

**DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE
CANADA**

ADM (HUMAN RESOURCES – MILITARY)

**DIRECTOR MILITARY GENDER INTEGRATION AND
EMPLOYMENT EQUITY
&
DIRECTOR STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCES**

D STRAT HR RESEARCH NOTE RN 09/02

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE 2002 EMPLOYMENT EQUITY AND
ADVISORY GROUP WORKSHOP EVALUATION AND
FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE**

by

N. J. HOLDEN

NOVEMBER 2002

OTTAWA, CANADA



**National
Defence**

**Défense
nationale**

OPERATIONAL RESEARCH DIVISION

CATEGORIES OF PUBLICATION

ORD Reports are the most authoritative and most carefully considered publications of the DGOR scientific community. They normally embody the results of major research activities or are significant works of lasting value or provide a comprehensive view on major defence research initiatives. ORD Reports are approved personally by DGOR, and are subject to peer review.

ORD Project Reports record the analysis and results of studies conducted for specific sponsors. This Category is the main vehicle to report completed research to the sponsors and may also describe a significant milestone in ongoing work. They are approved by DGOR and are subject to peer review. They are released initially to sponsors and may, with sponsor approval, be released to other agencies having an interest in the material.

Directorate Research Notes are issued by directorates. They are intended to outline, develop or document proposals, ideas, analysis or models which do not warrant more formal publication. They may record development work done in support of sponsored projects which could be applied elsewhere in the future. As such they help serve as the corporate scientific memory of the directorates.

ORD Journal Reprints provide readily available copies of articles published with DGOR approval, by OR researchers in learned journals, open technical publications, proceedings, etc.

ORD Contractor Reports document research done under contract of DGOR agencies by industrial concerns, universities, consultants, other government departments or agencies, etc. The scientific content is the responsibility of the originator but has been reviewed by the scientific authority for the contract and approved for release by DGOR.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

CANADA

DIRECTOR MILITARY GENDER INTEGRATION AND
EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

&

DIRECTOR STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCES

D STRAT HR RESEARCH NOTE RN 09/02

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE 2002 EMPLOYMENT EQUITY AND
ADVISORY GROUP WORKSHOP EVALUATION AND
FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE**

By:

N. J. Holden

Recommended by: *Debra Amner*
SSORT Team
Leader

Recommended by: *V. Aparicio, Lead*
for Director, Military
Gender Integration &
Employment Equity

Approved by: *S. Trusott*
Director, Strategic Human
Resources

The contents are the responsibility of the issuing authority and
publication by the author does not necessarily reflect the official
position of the Department of National Defence

OTTAWA, CANADA

NOVEMBER 2002

Abstract

The Director Military Gender Integration and Employment Equity (DMGIEE) and the Director of Civilian Human Resources, Policy and Organizational Support (DCHRPOS) held the Annual Employment Equity (EE) and Advisory Group (AG) Workshop in September 2002. The focus of the workshop was on recent developments in EE for the Canadian Forces (CF) and the Department of National Defence (DND), including policies and programs. Overall, the workshop was a success, according to an analysis of the Evaluation and Feedback Questionnaire completed by 71% of the delegates. Delegates were more than satisfied with the logistics for the workshop. In general, all of the sessions presented over the three days were rated highly, with the Diversity Training and the “Blue Eyes” Video sessions being rated the highest. In the future, the majority of delegates would like to see an EE workshop held once a year, for at least 3 days, in rotating locations across Canada, in either the spring or fall

Résumé

La Direction - Intégration des genres et équité en matière d'emploi (militaires) (DIGEEM) et la Direction – Planification des ressources humaines civiles et appui organisationnel (DPRHCAO) a présenté un atelier sur l'équité en matière d'emploi (EE) et les groupes consultatifs (GC) en septembre 2002. Le focus de l'atelier portait sur les récents développements en matière d'équité pour les Forces canadiennes (FC) et le Département de la Défense nationale (DDN), incluant les politiques et les programmes. Globalement, si on se fie à une analyse des résultats du questionnaire d'évaluation et de rétroaction rempli par 71 % des participants, l'atelier a été un succès. Les participants ont été extrêmement satisfaits de tous les aspects de l'atelier liés à la logistique. En général, toutes les séances tenues au cours de ces trois jours ont reçu des notes élevées, la formation sur la diversité et la vidéo « Blue Eyes » recevant les meilleures notes. La majorité des participants aimeraient qu'il y ait un atelier sur l'EE à chaque année, d'une durée de trois jours et se déroulant en alternance partout au Canada, au printemps ou à l'automne.

