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Executive summary

- New Zealand universities are required by law to monitor and report on their EEO situation and progress via an EEO programme. At the University of Waikato this is fulfilled through the Annual Report. The University of Waikato’s EEO Programme (2012-2015) focus is to increase opportunities for women, Māori and Pacific people, particularly in senior roles and in some occupational groups. The main action of the EEO Programme 2012-2015 is to carry out an Equity Assessment to provide clear understanding of EEO issues at the University of Waikato.

- The EEO assessment included understanding the career experiences of men and women, Māori and Pacific peoples at the University of Waikato. A Career Progression Survey of staff and senior leaders, which is a part of this assessment, was implemented in 2013-2014 via interviews and online surveys. Two separate online surveys were provided to capture the different career pathways of academic staff and general staff.

- A total of 114 academic staff and 188 general staff took part in the online survey; eight members of the Senior Leadership team and six staff members were interviewed as part of the Career Progression Survey.

- Main observations in the responses from academic staff include:
  1. Men and women work on their careers differently.
  2. Men and women discuss careers differently.
  3. Data on flexible working arrangements contradicts assumptions that flexible working relates to women.

Major observations from general staff include:

1. There are surprisingly similar responses between females and males.
2. Women participated in more professional development in the past three years than men; and women and men seek out different professional development options.
3. The main constraints on career progression are identified as the lack of job opportunities for career advancement, no career pathways, time constraints in the job restricting professional development opportunities and the lack of opportunities to experience higher level work.

- Maori staff members are frequently called on to provide formalities such as waiata and powhiri as part of their day to day responsibilities but this contribution is not recognised in promotions or in salary advancements. Because there are fewer Maori staff (10% of total staff), these duties fall on a few senior Maori staff.

- Interviews with senior leaders also identified that academic responsibilities such as supervision place demands on a few Maori staff and there is a need for balancing cultural obligations and academic aspects where a lot of time was imposed on a few Maori staff – e.g. high supervision loads.
• Current position descriptions and advertisements are not attractive to Maori and Pacific peoples; that needs to change.

• To meet the focus of the EEO Programme which is to increase opportunities for women, Māori and Pacific people, particularly in senior roles and in some occupational groups, ways forward for 2015 include:
  o A revision of position descriptions and job advertisements attractive to women, Maori and Pacific peoples.
  o Consideration of the issues pertaining to pay equity at the University.
  o Increasing leadership development opportunities for women particularly in HoS/CoD and middle management positions.
  o Better understanding of PGS by line managers and staff.
  o Embedding equality in organisational culture.
  o The development of a set of EEO indicators.
  o A review of the current EEO Programme.
Part 1

Background

1.1 Introduction

New Zealand universities are required by law to monitor and report on their Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) situation and progress. The legislative framework requiring universities to ensure there are equal employment opportunities is provided by:

- State Sector Act Amendment (No 2) 2004
- Human Rights Act 1993
- Employment Relations Act 2000
- Education Amendment Act 1993
- Equal Pay Act 1972

The State Sector Act requires the University to be a ‘good employer’ by operating a personnel policy containing provisions generally accepted as necessary for the fair and proper treatment of employees in all aspects of their employment. This includes provisions for:

- good and safe working conditions;
- an equal employment opportunities programme;
- impartial selection of suitably qualified persons for appointment;
- recognition of:
  (i) The aims and aspirations of the Māori people;
  (ii) The employment requirements of the Māori people;
  (iii) The need for greater involvement of the Māori people in the Education service;
- opportunities for the enhancement of the abilities of individual employees;
- recognition of the aims and aspirations, and the cultural differences, of ethnic or minority groups;
- recognition of the employment requirements of women; and
- recognition of the employment requirements of persons with disabilities.

Equal employment opportunities as defined by the EEO Trust means:

*Eliminating barriers to ensure that all employees are considered for the employment of their choice and have the chance to perform to their maximum potential.*

EEO/diversity practices include hiring based on merit, fairness at work, flexible working options and promotion based on talent. They relate to all aspects of employment including recruitment, pay and other rewards, career development and work conditions\(^1\).

---

This paper reports on an EEO assessment carried out over 2013-2014 as part of the University of Waikato EEO Programme 2012-2015. The focus of Phase 1 of the EEO Programme is to increase opportunities for women, Māori and Pacific people, particularly in senior roles and in some occupational groups. In the development of this proposed programme it became evident that there are many questions relating to EEO that need to be better understood. Therefore the main action of EEO Programme 2012-2015 was to carry out an Equality Assessment to provide clear understanding of EEO issues at the University.

**Box 1: Summary of Phase 1 of the EEO Programme 2012-2015**

1. The focus is on defining equity issues and employment opportunities for women, Māori and Pacific people
2. Development of an EEO programme that includes:
   a. a comprehensive assessment of the situation (Equality Assessment)
   b. a multi-level approach (individual, cultural, structural)
   c. developing strategies and indicators, benchmarking against relevant organisations
   d. developing an EEO communications plan
3. Obtaining Senior Leadership support and visible commitment
4. Obtaining Faculties/School/Divisions/Units support for EEO initiatives

1.2. **Career Progression Survey of the University of Waikato (UoW)**

1.2.1 **Background**

The Career Progression Survey is a component of a broader assessment of EEO at the University of Waikato that also includes an analysis of our current situation through:

- Relevant items from the Staff Engagement Survey 2009-2014.
- Staff profile data to analyse patterns and trends of representation across disciplines and seniority.
- The response by Māori and Pacific peoples to advertised positions.
- Practices and programmes for EEO target groups.

This specific paper reports on the findings of the EEO Career progression Survey aspect of the assessment.

This survey aim was to understand the career experiences of men and women and Māori and Pacific peoples at the University of Waikato. This included for example aspects such as the experiences of flexible working arrangements; experiences of seeking career advancement and promotion; and the feelings of inclusion and value of Māori. It is anticipated that the data from this study will form the basis for the development of the 2015-2018 Programme.

