

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2013

Summary of Findings Canterbury District



April 2013

Kenexa[®]
an IBM Company

RESPONSE RATE

	Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	689	759	8863
Response Rate	66.6%	70.7%	74.8%

Note: For tables in this report where comparisons are made between the District's 2013 and 2012 scores, as well as between the District and NZ Police (Total Org), **green font** indicates that the District's score is statistically higher than the comparison point, while **red font** indicates the score is statistically lower. The scores in the tables, excluding the response rate, are **level of agreement** (percent favourable) scores (unless otherwise stated). See the glossary on the last page of this report for definitions of all terms used.

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	60.8	69.7 (-8.9)	63.6 (-2.8)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	48.2	64.2 (-16.0)	54.9 (-6.7)
2. Quality and Excellence	36.4	NA	48.1 (-11.7)
3. My Supervisor	79.9	83.7 (-3.8)	76.6 (+3.3)
4. My Work Group	81.6	86.7 (-5.1)	79.9 (+1.7)
5. My Job	59.6	66.0 (-6.4)	62.4 (-2.8)
6. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	75.0	77.5 (-2.5)	73.4 (+1.6)
7. Learning and Development	55.1	64.4 (-9.3)	58.9 (-3.8)
8. Performance and Feedback	71.6	75.0 (-3.4)	69.7 (+1.9)
9. Recognition	42.7	53.4 (-10.7)	48.1 (-5.4)
10. Final Thoughts (Engagement Index)	65.8	77.7 (-11.9)	71.1 (-5.3)
11. The Survey - Your Views (Change Index)	18.7	36.1 (-17.4)	28.9 (-10.2)

SCORES ACROSS THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT

Section	Canterbury DHQ Area	Central Area Canterbury	Mid/South Area Canterbury	Northern Area Canterbury	Southern Area Canterbury	Canterbury District
Performance Index	58.3	60.8	62.7	58.2	57.3	59.1
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	48.3	52.7	52.1	44.2	43.1	48.2
2. Quality and Excellence	33.0	38.6	45.8	34.5	40.8	36.4
3. My Supervisor	80.4	81.4	81.0	78.7	76.1	79.9
4. My Work Group	80.8	81.7	86.1	85.6	87.7	83.0
5. My Job	60.0	59.0	62.7	58.5	56.5	59.6
6. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	72.8	75.3	82.1	76.3	74.5	75.0
7. Learning and Development	53.4	55.5	58.1	55.5	56.0	54.9
8. Performance and Feedback	68.8	72.0	73.8	77.1	72.6	71.6
9. Recognition	42.8	45.7	48.1	37.2	40.6	42.7
10. Final Thoughts	64.4	68.4	70.0	67.4	60.8	65.8
11. The Survey - Your Views	22.0	30.1	16.4	17.4	16.3	21.1

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.

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
65.8	77.7 (-11.9)	71.1 (-5.3)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Engaged	19.0	30.2 (-11.2)	24.5 (-5.5)
Ambivalent	61.1	59.7 (+1.4)	59.9 (+1.2)
Disengaged	19.9	10.1 (+9.8)	15.6 (+4.3)
Engagement Ratio	1:1	3:1	1.6:1

Proportion of Employees (%)

Engagement Across the District

Engagement Group	Canterbury DHQ Area	Central Area Canterbury	Mid/South Area Canterbury	Northern Area Canterbury	Southern Area Canterbury	Canterbury District - Baseline
Engaged	18.2	22.3	21.4	16.4	19.7	19.0
Ambivalent	61.7	57.5	63.1	65.4	53.5	61.1
Disengaged	20.1	20.2	15.5	18.2	26.8	19.9
Engagement Index	64.4	68.4	70.0	67.4	60.8	65.8
Engagement Ratio	0.9:1	1.1:1	1.4:1	0.9:1	0.7:1	1:1

PERFORMANCE ENABLEMENT WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT?

