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Executive Summary

This report addresses why employees in Facilities Management at the College of William and Mary expressed, in the 2015 Climate Survey, a noticeable concern with treatment in the workplace. The Race and Race Relations Task Force researched the issue and initiated further external assistance to explore the root of those concerns which appeared elevated among African American employees in Housekeeping.

Focus group attendees, comprising 88% of all employees represented at every level in Facilities Management, revealed a consistent discontent with disrespectful behavior personally experienced and/or observed in the workplace. Through focused discussion, participants visually described disrespectful behaviors as:

- Unfair treatment in which “favoritism” gave some employees (often undeserving) more desired duties, benefits, privileges, and breaks in disciplinary actions.
- Disrespectful tone, choice of words and condescending manner in which subordinate individuals are addressed both in public and private.
- Inconsistencies in management’s accountability to follow and enforce policies and procedures.

Over 1500 participant comments were recorded regarding working conditions, managerial practices, and wages. The comments were deemed 77% as negative, 16% as positive and 7% as neutral. Clearly, such a finding generates organizational concern and one that goes beyond the discussion of race. Race did not come up as an outcry of concern at the individual focus group sessions. When race was mentioned it encompassed an array of concerns that included insensitivity to racially inspired comments, disrespect, and unfair treatment of minority races.

From a broader view, however, the collected data indicated a gap in the more negative comments from sessions of majority African-American employees in housekeeping positions versus sessions with majority White employees in non-housekeeping positions (primarily professional trades). The collected data is not absolute in percentages by race because the anonymous comments cannot be connected to the actual person to determine the race. However, the percentages can be indicators of the contrasting experiences noted in the comments by sessions based on the majority race that stood out in each session.

The participants self-selected the focus group session they would attend from a choice of eight available time slots. What resulted were sessions that visibly showed a majority race, either African American or White, thus allowing for some patterns of comments to evolve and study. Overall, the employee data somewhat indicates 84% of African American comments were negative in describing experiences compared to 71% of White comments in describing negative experiences –creating a 13% gap. Comments from combined leadership were 57% negative when describing experiences. However, there was a 20% gap in the negative experiences of the executive team at 44% compared to the frontline team at 64%. There was a total of 19 employees identified as other than White or African American.

The findings of this report capture internal concerns facing many employees in the workplace. Recommendations to reduce perceptions of unfair treatment include clearly defining and embracing professional behavior while combatting favoritism. A clear definition could start with an all-employee training for a common understanding of what fair looks like and an accountability to quickly address what reflects a no tolerance culture.

Studies have shown that being treated with respect is more important to employees than recognition/appreciation, useful feedback or opportunities for learning growth and development. Recommendations to reduce perceptions of disrespect include starting with oneself by managing one’s own tone while modeling and recognizing good behavior in others. It is important to penalize bad behavior to

---

1 See Addendum 1 - “Let’s Talk Race”
2 Their comments could not be isolated in the data to determine significance.
discourage continued practice. Teach civility and set a cultural, behavioral norm that has checkpoints along the way to ensure compliance.

Recommendations to augment management accountability and consistencies in following policies and procedures include starting with transparency where the entire team is briefed on the concluding outcome of their voices for this report. Acknowledge areas of concern that the leadership team may not have been aware and address short term actions and long term goals to sustain progress towards the desired workplace.

There is a silver lining. Specific workplace concerns are identified providing a base for moving forward. No need to whisper or gossip about what is being done, who got away with it, etc. Through our research, we believe the department is in transition and headed in the direction stated in the Department’s vision to be a capable, motivated workplace with high morale and respect from stakeholders and peers –driven by internal values that include integrity, professionalism, and teamwork. Our observation is that executive leadership is addressing issues of unfair treatment, disrespectful behavior, and management accountability. Roadblocks, however are seen in the pace in which these actions are taken and the insufficient means of communication that is affecting the staff’s perceptions of management’s commitment to safe and efficient business practices.

Verbal comments and written notes indicate change is already being noticed, --and described positively as a night and day difference in one comment. Beyond the concerns, employees were eager to express the things they like most about working at William & Mary. They expressed their pride in the work they do to assist so many people each day, their appreciation of the William & Mary benefits program, and the close relationships they have built with staff and students.

There is no real and continuous success within an organization until all the parts are working and the tools are in place to repair when there is a breakdown. Change does not happen overnight, but checkpoints for prevention can speed the pace and keep the team on track. There has to be patience and a committed partnership at every level to create the inclusive desired workplace.
Opening

The College of William and Mary is the second oldest college in the nation after being established in 1693. For over 300 years the college has built a foundation on educating top talent who graduate and go on to become world leaders. Such a reputation has attracted and continues to attract some of the smartest students in the world as well as some of the brightest faculty and staff. Outsiders seek to become included among “The Tribe.”

The primary existence and purpose of the college is to continue the tradition of providing a premium education and spirit of service for those attending—and to create a new model of sustainability for higher education. This is achieved through the combined strengths, passions, and knowledge of faculty, students, and staff.

The staff at Facilities Management is the focus of this report. This team provides an array of services in support of strategic university initiatives, routine operations, and emergency preparedness and recovery. The services include
- facilities maintenance
- grounds & garden
- housekeeping
- moving and storage
- planning, design & construction,
- postal services
- safety
- support services and
- utilities and energy management.

Their Mission, Vision and Values are defined on the College of William and Mary official website as follows:

Mission
The Facilities Management Team creates, maintains, and continuously improves the William & Mary physical environment to enable excellence in teaching, research, and public service.

Vision
To be an exceptional Facilities Management organization as evidenced by:
- A capable, motivated workforce with high morale
- Efficient business practices and modern tools and equipment
- Respect from stakeholders and peers
- A beautiful, well maintained and highly functional campus

Values
Service - We are fully committed to our mission and the William & Mary Community. We focus on reliably providing versatile, innovative support with emphasis on always being good stewards of the campus and the resources entrusted to us.

Integrity - We hold ourselves accountable to the William & Mary community and to one another with the objective of being a trustworthy partner with those we serve. We strive for transparency and openness in our relationships.

Professionalism - We take pride in our institution and our work, are respectful of our colleagues across campus, display a positive, supportive approach to our work, and strive to be efficient in our activities.

Teamwork - As members of many teams, we communicate with our teammates and work collaboratively towards university goals. We care about our teammates and are vested in the success of the University and our organization.

Safety - We believe in "Safety First" for the University community and ourselves, making every effort to understand and mitigate the risks associated with our environment and work. We are constantly vigilant of our environment and proactive to improve the safety of the campus.

