

Executive Summary

Inquiry into Positive Organizational Development: Understanding Human Resources (UBC) Approach and Contributions to Social Sustainability at UBC

MAY 2016

INTRODUCTION AND GOALS

In this project, we have aimed to understand further how UBC's Human Resources department has utilized positive psychology, strengths-based inquiry, and Appreciative Inquiry into four of its leadership programs aimed at UBC faculty and staff: Academic Leadership Development Program (ALDP), Appreciative Leadership Program, Managing@UBC, and Community Leadership Program (CLP). ALDP is a cohort-based leadership development program offered each year to new Department Heads, Program Directors, Associate Deans, and other academic leaders at UBC. The Appreciative Leadership Program is a personal development leadership program. Managing@UBC is a leadership program for new managers, and among several objectives is designed to support the manager in their first year in the job. The Community Leadership Program was primarily designed for emerging leaders.

We wanted to identify how the asset-based elements (e.g. Appreciative Inquiry, strengths, strengths-based thinking) that are embedded in these leadership development programs, which UBC HR has offered over the last decade, have played out. Our primary focus was to understand what people's experiences have been in these leadership development programs, and to see whether or not they reflect the work of Dr. David Cooperrider, who pioneered "*the three circles of the strengths revolution*" framework (3), which supports strengths-based organizational innovation approach. It is also called the *IPOD (innovation-inspired positive organization development) Approach* (Cooperrider and Godwin 737), consisting of three "circles": *elevate, magnify, refract*.

Cooperrider's three circles of the strengths revolution framework approach stems from the Positive Psychology field of scholarship; he defines it as "the positive psychology of human strengths." (3) He has created a "framework for a strengths-based leadership system" (3) that is the basis for this study. This system has three "circles" or elements that branch out from one another: elevation ("the elevation of strengths"), magnification ("become a multiplier of strengths, from elevation to configurations") and refract ("harnessing the higher strengths of institutions as agents of change in society") (Cooperrider 3). In this study, we aimed to understand how the experiences of the participants of the four aforementioned programs relate to the three circles of the strengths revolution or IPOD approach – more specifically, how they relate to the three circles of *elevate, magnify, and refract*.

METHODOLOGY

This project took the format of a mixed method study that ran over four months (January to April 2016). The research team included the Sustainability Scholar and members of the Workplace Learning and Engagement Team.

The first part of the study involved doing a survey. The survey questions were designed by the research team, and underwent a test run involving ten employees of the Human Resources Department. The

survey questionnaire, which had a total of 36 questions, was divided into four parts: the questions on the first three sections revolved on the ideas of *elevate*, *magnify*, and *refract*, respectively. The final section asked participants about their demographics.

Participants of the Community Leadership Program (CLP), Managing@UBC, Appreciative Leadership Program, and Academic Leadership Development Program (ALDP) who completed their program between the years 2011 and 2015 (inclusive) were invited to take part in the online survey. It was deemed important to choose participants who had recently joined the program as well as participants who had completed the program a while ago in order to have a balance of participants whose experiences were still fresh, as well as those who have had the time to put into practice what they had learned from the program – in order to determine the longevity of the program’s impact, if any. It was determined that five years would be a suitable timeframe.

The second part of the study involved selecting some of these participants randomly¹ for one-on-one interviews, as well as focus groups. No Academic Leadership Program participants were invited to a focus group as we had anticipated difficulty in scheduling their time. The interviews lasted between 10 to 32 minutes, and the focus groups lasted 45 minutes each. The majority of the interview and focus group participants were asked three questions from the set². When appropriate to the discussion, follow up questions were asked, which came from within and outside the question set.

