

CFA Faculty Climate Survey Report:

Prepared by Dr. Janet Waters

A climate survey of faculty at Capilano University was last done in 2008, with the province wide Mercer survey, before Capilano became a university. Regular climate surveys are recommended for all institutions to monitor and “take the temperature” of employee levels of job satisfaction, morale, and organizational commitment. This helps to ensure organizations are achieving institutional goals such as increasing job satisfaction and commitment, ensuring work/life balance, performance evaluation and professional development, effective leadership and communication, etc. and decreasing discrimination and stress.

It is essential that organizations have a mechanism for both employees and administration to be aware of current concerns among their employees. The best and most effective climate surveys are tailored for the specific type of organization. Universities and colleges across North America conduct and publish periodic climate surveys tailored for universities which include issues relevant to faculty at their institution. For universities and colleges, for example, climate surveys include questions about the work and workloads of teaching and administration; collaborative decision making; resources to help faculty teach (staff, IT, etc.); pd; research; tenure; and promotion opportunities. The excellent COACHE faculty survey (from Harvard), for example, is typical in that it asks questions about the following faculty issues, among others: Nature of the work itself; Resources and support for the work; Collaboration; Mentoring; Institutional Governance and Leadership; Engagement; Work/Life balance; Climate, Culture and Collegiality at the institution; Opportunities for recognition and appreciation; and Global satisfaction and commitment.

As an example of the valuable information and positive changes that can result from a climate survey, the Roueche – Baker survey conducted at Capilano College in 1988 and repeated in 1990 surveyed faculty and staff on issues including Leadership; Motivation (Cooperation and development); Communication; Decision Making; Rewards; and Overall Job Satisfaction. After implementation of some recommendations resulting from sources of dissatisfaction in 1988, the 1990 survey was able to determine there had been (statistically significant) improvements in most of these areas for faculty from the previous survey. The climate had improved overall. Notable was a significant improvement in faculty satisfaction with their involvement in decision making, and in ratings of inspiration from the leadership of the college, although there remained dissatisfaction with administration’s assistance to faculty; the energy required to do one’s job; and the level of cooperation across departments.

The most recent climate survey done at Capilano College was the Mercer survey in 2008. This survey was not tailored specifically for faculty, or even for Capilano, as it was conducted at colleges across BC and surveyed faculty, staff and excluded administrators. This enabled comparisons between Capilano and the aggregated data across the other colleges, which was an advantage. However, its overly generic nature sometimes resulted in unclear or inapplicable questions (as for example it asked questions about supervisors instead of coordinators, which faculty found confusing). It was otherwise very thorough, and covered a wide variety of climate factors. The Mercer survey (as does the Harvard COACHE survey) asked 77 questions in the topics of: The organization as a place to work; The work and workload; Teamwork and cooperation; Workplace safety; Fairness, integrity and ethics; Communication; Work/Life balance; Professional development; Performance evaluation; Benefits communication; Leadership/Mission/Values; Administration/Management; Tools and Resources; Employee Commitment and Satisfaction; and Organizational focus. However, as a province wide survey it could not include issues of specific relevance to Capilano.

At the time, the Mercer survey found that the levels of favourable ratings by employees of Capilano College about typical job satisfaction and leadership issues were quite comparable to that of the BC Colleges Consortium in general.

Previously to this survey, a brief internal employee satisfaction survey in 2006 had reviewed employee satisfaction with the services provided by various supporting areas of the college, such as HR, facilities, and the mail room. In previous years, more thorough and comprehensive climate surveys had been done on a regular basis.

Since the Mercer survey in 2008, many changes have happened at Capilano University, including its transition to university status and attendant changes in administrative structures; a lengthy accreditation process; a new president and many changes in administrative processes, practices, and even in the people; opportunities to develop new degrees entailing new courses; and changes to instructors' work (such as reducing class time by 25%, a steep increase in on-line course management, a markedly increased workload, and computerized scheduling). Many of these changes offered opportunities for exciting innovations and professional development and self-reflection about our mission and values. However, they also entailed stressful learning curves, a heavier workload, and dramatic changes in how Capilano functioned.