This report is developed in summary of Facilities Management focus group discussions as requested by the Race and Race Relations Task Force. The opinions expressed in this report are those of Amediate LLC and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Race and Race Relations Task Force at The College of William and Mary.
**INTRODUCTION**

“If I had an hour to solve a problem, I’d spend 55 minutes thinking about the problem and 5 minutes thinking about the solution.”

*Advice from Albert Einstein*

---

The College of William and Mary, Race and Race Relations Task Force contracted Amediate LLC to assess and gather information to better understand the concerns of African American employees in Facilities Management—particularly non-exempt employees. This report, prepared by Amediate, LLC, explores concerns that were first identified following the Task Force review of the 2015 employee climate survey in which non-exempt African American employee responses appeared more negatively skewed over other groups within Facilities Management. For this report summary, all employee voices are included, regardless of demographics. Some categorizing was possible due to the demographic makeup of individual focus group sessions in which input was collected. The Task Force highlighted three distinct areas they saw to be problematic that included Working Conditions, Managerial Practices, and Wages.

**Getting to the root**

To understand what was feeding the concerns that so visibly became the tip of the iceberg, we went straight to the source and conducted ten focus group sessions aimed at gathering such data. In gathering source data, our approach at Amediate, LLC, was to objectively look at comments without premeditated assumptions about the meaning behind remarks made a year earlier on the climate survey. Obviously, we knew there were concerns but, we needed to define what respondents more clearly meant by remarks such as “little respect for employees…” and determine how that looked in the workplace.

Due to the nature of these concerns and the candid comments made anonymously, it was important that participants felt safe to speak in a collective environment. We wanted them to feel free to voice their thoughts and experiences without fear of negative repercussion. Based on the favorable responses from participants regarding their trust in the methodology and the high level of engagement, we believe we successfully created such an environment.

To make recommendations, as we were tasked to do in this report, we had to look at overall organizational health. We started by looking at what was working and what was not—at all levels.

**Overall**, we found there is a general sense of pride by the employees in the work they perform. They appear committed to a quality outcome as stated in the Facilities Management’s vision noting that the team “creates, maintains, and continuously improves the William & Mary physical environment to enable excellence in teaching, research, and public service.”

However, based on participant comments, there appears to be a disconnect from employee workplace expectations and the stated Facilities Management’s guiding vision and values. Specifically, the vision calls for “A capable, motivated workforce with high morale” and “Respect from stakeholders and peers” –

---

3 Taken from Race & Race Relations Task Force report.
4 Facilities Management made a leadership decision to require all employees in the department to attend the focus group sessions thus creating an 88% participation rate. Due to the high volume of input provided by the diversity of all employee participants, this report reflects the views of sessions with predominant African American and housekeeping employee participants as well as sessions with predominant White and trades employee participants.
5 HR provided the demographic makeup anonymously (without individual matching names) to consultants based on the collected sign in sheets.
6 Taken from climate survey comments.
7 See Appendix A
with values that include “Integrity, Professionalism, Teamwork and Safety.” What is desired is different from what many employees are describing as the present situation.

Comments gathered from the Focus Group sessions led us to conclude many team members, do not see the vision and values applied to them in the workplace environment. Collected data supported the notion that different groups categorized by race, gender and job title were having a different degree of positive and negative experiences. It appears an unintentional culture could be evolving in an opposing direction beyond the stated Facilities Management vision and values with leading concerns described by the team as feelings of unfair treatment, disrespect, and a lack of accountability by leaders. The word used most often to describe unfair treatment was “favoritism.” This word was used 81 times in the sticky note comments and implicated over 141 times. In one session, a full flip chart was dedicated to this issue using the word favoritism as the title. This sentiment was expressed in numerous aspects of the workplace.

**Favoritism** was perceived as the basis for decisions made in regards to promotions, advancement, who gets overtime, what kind of work they are assigned, how they are treated and how the merit wages are distributed. Many of the respondents repeatedly stated they saw decisions being made based on who was favored by leaders.

Respondents largely defined disrespect as the demeaning tone and manner in which they are addressed. This description included being yelled at, told they are dumb and being “talked down to” as though they are children.

**Lack of accountability by leaders** left many respondents addressing their feelings as helplessness when they felt slighted. Some employees could get away with breaking the rules while others could not. In some cases, respondents felt leaders observed inappropriate behavior and did nothing to correct--leaving the employee to conclude the misconduct was okay.

There is a silver lining. The strength in the passion and competence of the individuals that compose the Facilities Management team cannot be overlooked. They take pride in their contribution to the fine and elite reputation earned by the College of William and Mary.

The participants appeared appreciative of the focus group forum to address their concerns and hopeful that their voices would bring change. Undeniably, they expressed their belief that the opportunity to provide input was a start.

Facilities Management leadership is applauded in their collaboration with the Race and Race Relations Task Force to take proactive steps to delve into the root concerns expressed by team members in the climate survey.

Leadership was not left out of this process and were given the opportunity to voice their concerns in separate sessions that included the executive team in Session #3 and frontline supervisors in Session #9.

It was important that leadership saw themselves as part of the team solution and not a separate entity as “them and us.”

In general, management responses did lean more in the positive. However, there were self-admitted observations by executives of inappropriate behavior seen among front-line supervisors.

Overall, the team members are focused on doing great work in their immediate area of responsibility. It is how they work together as a team, however that is causing concern. Interwoven within the organization are struggles with fairness, trust, respect, conflict, accountability, and an overall sense of inclusiveness.

When there is a breakdown in these areas, non-productive conflict festers. The outburst occurs when staying silent becomes increasingly more unbearable than speaking up.

Bringing in Amediate, LLC, an outside consultant, is a further step in listening to those voices. The biggest outcry was, “Would any of this matter?”

---

*See Appendix B – Demographics by session and Appendix C - Data Report that categorizes positive/negative comments.*
Unintentional Culture
Based on our work with the College of William and Mary Facilities Management Team, we found that an unintentional workplace culture is existing and at odds with the newly stated vision and values embraced by the department. However, being that the stated vision and values were embraced and introduced to the department within the last year, we see this culture in transition. One focus group participant cautiously noted workplace improvement with an added “wait and see” as to whether it was here to stay. Specifically, the vision calls for “A capable, motivated workforce with high morale” and “Respect from stakeholders and peers” –with values that include “Integrity, Professionalism, Teamwork, and Safety.”

