Our Goals and Objectives

• My Workplace is one of the Principal's 5 Priorities

• Its goal is to facilitate a shift in McGill’s administrative workplace culture to:
  
  • embrace continuous learning and change,
  
  • inspire and encourage new ways of doing things, and
  
  • empower administrative staff to leverage their knowledge and expertise

Some organizational theorists call this a Learning Organization
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The Learning Organization Survey was designed to measure the degree to which the McGill University work culture reflects the attributes of a learning organization, organized around three “building blocks”:

- A supportive learning environment
- Concrete learning practices
- Leadership behavior that provides reinforcement

Survey first fielded in **spring of 2015** with all administrative and support staff

- 5-minute length; 1,253 respondents (45.5% response rate)
- Used to get a baseline read of scores against which progress could be measured in the future
- 35% of respondents left additional comments which were categorized according to theme and tone
- Summer discussion groups expanded upon key themes gleaned from the survey comments
- Various My Workplace initiatives were devised and rolled out in response to findings

Survey was fielded again in **winter of 2017** in order to see how much progress had been made

- Same questionnaire and methodology
- 1,153 respondents (39.5% response rate)
- 26% of respondents provided additional comments which will be further analyzed in the coming weeks
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My Workplace Timeline: What we’ve been up to since the first survey...

- **4/15**: Learning Organization Survey – Baseline
- **6/15**: Discussion groups held
- **8/15**: KPIs established
- **9/15**: Programs proposed and approved by P7
- **11/15**: Conversational Communication support
- **2/16**: Program design completed
- **3/16**: Mentoring program pilot launched
- **4/16**: Reduced rates on courses for McGill staff instituted
- **4/16**: Great Ideas Pipeline launched
- **5/16**: Resolving Workplace Conflicts Web page
- **8/16**: Training for Academic Administrators
- **1/17**: Supervisor Skills and Learning Circles pilots launched
- **1/17**: Learning Organization Survey - Post-Wave 1
- **12/16**: Job Shadowing pilot launched

**2015**
- **4/15**: New Provost and VP Academic appointed
- **7/15**: New Deans of Science and GPS appointed

**2016**
- **3/16**: Mentoring program pilot launched
- **4/16**: Reduced rates on courses for McGill staff instituted
- **5/16**: Resolving Workplace Conflicts Web page
- **8/16**: Training for Academic Administrators

**2017**
- **7/16**: New Deans of Law, Arts, and Schulich School of Music (Interim) appointed
Both “Leadership Behavior that Provides Reinforcement” and “Supportive Learning Environment” scores shifted a statistically significant amount, while “Concrete Learning and Practices” saw directional improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Learning Environment</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Learning Processes and Practices</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behavior that Provides Reinforcement</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p<.001$, two-tailed; effect size: $d=.16$

$p=.079$, two-tailed; effect size: $d=.08$

$p=.003$, two-tailed; effect size: $d=.13$

↑/↓ indicates the 2017 mean is significantly higher/lower (at $p<.05$, two-tailed) than the 2015 mean.
Learning Organization Survey: Questions with statistically significant shifts in mean scores

To what extent are the mission and goals of your unit aligned with those of the University (as you understand them)?

At McGill, employees enjoy a positive work climate.

At McGill, senior leaders (Principal, Provost, Deans, Vice-Principals, etc.) are interested in finding better ways of doing things.

To what extent are the mission and goals of your unit clear?

To what extent do employees in your unit, including managers, acknowledge their own limitations?

At McGill, how likely is it that good ideas have a clear path to implementation?

To what extent is voicing different opinions welcome in the McGill workplace?

To what extent are employees at McGill empowered to find better ways of doing things?

How effective is McGill at recognizing your unit’s contribution?

At McGill, how comfortable are employees with trying new approaches despite the risk of failure?

Green bold font indicates that the 2017 mean score is significantly higher (at p<.05, two-tailed) than the 2015 mean score.
At McGill, senior leaders (Principal, Provost, Deans, Vice-Principals, etc.) are interested in finding better ways of doing things.

Multiple points of view are welcome in your unit’s decision-making process.

To what extent are the mission and goals of your unit clear?