The quantitative analysis was done with the help of the Workforce Analyst, and the qualitative analysis involved the use of the software *NVivo 11*. Due to the lack of time, only one focus group (CLP) and three interviews (ALDP, Appreciative Leadership, Managing@UBC) were transcribed and analyzed through coding, performed by the Sustainability Scholar and the Workplace Learning and Engagement Workforce Analyst. In addition, this study was considered to be a pilot study to explore the primary steps in qualitative analysis, in preparation for a more rigorous qualitative study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Quantitative analysis

The following table summarizes the number of participants for the survey:

Program	Participants initially invited	Participants eligible ³	Respondents	Response rate
Academic Leadership Program	51	51	13	25.5%
Appreciative Leadership Program	27	25	15	60.0%
Community Leadership Program	50	34	11	32.4%
Managing@UBC	163	131	38	29.0%
<i>Total</i>	291	241	77	32.0%

¹ Participants were assigned numbers consecutively, and numbers from this set were randomly selected using the random number function on Microsoft Excel.

² See Appendix C.

³ This refers to participants who are employed by UBC, as well as those who are not on maternity leave, at the time.

One can see that there was a high response rate from participants of the Appreciative Leadership Program, despite being the program with the least number of participants eligible to join the survey. Similarly, Managing@UBC—despite having the highest number of participants eligible, had the second to the lowest response rate. One of the many reasons that could account for this would be the participants’ engagement with the program and how much value it had for them at this point in their lives and careers, the overall time they had available to complete their professional tasks as well as engage in the survey, and how much time had elapsed since they had finished the program. Because the programs were different in their formats and design, participants had different kinds of exposure to strengths-based work and appreciative inquiry, as well as different hours of commitment with the programs - ranging from several hours to three full days. As such, this may have affected their level of engagement with the program and after they have finished them. *One step that could be taken further in this study is to investigate whether or not there are elements within the Appreciative Leadership Program that make it especially interesting for participants even if they have already finished the program. Likewise, it is suggested that Managing@UBC be investigated to see what aspects of the program led to a lower response rate.*

We had taken the number of participants who had a positive response to the questions in each part. “Agree” and “Strongly Agree” represent these positive responses, and we claim that by selecting “Agree” and “Strongly Agree,” the participants are telling us that they have been positively impacted by the program. Because each question points to one of the three primary elements of the IPOD approach, we are confident that we are able to interpret the impact on the participants through this lens. Each number was then compared to the overall number of participants, and to the number of respondents within each program. The following table summarizes these numbers:

Leadership Program	Number of Responses	% of Total Respondents (Agree/Strongly Agree)				Total	% of Responses within each Leadership Program (Agree/Strongly Agree)			
		Part I: Elevate	Part II: Magnify	Part III: Refract	Total		Part I: Elevate	Part II: Magnify	Part III: Refract	Total
Academic Leadership Development Program	13	11.8%	8.7%	8.8%	9.7%	70.0%	51.3%	51.9%	57.7%	
Appreciative Leadership Program	15	16.1%	11.1%	12.3%	13.2%	83.3%	57.0%	63.3%	67.9%	
Community Leadership Program (CLP)	11	11.2%	6.1%	9.3%	8.8%	78.2%	42.4%	64.8%	61.8%	
Managing@UBC	38	42.7%	32.5%	26.5%	33.9%	86.6%	65.8%	53.6%	68.7%	
Grand Total	77	81.8%	58.3%	56.8%	65.6%	81.8%	58.3%	56.8%	65.6%	

This table can be interpreted in two different ways. The first one would be to compare the number of “Agree” and “Strongly Agree” responses per program against the overall number of participants. This would mean that Managing@UBC has the largest number of participants who have been positively impacted by the program, and ALDP the least. However, one could interpret that this is merely a reflection of how many participants there per program are vis-à-vis the total number of participants.

As such, what would be a more effective comparison is to look at how many positive responses there are between the participants within each program. This would then provide a much more accurate representation of how many participants have been positively impacted. From the data above, one can see that the highest group of participants who have been positively impacted by the program would be Managing@UBC, closely followed by the Appreciative Leadership Program. This is an interesting note as Managing@UBC has the lowest number of response rate, yet its participants have the highest rate of having been positively impacted by the program.

From the table above, one can also note that a grand total of 65.6 percent have responded “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to all questions. This would mean, then, that majority of the participants have been positively impacted by the program across all three dimensions of elevate, magnify, and refract.

