

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2012

Summary of Findings: Auckland City District

April 2012

KeneXa® | JRA



Safer Communities Together Kaupapa whai Oranga mō te iti me te rahi

KeneXa® | JRA

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Auckland City District
April, 2012
© JRA

RESPONSE RATE

	Auckland City District 2012	Auckland City District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	749	662	9393
Response Rate	74.8%	75.2%	77.1%

Note: For the tables below **Green font** indicates that the District's score is statistically higher than the average score for NZ Police on that survey section/question, and/or that a score has improved since the 2011 survey. **Red font** indicates the score is statistically lower, and/or has significantly declined since the 2011 survey. The scores in the tables, excluding the response rate, are weighted mean scores (unless otherwise stated). See the glossary on the last page of this report for definitions of all terms used.

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Auckland City District 2012	Auckland City District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	68.7	64.1 (+4.6)	67.7 (+1.0)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	64.4	57.9 (+6.5)	63.9 (+0.5)
2. My Supervisor	78.8	74.6 (+4.2)	75.6 (+3.2)
3. My Work Group	78.2	75.8 (+2.4)	76.7 (+1.5)
4. My Job	65.6	61.1 (+4.5)	65.7 (-0.1)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	73.1	69.3 (+3.8)	71.2 (+1.9)
6. Learning and Development	63.5	60.6 (+2.9)	62.7 (+0.8)
7. Performance and Feedback	70.7	68.2 (+2.5)	69.4 (+1.3)
8. Recognition	58.2	51.6 (+6.6)	58.0 (+0.2)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	74.2	69.9 (+4.3)	73.3 (+0.9)
10. The Survey - Your Views	50.7	41.8 (+8.9)	49.6 (+1.1)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT

Question	Auckland City District 2012	Auckland City District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	87.4	86.8 (+0.6)	85.8 (+1.6)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	83.7	78.6 (+5.1)	80.0 (+3.7)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	82.1	78.1 (+4.0)	79.2 (+2.9)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	81.8	79.3 (+2.5)	80.0 (+1.8)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	81.6	80.2 (+1.4)	80.0 (+1.6)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	80.8	80.1 (+0.7)	79.1 (+1.7)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	80.8	76.8 (+4.0)	77.6 (+3.2)
2.6: I have confidence in my supervisor	80.2	76.9 (+3.3)	77.1 (+3.1)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	79.2	75.7 (+3.5)	78.1 (+1.1)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	78.6	75.2 (+3.4)	79.3 (-0.7)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT

Question	Auckland City District 2012	Auckland City District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	48.3	41.9 (+6.4)	48.2 (+0.1)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	48.3	40.7 (+7.6)	47.8 (+0.5)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	48.7	44.8 (+3.9)	53.0 (-4.3)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	52.5	43.4 (+9.1)	51.3 (+1.2)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	53.1	43.1 (+10.0)	51.5 (+1.6)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	56.4	51.6 (+4.8)	56.0 (+0.4)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	56.9	50.2 (+6.7)	56.9 (0.0)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	57.8	47.7 (+10.1)	59.0 (-1.2)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	57.9	50.5 (+7.4)	57.4 (+0.5)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	59.1	51.2 (+7.9)	59.7 (-0.6)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT SINCE 2011 - POSITIVE

Question	Auckland City District 2012	Auckland City District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	68.4	58.0 (+10.4)	67.8 (+0.6)
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	64.4	54.3 (+10.1)	63.6 (+0.8)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	57.8	47.7 (+10.1)	59.0 (-1.2)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	53.1	43.1 (+10.0)	51.5 (+1.6)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	52.5	43.4 (+9.1)	51.3 (+1.2)
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	64.9	56.4 (+8.5)	65.6 (-0.7)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	63.4	55.0 (+8.4)	62.8 (+0.6)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	59.1	51.2 (+7.9)	59.7 (-0.6)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	48.3	40.7 (+7.6)	47.8 (+0.5)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	57.9	50.5 (+7.4)	57.4 (+0.5)

