturing commitments, which leaves them no time to give advice to tutors or to adequately supervise postgraduates.....It strikes me that if the staff are so seriously strapped for time then there has to be something seriously wrong with the workloads that they are being required to shoulder

More pressure to work longer to detriment of home and family..... There just isn't time or enthusiasm to write UWA teaching upgrade grants because of other time commitments and responsibilities.

Budget cuts; funding shortages (general comments)

(104)

These are general comments about lack of money or budget cuts; other comments which imply that the distribution of money is inequitable or that it is being spent unwisely have been categorised separately.

Budget restrictions over the past decade have affected every aspect of academia

Tighter budgets mean work is not always carried out as I would wish.

Less funding, more cutbacks in all departments.

Catastrophic decline in budget.

UWA continues to cut maintenance and infrastructure budgets

Too much uncertainty in departments as a result of funding shortages.

Lack of funding has exacerbated (already limited facilities)... In my department, in particular, more and more funding restrictions
Budgets are tighter causing tension amongst departments,
There is simply no money to put programmes into place
Decline in funding,.....Funding cuts cause a multitude of disquiets.
We're wasting more time scrambling for less "chicken feed" in funds

Comments about the survey

(74)

Maybe next time you should ask some questions about relationships between general and academic staff and about access to university facilities for those located principally off-campus
Section B is too ambiguous! Questions should be more specific otherwise answers are meaningless.
Too many questions to motivate people in participation.
As I only work 4 hours a week it was difficult answering many of the questions.
My responses are influenced by the department I work in and are obviously biased in that regard.
The survey questionnaire should be better tuned before it is actually used. A pilot survey could be utilised for such refinement.
Why bother about these surveys when nothing ever changes?

More demands, pressure or stress; results of stress : ill health / irritability / less collegiality / etc

(68)

While conscientious and committed, however the working environment has become increasingly stressful for many of us.
More stressful, more demanding and at the same time gives little in return,
(Less money), more pressure. As a consequence staff members are unhappy with their working arrangements and tend to be hostile both to students and to other staff members.
Although I enjoy my job at UWA, I believe the extent of system changes,(the work volume), increased complexity and the degree of job related stress have impacted on my health and life. This opinion is shared by other staff with whom I liaise.
..and pressures to increase funding input and research output. One can't do it all!!
Expectations - boosted to unreasonable proportions.
A critical threshold has been reached where staff simply cannot respond positively to such requests. The "core" of the University is fine, but too many new demands are being placed on staff.

Concerns, anxiety about job security / retrenchments / staff on short-term contracts / increasing casualisation

(66)

Job security has not been addressed as such. The preponderance of contract work and lack of permanent positions in administration is a cause for concern.
Job insecurity is becoming worse, I look for employment all the time.
Job security is the biggest problem for contract staff. There is no good strategy for rewarding or keeping good contract staff.
Due to the political climate, no job or career is safe.
General research staff (are not valued and) have little access to permanent employment.
Uncertainties over job security regarding restructuring
For grant-funded research staff, security is even less than previously experienced;
Lack of job security... Retrenchment/forced redundancy of two academic (dedicated, on tenure!) staff in our dept plus loss of other support staff has led to the following: 2. deep concern whether I will be employed by UWA until retirement in a few years.

Greater administrative load (on academics); increase in paperwork / bureaucracy / appraisals

(58)

More and more meaningless paperwork - more work delegated down to departments increasing the administrative load on academics.

Increasing amount of staff time devoted to administrative matters

Higher administrative loads, too many discussion documents, reviews etc. Too much time being seen to do the right thing rather than doing it – the atmosphere is becoming Orwellian.

Growth of paperwork at all levels is worrying.

Too much time has to be spent on justifying one's position and possible decisions - too little time is left for work

Too much administration which takes resources from the core business (Teaching & Research). If we must restructure, then we have to streamline administration and work smarter.

Bad bits: [*academics*] more responsibility for 'clerical' activities without reduction in the number of 'clerks'. Are we becoming bean counters, rather than academics?

Facilities, infrastructure, resources: inadequate / old / fewer

(56)

Resources and facilities for research have been categorised separately where research has been specifically mentioned

Poor resources for new equipment. UWA needs to spend some of its wealth on (RESEARCH) RECRUITMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE before it's too late - it's left behind by Curtin/Murdoch.

My productivity levels have dramatically dropped due to: 1. Inadequate and outdated resources

We're continually being asked to do more with fewer resources,

Deterioration in library resources.

There is a lack of infrastructure to support those staff who are trying to improve teaching.

The infrastructure is run down (machines are old or don't work; chairs in tutorials break; windows in tutorial rooms are bolted closed),

The lack of time means that equipment cannot be adequately maintained. The technology of the job is virtually stone age.