It is clearly long past time for a formal climate survey. To respond to this need, and to a recommendation from the Board of Governors that a climate survey be conducted at Capilano, the CFA struck a committee to begin work on a climate survey relevant to Capilano and to faculty and staff current concerns. Ideally, climate surveys include both faculty and staff, and in our past climate surveys, such as the 1988/90 surveys, a cross university committee composed of administration, faculty and staff worked together to formulate the survey or to choose an external version. However, in this case the Capilano administration declined to participate in a university wide Climate Survey committee. Therefore, to give the CFA executive and the membership information about the current climate among faculty, the CFA Climate Survey committee began in September, 2012, to research good university surveys. We found that, apart from questions tailored for specific concerns at individual universities, all had general topics such as noted above, and even specific questions in common.

This committee was doing its work long before the recent unexpected budget cuts occurred in late April, 2013, with their devastating impact on faculty morale. Certainly, the need for a survey of faculty morale became urgent after the cuts.

Therefore, a general set of issues and questions common to most university faculty surveys was compiled from specific examples of well established faculty climate surveys to form this CFA survey. Important factors for Job Satisfaction, in general, include optimally mentally challenging work, with autonomy and a feeling of control over one's work; equitable rewards, tangible or intangible; good supportive relationships with co-workers, staff and supervisors; and supportive working conditions.

Eventually questions regarding these issues were divided into two separate surveys. To assess overall faculty morale, satisfaction with the support we receive to do our jobs, our satisfaction with the level of collaboration in decision making, and with various levels of leadership, the current CFA Faculty Climate Survey, Part I, includes questions in the areas of factors crucial for Job Satisfaction and faculty morale. Since this is now a CFA survey (as the administration had refused to participate) we added questions about faculty satisfaction with the CFA as well.

Part II, the second half of the Faculty Climate Survey, will include the rest of the issues common to climate surveys, and of crucial interest to faculty, such as workload, stress, work/life balance, communication, pd, and evaluations.

This Faculty Climate Survey is both quantitative and qualitative. As requested by the research ethics process, participation was voluntary and strictly anonymous. The results were aggregated across the respondents and there was no possible access to the identity of the faculty members who responded. Demographic questions, such as a question about Big F Faculty membership, were asked only to ensure that generalization could occur across Faculties, and respondents were free to decline to answer any question. Aggregated survey results will be made available to the

membership, the larger university community, and the communities we serve when appropriate, and the raw data will be discarded after analysis.

Results

N = 211 (The 2008 Mercer survey participation was an equivalent percentage of the faculty at that time)

Numerical results can be found below. Qualitative analysis of the comments will follow. Note that the percentages below were rounded up, so don't always total 100%.

Demographics: F: 56% M: 44%

Position: 94% of respondents were instructional faculty, including 34% who were coordinators/convenors/chairs. 5% were non-instructional faculty.

Faculties: All 5 faculties were represented

Topics:

Feeling of control & participation in decisions affecting one's work: Adjusted to exclude respondents for whom the questions were not applicable

Questions: Level of Control Excluding n/a	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
In scheduling courses (Infosilem)	14%	26%	18%	23%	18%
In decisions about course curriculum, syllabus, content, texts	47%	41%	10%	2%	1%
In decisions about which courses to teach	30%	50%	12%	4%	4%
In decisions about course cancellations	9%	19%	30%	18%	24%
In departmental decision making	45%	37%	8%	9%	1%
In divisional decision making	20%	33%	26%	14%	7%
In academic planning in the university	3%	9%	23%	26%	39%
In decisions about marketing program	8%	31%	29%	17%	15%
In general satisfied with level of control over work	13%	38%	23%	20%	7%

Comments: With the faculty for whom these questions were not applicable deducted from the calculations, questions about faculty satisfaction with their level of autonomy and control, a crucial factor in job satisfaction, had mixed ratings.