NOTE: all questions showed an improvement in score since the 2011 survey

SCORES ACROSS THE AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT

Section	Auckland Dhq	Auckland Central	Auckland Cib	Auckland District Ops Support	Auckland East	Auckland West	Metro Operations	Auckland City Dist
Performance Index	67.0	68.5	66.2	65.5	66.8	75.7	62.5	68.7
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	63.7	64.0	61.8	59.1	63.1	71.2	57.4	64.4
2. My Supervisor	72.5	83.5	73.4	76.2	75.5	87.3	68.7	78.8
3. My Work Group	73.7	79.2	76.7	77.8	77.8	83.4	72.0	78.2
4. My Job	65.9	63.2	65.2	63.6	62.7	71.9	63.5	65.6
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	73.4	72.4	70.5	70.0	68.7	80.6	68.7	73.1
6. Learning and Development	58.7	61.7	60.6	62.4	63.3	71.8	59.5	63.5
7. Performance and Feedback	68.7	70.9	69.1	70.4	69.7	76.5	62.8	70.7
8. Recognition	57.7	57.4	53.6	54.3	56.2	67.1	49.8	58.2
9. Final Thoughts	75.2	72.0	72.2	69.1	73.9	80.9	66.6	74.2
10. The Survey - Your Views	52.2	54.0	45.8	39.9	46.5	56.9	42.5	50.7

Weighted Mean Scores (%)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the District on the survey sections – and reflect potentially important intervention areas. Green coloured scores reflect possible 'best practice' areas in terms of the respective survey section.

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT

Question	Auckland City District	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	84.3	81.0 (+3.3)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	78.2	80.9 (-2.7)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	73.1	69.4 (+3.7)
5.4: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had about other inappropriate conduct in the workplace without fear of reprisal (inappropriate conduct may include any actions or behaviours that make you feel uncomfortable in the workplace)	71.6	67.1 (+4.5)
5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	66.9	63.5 (+3.4)

Level of Agreement (%)

5.6: If you have witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace in the last 12 months, do you believe it has been dealt with effectively?

	Auckland City District	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	86.4	83.4 (+3.0)
Yes	4.0	4.6 (-0.6)
No	9.6	12.0 (-2.4)

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Auckland City District 2012	Auckland City District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
74.2	69.9 (+4.3)	73.3 (+0.9)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Auckland City District 2012	Auckland City District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	29.9	18.5 (+11.4)	27.8 (+2.1)
Ambivalent	57.0	64.4 (-7.4)	59.7 (-2.7)
Disengaged	13.1	17.1 (-4.0)	12.5 (+0.6)

Proportion of Employees (%)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2011	Key Driver Questions	Auckland City District 2012	Auckland City District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	72.1	67.8 (+4.3)	71.1 (+1.0)
	3	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	65.1	60.0 (+5.1)	65.5 (-0.4)
	NA	1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	63.2	57.4 (+5.8)	62.8 (+0.4)
	7	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	64.9	56.4 (+8.5)	65.6 (-0.7)
	2	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	77.8	75.0 (+2.8)	78.0 (-0.2)
	NA	5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	69.4	65.8 (+3.6)	66.5 (+2.9)
	NA	5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	78.5	74.6 (+3.9)	76.2 (+2.3)
	NA	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	61.1	55.3 (+5.8)	61.9 (-0.8)
	NA	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	63.6	59.1 (+4.5)	61.6 (+2.0)
	9	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	63.7	62.5 (+1.2)	62.2 (+1.5)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Note: The table above shows the results of a statistical analysis identifying those things assessed in the survey that are the most engaging to staff members within the District. These key drivers are rank ordered. The colour coding for each question reveals if a particular key driver is scoring higher (green), lower (red), or the same (orange) as NZ Police overall. Red key drivers are important to your employees' engagement levels but score poorly compared to the rest of the organisation and hence represents a particularly useful leverage point when attempting to further engage employees. The rank of key drivers that were identified in 2011 is shown in the column headed "Rank from 2011".