1.2.2 **EEO Career Progression Survey structure**

Ethics approval for the Career Progression Survey was granted by the University of Waikato Human Research Ethics Committee in February 2013.

**Stage 1:** The starting point of the survey was interview-style conversations with members of the Senior Leadership Team and a focus group with Deans to gather information on EEO in their areas. The purpose was to gather summary data to inform and facilitate progress towards achieving the University of Waikato’s EEO goals and to develop a set of relevant
indicators for the University. Four Deans, one Assistant Dean (focus Group), three Heads of Divisions and the PVC Maori were interviewed.

Stage 2: Staff were invited via the Official Circular, to undertake an anonymous on-line questionnaire to get perspectives, experiences and knowledge regarding issues such as career progression, professional development, PGS, flexible working and career opportunities at UOW. Separate questionnaires were provided for academic and general staff (see Appendix 1 for questionnaires). Stage 2 was followed by face-to-face staff interviews of staff which included three Academic staff members and three general staff members.

Two questionnaires were provided, one each for academic and general staff because these groups have very different career progression options and issues. Participation in the survey was as follows:

- Academic staff 114 (Females 74, Males 39, Other 1).
- General staff 188 (Females 149, Males 39).

There may be biases in the data due to a self-selected sample and a large non-response rate. In total, 292 staff responded to the survey which is around 21% of total staff numbers.

Survey data were tested using a Pearson’s Chi-Square to test if the difference between observed and expected values is actually significant. P-values were set at <0.005. Counts less than 5 were excluded.

Part 2
Academic staff responses to the Career Progression Survey

2.1 Academic staff respondent profile

A total of 114 academic staff including 74 females, 39 males, 1 other\(^2\) participated in the EEO Career Development Survey in 2013. This equates to 19% of academic staff at the University of Waikato. Tables 1-5 profile the survey respondents. It should be noted that this is a self-selected sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Category</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer/ Research fellow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) For confidentiality reasons, this respondent is not included in further data and analyses.
Table 2: Ethnicity of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ Pakeha</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European/American</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Respondent’s length of time working at the University of Waikato (number of years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time category</th>
<th>Length of time (yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Respondents’ employment category at the University of Waikato (number of staff members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Category</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer/ Research fellow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Respondents’ stage in life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage in life</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No dependents</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of children/child under 14</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of preschool children/child</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of teens</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer of other family members</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer of someone who is not a family member</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Main observations

2.2.1 Statistically significant results

This section provides results of survey data found to be statistically significant. Survey data are examined by comparing gender differences across significant variables to understand career progression experiences and barriers that may be relevant to improving representation of women in senior positions. Survey data that returned significant results
using bivariate analysis testing are provided in Table 6 that identify major findings which are discussed in the following section.

Table 6: Academic staff gender comparisons with statistically significant female/ male responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey statement?option</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Pearson's Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A member of official University committees</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10.584</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A member of Faculty committees</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15.143</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively working on advancing my career by increasing my skills through professional development</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>3.914</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had study leave in the last 3 years</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16.891</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended international conference in the past 3 years</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>19.705</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for promotion (not advancement) in the past five years and was promoted</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8.706</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for promotion (not advancement) in the past five years but was not successful</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5.742</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy with other commitments and will think about progressing my career in the future</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6.120</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor support from CoDs is a barrier to career development</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13.275</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an annual PGS</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16.206</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 Professional Development

Survey results show 49% of female respondents have had study leave over the past three years compared with only 10% of their male counterparts (Table 6). A similar pattern continues in the attendance at international conferences (88% female; 48% male). Across all academic employment categories, female respondent participation in professional development far exceeds male participation (Figures 1 and 2). These results maybe a function of a self-selected and small sample size.
2.2.3 Promotions

Although the survey data indicate that female respondents were significantly more active in applying for and obtaining promotion than male respondents, actual promotion data for that year was as follows:

- 294 female and 294 male academic staff members were eligible for promotion/advancement in 2013.
- 93 female academic staff were promoted compared with 85 male academics.
- 80% of female promotions were in employment groups Senior Lecturer Range 1 and below compared with 59% male promotions in the same employment groups.
- 25 female academic staff received $3,001+ compared with 38 male academic staff.
37 female academic staff received <$1,500 compared with 17 male academic staff. It would appear that the equality issue is not related to promotion application rates by female academic staff, rather from the current staff demographic situation of high female representation in the lower employment groups. However, according to 2013 HR data, this does not fully explain the disparity between female and male salary increases. Of the 25 female academics receiving an increase in salary in the salary band $80,000-$89,000, only one received an increase of >$3001; whereas of the 18 male academics in this salary band, six received increases of >$3001.

Some comments from female respondents and interviewees include the following comments on inequality:

There is confusion about the complexity in promotions process – no clear understanding of promotions and advancement.

I would like to see gender equity in practice as well as in policy. There is continuing blindness to the ongoing smoothing of the path for male academics, and the effects of this for women. Where there are more women academics, the career door-ways are still opened much wider for some men without their having to earn their passage in the ways women do.

My last application for promotion was blocked by my COD. This was a disheartening experience, despite feedback from three Professors across the university and at other universities in NZ, viewing my application and stating that this should be approved without question.

I am surrounded by others at a higher level who have produced far fewer outputs (journal publications); likewise at other universities the number of publications I have is far in excess of what is required to achieve associate professor.

Comments from male respondents on the subject of promotions included:

I believe there is a significant discrepancy between the way men and women are treated at the university (and indeed, most universities worldwide). It appears women are promoted on concrete achievements, while men are promoted on ‘perceived potential’.

There appears to be no possibility of career progression, unless you know, and are friends with, the right people.

There is a definite sense of inequality and favouritism shown to certain staff, like more flexibility with hours and study time being granted (and very new/ less experienced staff being promoted or advancing) which tends to make someone wonder if there are other ways to advance?