Lack of appreciation for staff / their efforts / their skills (e.g. excellence not rewarded, staff undervalued etc)

(55)

I feel that the upper management of UWA doesn't have much respect for staff

We feel all the time that our best efforts are simply taken, used and forgotten.[*technical staff*]

UWA may attract the best staff, but they treat them appallingly...

In five years of working here I/we have had no (job security) or support. It is very disheartening. We do an excellent job here and are not recognised for it.

There is no encouragement for people with many years of acquisition of skills to apply for jobs and NO RECOGNITION that such people may come to an area of study or research with levels of competence that represent considerable contributions.

The university is in danger of losing some of its most productive staff. It needs to acknowledge the productive (and reward them)

Staff who time-watch and have no commitment to UWA get promoted and those who give 110% get kept down.

Salaries low/inadequate (especially compared to industry); not remunerated for increased workload/responsibilities

(51)

Salary rates for admin staff especially IT related is out of touch with private enterprise and even most government organisations. Therefore difficult to attract quality staff.

Although the work environment and staff support are good, there will continue to be a migration to better paying private industry positions for good technical staff.

Academic salaries are appalling when compared to professional salaries.

The major problem relates to increased job requirements and a relative reduction in salary compared to peers. This is reducing the attractiveness of academic careers in my area.(biomedical)

Over the last three years I have been given more responsibility, requiring longer hours – but no extra pay. I enjoy the work but I would like to be paid more for the additional load.

Low / declining morale; climate of fear; general dissatisfaction

(42)

We do not pay adequate salaries to entice adequate teachers/researchers let alone the best.

I think that UWA staff suffer from a general malaise afflicting all tertiary staff. I can't say I have spoken to anyone really happy in the job for some time now.

Staff morale is much lower.

loss in morale. All very sad. My last response 3 years ago was much more positive.

Over the last 3 years I have detected increased levels of (stress), dissatisfaction and reduced level of cooperation from many staff.

A culture of fear and uncertainty is more prevalent

The dissatisfaction amongst academic staff is depressing and impacts on the whole University - I am admin staff. (The constant budget tightening) also affects morale

Not enough support for / money being spent on research and /or development

(40)

Pressure to perform and achieve Internationally recognised research without attaining recognition in terms of support and infrastructure. There is so much emphasis on obtaining grants and doing research, but when grants are obtained, we only find ourselves with MORE work to do! There is no system in place to reduce workload if grant applications are successful (for teaching/research staff).

If more money isn't spent on R&D, then Australian unis, in particular UWA, will fall behind its competitors.

insufficient support is given to those who can attract external funding to carry out leading-edge research without the security of long-term employment prospects.

& less research funding makes it harder. Postdoctoral scientists need: greater recognition for 'fall back funding' if NHMRC/ARC grants don't get up.

Despite statements to the contrary, undergraduate numbers dictate staffing levels and high-quality research-oriented departments are left to struggle.

external funding is difficult without university backing.

The combination of cost recovery procedures and increasingly more important industry funded research projects, particularly those with a confidentiality clause, are destroying work ethos and collaboration between researchers. Two of the most important characteristics of a university and the fundamental basis for world-class research.

Larger teaching loads; larger class sizes; less staff more students

(38)

Student: staff ratio has increased dramatically. I spend almost all my time supervising 15+ honours/masters/PhD students and in undergraduate teaching

Declining budget has seen constant upwards pressure on class sizes

Less staff to teach more students

Teaching hours have increased in quantifiable terms.

Teaching hours have reached breaking point. No reward for attracting students, class sizes increasing,

Management at faculty/ departmental level: inadequate / inflexible / autocratic / non-supportive / etc

(35)

However, this does not always filter down to the departmental level. Being a good academic does not automatically translate into being a good managerial HOD. I have been very disappointed with the senior academics in my department. There is no teamwork, mentoring or collegiality with academics lower on the ladder.

Management is totally lacking in vision. We are left to tinker and work off checklists.

"Ordinary" academics are subjected to SPOT tests - an equivalent for academic management is needed.

Due to change of the Head of our section. Management used to be competent, now it is ineffective at best and incompetent at worst. In general, I am happy with my job. It is management which make our workplace unhappy.

Total lack of support by Head of Department bordering on bullying.

Falling quality - of programmes, students; quality of teaching suffering

(34)

After being here 7 years it is heartbreaking to see how low standards have dropped, (how tight funding has become, and how the broad range of research at UWA is becoming increasingly narrow) I feel that we are not serving the West Australian community very well, let alone the international community.

Too much emphasis on minimally equipping students for a particular job instead of concentrating on intellectual and research development of students. Students are therefore less well equipped to face changing life experiences and have less breadth in their knowledge and education. As a result, academic staff seem less interested in extension of their students.