To what extent are the objectives of your unit measurable?

How often does your unit measure its performance against expectations?

To what extent are the mission and goals of your unit aligned with those of the University (as you understand them)?

At McGill, how likely is it that good ideas have a clear path to implementation?

How adequate is the training provided to new employees in your unit?

How adequate is the ongoing training available to experienced employees at McGill?

How often do you feel out of the information loop about important matters at McGill?

To what extent are employees at McGill empowered to find better ways of doing things?

To what extent do employees in your unit, including managers, acknowledge their own limitations?

To what extent are employees in your unit encouraged to engage in career planning?

How effective is your unit at recognizing the contributions of its employees?

How effective is McGill at recognizing your unit’s contribution?

At McGill, how comfortable are employees with trying new approaches despite the risk of failure?

To what extent is voicing different opinions welcome in the McGill workplace?

In your unit, how often do deadlines and/or work volume get in the way of doing a good job?

When planning and making decisions, how often does your unit consider: Best practices of other institutions (…)

When planning and making decisions, how often does your unit consider: Formal feedback from individuals you interact with

When planning and making decisions, how often does your unit consider: Employee feedback

How often does your unit share information with networks of experts within the organization?

How often does your unit share information with networks of experts outside the organization?

How effective is your unit at capturing and retaining the critical workplace knowledge of its employees?

At McGill, employees enjoy a positive work climate.

### Learning Organization Survey: Shift in mean scores by Faculties vs. Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series1</th>
<th>Series2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Negative shift
- Positive shift
Scores for staff in faculties increased more than for staff in central units:
  • All three indicator scores improved significantly for the staff in faculties, but only directionally for staff in central units.

Employee responses continue to correlate strongly with employee roles:
  • Executives and supervisory managers are still more likely to report that McGill reflects the attributes of a learning organization compared to non-supervisory managers.
  • In turn, non-supervisory managers continue to score higher compared to clerical and technical staff.
  • However, some of the biggest positive shifts in 2017 were among clerical and technical staff, narrowing this gap considerably.
**Learning Organization Survey: Shift in indicator scores by position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive Learning Environment</th>
<th>Concrete Learning Processes and Practices</th>
<th>Leadership Behavior that Provides Reinforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin/clerical/technical support</td>
<td>Admin/clerical/technical support</td>
<td>Admin/clerical/technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M without supervisory responsibility</td>
<td>M without supervisory responsibility</td>
<td>M without supervisory responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M or Executive with supervisory responsibility</td>
<td>M or Executive with supervisory responsibility</td>
<td>M or Executive with supervisory responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For Admin/clerical/technical support:
  - Supportive Learning Environment: 2.67 to 2.91
  - Concrete Learning Processes and Practices: 3.11 to 2.90
  - Leadership Behavior that Provides Reinforcement: 2.75 to 2.96

- For M without supervisory responsibility:
  - Supportive Learning Environment: 2.79 to 2.85
  - Concrete Learning Processes and Practices: 3.14 to 3.11
  - Leadership Behavior that Provides Reinforcement: 2.99 to 2.91

- For M or Executive with supervisory responsibility:
  - Supportive Learning Environment: 2.85 to 2.88
  - Concrete Learning Processes and Practices: 3.24 to 3.22
  - Leadership Behavior that Provides Reinforcement: 3.06 to 3.06

*indicates the 2017 mean is significantly higher/lower (at p<.05, two-tailed) than the 2015 mean*
Supportive Learning Environment

- Appreciation of differences
- Psychological safety
- Openness to new ideas
- Time for reflection

Concrete Learning Processes and Practices

- Experimentation time to test new ideas (Maybe Fail trying?)
- Systematic sharing of knowledge (internally and externally)
- Education and training to develop employees (both old and new)

Leadership that Provides Reinforcement

- Actively listening and questioning employees
- Being open to alternate viewpoints
- Valuing time spent on innovation and problem identification
- Encouraging and enabling learning and growth
Discussion Questions

1. Do I see examples of these attributes in my area? If yes, provide examples or instances.

2. How do I personally enable these attributes?

3. What enables or impedes my ability to foster these attributes?

4. How can My Workplace further engage with you?