Performance Enablement Index (average of all eight enablement questions)

Canterbury District 2013	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
45.2	54.3 (-9.1)

Enablement Questions

Concept	Question	Canterbury District 2013	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Quality emphasis	Day to day decisions demonstrate the quality of services are top priorities for NZ Police	41.3	52.9 (-11.6)
Involvement	NZ Police encourages ideas and suggestions from employees on how to improve the way things are done	31.4	42.5 (-11.1)
	I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect my work	45.6	52.5 (-6.9)
Resource access	I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	36.3	52.6 (-16.3)
	NZ Police's systems and processes enable me to do my job well	33.9	42.8 (-8.9)
Training	NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	44.4	49.7 (-5.3)
Collaboration	People I work with cooperate to get the job done	90.2	87.1 (+3.1)
Customer Service	NZ Police delivers on the promises it makes to its customers	38.9	54.2 (-15.3)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT?

	Key Driver Questions	Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	44.8	62.9 (-18.1)	59.6 (-14.8)
	9.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	40.9	53.6 (-12.7)	48.0 (-7.1)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	61.2	77.3 (-16.1)	66.8 (-5.6)
	5.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.3	84.1 (-5.8)	79.7 (-1.4)
	1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	34.5	57.7 (-23.2)	40.1 (-5.6)
	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	50.1	69.1 (-19.0)	57.9 (-7.8)
	1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	25.3	42.7 (-17.4)	34.8 (-9.5)
	2.4: NZ Police encourages ideas and suggestions from employees on how to improve the way things are done	31.4	NA	42.5 (-11.1)
	9.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	30.4	39.5 (-9.1)	32.9 (-2.5)
	1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	44.9	57.9 (-13.0)	53.5 (-8.6)

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.

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	Canterbury DHQ Area	Central Area Canterbury	Mid/South Area Canterbury	Northern Area Canterbury	Southern Area Canterbury	Canterbury District
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	43.1	55.3	52.4	39.4	38.0	44.8
9.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	39.5	46.8	50.0	33.0	40.8	40.9
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	59.9	66.0	66.7	60.0	56.3	61.2
5.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	77.2	77.7	84.5	78.2	77.5	78.3
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	38.0	36.2	36.9	29.4	21.1	34.5
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	50.2	57.4	57.1	42.2	44.3	50.1
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	25.5	29.8	29.8	20.9	20.0	25.3
2.4: NZ Police encourages ideas and suggestions from employees on how to improve the way things are done	31.0	37.2	35.7	22.7	34.3	31.4
9.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	30.0	29.8	39.3	30.0	22.9	30.4
1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	46.2	47.9	44.0	45.5	35.2	44.9

TAKING ACTION WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT?

Question	Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
11.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	23.6	41.2 (-17.6)	34.9 (-11.3)
11.2: Changes in response to the 2012 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my work group	13.8	30.9 (-17.1)	22.9 (-9.1)
11.3: My supervisor has actively involved our work group in making changes as a result of the last survey	25.9	NA	34.0 (-8.1)

Taking Action within the District

Area	Change Index	Canterbury District
Canterbury DHQ Area	22.0	21.1 (+0.9)
Central Area Canterbury	30.1	21.1 (+9.0)
Mid/South Area Canterbury	16.4	21.1 (-4.7)
Northern Area Canterbury	17.4	21.1 (-3.7)
Southern Area Canterbury	16.3	21.1 (-4.8)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT SINCE 2012 - POSITIVE

Question	Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
5.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	62.4	53.0 (+9.4)	63.5 (-1.1)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT SINCE 2012 - NEGATIVE

Question	Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	38.3	61.9 (-23.6)	43.2 (-4.9)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	34.5	57.7 (-23.2)	40.1 (-5.6)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	45.9	67.5 (-21.6)	54.2 (-8.3)
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	50.1	69.1 (-19.0)	57.9 (-7.8)
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	44.8	62.9 (-18.1)	59.6 (-14.8)
11.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	23.6	41.2 (-17.6)	34.9 (-11.3)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	25.3	42.7 (-17.4)	34.8 (-9.5)
11.2: Changes in response to the 2012 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my work group	13.8	30.9 (-17.1)	22.9 (-9.1)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	61.2	77.3 (-16.1)	66.8 (-5.6)
10.2: Overall, I would recommend NZ Police as a great place to work	61.2	76.4 (-15.2)	65.5 (-4.3)

