

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: Auckland Metro Crime & Ops Support

June 2011



SAFER COMMUNITIES TOGETHER Kaupapa whai Oranga mō te iti me te rahi



RESPONSE RATE

	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2011	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	214	224	9503
Response Rate	73.0%	73.0%	79.2%

Note: For the tables below **Green font** indicates that the Service Centre'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 2010 survey. **Red font** indicates the score is statistically lower, and/or has significantly declined since the 2010 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 AK METRO CRIME & OPS SUPPORT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2011	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	64.4	63.7 (+0.7)	64.2 (+0.2)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	59.9	56.6 (+3.3)	59.2 (+0.7)
2. My Supervisor	69.0	68.9 (+0.1)	72.3 (-3.3)
3. My Work Group	74.7	75.3 (-0.6)	74.7 (+0.0)
4. My Job	65.4	64.6 (+0.8)	62.7 (+2.7)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.7	66.9 (+2.8)	68.1 (+1.6)
6. Learning and Development	59.7	62.4 (-2.7)	60.1 (-0.4)
7. Performance and Feedback	66.1	68.5 (-2.4)	66.7 (-0.6)
8. Recognition	54.5	54.1 (+0.4)	53.1 (+1.4)
9. Final Thoughts	68.7	68.2 (+0.5)	70.5 (-1.8)
10. The Survey - Your Views	40.6	39.3 (+1.3)	42.8 (-2.2)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN AK METRO CRIME & OPS SUPPORT

Section	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2011	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	83.8	85.6 (-1.8)	85.3 (-1.5)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	79.4	76.6 (+2.8)	78.6 (+0.8)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	79.2	78.8 (+0.4)	76.1 (+3.1)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	78.1	75.7 (+2.4)	75.6 (+2.5)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	77.3	79.1 (-1.8)	78.3 (-1.0)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	77.2	74.8 (+2.4)	77.0 (+0.2)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	76.3	78.6 (-2.3)	77.5 (-1.2)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	76.1	77.1 (-1.0)	75.5 (+0.6)
3.5: I feel part of an effective work group	76.1	75.9 (+0.2)	74.3 (+1.8)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	74.8	73.9 (+0.9)	76.3 (-1.5)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN AK METRO CRIME & OPS SUPPORT

Section	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2011	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	40.7	40.2 (+0.5)	44.8 (-4.1)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	40.8	38.6 (+2.2)	40.8 (+0.0)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	46.4	39.5 (+6.9)	45.3 (+1.1)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	49.4	48.2 (+1.2)	43.7 (+5.7)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	50.2	45.3 (+4.9)	50.8 (-0.6)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	52.0	50.4 (+1.6)	51.9 (+0.1)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	52.9	51.8 (+1.1)	54.1 (-1.2)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	53.2	51.9 (+1.3)	51.9 (+1.3)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	54.4	54.6 (-0.2)	52.9 (+1.5)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	55.0	59.5 (-4.5)	56.5 (-1.5)

SCORES ACROSS AK METRO CRIME & OPS SUPPORT

Section	Metro Crime	Metro Operations	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support
Performance Index	65.3	60.2	64.4
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	60.8	55.3	59.9
2. My Supervisor	71.3	58.1	69.0
3. My Work Group	75.1	72.9	74.7
4. My Job	65.7	64.3	65.4
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	70.1	67.4	69.7
6. Learning and Development	59.9	59.0	59.7
7. Performance and Feedback	67.0	61.5	66.1
8. Recognition	56.6	44.4	54.5
9. Final Thoughts	69.2	66.4	68.7
10. The Survey - Your Views	42.4	32.4	40.6

Weighted Mean Scores (%)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the Service Centre 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.

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN AK METRO CRIME & OPS SUPPORT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2011	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
68.7	68.2 (+0.5)	70.5 (-1.8)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2011	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	15.5	17.4 (-1.9)	21.3 (-5.8)
Ambivalent	67.1	66.1 (+1.0)	63.2 (+3.9)
Disengaged	17.4	16.5 (+0.9)	15.5 (+1.9)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN AK METRO CRIME & OPS SUPPORT?

Question	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	71.4	75.9 (-4.5)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	78.4	77.6 (+0.8)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	67.1	64.7 (+2.4)
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)	67.6	62.4 (+5.2)
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	59.9	57.8 (+2.1)

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?

	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	88.8	82.1 (+6.7)
Yes	2.8	4.6 (-1.8)
No	8.4	13.3 (-4.9)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN AK METRO CRIME & OPS SUPPORT?