As defined by Laura C. Smythe, Organizational Culture Diagnostician, an organization’s culture is the shared assumptions about who makes decisions, how decisions are made, what is valued and prioritized -- and how it is all communicated both internally and externally. This culture drives the organization’s productivity, flexibility and reputation as seen from the inside and out. When measures are not in place to ensure the workplace culture is on task to meeting its ascribed standards of behaviors and operations, other undesired behaviors can creep in. If left unchecked, it becomes part of an evolving norm until a new and undesirable behavior has become the norm and not the exception.

Unintentional cultures tend to increase conflict. Per Smythe’s model, things can head in a downward spiral when existing within the organization are:

- Unclear or poorly-adhered-to organizational values and goals;
- Reactive leadership – Often with poor communication skills
- Employees experiencing unpredictable expectations and priorities
- Inconsistent interpretation of expectations/priorities and goals are occurring
- Differing and conflicting views about roles and work results

Many of the sticky notes and flip chart responses fell right into the captured categories listed above, thus supporting our conclusion that current behaviors and operations within the organization are not clearly demonstrating real progress towards the intended desired direction. To see real progress employees must see desired behaviors demonstrated beyond written statements. We used 26 variables to examine and categorize these responses and found that a few popped above the rest.

Top Areas of Concerns
Of the 1500 plus participant comments, 77% were deemed as negative, 16% as positive and 7% as neutral. The foremost concerns of Facilities Management focus group participants surrounded being treated fairly in workplace decisions, being treated with respect, and management accountability and consistencies in following policies and procedures. Merit wage distribution was of major concern to most, but this issue may or may not be within immediate remedy.

---

9 It should be noted that the organizational mission, vision, and values for driving the Facilities Management culture was introduced and adopted by leadership a year ago, (2015) –and presented to the entire team. Each team member was also provided ink pens printed with the stated values to reflect the standards by which Facilities Management would be guided. Prior to this, there was no stated mission, vision, or values statement. The participant input reflected in this report could be resulting from a combination of undesirable past cultural norms merging with evolving desirable cultural norms. Change does not happen overnight and measurement is paramount to ensure the change is going in the desired direction. This report reflects that measurement.

10 Appendix E Resources - Laura C. Smythe – Organizational Cultures – Unintended Cultures model

11 Appendix E resource – How to define and Drive an Intentional Culture

“I’ve learned that people will forget what you said, people will forget what you did, but people will never forget how you made them feel.”

Maya Angelou
**Perceptions of unfair treatment**

Over two million people leave their jobs each year because of unfairness in the workplace, costing employers an estimated $64 billion a year in hiring costs.\(^2\) In addition, people of color are three times more likely than white heterosexual males to say unfairness was the reason they quit their jobs.

Favoritism and nepotism came up 149 times in the collected data from the ten focus groups. Most often, the subject correlated with inconsistent practices that came up 313 times. Many employees expressed their concerns about getting ahead because they did not have the favored relationships with decision makers in the workplace. They noted they were aware of connections some co-workers had with leaders from prior working relationships, being a relative or sharing a common outside interest or in some cases, comments addressed a commonality of shared race. For some respondents, their comments reflected they felt these relationships put them at a disadvantage when others are favored. Favoritism can have a very negative impact on the work group and lead to a negative aftermath such as:\(^3\)

- **Lower morale** – When an employee observes favoritism, morale can drop when they start to believe that no matter what they do they will not be rewarded if they are not favored.
- **Resentment** - Employees can have resentment towards a manager and the person taking advantage of the situation.
- **Desertion** – Employees will start to leave when they feel they are not appreciated. (In this case, some employees said they did not feel they were in a financial position to leave).
- **Overlooked potential** – The opportunity to develop other talents and skills that might be among the team is missed.
- **Stunted growth** – When the wrong people are chosen due to favoritism you stunt the growth of the best employees that could be moving into management. You also miss the opportunity for succession planning.
- **Potential Legal Implications** – Favoritism can lead to legal action if an employee believes he/she was discriminated against and forced to work in a hostile environment.

**Recommendations:**

- **Define, embrace and promote professionalism** which is a stated core value to guide Facilities Management. Favoritism is unprofessional behavior and should not be tolerated. Leaders at all levels should lead the way and demonstrate behaviors that actively discourages treatment that can be perceived as unfair. This should be communicated to all employees including what is being done to ensure fair treatment.

- **Offer training to leaders and employees** to ensure everyone has a clear common understanding of what favoritism is, how it can be harmful to the workplace and what they should do if they observe such behavior. Keep in mind, an employee may not feel comfortable reporting direct issues surrounding this behavior if they do not feel they are in a trusting environment that supports their efforts. Open communication is paramount, --and the reporting employee must not be fearful of repercussions. The goal is to stop such behaviors, particularly once it is brought to the attention of the team.

- **Be willing to act quickly** to stop favoring behavior and unfair treatment. Knowing when and how to take quick action, is not the easiest thing to do, but having the conversation is the first step. As seen by the comments collected for this report, not addressing the concern can lead to a festering --where accusations become widespread and harmful to the workplace.

**Feelings of being disrespected and excluded**

According to a study of nearly 20,000 employees from around the world, the one thing that will increase employee engagement and foster commitment to an organization are leaders who demonstrate respect\(^4\). Being treated with respect was more important to employees than recognition and appreciation, communi-

---

\(^2\) Taken from Korn/Ferry Institute report
\(^3\) Adapted from article Favoritism and Nepotism: Dealing with Unfair Treatment in the Office
\(^4\) Taken from article “Half of Employees Don’t Feel Respected by Their Bosses”
Participants spoke a great deal about feeling disrespected in the way they are treated at work. Unfortunately, such behavior is on the rise in workplaces in general, and according to a polling of thousands of workers by Christine Porath and Christine Pearson, 98% say they have experienced uncivil behavior. Rude and disrespectful behavior should not be tolerated in the workplace, and it is costly to the organization. It is no fun being the target of such behavior, and according to their study, 94% report getting revenge with the offender. Often, in subtle ways an employee may intentionally decrease their work effort, intentionally decrease the quality of their work, or lose work time avoiding the offender.

Many comments from the participants reflected a perception that how they are treated depends on who they are, --who their supervisor is and what the supervisor’s mood is for the day.

Most of the rude and disrespectful behavior reflected by respondents dealt with the words and tone in which individuals were addressed. Part of the vision stated by Facilities Management is to keep a motivated workforce with high morale who is respectful to each other. Based on the collected comments, there a disconnect in the stated vision and what the participants say is a reality in their work environment.