Levels of autonomy and control in decisions about faculty work

- Faculty were positive about their level of control in decisions about their work, such as their course curriculum (**88%** were positive and almost half of the respondents were very satisfied, while only 3% were dissatisfied) and course assignments (**80%** were satisfied to very satisfied, and 8% were dissatisfied).
- Regarding their satisfaction with their level of control over course cancellations, 28% were positive, 30% were neutral, and **42%** were negative.
- In general, overall satisfaction with the level of control over one's work was more positive for half of the faculty (**51%**), with 23% neutral and 27% negative.

Levels of autonomy and control in decisions about scheduling and marketing courses and programs

- Reactions were split regarding faculty satisfaction with their level of control over scheduling, with an equal number of faculty happy as unhappy with infosilem. 40% were positive about scheduling, 18% were neutral and

41% were negative. Regarding decisions about marketing their program, again, reactions were split, as 29% were neutral, with 39% positive and 32% negative.

Levels of autonomy and control in decision making at various levels of administration

- Regarding faculty satisfaction with their level of control and autonomy in decision making at various levels of administration, from departmental to academic planning in the university, satisfaction is similarly mixed.
 - Faculty was highly positive about their opportunities to participate in **departmental decision making** (**82%** were positive with **45%** very satisfied, and only 10% negative).
 - Satisfaction with their opportunities to participate in **divisional decision making** was also positive for half the faculty (**53%**), although 26% were neutral and 21% were negative.
- Faculty satisfaction with their opportunities to participate in academic planning in the university differed markedly from the previous responses. While 12% are positive and 23% are neutral, **65% were dissatisfied** (with 39% very dissatisfied).

Quality of relationships with colleagues, staff, cords and admin

Questions: Quality of relationships	V.Good	Good	Neutral	Poor	V.Poor
Relationships with colleagues in area/ dept	69%	24%	4%	2%	1%
With staff in area/dept	64%	29%	4%	3%	0%
With coordinators in area or dept	62%	24%	8%	4%	2%
With the dean of area	19%	29%	26%	17%	9%
With the top levels of admin	4%	10%	27%	23%	37%
With other areas/depts	12%	42%	35%	9%	4%

Comments: A nearly unanimous majority of Faculty assessed the quality of their relationships with colleagues, staff and coordinators as good to very good.

Quality of the relationships with colleagues, staff and coordinators in one's area/department

- Overall, **93%** were positive about their relationships with colleagues and with staff, and **86%** about their relationships with their coordinators. This is a good indication that relationships within departments are good, and as positive relationships with co-workers and coordinators are important factors in Job Satisfaction, this is a positive finding within departments or areas. The Mercer survey also found a similar 91% positive response to a question about whether faculty liked the people with whom they worked. Few faculty evaluated their relationships with colleagues and staff as poor or very poor (only 3%!).
- **54%** were positive about relationships with other areas or departments as well (35% were neutral and 13% were negative).

Quality of the relationships with deans and top levels of administration

- Relationships with the dean of the area were a little less positive. Although about half, **48%**, rated these as positive, there was only 19% who rated the relationship with their dean as very good. 26% were neutral and **26%** were negative.
- However, faculty assessments of their relationships with the top levels of administration were markedly less positive, with only **14%** positive (4% very good), 27% neutral and **60% negative** (including **37% very poor**). In the job satisfaction factor of support from the top levels of administration, these ratings indicate this is one area which could jeopardize faculty morale.

Satisfaction with support from areas of the university in doing your work

Questions: Support from areas of U	V.Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	V. Dissatisfied
From staff in area/dept	59%	31%	6%	4%	0%
From IT	9%	42%	16%	20%	12%
From ETRC	27%	28%	40%	4%	3%
From TLC	6%	20%	61%	9%	4%
From Coord of area/dep	52%	32%	10%	4%	2%
From Dean	16%	25%	26%	21%	12%
From top levels of Admin	2%	10%	27%	24%	38%

Comments: Similarly, a strong majority of faculty were very satisfied with the level of support they receive from staff and coordinators in their area in doing their work. The faculty were also quite satisfied with the support they receive from the ETRC staff.