The following table breaks down the question in each section, and shows us the total number of participants who have responded “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to each question. One could first look at the overall percentage of participants who were positively impacted per section. Again, each section represents each circle of the IPOD approach—part I being elevate, part II magnify, and part III refract. As we have inferred, part I (elevate) has the highest number of participants who responded “Agree” or “Strongly Agree,” at 81.8%. As such, we infer from this that the participants were able to positively experience the elements of the *elevate* aspect in their involvement with the leadership program. Among the questions within this part that had the highest response rates were:

- Having some exposure to strengths and an appreciative inquiry approach in the program enabled me to... Become aware of the positive aspects of my leadership style (92.2%)*
- Become more aware of my strengths (89.6%)*
- Understand how my strengths contribute to my leadership style (89.6%)*

While the positive responses in this section remained between 77.9 to 92.2 percent among the questions, there is one question, however, that garnered a low positive response rate of 61%:

Manage the weaknesses of my leadership style.

As such, one would be able to infer that while the programs gave the participants an idea of what their strengths are, while they were helpful in giving them an opportunity reflect on their leadership style, the effect hovered mostly on providing *an awareness of strengths*, and may not have been as effective in giving them an idea of facing their weaknesses. That is, this could be a reflection that the program could provide its participants ideas on how to shift from simply being aware of their strengths to being able to use this awareness to manage their shortcomings.

THE THREE CIRCLES OF THE STRENGTHS REVOLUTION

Elevation: “the elevation of strengths”

Magnification: “become a multiplier of strengths, from elevation to configurations”

Refract: “harnessing the higher strengths of institutions as agents of change in society”

(Cooperrider 3)

From part I, one will see that there is a sudden plunge in the overall positive response from 81.8% to 58.3% in part II. That is, one would infer that there is a significant jump in the number of participants who positively experienced aspects of Appreciative Inquiry from elevate to magnify. Even within the responses themselves, the percentage of participants who selected “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” fell between 53.2 to 68.8 percent, with the exception of one question, in which only 37.7% responded positively: *Develop interview questions that demonstrate an applicant’s strengths in the hiring process.*

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS: 77	
Questions	% Total Agree/Strongly Agree
1. Become more aware of my strengths.	89.6%
2. Understand how my strengths contribute to my leadership style.	89.6%
3. Elevate the use of my strengths in my work.	77.9%
4. Become aware of the positive aspects of my leadership style.	92.2%
5. Manage the weaknesses of my leadership style.	61.0%
6. See the potential in those I lead.	83.1%
7. Appreciate the positive qualities of those I lead.	87.0%
8. Speak to those I lead in a way that focuses on their strengths.	81.8%
9. Be more intentional in the way I use language to positively influence those around me.	74.0%
10. Encourage those I lead to continuously build from their strengths.	81.8%
Subtotal Part I	81.8%
1. Use a strengths focus to recognize and build on our diversity.	57.1%
2. Engage with each other through a recognition of their strengths.	62.3%
3. Engage in performance conversations with an emphasis on strengths.	67.5%
4. Develop interview questions that demonstrate an applicant’s strengths in the hiring process.	37.7%
5. Respond positively and affirmatively to the needs of clients (e.g. students, colleagues, vendors, etc).	68.8%
6. Be more receptive to organizing events where colleagues can enjoy the company of each other.	54.5%
7. Build a shared vision drawn from our core purpose, values, and team strengths.	53.2%
8. Favour an approach to team building that focuses on strengths.	68.8%
9. Construct committee/project roles in ways that elevate members’ strengths.	54.5%
Subtotal Part II	58.3%
1. Understand that I have strengths that could potentially make a difference in my wider community.	81.8%
2. Better notice and value the positive qualities in my wider community.	72.7%
3. Use my strengths to get involved in projects that benefit my community.	59.7%
4. Volunteer in UBC-sponsored programs that bring about positive social change.	40.3%
5. Encourage my colleagues to get involved in UBC-sponsored programs that bring about positive social change.	51.9%
6. Encourage those I lead to participate in UBC-sponsored programs that bring about positive social change.	48.1%
7. Leverage my strengths to come up with sustainable actions that benefit the university.	53.2%
8. Encourage my team members/colleagues to share their understanding of strengths with other units.	46.8%
Subtotal Part III	56.8%

This drop in the positive response rate could mean that participants may not have fully integrated the concepts they have gained from the program into a more systematic approach, which characterizes the *magnify* process. This could also mean that the programs may need to have elements that will give participants know-how on being able to apply what they learn from the *elevate* aspect of the program into something more tangible and action-oriented.