Recommendations:

- **Manage yourself** – Leaders at all levels set the tone and must be aware that they are always being watched. For some employees, they will never read the employee handbook, but they will watch the behaviors of their leaders to determine what is and is not acceptable.

- **Model good behavior** – According to a recent study (Porath & Pearson), 25% of managers who admitted to behaving badly in the workplace stated they did so because they had observed uncivil behavior in their leaders. Ambitious employees are likely to follow in the footsteps of successful leaders, and if uncivil behavior works for them, they may see that as the way to the top.

- **Teach civility** – People can learn civility on the job. Role playing and video are great teaching tools paired with coaching. In a recent report, *EEOC Task Force on the Study of Harassment in the Workplace* found that not much had changed in the number of harassment complaints filed in the last thirty years after years of harassment training. They concluded that maybe employers should look at workforce “civility training” and focus less on eliminating unwelcome or offensive behavior based on characteristics protected under employment law --and focus more on promoting respect and civility in the workplace in general.

- **Create group norms** – Start a dialogue with team members and discuss the Facilities Management vision and values. Describe what behaviors are expected and model those behaviors in the workplace. Incorporate all team members in the conversation to ensure you have a feel for what behaviors are most important.

- **Reward/Recognize good behavior** – Facilities Management Kudos newsletter is an excellent way to continuously recognize good behavior. Maybe recognition for the little acts of kindness by peers might be something to consider as well. A reward with a parking space might bring on a big smile. Parking seems to be a big concern and a desired benefit.

- **Penalize bad behavior** – Be quick to identify troublesome behaviors and correct as soon as possible. Avoiding the behavior will not make it go away. Create an intentional culture that nurtures respect, take complaints seriously and follow up.

- **Conduct post-departure interviews** – It is important to reflect on the experiences of employees who leave because of incivility. Studies have found that departing employees are more likely to give honest

---

15 See Appendix E – “The Price of Incivility”
16 Select Task Force on the Study of Harassment in the Workplace, June, 2016
answers if you conduct the interview six months or later. In the case of Facilities Management, you have current data from this report to gain a clear understanding of problematic areas.

**Management accountability and consistencies in following policies and procedures**

Accountability was a major outcry from the focus groups. There was continuous mention of inconsistencies in the way managers enforce policies and procedures. Inconsistent practices seem to be the area causing the greatest friction. There were concerns at all levels regarding management accountabilities. Leadership is not easy, and enforcement of policies may be one of the most difficult tasks for supervisors and managers. Focus group polling questions #5, 6 and 7 asked questions specific to managerial practices. The responses from sessions with non-management participants were more negative in comparison to sessions with management participants who were more positive. However, members of the leadership team expressed concerns as well. Those comments included remarks such as lacking the ability to supervise their direct reports; being asked to do something that was against policy, or having to listen to leaders talk negatively about other leaders.

There appeared to be concern from non-management employees regarding adequate training of their supervisors. The training requested most often for their supervisors was skill development surrounding how to communicate with staff. During the focus group session with front line supervisors/managers, the group was asked if they felt they had received proper training, --many nodded affirmatively.

In a research study entitled “Good Manager, Bad Manager,” findings showed there is a modern deficit of skilled managers. Most companies proclaim finding and developing strong leaders is an urgent need and most acknowledge they don’t have much of a pipeline from which to pull leaders. The disturbing news is that half employees quit their jobs because of bad bosses.

The good news for leadership is that some comments reflected improvement in workplace procedures. One comment stated that in their area, things had changed like night and day since their survey was completed.

**Recommendations:**

Start off with a transparent conversation where the entire team is briefed with the concluding outcome of their voices. Acknowledge areas of concern that you may or may not have been aware. Discuss and reiterate how the stated Facilities Management vision and values will guide the departmental actions --thus addressing many of the concerns of inconsistency. Address short-term actions you plan to take immediately as well as long-term goals to sustain progress. Let the team know you heard all their voices and the task ahead is what the team can do collectively to ensure measurable results for the desired workplace.

**Teamwork**

Teamwork is stated as a value for driving the Facilities Management culture. It is defined as caring about each teammate and collaboratively working together with a personal stake (“vested”) in the success of the organization and the university. Teamwork (concentrating on the function of the group) is different from team building (focusing on the formation and makeup of the group) --but successful teamwork rarely happens without focused team building efforts.

Lack of teamwork was specifically addressed in a few comments primarily in the context of inconsistent and unfair practices that left feelings of being devalued and disrespected. True teamwork is observable. When it exists, members will start to visually see their peers and leaders taking the initiative to chip in and help when not asked. Members will suggest ideas for better efficiency without being discouraged or deterred if the ideas are not adopted, --and they will hold true to their word because they know the team depends on them.

Per some of the comments, not everyone felt they could depend on peers and leaders to follow through with commitments and/or be accountable when they fail to deliver. Participant input showed a sense of pride to get the job done in a quality manner but expressed frustration when they did not get the same sense from others. Several comments were made addressing the “extra work” they felt they were given unfairly --describing how they believe some get paid for the extra work and others don’t. In these cases, the extra work was not viewed as picking up the slack for a team member who would reciprocate for them when needed, but more in the spirit of some team members not having to pull their load and getting away with it.
**Recommendations:**
- Make sure the team goals are clear and understood by each team member.
- Make sure there is clarity in who is responsible for what task to avoid overlapping.
- Build trust and show loyalty to team members in an atmosphere of honesty and openness.
- For issues that rely heavily on team consensus and commitment, try to involve the entire team in the decision-making process.
- Be attentive to recognize interpersonal issues early and address them appropriately.
- Seek opportunities to empower employees to make individual decisions and show appreciation when the initiative is taken to resolve an issue.

**Trust and Communication**
No progress is made until trust is rooted in the foundation of an organization and effective communication channels are in place to connect progress. Both these areas came up in the focus group. It started with most attendees stating they did not know why they were required to attend the focus group. Most said they had not received the introductory letter. Some said they did not have access to email. Trust was a factor for some who expressed they were not comfortable openly sharing because they felt others would take information and distort, and/or run back to others to gossip. These two topics deserved to be noted in this report for further development. However, they did not appear to be the immediate verbal concerns expressed by the attendees.

**In conclusion**, it appears that all employees are not consistently having similar experiences as it relates to practices within the workplace. The shift in their experiences seem to be based on where they worked, who they worked for and what work they did. Based on the overall comments, the Facilities Management workplace culture could be evolving in an unintended direction --or it is in transition to their desired outcome. Now is the time to re-examine and make that determination.