ANATOMY OF A GREAT WORKPLACE™

Over a decade of research by JRA on what makes a great workplace in New Zealand reveals there are four common characteristics – Vision & Values, a strong sense of Community, a focus on employee Development, and a strong Performance Culture. The table below illustrates where the District's engagement drivers tend to fall and whether there is a specific pillar or more that should be targeted when looking for change targets.

	Vision and Values	Community	Development	Performance Culture
Organisation level		1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work 1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation
Team level		5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately 5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	
Individual level		1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable

PRIORITY AREAS – KEY DRIVER SCORES ACROSS KEY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

Reading across the table, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the District on the key drivers of employee engagement – and reflect potentially important intervention areas. Green coloured scores reflect possible 'best practice' areas in terms of the respective key driver.

Question	Auckland Dhq	Auckland Central	Auckland Cib	Auckland District Ops Support	Auckland East	Auckland West	Metro Operations	Auckland City Dist	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	72.7	71.0	68.8	66.4	71.9	77.6	66.8	72.1	71.1
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	66.5	62.7	61.2	55.4	65.7	75.3	50.4	65.1	65.5
1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	63.1	60.5	59.0	60.8	63.5	71.3	54.5	63.2	62.8
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	64.9	63.7	65.0	62.5	62.8	70.4	59.8	64.9	65.6
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	75.7	74.6	78.8	72.4	75.4	84.3	81.3	77.8	78.0
5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	68.3	68.9	64.4	69.1	65.0	78.5	63.9	69.4	66.5
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	78.5	80.3	75.8	76.3	76.9	83.7	67.5	78.5	76.2
6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	62.8	58.9	57.6	60.1	57.2	69.4	54.9	61.1	61.9
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	63.5	62.5	64.2	59.9	61.1	70.1	57.4	63.6	61.6
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	53.4	62.5	60.6	63.5	66.9	73.3	56.6	63.7	62.2

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – AUCKLAND CITY DISTRICT

The following summary provides insight into how employees perceive the District as a place to work and how it fares to the rest of NZ Police. Engagement levels within the District are examined, along with the results of a statistical analysis looking for the key drivers of engagement. A cursory examination of employee comments is also provided. The section concludes with an overall summary that highlights the key issues within the District that would likely provide it with the greatest improvement leverage when attempting to make the District a truly great – and engaging – place to work.

Response Rate

In 2012 a total of 749 people in the District completed the survey. This equates to 74.8% of all those invited to participate which is similar to the proportion of participants for 2011 (75.2%). This represents a very good response rate, ensuring that the results presented in this report provide an accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the District.

How Employees Perceive Auckland City District as a Place to Work

There has been a significant shift since 2011 as to how people in the Auckland City District think about their place of work. In 2012 the District's 'Performance Index' – the average score across all questions across all employees – has increased to 68.7% (up +4.6%), which is a great improvement from 2011.

All ten survey sections have had improvements, with increases ranging from +2.4% to +8.9%. The largest increases are seen in the sections 'The Survey – Your Views', 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation', 'Recognition', which have all had improvements greater than +6.0%.

Compared to the NZ Police overall the Auckland City District's 'Performance Index' scores the same on average. The District does however score higher than NZ Police for 'My Supervisor' (+3.2%), 'My Work Group' (+1.5%) and 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' (+1.9%). All other survey sections score similar to NZ Police overall.