The one question that had a very low response rate, which referred to seeing the strengths in an applicant during the hiring process, has, in fact, the lowest response rate among all the questions in the three

sections. This is an interesting point to discuss, as this question stands out from the rest in its category. The other question pointed at working with colleagues and clients – that is, individuals that already have an existing relationship with the participant – while this particular question focused on individuals who may or may not be potentially be affiliated with the participant. This had raised for us a question, then. Do the leadership programs emphasize enough that *magnify* – which is partly a systematic representation and process of uplifting the strengths of one’s subordinates – revolve not just on the people one is already working with? Are the participants aware that leadership, from an appreciative and strengths-based lens, also involve individuals one may be *potentially* working with?

The overall positive response rate of the last part, which referred to how well the participants experienced the *refract* aspect of the leadership programs, did not vary much from part II (*magnify*). At 56.8%, it is still significantly lower than part I, and has the lowest response rate among all three sections. The range of positive responses is also rather large, which spans from a response rate that is as low as 40.3% to as high as 81.8%. These are the two statements that have the highest and lowest positive response rates, respectively:

Understand that I have strengths that could potentially make a difference in my wider community. (81.8%)
Volunteer in UBC-sponsored programs that bring about positive social change. (40.3%)

The first statement starts with the word “understand,” while the second one starts with “volunteer.” Again, this could reflect the idea that while the leadership programs have given participants an *awareness* of the elements of strengths-based leadership, they may not have been as effective in making them take part or encourage them to actually pursue what the particular circle in the IPOD approach (*refract*, in this case) entails.

In addition, the responses for each question were broken down into the responses of the participants from each program, so that we are able to see what the percentage of participants from each program responding positively to each question is. Further, more in-depth inquiry into what these responses could mean is recommended for the future.

Demographics were also taken into consideration. We received the most number of responses from participants who finished their program in 2014, two years before the study began (31.2%). As such, we might be able to say that the majority of the responses are from individuals who finished their programs a long time ago (a wide time gap between finishing the program and answering our survey could mean that they have forgotten responses). Finishing the program in 2014 also means that they had around two years between the time they finished the program and the time they answered the survey – as such, they have had the opportunity to practice what they learned from the programs when they answered the survey.

In addition, we received the most number of responses from female participants (67.5%) – males accounted for only 23.4%, while 9.1% declined to answer. The high female participants could account for the fact that the number of female employees at UBC is higher. We also received the most number of responses (31.2%) from individuals aged 45-54 years old, which may tell us that they have had years of leadership experience, which may affect their view of the idea of *leadership*, and applying the concept of *appreciative inquiry* and strengths-based leadership, which may be a new leadership model to them. It may also simply be that this is a reflection of the age demographic of employees at UBC.

Qualitative analysis

Because of time constraints, the opportunity to pursue qualitative analysis was very limited. While the interview and focus group recordings were transcribed and coded in NVivo, we believe that the results of the coding may not be interpreted as effectively as possible as there was no agreed upon consensus nor a sturdy rubric on which of the three “nodes” (i.e. *elevate, magnify, refract*) the ideas should go to. In addition, we believe that because the IPOD approach is an idea that can shift between individuals, having only two coders undertake the task may not represent the three circles accurately. This could then affect interrater reliability.

However, we were able to extract the top ten most commonly used words in the four transcripts:

<i>strengths</i>	<i>people</i>	<i>know</i>
<i>think</i>	<i>work</i>	<i>really</i>
<i>program</i>	<i>just</i>	<i>good</i>
<i>kind</i>		

Further analysis could interpret the relationship of these words to the leadership programs and the IPOD approach.

It should be noted that all participants who were invited to take part in the focus groups and interviews were invited to take part in the survey as well. As such, the focus groups and interviews ought to reflect the quantitative data.