Change won’t happen overnight. It takes time. There are trust issues to address along with developing an effective communication channel for engaging everyone to be part of this process. Leadership cannot do this alone. The group took a big step forward with the Focus Group. They want to be in the organizational process, and they want to believe this time things will be different.

It all starts with a conversation --and as a team, you start to embrace and demonstrate the values and behaviors reflecting how you want to be defined.
Let’s Talk Race, Gender, Age, and Wage

Race

Overall, race presented fewer comments among the groups, however, those remarks are worth noting.

Race and Race Relations is not an easy topic to candidly discuss in a workplace setting. Discomfort in a mixed-group can arise from the risk of being accused of conveniently using the “race card” on the one hand --or accused of being “insensitive” to issues facing minority team members on the other hand.

The two-hour focus group sessions allowed us to gather needed data for further exploration and clarification of the concerns of African American employees and particularly non-exempt employees in Facilities Management --as well as provide a forum in which complicated issues such as race could be discussed. Participants were not to be forced or coerced to discuss race, however the facilitator was trained and prepared to go there if conversation flowed in that direction. The purpose was to gain clarity to comments from the climate survey and let the root issues evolve as the participants saw its relevance. Because all Facilities Management employees were required to participate, this report includes the diverse voices of all attendees beyond just African-Americans.

Participants who addressed race in candid expression did so primarily through anonymous means via sticky notes or confidential outside conversations with the facilitator. The comments included diverse two-sided concerns such as:

- African American employees being treated more harshly when disciplinary decisions are made --and not being judged by the same standards
- Some races being degraded
- Some racially insensitive comments being overlooked
- Some African Americans being treated better and have more opportunities
- Some African-Americans taking advantage of the race card
- Some African Americans being treated unfairly and with disrespect from other African Americans (this information was provided through verbal side comments)

There was limited group discussion of race at a few individual tables whose participants willingly flip charted the topic for others to see. Overall, however, the topic was met with reluctance and a few mumbles, but nothing that led to an in-depth discussion during any overall session. The short two-hour time frame per session may have limited the opportunity to create the necessary comfort for open dialogue.

The word “race” or related word was stated 14 times in the gathered sticky note data and three times on the flip charts.

The participants self-selected the focus group session they would attend from a choice of eight available time slots. What resulted were sessions that visibly showed a majority race, either African American or White, thus allowing for some patterns of comments to evolve and study.

To turn our observation into data we requested and received, from Human Resources, two demographics reports showing race, gender and job title. One that provided the overall Demographic makeup of the Facilities Management department; and a second one that provided the demographic makeup based on the sign-in sheets for each focus group session. The names were not included nor needed for either report. With the overall demographic report, we were able to

---

17 African Americans make up the largest racial minority group in Facilities Management
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calculate that African American employees and women employees are found primarily in housekeeping positions. Of the 280 FM employees, 162 (58%) are African Americans. Of the 162, 127 (78%) are in Housekeeping (Custodial). Of the 138 in Housekeeping; 127 (92%) are African Americans. Of the 280 FM employees, 116 are women; Of the 116, 95 (82%) are in Housekeeping (Custodial). Of the 138 in Housekeeping; 95 (60%) are women.

In analyzing the session comments, they were categorized as negative, positive, or neutral. Of all the departmental comments submitted, 77% categorized as negative, 16% as positive and 7% as neutral. The collected data indicated a likely gap in the more negative comments from sessions (1,5,7,8 & 10) with majority African American employees in housekeeping positions versus less negative comments from sessions (2,4 & 6) with majority White employees in non-housekeeping positions (primarily professional trades).

Overall, the employee data show likely figures that indicate 84% of African American comments were negative in describing experiences compared 71% of White comments in describing negative experiences. Comments from combined leadership sessions (3 & 9) show likely figures that indicate 57% negative when describing experiences. The executive team (session 3), however, described negative experiences at 44% compared to the frontline team (session 9) describing their negative experiences at 64%. The data figures are not absolute in percentages by race because the anonymous comments cannot be connected to the actual person to determine the race. However, we feel confident to make the likely connection because the percentages can be indicators of the contrasting experiences noted by the majority race that stood out in each session. There was a total of 19 employees identified as other than White or African American scattered throughout the ten sessions and is not seen as having a major impact on the likely percentages.

In conclusion, race did not come to the forefront as a major discussion, but it did appear as an undertone. The fact that some individuals felt a need to make comments privately on the side, write sticky notes and write it on the flip chart indicates there may be concerns underneath. Race is not an easy topic to discuss but not discussing it does not make it disappear. We believe addressing the three major concerns expressed by employee participants regarding unfair treatment, respect and management accountability, is the key to diminishing most concerns regarding race.

**Gender and Wage/ Respect**

In sessions where participants were majority women (5, 7 & 8), more negative than positive comments were recorded. However, the comments were not notably different compared to the sessions that were majority male. There were a few concerns where respondents expressed their perception of a disparate distribution of wages and an inconsistent level of respect based on gender.

Our collection of data did not include a query of wage specific information and no likely comparison can be concluded.

---

18 See Appendix B - This data analysis was made possible by cross checking the data comments by session (available only to the consultant) with the demographic makeup by session that was provided by HR (Demographic information available only to W&M HR) from the sign-in sheets. Consequently, the makeup compiled five sessions (1,5,7,8,10) with majority African Americans employees from housekeeping positions, three sessions (2,4,6,) with majority White employees from non-housekeeping positions and two session (3,9) with majority White from leadership positions.
Age
Not much was addressed in regards to age apart from issues surrounding the essential personnel snow shoveling policy. Comments reflect that roughly two years ago, Housekeeping employees were incorporated into this policy. They contend that before this policy change, they were not required to shovel snow.

In general, it is perceived that a higher percentage of Housekeeping employees are over 40 years of age. Several respondents expressed not only their concerns about their health in having to manually shovel snow—but also their perception that leadership did not care about those concerns.

Wage
The issue of wage was a major concern from members of the non-management team in general. Over 140 comments (including sessions dominated by leadership) were made on the sticky notes in regards to wage and of those, 124 were categorized as negative. The focus group flip-chart comments were similar in nature. These comments are consistent with the climate survey results as well as the focus group poll results.

19 Leadership contends this policy has been in place at least four years and it is required of housekeeping and all employees who already have the requirement in their job description to be able to do the physical labor that would be required to remove snow.
APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

**Feeling Safe**

Our methodology for creating this safe environment was to provide several options in which participants could comfortably express their thoughts, including speaking out publicly within the group. These sessions were not the time for participants to hold back and we wanted to give them every comfort in understanding this. The steps taken were as follows:

**Introductory letter**\(^{20}\) - An introductory letter was written by Amediate, LLC to be internally distributed to each member of the Facilities Management team before they attended the Focus Group sessions.