It is interesting to note that the ten highest rated questions across the District are almost the same as those from 2011. Intention to stay at NZ Police remains by far the highest rated item in the entire survey. The score of 87.4% is similar to the 2011 result and is higher than the NZ Police result of 85.8%. The 'My Supervisor' and 'My Work Group' sections dominate the make-up of the ten highest rated questions, with a total of seven survey items coming from these two sections. People feel that they are part of a group that works well together, where they know they can rely upon each other in their job, and where they have confidence in their supervisor who supports and encourages them in their job. On average people are able to 'agree' to a sense of commitment to NZ Police, and realise that NZ Police expects high standards of performance from them. These highest rated items tend to score higher than last year, and for the most part perform better than NZ Police in 2012.

An examination of the District's 10 lowest scoring items unveils three interesting observations. Firstly, all ten lowest scoring items for 2012 were lowest scoring items in 2011. Secondly, all ten lowest scoring items have increased significantly since 2011 (ranging from +3.9% to +10.1%). And thirdly, almost all ten lowest scoring items are scoring similar to NZ Police overall, which is a great improvement of 2011 when most of these low scoring items were significantly below NZ Police. As with 2011 the lowest scoring items lay around whether outcomes of the survey have had a positive impact, whether people are recognised appropriately through pay, merit based promotion, celebration of achievements and whether people have adequate access to tools and resources to do their job. In general people have taken a 'neutral' position as to whether NZ Police 'cares about the well-being of its staff' and whether 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff'.

Survey items from 'Vision and Purpose – Communication and Cooperation', 'The Survey – Your Views' and the 'My Job' survey sections dominate the list of 'biggest increases' from 2011. For 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' it is the number of items with significant improvements that make it a standout. In all, five survey items from this section are among the ten largest increases from 2011, with improvements ranging from +7.4% to +10.4%. People have a better understanding of NZ Police's vision, feel more informed about its activities, and think that NZ Police is a more effective organisation than it was a year ago. Meanwhile the increases seen in the two 'The Survey – Your Views' items show that more and more people are starting to see the benefits of actions taken as a direct result of past survey feedback. People in the District also feel their 'physical work environment' and access to 'tools and resources' is better than a year ago, even though they remain relatively low scoring items compared to the rest of the survey.

Looking at results across the District, most Auckland City Areas perform much the same as each other, except for the Areas of Auckland West and Metro Operations. The Auckland West Area outperforms all

other Areas by significant margins, and particularly that of Metro Operations that scores lowest across most survey sections. The variance between these two areas is significant, with Auckland West scoring on average +13.2% points higher than Metro Operations across the entire survey.

Respect and Integrity within the Auckland City District

'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' is a survey section that has increased significantly. On average, scores across the respect and integrity items has increased by +3.8% and score higher than NZ Police on average by +1.9% weighted mean points. Most people agree that employee diversity is respected within workgroups and that they know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination. However fewer people are confident about what would happen as a result of concerns being raised. Approximately one-third of respondents are not confident that concerns raised would be dealt with appropriately. The proportion of people who have witnessed some form of harassment, discrimination or workplace bullying, at 13.6% of staff, is less than the NZ Police overall result of 16.6%. However approximately two-thirds of those who have witnessed any such incident, do not believe it was dealt with effectively.

Employee Engagement within Auckland City District

A significant increase in the District's Engagement Index (up +4.3% from 2011) has also translated into a large shift in the proportion of people in the District who are now 'engaged' employees. The proportion of people who are 'engaged' is now 29.9% of staff, compared to 18.5% of staff a year ago. The proportion of people who are 'disengaged' has dropped markedly, from 17.1% in 2011 to now stand at 13.1%. In effect this means there are many more positive voices within the District than negative voices by a ratio greater than 2 to 1 (which is double the ratio from 2011).

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

Key driver analysis identifies via statistical analysis those survey items that have the greatest impact on employee engagement, while at the same time determining how NZ Police is performing against those same items.

A total of ten key drivers of engagement have been identified for the District. The 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' items of 'an enjoyable place to work', 'a sense of belonging' and 'common purpose', and working for 'an effective organisation' are the four highest ranked key drivers, and therefore the most engaging items from across the survey. These are all items that the District has improved greatly on from 2011, and which perform on par with NZ Police overall. The remaining key drivers are from the sections 'My Job', 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' and 'Learning and Development' and either perform better than or the same as NZ Police overall.