Satisfaction with support from staff and coordinators in one's area

- Overall, **90%** were satisfied (including 59% very satisfied) with the support from the staff in their area. Only 4% were dissatisfied and no faculty was very dissatisfied. The job satisfaction factor of support from staff is a strongly positive one. **84%** were satisfied with the support they receive from their coordinators, with only 6% negative.

Satisfaction with support from departments providing instructional support

- Regarding support from other areas crucial to faculty members' work, reactions were mixed, although in most cases more positive than negative. Faculty was positive about the Ed Tech (ETRC) department (**55%**) with only 7% negative. **51%** were satisfied with the support they receive from the IT department, a good sign, although **32%** are still dissatisfied. **61%** were neutral about the former TLC department and only 13% were dissatisfied.

Satisfaction with support from deans and top levels of administration

- Support from the dean and administrative level was rated as less satisfactory, however. **41%** of the faculty rated the support from the dean of their faculty area as satisfactory, while **33%** were dissatisfied.
- However, only **12%** of the faculty was satisfied with the level of support they receive from top levels of administration. 27% were neutral, but **62%** were dissatisfied, including 38% very dissatisfied. In the job satisfaction factor of support from the top levels of administration, these ratings indicate this is another area which has jeopardized faculty morale.

Has Decision making in general on campus in the past year been collegial, reasonable & fair?

Questions: Decision Making	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I feel consulted about campus decisions that affect me	4%	11%	14%	30%	41%
Satisfied with participation in the governance of dept	32%	41%	11%	12%	5%
Satisfied with participation in the governance of division	20%	36%	21%	15%	8%
Satisfied with participation in the governance of institution	5%	6%	20%	28%	42%
Decisions by top levels of administration are collegial	2%	5%	9%	24%	60%
Faculty are given meaningful roles in decision making committees	4%	12%	30%	27%	28%

Campus committees serve interests of all stakeholders	8%	15%	33%	24%	20%
Campus committees serve the goals of the top levels of admin	20%	31%	37%	4%	8%
Admin decisions reflect Cap's mission statement goals & values	3%	10%	19%	27%	41%
Admin decisions have been sound & reasonable	3%	6%	11%	31%	50%
Admin decisions have been fair	3%	5%	13%	30%	50%
Admin decisions have been in accordance with Collective Agreement	3%	6%	23%	27%	42%
On the whole, Cap is collegial	2%	15%	23%	29%	31%

Comments: A crucial factor in university and college climate surveys concern the faculty's perception of collegiality in decision making, a feeling that they are meaningfully included in decisions which affect them and that their participation is respected and valued. In any academic institution, collegiality is an essential element in wise decision making.

Collegial decision making in the governance of departments and divisions

- Congruent with the previous positive ratings of relationships and support within the departments and divisions, a majority of faculty were satisfied with their participation in the governance of their departments (**73%**) and their division (**56%**). Again, within departments and divisions, the level of collegiality is satisfactory for faculty department members, although less positive for some divisions.

Collegial decision making in the governance of the institution

- However, overall, only **15%** felt consulted about campus decisions which affect them and only **17%** feel that on the whole, Capilano is collegial. **71%** disagreed that they were consulted, and **60%** disagreed that Cap is collegial. In the Mercer survey from five years ago, **64% agreed** that administration seeks out the ideas and opinions of employees, and only **16% disagreed**. In effect, the ratings have completely reversed since 2008.
- This is an important factor for faculty morale and job satisfaction, as **70%** are dissatisfied with their participation in the governance of the institution; **84%** disagreed that the university's decisions were collegial; **55%** disagreed that faculty are given meaningful roles in the university's decision making committees; **44%** disagreed that campus committees serve the interests of all stakeholders, and **51%** believe the campus committees serve the goals of the top levels of administration. Whether accurate or not, this perception indicates a widespread lack of trust in the ability of the campus committees to address the needs of the university's stakeholders.
- Regarding the quality of the administration's decisions, between 8% to 13% of the Faculty agree that the administration's decisions reflect Capilano's mission and values, and are sound, reasonable, fair, and congruent with the Collective Agreement. **68%** disagree that admin decisions reflect Cap's mission statement, goals and values; **81%** disagree that admin decisions have been sound and reasonable; **80%** disagree that they have been fair; and **69%** disagree that they are in accordance with the Collective Agreement. (Only 9% agreed that admin decisions are in accordance with the CA; the 23% neutral rating can be perhaps explained from respondent comments that they didn't know the collective agreement well enough to judge.