Table Of Contents

Abstract/Résumé	i
Table of Contents	ii
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Aim	1
3.0 Methodology	1
4.0 Results	2
4.1 Delegate Information	2
4.2 Workshop Organization	2
4.3 Workshop Content	2
4.4 Future Employment Equity and Advisory Group Workshops	4
4.5 Comparison to the 2001 EE and AG Workshop	5
5.0 Summary and Recommendations	6
5.1 Summary	6
5.2 Recommendations	6
Reference	7
Annex A - The Questionnaire	A-1

AN ANALYSIS OF THE 2002 EMPLOYMENT EQUITY AND ADVISORY GROUP WORKSHOP EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

1.0 Introduction

1. The Director Military Gender Integration and Employment Equity (DMGIEE) and the Director Civilian Human Resources, Policy and Organizational Support (DCHRPOS) held the Annual Employment Equity (EE) and Advisory Group (AG) Workshop in Ottawa, Ontario, from 18 to 20 September 2002. The focus of the workshop was on recent developments in EE for the Canadian Forces (CF) and the Department of National Defence (DND), including policies and programs. One full day was dedicated to AGs to hold workshops and discuss issues, while the remaining two days were devoted to plenary sessions. The workshop was intended primarily for EE or Diversity Co-ordinators within the CF and DND, as well as local and national AG membership. Several civilian Human Resource Business Managers (HRBMs) were also in attendance.

2.0 Aim

2. The aim of this paper is to summarize the Evaluation and Feedback Questionnaire completed by delegates at the 2002 EE and AG Workshop and provide a comparison to the results of the 2001 EE and AG Workshop Evaluation and Feedback Questionnaire.

3.0 Methodology

3. A questionnaire was handed out to all participants to obtain their feedback on the last day of the EE and AG Workshop. Approximately 120 delegates attended the workshop. A total of 85 delegates completed the questionnaire for a response rate of 71%. The questionnaire was divided into four sections: Delegate Information, Workshop Organization, Workshop Content and Future EE and AG Workshops. A combination of closed and open-ended questions were asked in each section to obtain both quantitative and qualitative data. A copy of the Evaluation and Feedback Questionnaire can be found in Annex A. The questionnaire provided at the 2002 Workshop was the identical to the questionnaire provided in 2001, with the exception of the titles of the individual workshops, to allow for comparison.

4.0 Results

4.1 Delegate Information

4. When asked the question of how the delegates found out about the EE and AG Workshop, approximately 36% said through an AG, 29% said it was through the chain of command, and 15% through email or a friend. The role in which the delegates were participating during this workshop varied: roughly 45% were AG members, 22% were EE Staff Officers, 15% were HRBMs and 8% were potential AG members. Reasons for attendance were: 48% stated they work in the EE area; 15% were curious; and 14% attended because they were interested in starting an AG. Fourteen percent (14%) reported “other” reasons for attending. Examples of the qualitative responses to the “other” category include “AG co-chair”, “education”, and “to learn about current EE and Advisory Groups”. Only 7% of delegates were directed to attend.

4.2 Workshop Organization

5. Questions within this section were designed to assess the logistics, accommodations, meals and length of the Workshop, as well as general comments on the overall organization. Results in the section were very positive. More than half of the delegates (55%) were more than satisfied, i.e. either very satisfied or extremely satisfied, with the joining instructions and 73% of people were more than satisfied with the information package. 70% of the delegates were more than satisfied with the choice of the Southway Inn as the location for the Workshop. The meals provided by the Southway Inn were rated highly with approximately 84% of people extremely satisfied. Almost 75% were more than satisfied with the length of the Workshop. General comments were very positive. One delegate stated, “Very informative and well organized workshop!”. Suggestions for the next workshop included ensuring the hotel is fully accessible (i.e., washrooms, ramps, automatic doors, etc), having simultaneous French translation available, and providing the delegates a workshop package upon check-in as was done at the 2001 Workshop.

4.3 Workshop Content

6. The first day of the EE and AG Workshop was set aside for the AGs to hold workshops and discuss issues pertaining to their group. The evaluation form asked participants which session they attended. Results show that 21% attended the Defence Advisory Group for Persons with Disabilities (DAGPWD), 19% attended the Defence Aboriginal Advisory Group (DAAG), 13% attended the Defence Women’s Advisory Organization (DWAO) and 21% attended the Defence Visible Minority Advisory Group (DVMAG). Approximately 24% attended more than

one of these workshops. When the participants were asked what they found the most beneficial about the AG workshops, the majority of people stated the opportunity to network. Many also stated it was beneficial to hear personal experiences and the specific issues affecting AG members. Participants who attended the DWAO workshop found the presentation by Lorraine Dyke from Carleton University and Doug Burke from General Motors very informative and useful. Participants from the DVMAG found the facilitation by Carl Taylor very effective at pulling information out of all participants. Suggestions for future EE workshops included making the AG session more than one day and providing more education rather than formal AG meetings.