(Teaching loads have increased) which has had an adverse impact on quality

All this 'cost cutting' ultimately affects the quality of students. Up front fee paying for postgraduate courses is a joke and so inequitable!

UWA will be kicked out of the GO8 if the current trend does not reverse soon.

Undervaluing the real purpose of a university; more concerned about money than educating; scholarship / creativity is dying

(33)

The pervasive attitude that tertiary education (at UWA) must be run like a business or corporation and that academic staff are knowledge workers who do what the managers tell to do. Scholarship is dead or suffocated. The love of learning has all but disappeared.

This is terrible. We are a university. We educate. Recently we have been more focussed on making money than on our teaching responsibilities.

The university is being run by public relations people and managers who understand nothing about education, research and the role of the university.

I sincerely hate the idea of marketing/needng industry financial support for research. It has seriously undermined the genuinely curious pursuit.

Biggest problems at UWA - (1) running courses for making money rather than for academic reasons

Fewer / lack of opportunities for career change or advancement (fewer appropriate positions)

(31)

Career development: There is no possibility for career development at all for general staff involved in systems administration. There seems to be no avenue to utilise additional skills and abilities.

The university could do better by providing more opportunities to young (junior) staff via career development and promotions.

Research staff - virtually no career path

This means that effectively no hope for an academic career for anyone of my generation.

There is no adequate career structure for technical staff, particularly for those employed in small units.

Funding: inadequate or inequitable funding (to departments, to core activities); being used inefficiently

(29)

Empty rhetoric and time-wasting competition for modest resources need to be replaced by a complete overhaul of the budgetary process so that the University's teaching and research centres are fully funded first.

There's no money. Rather, there is but it doesn't reach those teaching and researching. Money! I don't see why the university can't pay for enough staff to do the work.

I am distressed by the tendency to corporatism, which is self-serving and drains funds away from the fundamental functions of teaching and research.

The University hasn't worked out a method of straight dealing - maybe it's too big. It clearly believes in the St Matthew principle 25:29 [*For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have in abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.*], or if it doesn't, it has not the wit or resolve to assist the deserving poor and under resourced.

Changes which are unsettling; uncertainty surrounding them; not enough information or not informed quickly enough about changes

(27)

Insecurity. We hear of change coming but nothing seems to happen - the major decision making processes are too slow resulting in long-term uncertainty and instability.

There is a lot of innuendo on change, which is very unsettling

Unknown future - particularly with regards restructuring.

Decreased time for research**(24)**

Future plans for departments often opaque, Decision-making needs to be more open.

There is no time left for any serious development in my research, which is typically done 12am - 3am when any seriously novel thoughts have evaporated.

Also finding it hard to find the time to research now.

As I have mentioned earlier - there is no time in this job for research.

I am concerned that unless significant time can be found for academics to spend thinking seriously about their research, (teaching & service to their disciplines), that growth targets for this University are no more than pipe dreams.

Lack of understanding / recognition of problems / activities in the university**(23)**

I feel that the upper management of UWA doesn't have much understanding of the core activities of this university - and that these pervade the overall administration of the university.

Central administration is a joke, out of touch and have no understanding of academic standards.

It would be comforting if there were some light at the end of the tunnel, but at present there is little sense that the executive is aware that sections of the university are almost at the end of their tether!

I am dissatisfied and bewildered at the lack of management action relating to staffing issues (morale, turnover, absenteeism, chain of command, department procedures and protocols).

Comments about leadership of university (other than lack direction / understanding)**(22)**

..and I lack confidence in the senior managers of the university.....The senior university managers should be in there fighting for the university and not kowtowing to government. They inspire absolutely no confidence.

Uni focus has been external whilst internal matters are simply neglected.

Good work is done despite the efforts of UWA management..... less competent CENTRAL management.

From my observations, UWA leadership fails to meet specific promises; my view is that this management trait degrades their effectiveness.

Change implemented poorly (e.g. without appropriate support or training); stress / problems caused by change(s)**(22)**

Over the last 12-15 months the introduction of PeopleSoft & the inadequate support for its implementation has been a source of concern and stress.

Teaching. The teaching philosophy and practice are under drastic changes in the Faculty in response to the Review of the degrees. If the nature of university teaching has changed fundamentally, we would have to address the problems of our staff structure, which has been set up for quite different purposes, or performance criteria. You cannot grow plums on an apple tree.

Implementing poor quality computer systems or failing to provide adequate training and resources to enable efficient implementation.

The faculty restructuring process was poorly planned and executed.