	Rank from 2010	Key Driver Questions	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2011	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	69.6	65.7 (+3.9)	68.3 (+1.3)
	NA	1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	46.4	39.5 (+6.9)	45.3 (+1.1)
	NA	6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	55.9	59.4 (-3.5)	57.9 (-2.0)
	2	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	57.4	61.0 (-3.6)	57.8 (-0.4)
	8	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	59.8	63.3 (-3.5)	61.1 (-1.3)

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 Service Centre. 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 2010 is shown in the column headed "Rank from 2010".

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 Service Centre'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	1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police 6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	
Team level			6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	
Individual level				

PRIORITY AREAS – KEY DRIVER SCORES ACROSS KEY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

Reading across the table, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the Service Centre 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	Metro Crime	Metro Operations	Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support	NZ Police (Total Org)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	70.7	64.2	69.6	68.3
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	48.7	35.1	46.4	45.3
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	55.4	58.1	55.9	57.9
6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	59.1	49.3	57.4	57.8
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	60.0	58.8	59.8	61.1

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – AK METRO CRIME & OPS SUPPORT

The following summary provides insight into how employees perceive the Service Centre as a place to work and how it fares to the rest of NZ Police. Engagement levels within the Service Centre 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 Service Centre that would likely provide it with the greatest improvement leverage when attempting to make the Service Centre a truly great – and engaging – place to work.

Response Rate

Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support have maintained their response rate since 2010, with 73% responding to the 2011 staff survey. This is a good response rate, which ensures that the results presented in this report provide an accurate reflection of employee attitudes and opinions towards the Service Centre.

How Employees Perceive Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support as a Place to Work

In 2011, Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support obtained a Performance Index score (average score across all survey questions) of 64.4%, which is very close to that of NZ Police overall (i.e., 64.2%). This suggests that Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support staff have a similar perception of their workplace as staff within NZ Police as a whole. Most section scores are likewise statistically similar to that for NZ Police overall.

The only significant difference between Ak Metro Crime & Ops and NZ Police overall came from the 'My Supervisor' section, with Ak Metro Crime & Ops scoring significantly *below* NZ Police overall. When looking at the individual questions within the 'My Supervisor' section, the greatest negative differences between Ak Metro Crime & Ops and NZ Police overall were observed on questions related to the perceived level of encouragement and support provided by supervisors (i.e. questions 2.2 and 2.5).

Compared to 2010, the only significant change in employee opinion comes from the 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' section, with Ak Metro Crime & Ops scoring significantly higher in 2011. An examination of the individual question scores shows that the greatest improvements since 2010 have come from questions related to being informed about activities within NZ Police and the level of interest NZ Police have in staff opinions.

It is very positive to see that the question asking about intention to stay is the highest rated question in the survey. Additionally, half of the ten highest rated questions have come from the 'My Work Group' section, which suggests that team dynamics are strong within Ak Metro Crime & Ops. There is little difference in the scores obtained on the highest rated questions in 2011, when compared against NZ Police overall and Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support's 2010 survey results. The only significant difference was seen on the question about a sense of personal achievement from one's job (i.e., question 4.3), where Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support scored significantly higher than NZ Police overall.

For the lowest rated questions, Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support have scored significantly higher than NZ Police overall on the question about merit-based appointments, but scored significantly lower than NZ Police overall for the question related to post-survey action. Compared to 2010, Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support have improved significantly on questions relating to the perceived degree of interest that NZ Police

have in employee opinions, and pay. However, Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support scored significantly lower in 2011 on the question the management of poor performance within work groups.

Comparing sub-units, Metro Operations have typically given ratings that are less positive than those of Metro Crime. It is worth noting that the scores obtained on the following sections are particularly dissimilar: 'The Survey – Your Views' and 'Recognition'.

Respect & Integrity within Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support

Although the proportion of Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support staff agreeing to statements within this section is relatively similar to that of NZ Police overall, there are two particular questions where the differences are more substantial. It is positive to see that a larger proportion of staff within Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support are confident about being able to seek help from others regarding inappropriate conduct, compared to NZ Police as a whole. In contrast, a lower proportion of Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support staff have agreed to the statement about the level of respect for employee diversity within work groups, which suggests that more attention or investigation is warranted in this area.

With regard to the question about the management of inappropriate workplace conduct, it is positive to see that a large proportion of staff have not witnessed or experienced this. However, it is concerning that of the Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support staff who have witnessed or experienced inappropriate workplace conduct, a lower proportion have indicated that they do not believe it has been dealt with effectively, compared to NZ Police overall.

Employee Engagement within Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support

Employee engagement levels within Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support are similar to that of NZ Police overall, and have not changed significantly since 2010.