2.2.4 PGS and relationship with the Chair of Department

The relationship that respondents have with their Chair of Department (CoD) is very important in the development of an academic’s career. Forty seven percent of female respondents, compared with 13% of male respondents, identified that their CoD is a barrier to their career progression. This is the case across all female academic employment groups and particularly dominant in Lecturer and Academic Other groups.
The relationship between the staff member and the CoD is important in career development because the PGS is the place for planning career development goal setting and for setting professional development intentions, and the PGS meeting is between the staff member and the CoD (or Head of School).

Our survey also asked for respondents views on the following question: *Does the PGS work for you as a mechanism to develop you and your career? If no, why.*

Across all employment groups, female and male, respondents gave a resounding ‘No’. Professors and Associate Professors describe the PGS as ‘limiting the conversation’ and the incapacity of CoDs / Deans to carry out the PGS conversation. Other comments include:

...the reality is this is not professional goal setting;

it is performance management; there is no direct relevance of PGS to career development;

it’s more about KPIs and not at all about career development;

the University seems to have no concept of a career developmental process of becoming a better and better scholar.

Senior Lecturers also refer to poor CoD capability to carry out the PGS. All groups identify that there are no resources to support change, no follow-up, no support, no opportunities and that heavy teaching workloads limit the effectiveness of goal setting.

Of 113 academic staff, only 10 provided a positive response that the PGS worked as a mechanism to develop their career.

... it puts in place an expectation and mechanism for a two-way review that includes the question of what the University can do for a staff member as well as what the staff member can do to satisfy the University;

It gives a measure of progress from year to year;

For the first year I asked what I needed to do to get ahead, and we identified the activities that I should try to participate in.

Across all employment groups and gender, there appears to be very poor understanding of the PGS purpose and process and only the above three comments that indicate any level of personal ownership of the PGS and personal responsibility for career development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Frequency of PGS for Academic staff</th>
<th>Academic staff frequency of PGS</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 yearly</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.5 Career development and timing
Surprisingly, 23% of male respondents identify that they are too busy with other commitments and will think about progressing their career at a later date, compared with just 7% of females who say they are too busy. This finding is in stark contrast with expected career development pathways in which it is typically women whose careers are interrupted by other commitments. Our data show a significant difference in male/female responses relating to career progression and other commitments.

2.3 Career development - other observations

2.3.1 Where gender is not an issue in career development
Responses to aspects related to career development (Table 8) covered by our survey returned no significant gender differences. For example, 41% of male respondents, compared with 32% of females, agree that they would like to progress their careers but do not know how to. Similar percentages of female and male respondents see that there are no opportunities for them at the University but have career goals to achieve their career aspirations. Around equal percentages of females and males have demonstrated ability to work at higher levels; however, Table 9 shows that this demonstration of ability varies considerably across employment groups ranging from 100% (Associate Professors) to 77% (Senior Lecturer L1/Research Fellow).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey statement</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have reached this stage in my career by accident rather than through planning</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know what I want in my career and have career goals</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am prepared to go to another organisation to progress my career</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am happy where I am and not interested in advancing my career</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to progress my career but don’t know how</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to progress my career but there are no opportunities for me at the University of Waikato</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have the confidence to progress my career</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what my CV needs to look like to apply for jobs at a higher level</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have demonstrated my ability and skills to work at a higher level</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Demonstration of ability and skills to work at a higher level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment group</th>
<th>% demonstrating their ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer L2/Senior Research Fellow</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer L1/Senior Research Fellow</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer /Research Fellow</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic other</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.2  Flexible working arrangements

Questions relating to flexible working conditions typically refer to the options available for child care which was typically the responsibility of the mother. Although increasingly fathers are picking up this responsibility, the responsibility for juggling work and child care traditionally lies with the mother. It is an important point for women, particularly for young mothers whose careers are effectively ‘on ice’ in the first stage of infant life; flexibility allows the parent options to stay in touch with her/his career. This factor is recognised in the State Sector Act includes that provision is made for the recognition of the employment requirements of women.

In a university setting, the notion of flexible working has also traditionally been part of academic life. The expectations for flexibility are increasing in response to online and anywhere/anytime teaching and learning. Therefore in this report flexible working conditions are considered in the broadest context because the changing nature of academic workload/life balance is increasingly an important career issue for all staff. Our survey results show that:

- 34% of female respondents currently have (or have had in the past) flexible working arrangements compared with 38% of male respondents; and
- 24% of female respondents report that they are able to carry out their work duties while on flexible working arrangements compared with 38% of males.

In response to the opportunity to comment on flexible working at the University, comments from female staff for the most part were positive. Most respondents and interviewees pointed out that academic work went beyond the basic week, and flexibility is simply part of getting the work done.

I consider flexibility to be an important condition of academic work - much of our work can be done flexibly. The demands of the job frequently impinge on family life and personal time, and flexibility is an important aspect of quid pro quo, and of ensuring ongoing goodwill.

There is a constant demand to be here and to take leave simultaneously.

I need flexibility to get everything done.

I rank the flexible working conditions as one of the most important aspects of my job.

Danger in going part time – end up doing full time work in a part time job.

More flexibility would provide better opportunities for staff with family responsibilities but the historic flexible working arrangements and multiple fractional appointments now prevent others from having flexibility.

Other concerns included the increasing workloads and expectations – for example:

With children at school, the opportunity to leave early on some days during the week and complete work off campus over school holidays is very important. I am a genuinely industrious person but I am concerned that we are becoming increasingly expected to work in our offices all the time. Much of my research also needs to take place outside the office and I would not like to see this expectation of us working in the office becoming tighter.
Flexible working can have its downfall e.g. you end up blurring the lines between home/leisure and work. So life becomes all about work.

Concerns were also raised about the maternity leave and flexibility for child care. For example

My application for flexible working was perceived as an opportunity to get rid of me (got told as such). Had to accelerate request to Dean and compromised on my request. Very stressful experience returning from maternity leave!

Responses from male respondents are mixed and include the following examples.

I think wider availability of flexible working arrangements would make childcare issues easier to manage for staff members and would be ultimately less costly to the university.