This report therefore suggests that one of the primary steps in pursuing this study to the next level is to undertake a more in-depth quantitative analysis. Further recommendations are outlined in the section below in the *Conclusion and Recommendations* section.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, *Inquiry into Positive Organizational Development*, we aimed to understand how four of UBC Human Resources’ leadership programs—Academic Leadership Development Program, Appreciative Leadership Program, Managing@UBC, and Community Leadership Program align with the leadership framework conceptualized by David Cooperrider, called the *three circles of the strengths revolution*, also called the *IPOD* approach. To do this, we sought the feedback of participants from the past five years through an online survey, interviews, and focus groups.

From this study, we were able to gather all the data we had expected to. In addition, we were also able to interpret some of the statistical data from the survey. Because of lack of time, qualitative analysis was not as thorough as we had wanted it to be, although we were able to transcribe three interviews and one focus group.

Therefore, one can say that this study is a *primary* and *preliminary* investigation into how these four leadership programs offered by UBC’s HR Department align with Cooperrider’s strengths-based leadership concept. One could also say that this is the first step – mostly data gathering with preliminary analysis – that could be investigated further in the future.

Nevertheless, there are rich and significant data gathered from this study that could potentially be used as a basis for improving, augmenting, and amending the program so that they would align further with the three circles of the strengths revolution framework or IPOD approach.

Here are several recommendations in order to take the study further:

- A project of such scale needs time. Indeed, for future projects involving the same amount of time (250 hours), it would be worthwhile to dedicate one aspect of research to this time in order to go much more in-depth. For this project, much of the time was spent on administrative tasks such as contacting participants, traveling to interview sites, and discussions among team members. While these are definitely essential, it would be important to narrow the scope of research in order to bring about a bigger output.
- There is a very rich set of data collected from participants. It would be very worthwhile to go through these statistics and compare them to one another. One may find information that correlates to the idea of Cooperrider's strengths-based leadership framework. For example, as mentioned in the analysis section above, it is suggested that future analysis look into every single question, and investigate how the breakdown of responses per program could be interpreted.
- For the qualitative analysis, it is suggested that the remaining interviews and focus groups be transcribed and analyzed, and that the transcripts be coded by other individuals, and test for interrater reliability. Prior to this, there must be a standard rubric from which the coding will be done, which should include as many concepts within each node as much as possible – for example, indicating that *elevate* could also mean working from one's own strengths, being generative, being generous.
- It is also suggested to search for thematic patterns across the interviews and focus groups, and see if any of them reflect the quantitative data.
- The most commonly occurring word among the transcribed interviews and focus group is *strength*. We suggest investigating further the idea of "strength" and its nuances within the interviews and focus groups, and how they fit within the three circles of the three circles of the strengths revolution or IPOD approach: *elevate*, *magnify*, and *refract*.

REFERENCES

Cooperrider, David. "Three Circles of the Strengths Revolution." *Leadership Excellence*. March 2012: 29.3.

Print.

Cooperrider, David L., and Lindsey N. Godwin. "Positive Organization Development: Innovation-inspired Change in an Economy and Ecology of Strengths." *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*. Ed. Kim S. Cameron and Gretchen M. Spreitzer. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 737-50. Print.

APPENDIX A

Survey questions

During your leadership program, you were (likely) exposed to a process called “Appreciative Inquiry,” which has the underlying assumption that people and organizations are, by nature, full of assets, capabilities, and resources that are just waiting to be located, affirmed, stretched, and encouraged (UBC HR, 2015).

You may also recall that in the program, you were asked to describe as part of a guided interview process a high point or being at your best experience, in relation to your learning. You were also asked to describe the role that your strengths and those of others contributed to that experience.

“Strengths are defined as those things that make us feel stronger – the things that bring our institutions and ourselves to life.” (Cooperrider & Godwin, 2011)

PART I

Please answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 6:

- 1= Strongly disagree
- 2= Disagree
- 3= Neither agree nor disagree
- 4= Agree
- 5= Strongly agree
- 6= NA/Don't know

Having some exposure to strengths and an appreciative inquiry approach in the program enabled me to...