Using the 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' model, we see that a sense of 'Community', 'Development' and a 'Performance Culture' are important and engaging to Auckland City District staff and represent significant leverage points for continued improvements in the District. A sense of 'Community' is an area that is particularly important to the District, and which is performing relatively well in. Efforts should be made to ensure that this is maintained and leveraged further, as there is great potential to lift results above the NZ Police average.

These key drivers offer the District a 'springboard' to help lift scores and make improvements in other low scoring survey items, or Areas with the District that are not performing as well as others. As seen in section scores, it is the Auckland West Area that in general scores highest across the key driver items for the District, and is an Area that may offer insights from the last 12 months that could be implemented in lower scoring Areas such as the Metro Operations Area.

Employee Comments

As has happened in the previous year's survey, the elements that people like the best about working at NZ Police in the Auckland City District appear to have remained constant over the last 12 months, with the 'people we work with', the 'teamwork and camaraderie', the 'diversity and variety of work' and 'serving the community' all frequently mentioned in employee comments as elements that make working at NZ Police great. There is a sense of belonging, commitment and dedication in that people are working together to get the job done.

There are a wide variety of comments on the elements where NZ Police could do better. A large number of these refer to resourcing in general, with other comments made that are specific to staffing levels and tools and equipment required to do the job. Recognition seems to be another theme, be it in the form of pay, promotion based on merit, or a general appreciation of peoples' efforts. Improved communication from management and comments regarding better management/direct supervisor actions are also

mentioned, as is the need for poor performance to be dealt with accordingly. 'Paperwork' is another common theme that seems to be getting in the way of people being able to do what they do best in their job.

Note that this is a cursory analysis and it is recommended that you read respondent comments in detail.

Summary

The 2012 survey results for the Auckland City District overall have improved greatly on the year prior. There have been substantial increases across all survey sections, which have translated in to a much higher proportion of people in the District who are 'engaged' in their work, compared to those who are 'disengaged'. This improvement has allowed the District to keep pace with the overall results and engagement levels for NZ Police which has also had significant improvements since 2011.

There has undoubtedly been an investment in time allowing for improvements to be made in key areas since 2011. This is particularly noted with large increases seen for the 'The Survey – Your Views' items. More people certainly believe that the survey, and the outcomes of the survey, is having a positive impact on their workplace. While this is pleasing to see, scores on these survey 'impact items' still remain relatively neutral (just above the 50% mark) meaning there is plenty of opportunity for post survey actions to have a greater impact on people's daily work.

Opportunities exist in Areas that score lower than the District results. The Auckland West leads the way in 2012, with higher scores seen across the entire survey compared to all other Areas. Meanwhile specific attention is recommended to address low scores in the Metro Operations Area. It is recommended that the Areas share ideas on what has (or hasn't) worked well for them since the previous survey, and look to leverage off each other to implement successful changes. For example people in the Auckland West Area have a far more positive view of the impact of the 2011 survey, than colleagues from Auckland District Ops Support and Metro Operations.

The Auckland City District is in a good position to benefit operationally from higher engagement levels. Emphasis should be given to ensure that strong scoring key drivers remain strong, while the District looks to make improvements in other lower scoring items, and while focussing on lower scoring Areas within the District.

Where to Next?

The key to driving any change or improvement effort is in following a suitable **action plan**. An action planning template is provided over the page and allows you to detail the key issues to be addressed (focus areas), along with specific actions to occur, expected benefits, accountabilities, timeframes and progress reporting. District's that adopt a standard action planning approach, provide support to those involved, and review the quality of planning output are those far more likely to see greater improvement in their subsequent survey results.