The university is a wonderful place to work when you have young children, very flexible working environment.

The flexible work here is brilliant. I actually end up doing more time than I should but I don’t mind at all because I can manage it with everything else in my life.

It’s one of the best things about working here.

This ‘luxury’ is being taken away from us. There is now an expectation of on-site presence between 8.30 - 5pm, even if the environment is not conducive for preparation/marking etc. at the time. There seems to be more emphasis on ‘being seen’ than being efficient!

In summary, observations and perceptions of flexible working arrangements vary according to line managers.

2.4 What needs to change?

2.4.1 Career boosts for academic staff

Participants in the survey were asked to provide comment on factors that would provide a boost to their career and what the University could do to assist their career development.

In response, both females and males referred repeatedly to heavy workloads and long teaching hours and the lack of resources for international conferences and technical support – all of which impact on their research capacity and achievements. It is an unfortunate truth that we exist in a tight fiscal environment where resources are not abundant. We are challenged to be more efficient and to work together; but as one respondent points out, the University needs to clarify its messages. She states what is needed is:

Promotion criteria that are in line with contemporary thinking about working in a relational way and are not focused on the notion of individual and self-interest.

Other aspects of departmental work are also highlighted as not valued and not recognised in promotion. For example:

Recognition of the Convenor role of our professional programme in order to resource it appropriately and reimburse the incumbent for their leadership skills. Thus allowing time for study leave and eventual academic and career advancement;

and,
Proper recognition of my many leadership roles and more time to undertake research in a sustained way rather than trying to fit it into the shreds of time left over from teaching and leadership/service roles. Don’t get me wrong, I do want to pursue the latter, and have chosen to do so, because I’m good at those roles and can flourish in them and make a powerful contribution to the institution and to my profession, but since my contribution isn’t fully recognised or rewarded, I need to be able to research productively as well and for that I need time.

Other respondents identify the need for professional development, mentoring and effective PGS meetings. Others talk of equality of workload and that the University should for example:

- ensure fair and equitable resourcing across faculties and departments and implement a consistent workload formula for all academic staff within each faculty. I know of some areas where staff teach 2 or 3 papers a year, while in others there are people teaching 5 or 6. Some faculty members simply have more available time to research and publish, and this inequity isn’t adequately accounted for in promotion processes.

Some male respondents would like:

- to find out what others have done and hear their success stories;
- have the opportunities to upskill technologically; and
- professional development for presentation skills, handling media and debating;

while female respondents want:

- a level playing field and
- recognition and an investigation into workloads.

In short, to provide equitable and positive career development for all staff, multiple and varied approaches are needed.

Part 3

General staff responses to the Career Assessment Survey

3.1 Respondent profile

A total of 188 general staff including 149 females, 39 males participated in the EEO Career Development Survey in 2013. This equates to about 19% of academic staff at the University of Waikato. Tables 10-13 profile the survey respondents which is a self-selected sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Respondents’ employment category and gender (number of staff members)</th>
<th>General staff</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Level 6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Respondent’s length of time working at the University of Waikato

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>+20</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Respondents’ stage in life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of life</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>% Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No dependents</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of children/child under 14</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of preschool children/child</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of teens</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer of other family members</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer of someone who is not a family member</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Respondents’ ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Maori</th>
<th>NZ European</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Main observations

Bivariate analysis of the general staff survey data identifies only four significant differences between female and male responses. These are:

i. 72% of females compared with 12% males want to be on committees (Chi-square = 4.082, P-Value = 0.043);

ii. 48% of females compared with 69% males would like to progress their career but see there are no opportunities for them at the University of Waikato (Chi-square 5.485, P-Value 0.019);

iii. Cross tabulating ‘having career goals’ against ‘reaching the stage in career by accident’ has statistical significance (Pearson Chi-Square 41.662; P-Value 0.000);

iv. There is statistical significance (Pearson Chi-Square = 7.803; P-Value = 0.050) between the frequency of PGS and individuals having career progression goals.

However, the most surprising finding is similarity between female and male responses. Table 14 provides a summary of these responses, none of which was found to be statistically significant.
Table 14: Career progression gender responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey statement</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have reached this stage in my career by accident rather than through planning</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know what I want in my career and have career goals</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am happy where I am and not interested in advancing my career</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to progress my career but don’t know how</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have tried to progress my career within the University but have not been successful</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have applied for other jobs in the University and have been successful</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have the confidence to progress my career</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have demonstrated my ability and skills to work at a higher level</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what my CV needs to look like to apply for jobs at a higher level</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, survey questions were cross-tabulated to look for similarity/differences between variables. Chi-Square results showed:

- There is no statistical significance in female/male general staff response regarding ‘reaching the stage in career by accident’ and ‘not interested in advancing careers’.
- Individual’s confidence in their abilities to progress their career is not related to their employment category (e.g. <Level 6 and Senior).
- Individuals’ interest in advancing their careers is not correlated with their stage of life.
- Success in obtaining other jobs within the University is not related to employment categories.
- There is no statistical significance between the frequency of PGS and the ability to or interest in career progression.

3.3 PGS and relationships with line managers

3.3.1 Frequency of PGS

Table 15 provides the frequency of PGS for general staff respondents. The University aims for 100% of staff to have a PGS each year. However, this is yet to be achieved; in 2013 the organisation achieved 73% and in 2014, 81%. Seventy four percent shown in Table 15 is consistent with the 2013 results. The PGS conversation between the line manager and staff member is important for career progression in terms of establishing career goals and professional development. However, it remains and unpopular mechanism for such development - as evidenced below in 3.3.2.

Table 15: Frequency of PGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General staff Frequency PGS</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every 2-3 years</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every year</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 PGS as a mechanism to develop staff and careers

Just 26 respondents (14%) felt that PGS worked for them as a mechanism to develop them and their career. Their responses included the following comments:

- it seems rather cumbersome but I have found it helpful to clarify and advance goals each year;

- yes - although financial constraints in recent years have prevented participation in workshops conferences and other courses;

- Yes and no. It provides an opportunity to state officially or in writing where one would like to progress further; or discuss what one could do to advance oneself. However, the PGS does not work if what is discussed and written as goals is not actioned or given fair consideration at higher levels than line manager.