When looking at the engagement profiles, there is a lower proportion of engaged staff and a higher proportion of ambivalent staff in Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support, compared to NZ Police as a whole. Relative to 2010, Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support have similar proportions of engaged, ambivalent and disengaged staff in 2011.

Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies what engages the Service Centre's employees the most – information which serves as a means for increasing current engagement levels.

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

It is important to recognise that not all low scoring areas in a survey are necessarily engaging to employees. This report includes the results of a key driver analysis that highlight what things assessed in the survey actually have an impact on the engagement levels of staff in Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support.

It is positive to see that all of the identified key drivers are performing on par with NZ Police as a whole this year. The top key driver identified in 2010 ('NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work') has retained its position in 2011 and it is encouraging to see that there has been a significant improvement in its score since 2010. There has also been a significant improvement in the score of the second key driver ('NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff'), despite it being one of the lowest rated questions in the 2011 survey. It is worth noting that three out of the five identified key drivers relate to employee development and it is concerning that these scores have significantly declined since 2010. Given their strong impact on engagement levels, it will be worthwhile encouraging greater employee development by increasing the number of development opportunities and ensuring that everyone can easily access these.

Employee Comments

When asked about what makes NZ Police a great place to work, most staff indicated that it was the people around them and the sense of camaraderie that made NZ Police a great workplace. Other common themes included the meaningful nature of police work, the diversity of work tasks and the flexibility available to achieve a healthy work-life balance.

When asked to identify what needs to change to make NZ Police a great workplace, most of the comments related to the leaders at NZ Police. More specifically, staff sought more support from their leaders, expressed concerns about the ability of their leaders or suggested that some leaders were out of touch with their staff. Other issues that were raised include the lack of resources, inadequate pay, limited communication and consultation, due credit or recognition not being given to staff, the need for improved performance management, staff recruitment based on lowered standards, limited development opportunities and unequal staff treatment.

Please note that this is a cursory analysis and it is recommended that you read the comments in detail.

Summary

As in 2010, Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support have generally achieved similar scores to NZ Police overall this year. This is a positive sign, given that staff perceptions within NZ Police as a whole have generally improved in 2011. The largest gap between Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support and NZ Police overall came from the 'My Supervisor' section, where Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support scored significantly below NZ Police overall (-3.3%). It is also encouraging to see that since 2010, Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support have scored significantly higher in the 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' section.

'NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work' is still the top key driver of employee engagement within Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support this year. Thus, it is good to see that the score for this question has increased significantly since 2010. Similar to 2010, the Key Driver analysis has revealed that significant leverage points still exist for Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support in the area of staff development. Specifically, it would be beneficial direct efforts towards improving staff perceptions of development opportunities. This might involve increasing the number of development opportunities, improving staff awareness of these opportunities or ensuring that all staff can easily participate in these activities should they choose to.

Additionally, encouraging Ak Metro Crime & Ops Support staff to suggest ways of improving current procedures should have a positive impact on engagement levels. Moreover, taking staff opinions into consideration before implementing any post-survey initiatives could also serve to improve perceptions related to the second key driver: 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff'. Addressing the issues raised in the comments made by staff should further improve staff perceptions in this area.

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. Districts 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 2011 (Total Org)	NZ Police 2010 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	9503	9280
Response Rate	79.2%	77.1%

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE NZ POLICE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	NZ Police 2011	NZ Police 2010
Performance Index	64.2	63.1 (+1.1)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	59.2	57.1 (+2.1)
2. My Supervisor	72.3	71.3 (+1.0)
3. My Work Group	74.7	74.3 (+0.4)
4. My Job	62.7	61.9 (+0.8)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	68.1	66.8 (+1.3)
6. Learning and Development	60.1	60.2 (-0.1)
7. Performance and Feedback	66.7	67.6 (-0.9)
8. Recognition	53.1	51.6 (+1.5)
9. Final Thoughts	70.5	68.6 (+1.9)
10. The Survey - Your Views	42.8	40.2 (+2.6)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

ENGAGEMENT PROFILE

Engagement Group	NZ Police 2011	NZ Police 2010
Engaged	21.3	17.8 (+3.5)
Ambivalent	63.2	64.4 (-1.2)
Disengaged	15.5	17.8 (-2.3)

Proportion of Employees (%)

Workplace Survey

Action Plan Template

Item #	Focus Area (e.g. recognition communication, performance,)	Action Agreed	Progress/completion measured by?	Timeframe for agreed actions	Person Responsible	Outcomes/ Benefits Expected	Relate to existing initiatives? Yes/No	How progress will be communicated to staff

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 2011 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.