1. Become more aware of my strengths.
2. Understand how my strengths contribute to my leadership style.
3. Elevate the use of my strengths in my work.
4. Become aware of the positive aspects of my leadership style.
5. Manage the weaknesses of my leadership style.
6. See the potential in those I lead.
7. Appreciate the positive qualities of those I lead.
8. Speak to those I lead in a way that focuses on their strengths.
9. Be more intentional in the way I use language to positively influence those around me.
10. Encourage those I lead to continuously build from their strengths.

PART II

Please answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 6

- 1= Strongly disagree
- 2= Disagree
- 3= Neither agree nor disagree
- 4= Agree
- 5= Strongly agree
- 6= NA/Don't know

Having some exposure to strengths and an appreciative inquiry approach in the program enabled me to encourage my unit to...

1. Use a strengths focus to recognize and build on our diversity.
2. Engage with each other through a recognition of their strengths.
3. Engage in performance conversations with an emphasis on strengths.
4. Develop interview questions that demonstrate an applicant's strengths in the hiring process.
5. Respond positively and affirmatively to the needs of clients (for e.g. students, colleagues, vendors, etc).
6. Be more receptive to organizing events where colleagues can enjoy the company of each other.
7. Build a shared vision drawn from our core purpose, values, and strengths.
8. Favour an approach to team building that focuses on strengths.
9. Construct committee/project roles in ways that elevate members' strengths.

PART III

Please answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 6:

- 1= Strongly disagree
- 2= Disagree
- 3= Neither agree nor disagree
- 4= Agree
- 5= Strongly agree
- 6= NA/Don't know

Having some exposure to strengths and an appreciative inquiry approach in the program enabled me to...

1. Understand that I have strengths that could potentially make a difference in my wider community.
2. Better notice and value the positive qualities in my wider community.
3. Use my strengths to get involved in projects that benefit my community.
4. Volunteer in UBC-sponsored programs that bring about positive social change.
5. Encourage my colleagues to get involved in UBC-sponsored programs that bring about positive social change.
6. Encourage those I lead to participate in UBC-sponsored programs that bring about positive social change.
7. Leverage my strengths to come up with sustainable actions that benefit the university
8. Encourage my team members/colleagues to share their understanding of strengths with other units.

PART IV: Participant details (demographics)

1. Which Leadership Program did you attend?
 - a) Managing@UBC
 - b) Academic Leadership Development Program
 - c) Community Leadership Program (CLP)
 - d) Appreciative Leadership Program

2. In which year did you attend this leadership program?
 - a) 2010 - 2011
 - b) 2011 - 2012
 - c) 2012 - 2013
 - d) 2013 - 2014
 - e) 2014 - 2015

3. Are you:
 - a) Faculty
 - b) Staff
 - c) Decline to answer

4. Which Faculty/VP portfolio did you belong to when you joined the leadership program:
 - a) Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
 - b) Faculty of Grad Studies & Postdoc Studies
 - c) Faculty of Applied Science
 - d) Faculty of Arts
 - e) Faculty of Dentistry
 - f) Faculty of Education
 - g) Faculty of Forestry
 - h) Faculty of Land & Food Systems
 - i) Faculty of Law
 - j) Faculty of Medicine
 - k) Faculty of Science
 - l) Office of the President
 - m) The Sauder School of Business
 - n) VP Academic & Provost
 - o) VP Development & Alumni Engagement
 - p) VP External Relations & Communications
 - q) VP Finance, Resources & Ops.
 - r) VP Human Resources
 - s) VP Research & International
 - t) VP Students
 - u) Decline to answer

5. Which Faculty/VP portfolio do you currently belong to?
 - a) Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
 - b) Faculty of Grad Studies & Postdoc Studies
 - c) Faculty of Applied Science
 - d) Faculty of Arts
 - e) Faculty of Dentistry
 - f) Faculty of Education
 - g) Faculty of Forestry
 - h) Faculty of Land & Food Systems
 - i) Faculty of Law
 - j) Faculty of Medicine