**On the day of the two-hour Focus Group sessions**

**15-slide PowerPoint guided facilitation** –

- **Section one** included five introductory slides in which the facilitator addressed the purpose of the focus group and answered preliminary questions from participants.

- **Section two** included eight slides allowing participants to respond with instant response devices to eight questions\(^{21}\) categorized into the three problematic areas identified by the Task Force. They were asked to respond based on how their observations and experiences affected their view of the workplace in Facilities Management relative to the following three categories:
  - Working Conditions - sought to find out their overall experience in general while working in Facilities Management,
  - Managerial Practices - sought to gain knowledge specifically of their overall experiences in the working relationship with management, and
  - Wage distribution within Facilities Management – sought to gain knowledge on their overall thoughts and experiences on the distribution of wages within Facilities Management,

- **Section three** included two wrap-up slides that allowed participants to discuss their overall experience while working at the College of William and Mary. They were asked to highlight what made them proud, where they thought improvement was needed and what they thought needed to be discontinued. There was also a final note opportunity to say whatever was on their minds that we may not have discussed.

**Note:** Each question had a counter on the PowerPoint screen to indicate the number of anonymous responses being recorded after clicks. In most cases, we were able to get a 100% response rate or very close to that. People could click as many times as they wanted towards the screen, but their vote would only be recorded once. Sometimes participants made numerous clicks when we were close to the total number of all being recorded. Not knowing who was missing they would all click again until the screen showed every clicker was recorded. In some cases, the effort still did not get 100% but, we had to move on. It could have also been that respondent chose not to register a click for that particular question.

\(^{20}\) See Appendix A1 – Introduction letter

\(^{21}\) See Appendix A2 – PowerPoint pdf showing eight Likert scale (1-5) questions
**Sticky note responses**

For clarity to Likert Scale responses, participants were asked to describe on the sticky notes more specifically why they responded the way they did. We asked them to be descriptive and visual with examples if needed. No names required to their notes. Over 1500 sticky note comments were collected and recorded from the ten sessions. The comments were categorized into 26 variables to describe the concerns. Of the 1500 comments, 1188 leaned negative and 251 leaned positive with the balance more neutral. An additional 1100 sticky note comments were collected that addressed other areas of the PowerPoint slides beyond the eight questions. These comments were not categorized as negative/positive or categorized into the 26 variables.

**Group table discussions**

Participants were asked to verbalize within their group table more specifically what workplace experiences caused them to vote their choices/thoughts the way they did. The forum for open discussion was to allow an opportunity for dialogue among peers to address any workplace issue on their minds—particularly those identified in the climate survey.

**Flip Chart responses**

Table groups were asked to flipchart their discussions. Over 99 flipcharts were collectively created by participants and posted for all to see within their individual session.

Even with all efforts to create free flowing discussion, there appeared to be some hesitation for frankness at their group table discussions when the topic was race. This, despite a focus group ground rule being that “WHAT IS SAID IN THIS ROOM STAYS HERE.” Overheard by facilitator were comments like “I’m not saying anything in front of some of the people in here because I know it will go right back to the wrong ears.” Or, in some cases, the facilitator was pulled aside and specifically told there was mistrust that comments would stay confidential.

Despite confidential concerns expressed by a few, many did have meaningful and candid conversations at their tables and provided flip chart responses. Dialogue is a step in the right direction when individuals are willing to openly have conversations that may be difficult by others’ account.

---

22 Facilitator randomly assigned participants to tables via count off
August 31, 2016

Re: Facilities Management Focus Group Session

Dear Team Members,

Last year many of you in Facilities Management participated in an anonymous employee climate survey. The purpose was to voice your views on how the environment at the College of William and Mary was meeting your expectations as a place to work. Your response ratings and thoughtful comments brought concerns and issues to the forefront that is worthy of further exploration and clarification.

To ensure this is not just another survey, the Task Force for Race and Race Relations asked Amediate, LLC, to come in as an outside consultant to conduct focus groups and examine in more detail the concluding message. Now is the time to talk and have real conversations.

We, at Amediate, LLC, are here to help tell your true story about your workplace and how it looks when you feel included and appreciated. We look forward to meeting you all during the last week of September and the first week of October over a scattered schedule.

In all sincerity,

Sharon E. Harrington
Managing Consultant
Amediate, LLC

500 E. Plume St., Suite 404, Norfolk, VA 23510 | P.O. Box 1206, Norfolk, VA 23501 | 757-292-0012
www.AmediateLLC.com
**APPENDIX A2 - METHODOLOGY**

**POWERPOINT FACILITATION GUIDE**

---

**Welcome**

“Our Collective Voices”
Focus Group Sessions
September 27-28, 2016 & October 3-5, 2016

---

**Focus Groups Defined**

What they are...
- Additional means to collect data for clarity
- A group to discuss a specific topic in an open and spontaneous forum
- A means to generate a maximum number of different ideas and opinions from many different people.

What they are not...
- A debate
- Group therapy
- A conflict resolution session
- A problem solving session
- An opportunity to collaborate
- A promotional opportunity
- An educational session
- A grip session

---

**First Things First**

I’m here because…
My expectations are…

---

**Ground Rules**

- We want YOU to do the talking.
  - We would like the topic to be led by you, and not by the facilitator.
  - It's okay to ask if you don't understand something.
- There are no right or wrong answers.
  - Every person's ideas and opinions are important.
- You will have a voice.
  - Opening whether you agree or disagree.
- We worked to have a wide range of opinions.
- Care about what's based in your heart.
- What is said in this room stays here.
  - We ask you to keep confidential all information discussed during the meetings.
  - By participating in this activity, you agree to not discuss with others, even non-employees, in your specific workplace or you stated your name.
  - Please respect each other's privacy and not report specific comments heard byron with this group.

---

**Any Questions?**

---

**Areas of concern in the workplace creating dissatisfaction**

- Working Conditions
  - Workplace environment
  - Workplace policies and procedures
- Management Practices
  - How management affects your workplace culture
  - How management enforces workplace policies and procedures
- Wages
  - Equity in distribution
  - Opportunities for advancement

---

**Working Conditions**

1. At FAC, I feel the work environment (culture) is one in which all employees are appreciated and treated with respect.

   - Strongly disagree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - It depends
   - Somewhat agree
   - Strongly agree

---
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POWERPOINT FACILITATION GUIDE (CONT.)