BIGGEST POSITIVE DIFFERENCES TO NZ POLICE TOP 25%

Question	Canterbury District 2013	NZ Police Top 25%
4.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	89.4	88.3 (+1.1)
3.1: My supervisor communicates the goals and objectives of our work group effectively	78.2	77.4 (+0.8)
3.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	85.3	84.5 (+0.8)
4.1: People I work with cooperate to get the job done	90.2	89.8 (+0.4)
3.6: I get regular feedback on my performance from my supervisor (formal/informal)	70.7	70.5 (+0.2)

BIGGEST NEGATIVE DIFFERENCES TO NZ POLICE TOP 25%

Question	Canterbury District 2013	NZ Police Top 25%
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	44.8	74.1 (-29.3)
5.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	36.3	63.4 (-27.1)
2.1: NZ Police delivers on the promises it makes to its customers	38.9	65.1 (-26.2)
11.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	23.6	49.4 (-25.8)
2.2: Day-to-day decisions demonstrate that quality of services is a top priority for NZ Police	41.3	65.4 (-24.1)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	25.3	49.4 (-24.1)
10.6: NZ Police inspires me to do the best I can in my job every day	49.4	73.3 (-23.9)
1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	44.9	68.2 (-23.3)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	45.9	68.7 (-22.8)
10.4: I feel inspired to go the extra mile to help NZ Police succeed	61.1	82.8 (-21.7)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT

Question	Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
6.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	84.4	87.0 (-2.6)	82.9 (+1.5)
6.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	78.9	82.8 (-3.9)	81.4 (-2.5)
6.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	72.8	74.7 (-1.9)	70.2 (+2.6)
6.4: 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)	71.4	71.8 (-0.4)	68.4 (+3.0)
6.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	67.5	71.1 (-3.6)	64.2 (+3.3)

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?

	Canterbury District 2013	Canterbury District 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Not Applicable	87.1	85.4 (+1.7)	84.0 (+3.1)
Yes	2.6	5.0 (-2.4)	3.9 (-1.3)
No	10.3	9.6 (+0.7)	12.1 (-1.8)

Gender Differences Within the District

Question	Canterbury District - Female	Canterbury District - Male
6.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	84.4	84.4
6.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	78.9	78.9
6.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	70.2	73.7
6.4: 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)	69.6	72.0
6.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	65.8	68.0
Respect & Integrity in the Workplace (Overall Section Score)	73.8	75.4

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?

	Canterbury District - Female	Canterbury District - Male
Not Applicable	84.6	87.9
Yes	1.9	2.8
No	13.6	9.3

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – CANTERBURY DISTRICT

The following summary provides insight into how employees perceive the Canterbury 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 Canterbury District a truly great – and engaging – place to work.

Response Rate

Survey participation levels in the Canterbury District are slightly lower than that seen in 2012. With a total of 689 people responding, the participation rate of 66.6% is also lower than the NZ Police overall participation rate of 74.8%. However, with 2 out of every 3 invited participants in the District responding, the results presented in this report provide an accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the Canterbury District.

How Employees Perceive the Canterbury District as a Place to Work

People in the Canterbury District are less positive about their place of work, than they were one year ago. The average score across all survey items (the Performance Index score) has fallen significantly by 8.9 points to 60.8%. This indicates that on average only 6 out of every 10 respondents in the District agree, or strongly agree with the survey questions. In all a total of 7 survey section scores have fallen significantly, including Employee Engagement. Negative changes range from -5.1 points for 'My Work Group', through to -16.0 points for 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation'. 'My Supervisor', 'Respect & Integrity in the Workplace' and 'Performance and Feedback' are the only survey sections that did not decrease.

An examination of the largest differences since 2012 emphasises the downward shift seen in section scores. Of the 10 questions with the largest negative differences, 7 questions alone come from 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' survey section. Not only have the largest differences dropped in excess of double digit points (ranging from -15.2 to -23.6 points), but in most cases the proportion of employees who agree to these questions is less than half of respondents (such as for communication being open and honest, staff feeling informed about NZ Police and its activities, that NZ Police care for the well-being of staff, that NZ Police is interested in employee views, or even that staff are working for an effective organisation). Far less staff agree that the outcomes of the survey have had or will have a positive impact on the workplace, and significantly fewer people in the Canterbury District recommend NZ Police as a great place to work. Satisfaction with the physical work environment is the only question to improve on 2012.