The majority of respondents were not positive about PGS assisted in their development which is surprising given that 47% of respondents identified their line manager as the person they went to for career advice.

Unlike academic responses to this survey question where the majority of respondents perceived the ineffectiveness of PGS was due to line manager (CoD) incapability, in all but a few exceptions, general staff did not place the blame for PGS failure on their line managers. Instead for general staff the problems covered career progression, being at the top of their scales, workloads and a lack of resources. Examples of their comments follow:

- I believe in Professional goal setting, but do not believe in the sessions with your line manager as they tend to be important on the day - but then forgotten. I live my career by the goals I set myself and so reinforcement from my line manager, whilst it would be great, is not actually necessary given that it is only 1 day out of the year that they take an interest in my goals.

- Personally I think that the PGS can be helpful with setting individual (personal) goals for the year within someone’s position, but for the majority of the general staff the PGS doesn’t really work as a tool for career development. The main reason the PGS doesn’t work for me is that there are no career progression options available within my area so the only option to progress my career would be to apply for a different/higher level position in a different area of the Faculty/University.

- Not really, due to staffing changes in our department we are still responsible for a high workload with decreased staff numbers - no substantial changes in sight, so can’t see much will change with goal setting.

- My manager just goes through the motions of asking me, what would you like to do this year? I am lacking the knowledge of what there even is available to develop into, and my manager likes to lead this office with "tunnel vision", ie they seem to want individual employees to just concentrate on the tiny part they’re playing, "looking across the desk" is not encouraged, in fact I have felt constantly belittled and my achievements have not been recognised.
Everything I do in terms of development has been my private initiative, nothing to do with PGS.

Not really, because there is no encouragement from Management to progress. Too tied up with the day to day tasks.

Nope, I am at the top of my scale and there appears to be no room for further development. I probably have to go work elsewhere to progress.

I find the deadlines and volume of work of my position, which is out of my control, limits my opportunities to fulfil my goals, making goal setting rather useless.

It is a paper only exercise as there is little, if any allocated budget for professional development.

No not really the line manager is not able to assist. I am asked to think about how I want to advance my career in UOW and when I suggest a avenue it comes downs that there is not much he can do in my current position as I have reached the top of my scale. So how do I progress to a higher position if there is little opportunity as staff don’t move on in the field that I work in.

### 3.4 Professional Development

Survey results show that female general staff respondents have participated in more professional development in the past three years than their male counterparts (Figures 3 and 4). Male respondents (level six and above) are seeking more external options such as conferences/workshops and voluntary professional work and their participation in activities to improve their digital literacy is far greater than female respondents. Female respondents Level 6 and above are more actively involved in online courses, University qualifications and far outnumber male participation in General Staff Day (Figure 3) despite there being an equal percentage of females and males in this general staff level (Figure 5). It is perhaps understandable that female staff outnumber males at the Women in Leadership Day.

Also of note is that male respondents far outnumber females (Males = 28%; Females = 4%) in participation in digital literacy professional development (other than WCELfest). This is an important point for improving the capability of women academic staff given the University’s intentions for a blended approach to teaching and learning and the growing pressure for online programmes.

According to this survey there is more uptake of Professional Development by female staff than male staff who are below Level six (Figure 4). The exception is males outnumber females in the uptake of University degrees or post graduate papers (Figure 4).

The overall participation of both female and male staff who are below Level six is far lower than the participation of General staff above Level six. For example, 79% of female respondents above Level six have attended the Women in Leadership Day over the past three years compared with 53% of women below Level six. This is an important finding.
because all women staff, regardless of their employment level are encouraged to attend the Women in Leadership Day. Anecdotal evidence indicates there is a misguided perception that the Women in Leadership Day is only for women in leadership roles.
Flexible working was included in the survey because having flexibility is important, particularly for young mothers and for parents with young/dependent children and other family members. Traditionally women have taken up the caring role in families so we expected a difference between female and male uptake of flexible working arrangements. However this is not the case; there is no significant difference between females and males (Peasons Chi –Square = 0.098; P-Value = 0.755) (Table 15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey statement</th>
<th>% Females</th>
<th>% Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I currently have (or have had in the past)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexible working arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never applied for flexible working hours</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents’ comments on their experience with applying for flexible working conditions identify that staff value flexibility in their jobs. For example,

*I think the University understands the importance of providing flexible working conditions to its employees.*

*I find flexible working to be very valuable and the fact that it is so readily available when needed makes me feel very committed to the University.*

However, it is not always supported by the University. Line managers’ resistance to flexibility is given as the main barrier to flexible working. Here is what some respondents had to say:
I enjoyed flexible working at my previous job. For example if I started at 8am I could finish at 4pm. It was great as you did a full day’s work but also had time to spend with family, cook dinner, and exercise etc after work. Sometimes we give 100% to our jobs that we don’t have that work-life balance and a flexible working arrangement may assist with that. However, I have raised this option previously and was told “not university policy”. So now I still start work at 8am and don’t finish until 5pm and so each day give 30 minutes to the University for free!

I would love flexible work conditions, especially since my area does not have student contact, ie the work could be done at any time of the day really, but my (line) manager is not flexible in the slightest. Even in situations where I have asked to leave work for a few hours to attend to unexpected situations at home, and of course offered to make up the time later, my manager declined.

I have found my manager to be supportive when I need time off for appointments/other commitments although this is not necessarily mirrored by the out of hours work I do in the role.

Overworked and under resourced units are unable to provide flexibility - whether that is for education, family, medical.

Flexibility is important, not just for family reasons (the only legal requirement).

My line manager does not support flexible working hours and I must work 8.30 to 5.00pm everyday regardless of my family needs.