Change for the sake of change, with no real commitment or follow-through; too many changes**(21)**

Change with no cost-benefit analysis. Requiring executive deans to produce cost-benefit analyses before instituting changes: this would save the university more than most of the changes would ever claim to save.

Too many changes - too close together

This restructuring for the sake of changing have you heard "If it ain't broken don't fix it"?

...the perception among academics is that management decisions seem to be aimed more at improvement of the manager's CVs than improvement or maintenance of substance. We see little evidence of long-term commitment.

Lack of training or professional development: not enough time / not enough money / lack of availability (20)

I've worked in several tertiary institutions outside of Australia and I'm sorry to say that my present position is substandard compared to my other positions in terms of..... 2. professional development - neither money nor opportunity

Excellent facilities, resources and staff development services are provided but (increasing workload - much of it not core business) - means there is very little time to make use of 'opportunities' and no money to go on an industry training course - \$2.5k for 1 week.

General staff / academic staff divisions; not enough recognition of GS contribution - (19)

constant implicit messages which devalue the contribution of general staff,Maybe next time you should ask some questions about relationships between general and academic staff

my present position is substandard compared to my other positions in terms of4) respect for the job we do in our division even though many of us are equally or more qualified than some of the so-called "academic" staff.

We need to eliminate the general staff/academic staff divide. General staff are treated like lesser beings. We work for the University too - we want to be heard on where it is going and how to get there.

UWA too conservative; complacent; slow to change; systems which encourage this (19)

I recognise the University's efforts to (improve research, teaching and ethical concerns), but it remains conservative and elitist at times, which means the university cuts itself off from opportunities/experiences.

Funding model drives Faculties down historical paths and discourages investment in new activities/approaches.

General culture of conservative complacency glossed with a veneer of contemporaneity.

More control and direction needed; unclear directions; no cohesive plan; disorganised (19)

there needs to be direction from those high up and strict procedures put in place. The university is perceived by outside companies as being highly disorganised (and archaic) in its attitudes. To function at the level demanded in today's world we need to be better organised.

Lack of any cohesive plan for the future

Visionary leadership required to steer the university through very difficult times. Focus on quality and core activities and not be drawn into trendy but fatuous directions by governments which come and go.

Senior staff / academics with too much power; using power inappropriately (19)

Management of my workplace has remained: dictatorial, secretive, complex, confusing, inconsiderate, dismissive...The cronyism, old boys network,..... The feudal nature of much of the faculty has not changed. The arrogance of many senior staff is still unbelievable and apparently totally unchecked.

The "old-boy" network and favouritism seems to reign at certain levels.

At the departmental level, long serving senior academics treat facilities as personal property and have too much power over people and planning. I suspect they block entry of new people and innovation. Conflict with staff lower in the hierarchy are difficult to resolve, and also lead to departures and erosion of skills base..... but it is a place of continual improvement so we live in hope that entrenched privilege will not last forever.

Unsatisfactory work performance; unproductive staff (18)

Staff that have been here a long time could be more (helpful and) productive.

Workloads are not distributed equally - incompetence is rewarded by minimal teaching load and/or minimal review of teaching standards....The collective view is tainted by just a few waiting to collect their retirement fund.

Lack of support staff (clerical, technical); difficult to attract funding for this**(17)**

It is full of people who can't do their job and won't let others do theirs.

Time to do things is constantly being eroded - we do not have enough technical staff to conduct research. With the current shortage of funding, attracting funds for technical support is becoming increasingly difficult. (This has further eroded our time to do research.)

I do not have adequate administrative and secretarial support for the teaching and research loads that I carry.

Major sources of dissatisfaction not addressed. 2. secretarial support

Over-management: Too many managers / high-level positions; too much power in management**(17)**

There is a big move to over management, which does not act decisively or in the best interest of a major university.

Top-down management is intensive and unsettling,

Management levels have increased, hands on employees have been kept the same.

Selection of miscellaneous comments

Software piracy is widespread. I try to spend more time eradicating this, but support is difficult from my department

I believe we should seek large donations/bequests for these specialist areas as do the US universities so that their enormous value is not lost.

Category B status degrading departmental cohesion.

More emphasis should be placed on maintaining a healthy work environment.

In 1984 we had an International Indian Ocean Festival. Why can't this be repeated? It was a great promotion for UWA, multiculturalism and the performing arts.

UWA non teaching breaks have poor overlap with those of other universities especially with those over east. Makes it difficult to schedule visits. Why not align the academic calendar better?

I would like to see the assessment of schools and faculties sped up.

Research workers and PhD students are often abused as defacto teaching staff - especially for honours and other postgrad students.

Few mentors

University intellectual property arrangements are antiquated and inappropriate for technology based disciplines.

Departmental reviews are destructive and the process itself should be reviewed.