Ethics

Questions: Ethics	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Faculty are treated with dignity & respect by admin	4%	14%	17%	31%	34%
Admin treats the CFA with respect	2%	10%	22%	35%	33%
Faculty are treated with dignity & respect by colleagues	33%	52%	9%	4%	3%

Policies & procedures are implemented fairly	3%	18%	33%	26%	21%
Academic freedom is well respected	5%	21%	33%	21%	21%
Constructive criticism & self-evaluation is encouraged	3%	32%	26%	21%	17%
Whistle blowers are rewarded	2%	3%	58%	17%	20%

Comments: For job satisfaction, organizational commitment and positive faculty morale, faculty need to feel they are being treated with dignity and respect by colleagues and by the administration, and that the institution has implemented policies and procedures to address ethical issues such as harassment. Of course, since academic freedom was first proposed for universities and incorporated since the 19th century, knowing one can raise controversial issues, dispute establishment opinions and claims and apply constructive criticism in one's discipline and in one's institution has also been of paramount importance.

Faulty and the Faculty Association is treated with respect

- Most faculty do feel respected by their colleagues (**85%** agreed with this statement and only 7% disagreed).
- In the 2008 Mercer survey, **73%** of faculty **agreed** they were treated with respect by administration. However, in this survey, only 17% agreed and **65% disagreed** that administration treats faculty with respect (17% were neutral)
- **67% disagreed** that administration treats the Faculty Association with respect (11% agreed and 22% were neutral).

Other ethical concerns

- Statements about other ethical concerns led to a variety of ratings, possibly dependent on the respondents' particular Faculty or department.
 - Regarding whether policies and procedures are implemented fairly, which in the Mercer survey was positive for 64% and negative for 21%, had a very different result in this present survey, indicating a steep decline: only 20% agreed, 33% were neutral and **47%** disagreed.
 - Regarding respect for academic freedom: only 26% agreed, 33% were neutral and **42%** disagreed.
 - Regarding whether there was encouragement of constructive criticism and self-evaluation, 35% agreed, 26% were neutral and 39% disagreed).
- Comments revealed that the 58% who were neutral about whistle-blowers were so because they knew of no specific cases.

Leadership

Questions: Leadership	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Top admin place a high value on the needs of the North Shore community	4%	9%	26%	27%	34%
The BoG is sensitive to the needs of the N.S. community	3%	10%	30%	27%	31%
Top Admin respects the co-governance model of the CA	3%	5%	20%	30%	43%
Senate has a meaningful impact on decisions	3%	18%	38%	23%	18%
Top Admin understands the day to day challenges of faculty	3%	8%	18%	35%	38%
The BOG understands the day to day challenges of faculty	2%	5%	25%	29%	39%
President leads effectively	3%	6%	21%	20%	52%
President's strategic direction & planning are collegial/	2%	6%	12%	24%	58%

consultative					
President's strategic direction is congruent with Cap's mission & values	3%	4%	23%	22%	49%
President effectively communicates Cap's mission & values	3%	5%	17%	27%	48%
President's leadership is inspiring & visionary	3%	3%	15%	19%	61%
I agree with Cap's current direction	3%	3%	20%	22%	52%