7. Delegates were also provided with the opportunity to rate each session on the second and third day of the Workshop. Table I provides the mean satisfaction for each presentation/session. The “Blues Eyes” video and Diversity Training sessions were rated the highest, with a mean satisfaction of 4.25 and 4.22 respectively. Overall, all sessions were rated above average by delegates.

TABLE I: SATISFACTION WITH WORKSHOP CONTENT

	Mean Satisfaction
DAY 2	
DND Civilian Overview	3.44
CF Self-Id Census and Workforce Analysis	3.62
Employment Systems Review (Mil & Civ)	3.36
CF EE plan	3.52
Workplace Accommodation	3.76
Inclusive Meetings	3.79
“Blue Eyes”	4.25
Guest Speaker – Phil Fontaine	4.07
DAY 3	
Diversity Training	4.22
Panel Discussion	3.66

Ratings = 1 - Not at all satisfied, 2 - Somewhat satisfied, 3 - Satisfied, 4 - Very satisfied, 5 - Extremely satisfied

8. When delegates were asked to consider the whole workshop and what sessions were the most useful, the majority of delegates reported the full day of AG workshops the most useful. One delegate who attended the DAGPWD said it “assisted me in understanding issues and how to deal with them”. Another delegate who attended the DVMAG session said it was “excellent networking and start [to] a national baseline!!” Delegates also found the Diversity Training and the “Blue Eyes” video useful. As one delegate stated with regards to the Diversity Training: “I am probably as guilty as most of seeing others through my ‘Canadian Eyes’”. Comments about the “Blue Eyes” video were also very positive. One delegate stated “The “Blue Eyes” video was very powerful. It generated a great deal of emotion and diverse conversation”.

9. When delegates were asked which session was the least useful, the majority had no comments or stated that all sessions were useful. There was some frustration with a few of the sessions of Day Two. Some of the delegates were dissatisfied with the presentations on the CF Self-Id Census and Workforce Analysis, Employment Systems Review (ESR) and Workplace Accommodation. With regards to the CF Self-Id Census and Workforce Analysis, some found the presentation too technical. It was felt by some that the presentation on the ESR was not detailed enough with specifics and timings of the project. Concerns about the workplace accommodation session were in relation to the presentation style.

10. Delegates were also asked whether or not their expectations for the workshop were met. The majority of responses were “yes” and many said it exceeded their expectations. There were a few people, however, who were a little disappointed not to have received more specific information on how to set up local AGs. When rating the overall workshop, 78% of delegates were more than satisfied with the workshop.

4.4 Future Employment Equity and Advisory Group Workshops

11. When asked if they would recommend future workshops to Human Resource (HR) staff and Operational/Non HR staff (eg. Unit CO), 92% and 79% of delegates respectively said yes. One delegate stated HR staff should attend because “education at ALL levels is the key...most definitely it needs to come from all levels and the support must start at the top”. It was felt that Op/Non HR staff should attend because “we have to get the CO’s and Unit CWO’s educated!”.

12. When asked about the future frequency of EE workshops, the majority of delegates (72%) said “once a year”. Approximately 58% of delegates reported three days as the ideal length of future workshops, with 24% reporting two days and 13% reporting four days as the ideal length. Suggestions for locations of future workshops included Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, Ottawa,

Halifax and Winnipeg. Delegates would like to see the workshops rotated to different parts of Canada. Some would also like to see these workshops take place on the Bases/Wings across Canada. There were two views about the best timing for the meeting. One was to hold the workshops in the fall, just after the active posting season (APS), so anyone new coming into the area of EE would be able to “get up-to-speed” on the issues. The other was to have it in April or May at the beginning of the fiscal year.

4.5 Comparison to the 2001 EE and AG Workshop¹

13. Attendance at the 2002 EE and AG workshop increased significantly from the previous year. In 2001 there were only 69 delegates, whereas in 2002 there were approximately 120 delegates. The main source of information about the workshop in 2001 was through the chain of command, but in 2002 it was through the AGs. There was also an increase in the number of delegates who were AG members in 2002 (31% in 2001 and 45% in 2002).