Compared to the NZ Police overall survey results, the Performance Index score for the Canterbury District is similar to that of NZ Police. However, in examining survey sections scores we see the Canterbury District performing significantly behind the NZ Police average for 'Vision and Purpose + Communication' (-6.7), 'Quality and Excellence' (-11.7), 'Recognition' (-5.4), 'Employee Engagement' (-5.3) and 'The Survey – Your Views' (-10.2).

Compared to the Top 25% of NZ Police, there are a number of questions where the Canterbury District scores similarly to this high performing internal benchmark. The questions that score similar to that of the Top 25% of NZ Police are in regard to 'My Supervisor' (and their ability to communicate goals and objectives of the work group effectively, treat staff with respect, and give regular feedback of staff performance), and 'My Work Group' (being able to rely on support of others, and cooperating to get the job done). In regards to questions with the 10 largest negative differences to the Top 25% of NZ Police, we see the Canterbury District score lower in excess of 20.0 points on each question. Once again, almost half these questions come from the section 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation', making this a key area for improvement within the Canterbury District.

When looking across the Canterbury District we see the Mid/South Area Canterbury scoring consistently higher than other areas across most survey sections. Meanwhile Southern Area Canterbury and Canterbury DHQ Area score lowest across many survey sections.

Respect and Integrity within the Canterbury District

Generally speaking the proportion of staff that hold a favourable view on 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey questions is similar to 2012, with no significant change seen in any of the 5 respect and integrity questions. The Canterbury District also scores on par with the rest of NZ Police on these questions.

That said, almost one third of Canterbury District respondents do not feel confident that any concerns they may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination, or other inappropriate conduct would be

dealt with appropriately. Additionally, of the 12.9% of respondents who had either witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace in the last 12 months, four-fifths of these people were not able to agree that the incident had been dealt with effectively (an increase from 2012 when two-thirds felt this way). Therefore, there is room for the District to move further towards a safe working environment.

An analysis of the 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' questions by Gender does not pick up any major concerns between responses from male and female respondents, with responses across all respect and integrity questions similar for the two groups.

Employee Engagement within Canterbury District

Employee Engagement levels in the Canterbury District have fallen significantly since 2012. The Engagement Index score of 65.8% shows that just under two-thirds of Canterbury District respondents agree or strongly agree (on average) to the 6 survey questions used to measure engagement. This is down from just over three-quarters of respondents in 2012. The Canterbury District result is also significantly lower than the NZ Police overall score of 71.1% for engagement.

The proportion of 'engaged' staff has fallen by over one-third, from 30.2% in 2012, to 19.0% in 2013. Conversely, the proportion of staff that are deemed to be 'disengaged' has almost doubled from 10.1% in 2012, to 19.9% to 2013. As a result, the proportion of 'engaged to disengaged' staff is now 1:1, which is a dramatic fall from the ratio of 3 engaged staff for every 1 disengaged staff member. This result is also below the overall NZ Police ratio of 1.6:1.

Looking across the Canterbury District, Mid/South Area Canterbury is the only area with greater ratio of 'engaged to disengaged' staff (1.4:1). With a 1:1 ratio, Central Area Canterbury is on par with the overall Canterbury District. Of concern are all remaining areas, with lower proportions of 'engaged' staff than 'disengaged' staff – Canterbury DHQ Area (0.9:1), Northern Area Canterbury (0.9:1), and Southern Area Canterbury (0.7:1). In short, there are more 'negative voices' in these areas than there are 'positive voices'.

Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies what engages the Canterbury District'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

Key driver analysis was performed on the Canterbury District's results, and this process has highlighted which questions in the survey actually have the strongest relationship with employee engagement scores. They are the most influential to drive improvement in engagement levels.