The following are some of the strategies we suggest need to be kept in mind when using survey results to drive change. Whilst there can never be one 'best' approach to the post-survey process that will suit all organisations, there are nevertheless a range of strategies that experience has shown leads to the greatest likelihood of performance improvement.

Focus on a limited number of key issues. Look for themes that emerge from your set of key drivers, paying particular attention to your 'red zone' key drivers. Try to distil these themes down to two or three major goals (80/20 principle).

Communication is vital. Do your best to keep everyone fully informed at all stages of the process, from results reporting to issue prioritisation to progress reports. Communicate survey results quickly (staff know you have them). Communicate senior management's initial response and the process to be followed. People want to know what is going to happen, how they will be involved. Have members of the management team present the results to their teams, while encouraging feedback and contribution. Consider using facilitators to assist in the process, and don't overlook the contribution supervisors may make (employees often prefer to receive organisational information directly from their supervisors rather than via emails or newsletters).

Act quickly. Make sure you act on your survey results within three months of survey results being reported. Survey momentum can be short lived and employees will quickly begin to question the relevancy of interventions that come too long after the survey has been completed. Look for the obvious "low-hanging fruit" or "easy fixes," and target them early on. Don't waste time on things you can't change – focus on things you CAN change. More complex issues can be addressed progressively during the year.

Measure your progress. Often desired improvement goals are not met because the survey is regarded as a one-off events, rather than an essential business process and KPI. Sustaining performance improvement requires not only the formulation of relevant and realistic action plans, but also regular monitoring of the impact of those initiatives. On-going measurement not only provides essential feedback on what's working and what's not, it also creates a 'virtuous cycle' where improvement becomes a reinforcing thing. Measurement is also a critical to ensure those responsible for change are held accountable. And there must be consequences – consequences for no change, and consequences for positive change.

Recognise and celebrate success. Often one of the most overlooked aspects of the survey process! And one of the most important. Obviously 'red zone' drivers need urgent attention, but don't overlook those 'green zone' drivers where your above-benchmark performance is something to celebrate (and maintain). One of the features of truly great workplaces is the emphasis they place on celebrating success. And success is all around you – celebrate, and see the different it makes!

Reinforce the survey follow-up process. Once your post-survey initiatives start to happen, make sure you take every opportunity to communicate and update staff on progress regularly. Too often organisations introduce excellent initiatives post-survey, but forget to tell anyone! Consider a quarterly update, or a section in your staff newsletter where you recap on the goals that were set and provide updates on progress to-date. This, more than anything, will reinforce to staff the value of the survey – the organisation was interested in my views, they have listened, and now they're doing something about them.

TOTAL ORGANISATION RESULTS

RESPONSE RATE

	NZ Police 2012	NZ Police 2011
Number of Responses	9393	9503
Response Rate	77.1%	79.2%

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE NZ POLICE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	NZ Police 2012	NZ Police 2011
Performance Index	67.7	64.2 (+3.5)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	63.9	59.2 (+4.7)
2. My Supervisor	75.6	72.3 (+3.3)
3. My Work Group	76.7	74.7 (+2.0)
4. My Job	65.7	62.7 (+3.0)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	71.2	68.1 (+3.1)
6. Learning and Development	62.7	60.1 (+2.6)
7. Performance and Feedback	69.4	66.7 (+2.7)
8. Recognition	58.0	53.1 (+4.9)
9. Final Thoughts	73.3	70.5 (+2.8)
10. The Survey - Your Views	49.6	42.8 (+6.8)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

ENGAGEMENT PROFILE

Engagement Group	NZ Police 2012	NZ Police 2011
Engaged	27.8	21.3 (+6.5)
Ambivalent	59.7	63.2 (-3.5)
Disengaged	12.5	15.5 (-3.0)

Proportion of Employees (%)

GLOSSARY

Anatomy of a Great Workplace: Research carried out by JRA over many years into the nature of great workplaces has revealed that best-practice organisations all share four common characteristics. We call these the 'four pillars' of JRA's Anatomy of a Great Workplace™. The four pillars are enduring organisational qualities that are the product of a variety of practices, each of which has been crafted by local leadership according to their organisation's unique circumstances. This model serves as a useful diagnostic and planning tool. In the Anatomy table, each of the key drivers of employee engagement within a particular demographic variable has been shown assigned to its applicable 'Pillar'. Additionally, each key driver has been positioned to indicate whether action should be focused at the individual, team, or organisation level. By examining the concentration of key drivers in each Pillar it is possible to gain further insight into areas where intervention strategies are most likely to deliver significant performance gains.