Comments: Perceptions about the efficacy of the institution's leadership (the top levels of administration, including the President; the Senate; and the Board of Governors) were negatively evaluated on all related questions. Again, comments regarding Neutral answers indicated this often reflected lack of direct knowledge. In the Mercer survey of 2008, **45% were positive** that the leadership's objectives were clear, and **43% agreed** with the leadership's planning. **46%** felt that the leader explained why important decisions had been made, and **45%** felt the leader was able to communicate a clear vision of the future. In 2008, nearly half the faculty were positive about key leadership performance indications, which at the time seemed like a low percentage. In the present survey, only **6% to 9%** of faculty **agree** that the leadership has been effective, collegial, or inspiring.

Perception that the leadership understands the needs of the community and the faculty

- Regarding the administration, senate and board of governors' knowledge about the needs of the North Shore communities we serve, and their knowledge about the day to day challenges of faculty, the results indicate that faculty either disagree with these statements or were neutral (indicating they had no direct knowledge).
 - **Senate: 41% disagreed** that the Senate has a meaningful impact on academic decisions; 21% agreed; 38% were neutral.
 - **Administration: 61%** of the faculty **disagreed** that the top levels of the administration place a high value on serving the needs of the North Shore community and its regions, 13% agreed, and 26% were neutral.
 - **72%** of the faculty **disagreed** that the administration understands the day to day challenges faced by instructors; 10% agreed that they do; 18% were neutral. In the 2008 Mercer survey, 32% agreed with this statement, and 45% disagreed. The current findings are markedly more negative.
 - **Board of Governors: 61%** of the faculty **disagreed** that the Board of Governors was sensitive to the needs of the university community and to regions served by the university; 13% believed they were and 30% were neutral.
 - **69%** of the faculty disagreed that the Board understands the day to day challenges faced by instructors, 6% believed that they do and 25% were neutral.

Perception that the leadership understands and respects the co-governance model

- Regarding the collegial model, Faculty perception was again that the top levels of administration do not respect the co-governance model of the Collective Agreement. Only **7%** believed that they do, while **73%** disagreed (20% were neutral).
- Regarding the President's strategic direction and planning processes, **7%** believed they are collegial and consultative. **81%** disagree. 12% are neutral.

Perceptions about the President's leadership

- **8%** believe the President of the university provides effective leadership; **71%** disagree; 21% are neutral.
- **8%** believe the President is effective in communicating the university's mission and values. **75%** disagree. 17% are neutral.

- **6%** believe the President’s leadership is inspiring and visionary. **80%** disagree. 15% are neutral.

Perceptions about the current direction of the university

- **7%** agreed that the President’s strategic direction is congruent with the institution’s mission and values. **70%** disagree. 23% are neutral.
- **6%** agree with the current direction of the university. **74%** disagree. 20% are neutral.

Overall job satisfaction

- A global assessment is often used to assess job satisfaction and has been found to be a valid measure. The first two questions below were measures of global job satisfaction, while the last three measure organizational commitment.

Questions: Overall job satisfaction	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Overall, I am satisfied with my dept as a place to work	39%	42%	10%	4%	4%
Overall, I am satisfied with Cap as a place to work	12%	33%	17%	26%	12%
Cap has a good reputation in the community	9%	43%	22%	21%	6%
I feel confident in Cap’s future success in serving students and community	6%	21%	17%	32%	25%
I would recommend Cap to new faculty	10%	26%	26%	23%	14%
I would recommend Cap to students	13%	44%	22%	14%	7%
I would again choose to work here	16%	30%	29%	18%	9%
In the past I felt a strong commitment to Cap	59%	29%	10%	2%	1%
I still feel a strong commitment to Cap	15%	25%	23%	24%	14%

Comments: Happily, and congruent with previous findings, a strong majority of Faculty (**81%**) are satisfied with their department as a place to work. 45% are satisfied with Cap as a place to work; 52% feel Cap has a good reputation in the community; 57% would recommend Cap to students; and 46% would again choose to work here. However, although these findings are positive, they are much lower than the findings in the 2008 Mercer survey.