3.6 What needs to change

3.6.1 Career boosts for general staff

The most common thread in response to the survey question ‘What would give your career a real boost?’, concerned work being valued and acknowledged by being placed in the correct level. Many respondents felt they were working above and beyond their level but to date had been unsuccessful in their attempts to have their positions reviewed and re-assessed. Some comments follow:

The disconnection of job positions and being ‘fixed’ to a single salary scale.

The ability for our work to be recognised, to have our jobs re-evaluated - this has been stamped out by senior management and HR.

Having my position assessed and placed in line with other staff doing the same work as myself across the University.

Other ‘boosts’ identified included:
- that time constraints in the job prevented some staff from professional development opportunities;
- the lack of job opportunities for career development; and
- the lack of opportunities to experience higher level work.

3.6.2 What the University can do

Respondents were asked “How can the University assist you in your career development?” A sample of responses from general staff are as follows:

Be more open and work across Units Departments Faculties and Divisions.
Better career advice at faculty level. Faculty advisors seem to focus in on study plans to complete qualifications rather than looking at the big picture and goals of what you hope to achieve through your qualification.

It is already assisting. The rest is up to me.

Having the flexibility to offload work functions so that when we take on activities to extend ourselves, i.e. so that we are completing higher duties, the work environment is such that we actually have time to master the new duties.

Continuing to provide opportunities for formal and informal professional development
I’ve just enrolled for the PG Cert in leadership in higher education and I believe that this will be a great help. A mentorship programme with other staff at similar stages in their career and/or staff who are a few steps ahead might also be useful, but I don’t expect there to be many suitable staff members.

Reassess our jobs as they have doubled in significance but HR and SL continue to ignore this.

Actually ALLOWING people to progress up. Make funds available for this. Alleviating time pressure on staff to give them the opportunity to participate in professional development.

Change the way General Staff positions are handled. Currently pretty much ALL positions for general staff have a very narrow salary/skills band, rather than a skill based wide range.

Already is, but unfortunate that I will need to leave the University to obtain the role I want.

Part 4:

4.1 Equality for Maori and Pacific peoples contribution to the organisation

According to survey results, female respondents contribute more to University level committees than male respondents. This is an important point because it was previously thought that female staff were less likely to be involved in University committees and more likely to be involved in committee work at the local level. It is also important because, time on committees potentially subtracts from time spent on other academic activity that contributes more significantly to academic promotion.

From a cultural diversity perspective, respondents were asked how they contributed to the cultural distinctiveness of the University. Both female and male respondents comments identified their contributions included mentoring Māori and Pacific students, the application of the Treaty of Waitangi; the need to employ a diversity of staff; and support for women and the need for networks for women. As one respondent stated:

A core principle of my professional practice are the elements of manaakitanga that are critical to the relationships we build with each other as colleagues, with our students and external stakeholders. It is crucial that what we espouse is what we practice in our partnerships with schools, students postgraduate students and each other. I know through students’ emails, evaluations and colleagues’
comments that these principles, values and beliefs make a contribution to the culture of our department, faculty and externally.

Māori staff identify areas where there is inequality. Of particular note is that Māori staff members are frequently called on to provide formalities such as waiata and powhiri as part of their day to day responsibilities but this contribution is not recognised in promotions or in salary advancements. Because there are fewer Māori staff (10% of total staff), these duties fall on a few senior Māori staff. As one senior leader put it:

*It is important that Māori are not penalised because they perform an array of cultural obligations as a serious part of their job. This is not currently sufficiently recognised. It is important to how the University looks, but not easy to address. There are key people who perform these roles, general and academic staff, based on who they are and which iwi they come from, regardless of where they sit in the university ranking system.*

Interviews with senior leaders also identified that academic responsibilities such as supervision also places demands on a few. They discussed the problem of:

- **Balancing cultural obligations and academic aspects where a lot of time was imposed on a few Māori staff – e.g. high supervision loads;**
- **SMPD has fewer staff but provides staff to all university committees.**

Staff comments on this matter included:

*Equal recognition needs to be given to all forms of contribution - teaching, service and research (not the current lip service).*

The percentage of Māori and Pacific staff has remained stubbornly low over the past decade and that needs to change because, as noted by a senior leader:

*It is desirable to have a staff that reflect our students (Māori, Pacific, women). But EEO doesn’t just happen because we write good policy, it requires more than policies- it needs systems as well. We need to not focus on merit. ‘Merit’ is not a neutral word – it’s loaded with all sorts of values. We need to employ staff to renew, not just employ the same expertise/skills all the time. We need to open up new areas which it’s hard but not impossible; it just requires a commitment. Advertisements for jobs are coded in a way that puts Māori off – e.g. “international reputation”- Māori don’t think their work is international. By including Māori words it shows Māori we want them to apply.*

Position descriptions and advertisements are currently not attractive to Māori and Pacific peoples that needs to change.

## Part 5

### Senior leaders and staff views on EEO

#### 5.1 Impressions of EEO issues

Our interviews with senior leaders indicated there is a range of interpretations and understandings of EEO at the senior level. Interpretations of the meaning of EEO include:
Perceptions included that there was poor understanding of EEO by CoDs and managers. EEO issues raised include:

- Lack of career pathways.
- Women do the bottom layer academic and administration jobs.
- Lack of role models in areas where women are poorly represented.
- Women in fixed term contracts makes it difficult to plan a career.
- EEO succession planning is difficult in work areas where women are not attracted and where there is low staff turnover.
- Low numbers of Māori and Pacific peoples
- Feminising of occupations

The PBRF may have created inequality because PBRF puts the focus onto publication…

…it works better for people who won’t teach or do administration, it creates an unevenness in the picking up of tasks – it’s out of balance. It impacts on recruitment by favouring older people with ‘As’ and favours people who have research-only jobs often with little or no teaching experience. Appointing more higher level Professors for PBRF would be destructive.

It was also noted that historically the University had an active commitment to EEO but that had changed in recent years.