Employee Engagement: is a multi-dimensional concept that describes the extent to which employees mentally, emotionally and physically apply themselves at work. Engagement is measured by six questions in the survey and includes job satisfaction, organisational commitment, willingness to recommend the organisation as a great place to work, discretionary effort, taking an active interest in the organisation, and general effort.

Engagement Index: The average score across the six engagement questions, across all employees.

Engagement Profile: Employees are categorised as either engaged, ambivalent or disengaged according to their Engagement Index. Employees who score above 87.5% (weighted mean score) are classified as engaged given they respond very positively to most of the engagement questions. Employees above 50% but below 87.5% are classified as ambivalent given they respond with mostly 'neutral' or 'agree' questions (i.e., not *strong* responses to the engagement questions). Disengaged employees are those that score below 50%. These employees are not sufficiently motivated by the organisation to provide an agree to strongly agree response to any of the engagement questions.

Key Driver Analysis: is a statistical technique (multiple regression) that helps in the interpretation of survey data and enables an organisation to put together actionable responses to survey results. It is essentially a tool that allows us to identify what specific dimensions of organisational climate (assessed in a survey) have the greatest impact on engagement levels. By knowing this, managers can prioritise improvement opportunities and prepare a focused number of strategies that will maximise future employee engagement.

'Statistical Significance' versus 'Significance of the Result': A 'statistically significant' result indicates that there is a difference in scores between two groups of respondents. So if your District's weighted mean score was 72% on a particular question and the NZ Police average was 76%, then this is likely to be a large enough difference to reflect a true divergence in employee opinion across the two groups (not just 'random variation in scores'). One group sees things more positively than the other group, so much so that the difference would be identified as 'statistically significant' via statistical analysis. But it is important to recognise that statistical analysis is impacted by the size of the survey sample. Very large survey samples means there is sufficient 'statistical power' to detect even very small differences in scores. For example, if your survey sample had more than 800 respondents, then a difference of just 1% would be found to be 'statistically significant'. But clearly a difference of 1% is not particularly meaningful. In fact, it is probably too small to warrant any great change effort - regardless of whether it was identified as 'statistically significant'. As such, when viewing results online and thinking of 'what's important here', think of those things that represent *substantive* differences. That would likely be differences of around 3.5% or more for smaller groups (100 – 150 employees), and 2% or more for larger groups (above 450 employees).

The Questionnaire: The 2012 New Zealand Police Workplace Survey contained 67 statements designed to measure a workplace on a range of issues in the organisation. Respondents were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with each statement using a five point rating system. This rating system ranged from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Questions were separated into 11 sections according to statements that naturally cluster together and measure similar issues.

Weighted Mean Score: The survey scores reported herein are known as 'weighted mean scores'. They range between 0% and 100% and represent a 'strength of agreement' score. The weighted mean score is calculated by first converting each response option into a weighting (strongly agree = 100%, agree = 75%, neutral = 50%, disagree = 25%, and strongly disagree = 0%). All weighted responses are added together, and then divided by the total number of valid respondents (i.e., excluding all 'do not know' responses). A perfect score of 100% is achieved if respondents strongly agree with the statement, while 0% is scored if respondents strongly disagree. A score of around 75% is often desirable given that means most people have responded to a question with an 'agree'. But questions do vary and comparisons to your organisation's norms (the typical score) should be made.