Working Conditions
2. At FAC, I feel the work environment (culture) is one in which all employees are treated fairly.
   1. Strongly disagree 68%
   2. Somewhat disagree 29%
   3. It depends 3%
   4. Somewhat agree 2%
   5. Strongly agree 0%

3. At FAC, I feel all employees are provided the resources needed to do their assigned job.
   1. Strongly disagree 84%
   2. Somewhat disagree 16%
   3. It depends 0%
   4. Somewhat agree 0%
   5. Strongly agree 0%

4. At FAC, workplace policies and procedures are decided with the input of workers and do reflect the well-being of all FAC employees.
   1. Strongly disagree 80%
   2. Somewhat disagree 18%
   3. It depends 2%
   4. Somewhat agree 0%
   5. Strongly agree 0%

Managerial Practices
5. I believe FAC leadership make advancement decisions based primarily on merit.
   1. Strongly disagree 60%
   2. Somewhat disagree 20%
   3. It depends 10%
   4. Somewhat agree 10%
   5. Strongly agree 0%

6. I believe FAC leadership applies policies and procedures the same way to all employees.
   1. Strongly disagree 80%
   2. Somewhat disagree 18%
   3. It depends 2%
   4. Somewhat agree 0%
   5. Strongly agree 0%

7. I believe FAC leadership is respectful to all employees.
   1. Strongly disagree 60%
   2. Somewhat disagree 20%
   3. It depends 10%
   4. Somewhat agree 10%
   5. Strongly agree 0%
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POWERPOINT FACILITATION GUIDE (CONT.)

Wages
8. I believe FAC employees receive fair wage distribution among all employees.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat disagree
3. It depends
4. Somewhat agree
5. Strongly agree

Overall
• Things that make me proud to work in FAC at William & Mary and I want to see continued.
• Conditions where the most friction is occurring and when left unaddressed the road becomes rockier with higher mountains to climb. I want to see this area addressed immediately.
• Practices that are not working and need to be discontinued as soon as possible.

Still not too late for comments
Sticky notes
Final comments on anything you did not get to address during this session

Thank you.
APPENDIX B - DEMOGRAPHICS COUNT, JOB TITLE, AND WORKING ENVIRONMENT CONTINUUM GRADING BY SESSION

RACE/ETHNICITY COUNT BY SESSION

- Black or African American
- Multi
- White
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Undisclosed
- American Indian or Alaskan Native

SESSION 1
29 – Attendees
19 – Black (16 Custodial, 3 Admin/Support)
9 – White (1 Custodial, 4 Admin/Support, 4 Trade)
1 – Multi - (1 Custodial)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 46 ↔ 89 (43)
Mgmt. Practices: 32 ↔ 78 (46)
Wages: 28 ↔ 71* (53)

SESSION 2
28 – Attendees
9 – Black (2 Custodial Workers, 5 Grounds, 1 Admin/Support, 1 Trade)
16 – White (1 Custodial, 3 Grounds, 1 Admin/Support, 11 Trade)
2 – Hispanic - (2 Trade)
1 – Undisclosed – (1 Grounds)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 58 ↔ 82 (24)
Mgmt. Practices: 53 ↔ 82 (29)
Wages: 36 ↔ 83 (47)

SESSION 3
9 – Attendees
1 – Black (1 Admin/Support)
8 – White (8 Admin/Support)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 66 ↔ 87 (21)
Mgmt. Practices: 71 ↔ 88 (17)
Wages: 69 ↔ 88 (19)

SESSION 4
19 – Attendees
5 – Black (1 Custodial, 3 Trade, 1 Grounds)
12 – White (2 Admin/Support, 8 Trade, 2 Grounds)
1 – Asian - (1 Admin/Support)
1 – Hispanic - (1 Trade)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 65 ↔ 85 (20)
Mgmt. Practices: 58 ↔ 81 (23)
Wages: 55 ↔ 83 (28)

SESSION 5
31 – Attendees
27 – Black (24 Custodial, 3 Admin/Support)
2 – White (2 Trade)
1 – Asian - (1 Custodial)
1 – American Indian - (1 Admin/Support)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 41 ↔ 78 (37)
Mgmt. I Practices: 38 ↔ 86 (48)
Wages: 32 ↔ 85 (53)

SESSION 6
18 – Attendees
3 – Black (1 Custodial, 2 Admin/Support)
15 – White (1 Grounds, 2 Admin/Support, 12 Trade)
1 – Multi - (1 Custodial)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 47 ↔ 78 (21)
Mgmt. Practices: 43 ↔ 73 (30)
Wages: 43 ↔ 83 (40)

SESSION 7
36 – Attendees
27 – Black (23 Custodial, 2 Admin/Support, 2 Trade)
6 – White (1 Custodial, 3 Admin/Support, 2 Trade)
1 – Asian - (1 Custodial)
1 – American Indian/Alaskan Native - (1 Custodial)
1 – Undisclosed - (1 Custodial)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 46 ↔ 76 (30)
Mgmt. Practices: 49 ↔ 75 (26)
Wages: 36 ↔ 69 (33)

SESSION 8
24 – Attendees
17 – Black (15 Custodial, 2 Admin/Support)
3 – White (1 Custodial, 1 Admin/Support, 1 Trade)
2 – Asian - (1 Custodial, 1 Admin Support)
1 – Hispanic - (1 Custodial)
1 – Undisclosed - (1 Custodial)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 60 ↔ 87 (27)
Mgmt. Practices: 50 ↔ 82 (32)
Wages: 52 ↔ 81 (29)

SESSION 9
28 – Attendees
11 – Black (10 Custodial, 1 Admin/Support)
16 – White (4 Grounds, 5 Admin/Support, 6 Trade)
1 – Hispanic - (1 Admin/Support)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 51 ↔ 83 (32)
Mgmt. Practices: 54 ↔ 80 (26)
Wages: 41 ↔ 77 (36)

SESSION 10
23 – Attendees
18 – Black (11 Custodial, 1 Admin/Support, 6 Trade)
4 – White (1 Admin/Support, 3 Trade)
1 – Undisclosed - (1 Admin/Support)