Confidence in the University’s future

- The Mercer survey found **54%** of faculty expressed confidence in the organization’s future, with 19% negative about it. In the present survey, various questions measuring confidence in the university’s future found a mixture of opinions.
 - Regarding Capilano’s reputation in the community, **52%** agree that Capilano has a good reputation, 22% are neutral and 27% are negative.
 - Regarding whether faculty would continue to recommend Capilano to students, **57%** of faculty will still recommend Cap to students (with 21% disagreeing)
 - However, only **36%** would recommend Capilano to new faculty. In the 2008 Mercer survey, **75%** agreed with this statement, a higher percentage than the overall BC college percentage, and only 10% disagreed. In five years, agreement has decreased 50%. In fact, **38%** would not recommend Capilano to new faculty.
 - Only **27%** agreed that they felt confident in the university’s future success in serving the needs of students and the community (including only 6% who strongly agreed), again a decrease of 50% from the Mercer survey. While 17% were neutral, **57%** disagreed with this statement. This is a marked increase of

almost 200% in pessimism compared to 2008, which found only 19% were negative about Capilano's future.

Organizational Commitment:

- In the Mercer survey, **76%** agreed they had a strong commitment to Capilano. This is reflected in the present survey question regarding whether the faculty member felt a strong commitment to Capilano in the past, to which an equivalent number - **78%** - responded positively (with 59% strongly agreeing) and only 3% disagreed with this statement. However, the further question regarding present commitment shows a significant reduction has occurred. **40%** (a decrease of 50% from previous high levels) now indicate they still feel a strong commitment to Capilano, with 23% neutral and **38%** disagreeing with the statement.

Overall Job Satisfaction

- Two questions were global measures of job satisfaction, which have been found to be reliable measures of this factor.
 - Again, departments seem to be responsible for good faculty morale and positive job satisfaction. The statement, "Overall I am satisfied with my department as a place to work" led to very high agreement. **80%** agreed, and only 9% disagreed.
 - In the Mercer survey, the statement, "Overall, I am satisfied with the university as a place to work" was agreed to by **65%** of the faculty. In the present study, global satisfaction with the organization has decreased to **44%**. **48%** disagreed.

Satisfaction with the Capilano Faculty Association:

Questions: Satisfaction with the CFA.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Provides ample opportunity to participate in committees & decisions	46%	44%	8%	1%	1%
My steward effectively serves my interests	27%	50%	16%	6%	2%
Overall, the CFA serves the interests of the membership	29%	55%	10%	5%	2%
Serving the NS communities is important to the CFA	36%	42%	18%	4%	0%
CFA exec respects its membership	46%	39%	12%	3%	1%
And understands the members issue	41%	41%	13%	3%	2%
Is concerned about protecting the CA	63%	30%	6%	1%	1%
And must be involved in collegial decision making at Cap	65%	24%	9%	2%	1%

Comments: As the CFA has an important role to play in the collegial model, we asked questions about the CFA as well.

- **90%** of respondents agreed that the CFA provides ample opportunity to participate in committees and decisions - only 2% disagreed.
- **84%** believe the CFA serves the interests of the membership, with 7% disagreeing, and **84%** agreed that serving the needs of the North Shore communities is important to the CFA (only 4% disagreeing). **85%** feel that the CFA executive respects its membership, and **82%** that the exec understands the members' issues, with only 4% and 5% respectively disagreeing. **77%** of the faculty agree the stewards effectively serve their interests (8% disagree)
- **89%** agree (with **65% strongly agreeing**) that the CFA must be involved in collegial decision making at Cap. 3% disagreed and 9% were neutral.
- **93%** agreed that the CFA is concerned about protecting the Collective Agreement.

Participation in CFA:

	Freq	Occasionally	Never
I've served on a CFA committee	17%	42%	42%
Willing to in the future	15%	72%	14%
Willing to serve on the negotiating team	4%	33%	63%
Willing to serve on the executive	5%	32%	63%