In total, 8 out of the 10 key driver items that have been identified for the Canterbury District are performing significantly lower than NZ Police overall, with the bulk of these low performing key drivers being inter-related and coming from the survey section 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation'. The majority of these key drivers are also among those showing the biggest decrease since 2012 - 'working for an effective organisation', 'an enjoyable place to work', 'care for well-being of staff', 'a sense of belonging', 'an interest in staff views and opinions', and 'a sense of common purpose', showing an immediate need for the Canterbury District to intervene and focus on re-connecting people, involving them and re-building a sense of 'place' for staff.

An examination of the key driver questions within the Canterbury District we see Central Area Canterbury and Mid/South Area Canterbury generally perform better than other areas. That said, the key driver question scores for these two areas are only just on par with the NZ Police overall result. Generally speaking Northern Area Canterbury and Southern Area Canterbury have the lowest scores in the Canterbury District for the key driver questions, and thus require attention in addressing the results that are in many instances significantly below both the NZ Police and Canterbury District overall results.

Performance Enablement within the Canterbury District

'Performance Enablement' is about ensuring that staff have the basic resources, training and support they need to do their jobs. Additionally, it considers an emphasis on delivering a quality, customer-focused service to support a high performing workplace. A workforce that is both highly enabled (can do the job) and engaged (want to do the job) will outperform those that lack enablement or engagement.

With a Performance Enablement Index score of 45.2% the Canterbury District scores significantly lower than the NZ Police overall result of 54.3%. Of the 8 questions used to measure Enablement, the Canterbury District scores significantly below NZ Police on all 7 questions that measure Quality Emphasis,

Involvement, Resource access, Training and Customer Service. The remaining enablement measure of Collaboration scores the same as NZ Police overall.

Taking Action within the Canterbury District

An examination of the 'Taking Action' items highlights that the results of the NZ Police survey are not being fully utilised to make improvements in the Canterbury District. Far fewer people than last year feel action will be taken based on this year's survey result, with less than a quarter of respondents agreeing. Only a quarter of respondents can agree that their supervisor involved their work group in making changes as a result of last year's survey, while only 13.8% agreed that changes had a positive impact on the work group.

Employee Comments

Overwhelmingly, comments regarding things that people really like about working at NZ Police refer to the people that they work with and the camaraderie that exists in NZ Police. Staff like that they are working with like-minded people, who are all there to contribute and work together for the common good of the community. Variety of work, flexibility in work, and job security are also recurring themes within the comments.

Of the things that need to change, there is a wide array of subjects that are made mention of. One of the more frequent themes centres round resourcing in general, along with comments specific to financial constraints for funding, staffing numbers, and tools such as cars and computer. Other topics mentioned include workloads, excessive paperwork, better training and the need for greater pay. Management and communication in general are also often mentioned.

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

Summary

At the overall level the results for the Canterbury District have decreased significantly since 2012, with the overall Performance Index and a majority of the survey sections including Employee Engagement scoring significantly lower than in 2012. Significant decreases occur across the survey, with a great number of questions from 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' scoring much lower than a year ago, and significantly behind the NZ Police overall result. Most telling is that across the whole survey, only one question in total has seen a significant improvement from last year. The survey results this year suggest that staff feel less informed, involved and connected to the wider NZ Police, potentially leading to a reduced sense that NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work in, and an effective organisation to work for.

As mentioned, levels of engagement have decreased markedly. The proportion of 'engaged' staff has dropped by around one-third to 19.0%, while the proportion of 'disengaged' staff has almost doubled to 19.9%. For every one 'engaged' person in the Canterbury District, there is now one 'disengaged' person. Not surprisingly the key driver analysis shows that the questions that have the greatest influence on driving engagement, are ones that the Canterbury District is for the most part scoring poorly on compared to NZ Police overall. These same questions also decreased substantially since 2012.

Within the District, the Mid/South Area Canterbury generally performs stronger over most survey sections. That said the Mid/South Area Canterbury results are in many instance only on par with NZ Police overall. Of concern are Canterbury DHQ Area, Northern Area Canterbury, Central Area Canterbury and Southern Area Canterbury, which at best have an 'engaged to disengaged' ratio of 1:1, and at worst have a ratio of 0.7:1. While Mid/South Area Canterbury scores better than other areas on key driver questions, it is fair to say that all areas in the District have significant opportunity for improvement in driving engagement, particularly with a focus on improving scores within the 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' section.