There is a perception that women can have different priorities than promotion and have other things they prefer to focus on which is summarised in the following comment:

Women are more interested in the teaching and a lot of women end up teaching the big first year courses. It’s important to enthuse the first year students so they come back for the second year; Women have the right skills for this.

and also noted that in (at least) one area of the University

there were high numbers of women in part time positions – which accommodates families but it also needs to accommodate the workplace otherwise it is unfair on colleagues.

5.2 EEO wish lists

Staff and senior leaders participating in interviews were asked to identify their wish list for EEO at the University of Waikato. Their responses follow.

5.2.1 Staff wish list

- Transparency with placement on salary scales.
- Review of position descriptions.
- That the University vacancies are advertised to staff in the first instance to show that staff are valued.
- That academic and general staff have a better understanding of each other’s role.
- That there be a review of salaries with ITS and the Library to ensure equal pay between males and females.
- That the University is open and transparent about opportunities.
• Opportunities should not be based on pay-scale but on the attributes and experience of the person.
• That the University vacancies are advertised to staff in the first instance to show that staff are valued.
• That there is a better culture of connection between the VC and SLT with staff.
• There is a need for an inspirational leader with high technical knowledge.
• Transparent recruitment that seeks out the best.
• That there is a culture in which people are valued.
• That there is transparency regarding promotion and advancement.
• The influence of PBRF on Māori needs to be considered.
• To grow and invest in Māori staff.

5.2.2 Senior Leaders wish list
• Put money aside to make strategic appointments.
• Changes need to be made to the way jobs are advertised and described to encourage EEO target groups to apply.
• A comprehensive infrastructure for Pacific students.
• More women, Māori and Pacific peoples in high levels.
• EEO needs to be part of the budget process.
• EEO target groups should be shortlisted for jobs.
• There is a need to improve disability and emergency evacuation.
• Workforce design is needed:
  o The University has a clear understanding of the staff profile with respect to gender, race, background, conditions of employment (e.g. part time/full time), pay gap, salaries, what jobs people are doing, how we value the roles (e.g. jobs done by women).
  o There is not equal employment across campus. Women’s jobs in some areas are not recognised and are graded lowly compared with other areas in the University. These staff are an invisible class.
  o To understand the design takes drilling down – is not just surface level, box ticking.
  o The design needs spear heading to attract women – needs to be part of the decision making.
• A more proactive approach from HR. E.g. change the HR form to include the question: Have EEO applicants been considered?
• High profile faces who will focus on EEO at the right level to influence.
Part 6 - What next?

The Career Progression Survey and interviews highlighted areas where changes can be made to assist the University to improve its EEO performance. Many are aspirational but from a practical perspective attention will be given to the following issues over 2015 to meet the focus of the EEO Programme which is to increase opportunities for women, Māori and Pacific people, particularly in senior roles and in some occupational groups. Ways forward for 2015 A revision of position descriptions and job advertisements attractive to women, Maori and Pacific peoples
  - Consideration of the issues pertaining pay equity at the University
  - Increasing leadership development opportunities for women particularly in HoS/CoD and middle management positions
  - Better understanding of PGS by line managers and staff
  - Embedding equality in organisational culture
  - The development of a set of EEO indicators
  - A review of the current EEO Programme
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Interview schedule

- Introductions and introduce the background to The University of Waikato EEO Study (Women, Maori, Pacific staff)
- Information for participants (what the process will entail)
- Ethics consent process

Questions:
1. What is your understanding of the EEO goals for the University of Waikato?
   a. Do you think line managers share the same understanding? If so, why?
   b. Do you think staff members understand what they need to do in order to be promoted? (Willingness and readiness to advance)
   c. Do the Division / Faculty communicate that excellence drives promotion?
   d. Why do you think some staff members do not apply for promotion?

2. Do you perceive any EEO issues currently being faced in your Division / Faculty? If so, what are they? Please explain …

3. What initiatives, processes or support are you currently offering within your Division / Faculty to achieve EEO goals? (Including :)
   a. Role of PGS in achieving EEO goals (Does promotion feature in PGS?)
   b. Mechanisms or opportunities for career progression (What are the issues around promotion? Is there mentoring or training available for promotion / preparation of CV?)
   c. Role of local professional development and training
   d. Role of central professional development
   e. Career support / development for people with disabilities
   f. Recruitment priorities, advertising strategies, attractiveness to EEO target groups
   g. Retention strategies for EEO target groups
   h. Flexible working arrangements / challenges of flexible working arrangements
   i. Achieving cultural distinctiveness
   j. Leadership development of EEO target groups
   k. Mentoring options in Division / Faculty and wider University

4. What is your wish-list for moving forward to achieve EEO goals? (What would give women, Maori and Pacific staff a career boost / assist in their career development?)
Appendix 2: Online Questionnaire for academic staff

1. Gender – male/female
2. Ethnicity
   a. NZ European/Pakeha
   b. Māori
   c. Pacific Peoples
   d. European
   e. Asian
   f. Other
3. What is your highest qualification? When achieved? From which organisation?
4. Job /role
   a. Professor
   b. Associate Professor
   c. Senior Lecturer Level 2 – research & teaching
   d. Senior Lecturer Level 1 – research & teaching
   e. Lecturer – research & teaching
   f. Research only
   g. Teaching only
   h. Tutor
   i. Other
5. Stage in life
   a. Parent of preschool child/children
   b. Parent of children under 14
   c. Parent of teens
   d. Carer of other family members
   e. Carer of someone who is not a member of your family
   f. No dependents
6. In your job are you
   a. Continuing Full time
   b. Continuing Part time
   c. Short term Contracted
7. How long have you been working at the University of Waikato?
8. How long have you been in tertiary education?
9. How many tertiary institutions have you worked at?
10. Do you hold a PhD? What year did you complete your PhD?
11. Do you have career progression goals?
12. Who advises you on your career development
   a. Senior academic staff
   b. Line manager
   c. Colleagues
   d. Friends
   e. University mentor
   f. External mentor
   g. Other
   h. No advisor
13. If you have an advisor, is your advisor male or female?
14. Which statements best apply to you
   a. I’m happy where I am and not interested in advancing my career
   b. I’m busy with family/other commitments and I will think about progressing my career in the future
c. I’d like to advance my career but don’t know how

d. I’d like to advance my career but there are no opportunities at UoW

e. I have tried to progress my career but have not succeeded

f. I am actively working on progressing my career

g. None of these

h. Other

15. Have you applied for promotion (rather than advancement) at the University of Waikato?
   a. yes
   b. no

16. Have you found barriers to applying for promotion such as
   a. Poor support from your line manager
   b. Uncertainty about the process
   c. Others advising you not to bother
   d. Uncertainty about your promotion options
   e. Uncertainty about what is required for promotion
   f. Lacking the confidence to apply
   g. A perception that you won’t be successful
   h. Other reasons