- k) Faculty of Science
 - l) Office of the President
 - m) The Sauder School of Business
 - n) VP Academic & Provost
 - o) VP Development & Alumni Engagement
 - p) VP External Relations & Communications
 - q) VP Finance, Resources & Ops.
 - r) VP Human Resources
 - s) VP Research & International
 - t) VP Students
 - u) Decline to answer
6. Which bargaining unit do you currently belong to?
- a) Agassiz Farm Workers
 - b) BCGEU UBC - Childcare Vancouver
 - c) CUPE 116 (Aquatic Centre)
 - d) CUPE 116 (Clerk/Secretary/Bookstore)
 - e) CUPE 116 (Service, Technicians, Trades)
 - f) CUPE 2278 (Non-CR Instructors)
 - g) CUPE 2278 (Teaching Assistants)
 - h) CUPE 2950 (Chan Centre)
 - i) CUPE 2950 (Clerk/Secretary/Library)
 - j) Excluded M&P
 - k) Executive Administrative Staff (Non-Union)
 - l) Faculty (Faculty Association)
 - m) Faculty (Non-Faculty Association)
 - n) IUOE 882
 - o) AAPS (Management & Professional)
 - p) Non-Union Childcare
 - q) Other Staff
 - r) Service Unit Directors
 - s) Senior Executives - Academic & Administrative
 - t) Student Workers
 - u) Non-Union Technicians & Research Assistants
 - v) Decline to answer
7. How long have you been employed by UBC?
- a) Less than six months
 - b) Six months but less than one year
 - c) One but less than three years
 - d) Three but less than five years
 - e) Five but less than 10 years
 - f) Ten but less than 20 years
 - g) 20 years or longer
 - h) Decline to answer

8. Age
- a) Under 25
 - b) 25-34
 - c) 35-44
 - d) 45-54
 - e) 55-59
 - f) 60-64
 - g) 65-69
 - h) 70+
 - i) Decline to answer
9. Gender
- a) Male
 - b) Female
 - c) Decline to answer

APPENDIX B

Brief introduction for focus group and interview sessions

Thank you very much for being here and taking part in the Human Resources-sponsored project entitled Inquiry into Positive Organizational Development. As you know, we are seeking to understand how the use of appreciative inquiry and/or a strengths-based approach within <<program name>> may have influenced your leadership at multiple levels: as an individual, within your unit/team, and within the wider community.

You may recall that during your leadership program, you were exposed to a process called “Appreciative Inquiry,” which has the underlying assumption that people and organizations are, by nature, full of assets, capabilities, and resources that are just waiting to be located, affirmed, stretched, and encouraged. You may also recall that in the program, you were asked to describe as part of a guided interview process a high point or being at your best experience, in relation to your learning. You were also asked to describe the role that your strengths and those of others contributed to that experience.

Please note that I will be referring to the word “strengths” as “...those things that make us feel strong – the things that bring our institutions and ourselves to life.

The focus group/interview consists of three questions, and I am hoping that we will get to all of them in the 45 minutes we have together. As such, I am targeting approximately 12-13 minutes per question, and kindly ask for your help in keeping me on track when responding to the questions. If we have time left, I may continue to ask additional questions. This session should be done at <<time end>>.

The session will also be audio recorded. Confidentiality and anonymity is a priority for us. Your responses will not be attributed or linked to you, and all recordings will be destroyed upon completion of the project.

Focus group only:

We also kindly request you to please not share your colleagues' responses with anyone. We also kindly request you to please speak up so that the recorder will be able to capture what you say clearly. Please help yourselves to the lunch/snacks and to coffee/tea/water.

Do you have any questions before we start?

APPENDIX C

Focus group and interview questions

1. In what ways, if any, have the strengths based ideas you gained from attending the program influenced your work as leaders? (Ask for examples)
2. What has been the most impactful of the strengths/appreciative inquiry approaches for you?
3. How have you engaged members in your unit with strengths-based approaches to work and/or conversations?
4. How have you engaged colleagues/others at the University with strengths/appreciative inquiry approaches to work and/or conversations?
5. How do you combine the idea of strength and leadership when dealing with your colleagues?
6. How do you define strengths-based leadership, and is it something you are practicing now? Why or why not?