CONTINUUM DATA
Working Conditions: 48 ↔ 85 (37)
Mgmt. Practices: 42 ↔ 73 (31)
Wages: 40 ↔ 81 (42)
### Gender Count by Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Not Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Continuum Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Working Conditions</th>
<th>Mgmt. Practices</th>
<th>Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46 ↔ 89 (43)</td>
<td>32 ↔ 78 (46)</td>
<td>28 ↔ 71* (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>58 ↔ 82 (24)</td>
<td>53 ↔ 82 (29)</td>
<td>36 ↔ 83 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>66 ↔ 87 (21)</td>
<td>71 ↔ 88 (17)</td>
<td>69 ↔ 88 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65 ↔ 85 (20)</td>
<td>58 ↔ 81 (23)</td>
<td>55 ↔ 83 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41 ↔ 78 (37)</td>
<td>38 ↔ 86 (48)</td>
<td>32 ↔ 85 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>47 ↔ 78 (31)</td>
<td>43 ↔ 73 (30)</td>
<td>43 ↔ 83 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>46 ↔ 76 (30)</td>
<td>49 ↔ 75 (26)</td>
<td>36 ↔ 69 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60 ↔ 87 (27)</td>
<td>50 ↔ 82 (32)</td>
<td>52 ↔ 81 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Appendix B (cont.)
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APPENDIX B1 - CONTINUUM GRADE SCORE

Slide 5 of the PowerPoint guided facilitation asked participants to provide a number grade score on a continuum scale of 1 to 100 on how they would score their working environment in present state (which is why they were at the focus group session) and how they would score in an ideal state.23 In describing the ideal state, they were told what would the score be if they felt satisfied without expecting perfection. They were told to put a score that would describe them at a point where things might not be perfect, but they certainly felt good about coming to work each day.

23 This instrument was adapted from a tool developed by preeminent leadership coach and author Marshall Goldsmith. Only the first part of the tool was used for this exercise. The actual instrument is a 14-point process that engages the team members to grade current and desired conditions and then go on to identify desirable behaviors and a team commitment to demonstrate those behaviors with measurable assessment points along the way.
APPENDIX C - DATA REPORT BY THREE MAJOR AREAS - WORKING CONDITIONS, MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND WAGES

Data Report by Major Area

As you review this report there are two aspects of the data that need further explanation:

- Numbers for positive comments and negative comments may not always add up to total comments since some comments were neutral.
- Comment data may appear more negative than poll data exhibits because of comments containing “It depends” … “on my supervisor’s mood”, “if they like you”, or “who you are” type comments were deemed negative. Authors of these type comments may have selected the “It Depends” for the clicker polls.
- There are three instances where post-it data is either missing or became mixed in with another session’s data. These are isolated to the first day of facilitating focus groups during sessions 1 and 2 --before a revised strategy for post-it note collection was deployed. They include question 3 from session 2, question 7 and 8 from session 1.

Overall Combined Comment Results
Majority Leadership Combined (sessions 3,9)

- Negative: 11%
- Neutral: 56%
- Positive: 33%

Majority Executive Leadership (session 3)

- Negative: 11%
- Neutral: 43%
- Positive: 47%

Majority Frontline Leadership (session 9)

- Negative: 25%
- Neutral: 11%
- Positive: 64%
1. AT, FAC, I FEEL THE WORK ENVIRONMENT (CULTURE) IS ONE IN WHICH ALL EMPLOYEES ARE APPRECIATED AND TREATED WITH RESPECT.

![Bar chart showing positive and negative comments]

Major Themes - 78 mention favoritism or other inconsistent practices.

2. AT, FAC, I FEEL THE WORK ENVIRONMENT (CULTURE) IS ONE IN WHICH ALL EMPLOYEES ARE TREATED FAIRLY.

![Bar chart showing positive and negative comments]

Major Themes - Inconsistent practices various privileges, rules and even hiring practices executed without consistency.
Working Conditions (continued)

3. AT, FAC, I FEEL ALL EMPLOYEES ARE PROVIDED THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO DO THEIR ASSIGNED JOB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Comments</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL (1-10)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Themes - Several comments about inadequate staffing levels, insufficient training, and ineffective cleaning chemicals.

Working Conditions

4. AT, FAC, WORKPLACE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE DECIDED WITH THE INPUT OF WORKERS AND DO REFLECT THE WELL-BEING OF ALL FAC EMPLOYEES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Comments</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL (1-10)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Themes - A large area of friction appears to be the change in the essential personnel policy regarding snow days. Many comments to the effect that management may say they want input but employee input is often ignored.
5. I BELIEVE FAC LEADERSHIP MAKE ADVANCEMENT DECISIONS BASED PRIMARILY ON MERIT.

Major Themes - Inconsistent practices appear to be causing the greatest friction in this area. 8 comments mention “good ole/old boy network/system”, 17 - contain “favor” as in favorites, favoritism, 30 had perceived inconsistent practices.

6. I BELIEVE FAC LEADERSHIP APPLIES POLICIES AND PROCEDURES THE SAME WAY TO ALL EMPLOYEES.

Major Themes - 17 comments contain “favor” as in favorites and 94 comments were perceived as exhibiting favoritism or inconsistent practices.
Managerial Practices (continued)

7. I BELIEVE FAC LEADERSHIP IS RESPECTFUL TO EMPLOYEES.

Major Themes - Respect seems to be inconsistently given and depends on a variety of things from favoritism, supervisor mood, etc....

Wages

8: I BELIEVE FAC EMPLOYEES RECEIVE FAIR WAGE DISTRIBUTION AMONG ALL EMPLOYEES.

Major Themes - Many view the state vs. university system unfair. Some complained of rising cost of parking passes and insurance decreasing their take home pay. Many are pleased with their benefits but wish their hourly wage were higher. Some mention of favoritism.
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SHARON E. HARRINGTON MA, CPLP is the Founder and Senior Managing Consultant of Amediate LLC. Amediate, LLC is a small woman-owned business offering consultant services in conflict management at every level throughout an organization by designing and facilitating customized systems that support a self-mediating environment. http://www.amediatellc.com/

DANUELLE TUCKER
Danuelle Tucker is a software engineer with a focus in database development. She has over ten years of experience in the software industry with companies such as Microsoft, E-Systems, FileNet and Tuskegee’s VA Hospital’s information resource department. She is also fluent in C, Java and Visual Basic and enjoys finding software solutions to workplace problems.
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Internet sources
- Pearson, Christine (2013). 10 steps to halt the contagion of workplace incivility. Thunderbird University website (http://www.thunderbird.edu/article/10-steps-halt-contagion-workplace-incivility)
- How to Define and Drive an Intentional Culture (http://www.cherylmcmillan.com/how-to-define-and-drive-an-intentional-culture/)

Articles

Report

Books
- Wah, LM. (2011) Let’s get real: What people of color can’t say and whites won’t ask about racism