14. The overall satisfaction rating of the workshop declined from last year. In 2001 approximately 90% of people were more than satisfied, whereas 78% were more than satisfied in 2002. With regards to the workshop organization, results show that the satisfaction level decreased in 2002. The percentages of delegates more than satisfied with the joining instructions declined (84% in 2001 and 55% in 2002), as did the satisfaction level with the delegate package (92% in 2001 and 73% in 2002) and the hotel (98% in 2001 and 70% in 2002). Satisfaction with the length of the workshop was fairly consistent over the two years (79% in 2001 and 74% in 2002).

15. Comparison of the workshop content is difficult since it was very different each year. However, delegates found the Diversity Training and video portions of the workshops each year to be very useful. During the 2001 workshop, feedback from the AGs discussion sessions was that they were a little disorganized, but in 2002 the majority of delegates stated that the AG day was the most useful.

16. Delegates from both years agree that both HR staff and Non-HR staff should attend future workshops. There was an increased endorsement for annual workshops (65% in 2001 and 72% in 2002) and for the workshop length to be at least 3 days (47% in 2001 and 58% in 2002). There was also agreement that in future, the workshops should be held in different locations across Canada (i.e, Halifax, Vancouver, Ottawa, etc.).

¹ See Holden, N.J., “An Analysis of the 2001 Employment Equity and Advisory Group Workshop Evaluation and Feedback Questionnaire.” DSHRC Research Note RN 04/01, August 2001.

5.0 Summary and Recommendations

5.1 Summary

17. Overall, the 2002 EE and AG Workshop held in Ottawa was a success according to the Evaluation and Feedback Questionnaire completed by 71% of the delegates. However, the overall level of satisfaction was lower than last year. The majority of delegates were more than satisfied with the logistics for the workshop. All the sessions presented over the three days were also rated highly, with the Diversity Training and the “Blue Eyes” Video sessions being rated the highest. The majority of delegates found the one-day AG workshops to be the most useful session.

18. The decline in the overall level of satisfaction can be attributed to less satisfaction with the workshop organization. Delegates still agree that an EE workshop should be held at least once a year for three days, with the Workshop being held in different locations across Canada in either the Spring or Fall.

5.2 Recommendations

19. It is recommended that DMGIEE and DCHRPOS conduct another three-day EE and AG Workshop in September 2003. It is also recommended that the annual EE and AG Workshop alternate locations between Ottawa and a different Canadian city and/or base every other year.

Reference

Holden, N.J., *An Analysis of the 2001 Employment Equity and Advisory Group Workshop Evaluation and Feedback Questionnaire*. DSHRC Research Note RN 04/01, August 2001.

Annex A – The Questionnaire

2002 Employment Equity and Advisory Groups Workshop Evaluation and Feedback Questionnaire

Please complete the following sections. If more space is required please use the back of the form. Where a numerical rating between 1 and 5 is requested, please use the following scale:

- 1 Not at all satisfied/did not meet my expectations/not useful to me
- 2 Somewhat satisfied/met some of my expectations/somewhat useful to me
- 3 Satisfied/met my expectations/useful to me
- 4 Very satisfied/somewhat exceeded my expectations/very useful to me
- 5 Extremely satisfied/exceeded my expectations/extremely useful to me

Delegate Information

How did you learn about this workshop:

Chain of command _____ Friend/Fellow worker _____ Advisory Group _____
Direct Fax _____ e-mail _____ Other (please specify) _____

In what role did you participate in this workshop:

EE Staff Officer _____ HRBM _____ Advisory Group Member _____
Potential Advisory Group member _____ Other (please specify) _____

Why did you attend this workshop?

Directed to Attend _____ Interested in Starting an Advisory Group _____
Work in EE Area _____ Curious/Investigational _____
Other (please specify) _____

What were your expectations for this workshop?

Workshop Organization

How did you find the (please feel free to provide comments/suggestions – if you need more space please use other side of the sheet):

Joining Instructions	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Delegate Information Package	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Accommodation	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Meals	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Length of Workshop	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Other (please specify)	1	2	3	4	5	_____

General Comments:

Workshop Content

Please rate the following workshop sessions (again, please feel free to provide comments/suggestions – if you need more space please use the other side of the sheet):

Day One – September 18th

Which Workshop did you attend? (Please check all that you attended if more than one)

- Defence Advisory Group for Persons with Disabilities _____
- Defence Aboriginal Advisory Group _____
- Defence Women’s Advisory Organization _____
- Defence Visible Minority Advisory Group _____

What did you find of most benefit/interest?