17. Do you feel you have demonstrated that you can step up to a higher level job by showing the leadership required by a higher level position?

18. Do you know what skills you will need to be successful at the next level?

19. Do you know what your CV needs to contain to be successful in an application for promotion?

20. Have you taken advice on applying for a promotion

21. Does PGS (professional goal setting) work for you as a mechanism to developing you and your career?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. If no, describe why not

22. How do you rate your understanding of how PGS can assist you to succeed in your career development?
   a. Very good
   b. Good
   c. Poor

23. Do you feel your line manager understands the role of PGS in helping to develop your capabilities?

24. What is the frequency that you have a PGS with your line manager
   a. Every year
   b. Every 2 or 3 years
   c. Rarely
   d. Never

25. What professional development have you had in the past three years?
   a. University PD courses
   b. Induction
   c. University degree or post-grad papers
   d. Conferences/workshops
   e. Online courses
   f. External courses
   g. General staff day
   h. Women in Leadership day
   i. Kingitanga day
   j. Mentoring /coaching
26. What professional development would you like over the next year?
27. What would give your career a real boost?
28. Overall, is this a positive workplace with respect of career opportunities for you?
29. How can the University further assist you in your career development?
30. Have you ever applied for flexible working arrangements?
31. During the flexible working arrangement, were you able to fulfil your job responsibilities
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. N/A
32. Do you have any comments you would like to make about your experiences relating to flexible working?
33. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your perceptions or experiences of career progression at the University of Waikato?
34. Do you contribute to the cultural distinctiveness of the University?
   a. Frequently
   b. Often
   c. Occasionally
   d. Rarely
   e. Never
35. If yes, what is the nature of that contribution?
36. If yes, does the University recognise you for your contribution?
37. How?
38. 

**Appendix 3: Online questionnaire – General staff**

1. Gender – male/female
2. Ethnicity
   a. NZ Pakeha /European
   b. Māori
   c. Pacific Peoples
   d. European
   e. Asian
   f. Other
3. What is your highest qualification? When achieved? From which organisation?
4. Job /role
   a. General Staff Senior (Level 6 and above)
   b. General Staff
5. Stage in life
   a. Parent of preschool child/children
   b. Parent of children under 14
   c. Parent of teens
   d. Carer of other family members
   e. Carer of someone who is not a member of your family
   f. No dependents
6. In your job are you
   a. Continuing Full time
b. Continuing Part time
   c. Contracted fixed term

7. How long have you been at the University of Waikato?
8. Do you have career progression goals?
9. Who do you go to for career support and advice?
   a. Senior academic staff
   b. Line manager
   c. Colleagues
   d. Friends
   e. University mentor
   f. External mentor
   g. No advisor/support
   h. Other
10. If you have an advisor, is your advisor male or female?
11. Have you applied for another job at a higher level at the University of Waikato?
12. Have you found barriers to career development such as
   a. Poor support from your line manager
   b. Uncertainty about the process
   c. Others advising you not to bother
   d. Uncertainty about your options
   e. Lacking the confidence to apply
   f. A perception that you won’t be successful
   g. Other reasons
13. What statements best apply to you
   a. I’m happy where I am and not interested in advancing my career
   b. I’m busy with family/other commitments and I will think about progressing my
      career in the future
   c. I’d like to progress my career but don’t know how
   d. I’d like to progress my career but there are no opportunities at UoW
   e. I have tried to progress my career but have not been successful
   f. I am actively working on advancing my career
   g. None of these
   h. Other
14. Do you feel you have demonstrated that you can step up to a higher level job?
15. Do you know what skills you will need to be successful at the next level?
16. Do you know what your CV needs to look like to apply higher level jobs?
17. Does PGS (professional goal setting) work for you as a mechanism to develop you and your
    career?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. If no, describe why not
18. What is the frequency that you have a PGS with your line manager?
   a. Every year
   b. Every 2 or 3 years
   c. Rarely
   d. Never
19. Do you feel your line manager understands the role of PGS in helping to develop your
    capabilities?
20. How do you rate your understanding of how PGS can assist you to succeed in your career
    development?
   a. Very good
21. What professional development have you had in the past three years?
   a. University PD courses
   b. Induction
   c. University degree or post-grad papers
   d. Conferences/workshops
   e. Online courses
   f. External courses
   g. General staff day
   h. Women in Leadership day
   i. Kingitanga day
   j. Mentoring/coaching
   k. Other

22. What professional development would you like over the next year?

23. What would give your career a real boost?

24. How can the University further assist you in your career development?

25. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your perceptions or experiences of career progression at the University of Waikato?

26. Have you ever applied for flexible working arrangements?

27. During the flexible working arrangement, were you able to fulfil your job responsibilities?
   a. Yes
   b. No

28. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about your experiences relating to flexible working?

29. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your perceptions or experiences of career progression at the University of Waikato?

30. Do you contribute to the cultural distinctiveness of the University?
   f. Frequently
   g. Often
   h. Occasionally
   i. Rarely
   j. Never

31. If yes, what is the nature of that contribution?

32. If yes, does the University recognise you for your contribution?

33. How?