What was of least benefit/interest?

Suggestions for future Advisory Group workshops:

Day Two – September 19th

DND Civilian Overview	1	2	3	4	5	_____
CF Self-Id Census and Workforce Analysis	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Employment System Review (Mil & Civ)	1	2	3	4	5	_____
CF EE Plan	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Workplace Accommodation	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Inclusive Meetings	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Video - “Blue Eyes”	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Guest Speaker – Mr. Phil Fontaine	1	2	3	4	5	_____

Day Three – September 20th

Diversity Training	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Panel Discussion	1	2	3	4	5	_____

Considering the whole workshop:

What did you find to be the most useful session and why?

What did you find to be the least useful session and why?

Were your expectations for this workshop met, and if not, why not?

Please provide an overall rating of this workshop 1 2 3 4 5

Future Employment Equity and Advisory Group Workshops

Would you recommend attending future workshops to:

HR Staff Yes _____ No _____ Please explain _____

Op/Non HR Staff (e.g. Unit CO) Yes _____ No _____

Please explain _____

How frequently do you think we should hold future workshops:

More frequently than once a year _____ Once a year _____ Every Two years _____

Other (please specify) _____

What would you consider to be the ideal length of a future workshop:

One day _____ Two days _____ Three days _____ Four days _____

Other (please specify) _____

What location(s) would you suggest for future workshops

What time of year would you recommend for holding future workshops and why

UNCLASSIFIED

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA		
(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)		
1 ORIGINATOR (the name and address of the organization preparing the document Organizations for whom the document was prepared e.g Establishment Sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, are entered in Section 8)	2 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (overall security classification of the document, including special warning terms if applicable)	
DIRECTOR STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCE, ADM(HR-Mil), NATIONAL DEFENCE HQ, OTTAWA, CANADA, K1A 0K2	Unclassified	
3. TITLE (the complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification should be indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S, C or U) in parentheses after the title)		
AN ANALYSIS OF THE 2002 EMPLOYMENT EQUITY AND ADVISORY GROUP WORKSHOP EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE (U)		
4 AUTHORS (last name, first name, middle initial)		
Holden, N. J.		
5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (month Year of Publication of document)	6a NO OF PAGES (total containing information Include Annexes, Appendices, etc.)	6b NO OF REFS (total cited in document)
November 2002	10	1
7 DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (the category of document, e.g technical report, technical note or memorandum If appropriate, enter the type of report e.g interim, progress, summary, annual or final Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered)		
Research Note		
8 SPONSORING ACTIVITY (the name of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development Include the address)		
ADM (HR-Mil)		
9a PROJECT OR GRANT NO (if appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written Please specify whether project or grant)	9b CONTRACT NO (if appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written)	
NIL	NIL	
10a ORIGINATOR's document number (the official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity This number must be unique to this document)	10b OTHER DOCUMENT NOS (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor)	
D STRAT HR RESEARCH NOTE RN 09/02		
11 DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY (any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlimited distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to defence departments and defence contractors further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to defence departments and Canadian defence contractors, further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to government departments and agencies, further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to defence departments; further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)		
12 DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT (any limitation to the bibliographic announcement of this document This will normally correspond to the Document Availability (11) However, where further distribution (beyond the audience specified in 11) is possible, a wider announcement audience may be selected)		

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF FORM

13 ABSTRACT (a brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both official languages unless the text is bilingual)

The Director Military Gender Integration and Employment Equity (DMGIEE) and the Director Civilian Human Resources, Policy and Organizational Support (DCHRPOS) the Annual Employment Equity (EE) and Advisory Group (AG) Workshop in September 2002. The focus of the workshop was on recent developments in EE for the Canadian Forces (CF) and the Department of National Defence (DND), including policies and programs. Overall, the workshop was a success, according to an analysis of the Evaluation and Feedback Questionnaire completed by 71% of the delegates. Delegates were more than satisfied with the logistics for the workshop. In general, all of the sessions presented over the three days were rated highly, with the Diversity Training and the "Blue Eyes" Video sessions being rated the highest. In the future, the majority of delegates would like to see an EE workshop held once a year, for at least 3 days, in rotating locations across Canada, in either the Spring or Fall.

14 KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS (technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus, e.g. Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus-identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

Advisory Groups
CF Employment Equity Plan
CF Self-Id Census
CF Workforce Analysis
Diversity Training
Employment Equity
Employment Systems Review
Inclusive Meetings
Workplace Accommodation

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF FORM

Canada^{ca}

51 8715

CA021971