In addressing the survey results, and in preparation for taking action as a direct result of the survey, it is highly recommended that the Canterbury District has an understanding of what has, and has not, happened in the past regarding 'taking action'. Currently, less than one-quarter of staff feel confident that actions will be taken based on the current survey, which is a significant drop from 41.2% of staff in 2012. In addition, very few respondents could agree that changes in response to the 2012 survey had made a positive difference.

Research and experience has shown time and time again the linkage between well implemented post survey actions and initiatives, and improvements in engagement levels in subsequent employee surveys. The Canterbury District has a significant opportunity to lift engagement levels by demonstrating that the results are used for the purpose intended, and that peoples' feedback is taken seriously and that NZ Police is taking the steps required to make it a great place to work. A good starting point for the Canterbury

District is to focus on the identified key drivers, particularly those in regard to 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation', where a great number of gains may be made through one or two disciplined and well-targeted initiatives.

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 difference 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 2013	NZ Police 2012
Number of Responses	8863	9393
Response Rate	74.8%	77.1%

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE NZ POLICE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	NZ Police 2013	NZ Police 2012
Performance Index	63.6	64.7 (-1.1)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	54.9	58.2 (-3.3)
2. Quality and Excellence	48.1	NA
3. My Supervisor	76.6	76.4 (+0.2)
4. My Work Group	79.9	79.2 (+0.7)
5. My Job	62.4	63.3 (-0.9)
6. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	73.4	72.4 (+1.0)
7. Learning and Development	58.9	59.6 (-0.7)
8. Performance and Feedback	69.7	68.9 (+0.8)
9. Recognition	48.1	48.3 (-0.2)
10. Final Thoughts (Engagement Index)	71.1	74.4 (-3.3)
11. The Survey - Your Views (Change Index)	28.9	31.9 (-3.0)

ENGAGEMENT PROFILE

Engagement Group	NZ Police 2013	NZ Police 2012
Engaged	24.5	27.8 (-3.3)
Ambivalent	59.9	59.7 (+0.2)
Disengaged	15.6	12.5 (+3.1)
Engagement Ratio	1.6:1	2.2:1

Proportion of Employees (%)

GLOSSARY

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.

Engagement Ratio: the proportion of engaged to disengaged employees

Change Index: the overall section score for 'The Survey – Your Views'

Performance enablement is the organisation's ability to harness engagement by creating an environment in which staff are enabled to do their job to the best of their ability. Enabled employees are well equipped to do their job, are adequately trained, work cooperatively with others to get the job done, and have appropriate channels to voice themselves. Quality of service is prioritised these staff, and as a result, they can be expected to display greater customer focus.

Performance enablement index: the average score across the below eight enablement questions

- Day to day decisions demonstrate that quality of services is a top priority for NZ Police
- NZ Police encourages ideas and suggestions from employees on how to improve the way things are done
- I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect my work
- I have the tools and resources I need to do my job
- NZ Police's systems and processes enable me to do my job well
- NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do
- People I work with cooperate to get the job done
- NZ Police delivers on the promises it makes to its customers

Key Driver Analysis: is a statistical technique (correlation) 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 level of agreement score was 72% on a particular question and the NZ Police average was 80%, 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. As such, when viewing results online and thinking of 'what's important here', think of those things that represent substantive differences. For a result to be considered 'statistically significant' in this report we have used the below rules of thumb, based on the size of the District or Service Centre:

- 100 people or more: 5%
- 50 to 99 people: 10%
- Less than 50 people: 15%

The Questionnaire: The 2013 New Zealand Police Workplace Survey contained 66 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.

Level of Agreement Score (Percent Favourable): The survey scores reported herein are known as 'level of agreement scores'. They range between 0% and 100% and refer to the percentage of valid responses that 'agree' to some extent with the statement. Level of agreement scoring involves a fairly simple calculation. 'Valid' responses are all responses to the question, EXCLUDING those who did not answer the question and therefore their answer by default was recorded as 'Do not know.'

For a standard 5 point 'Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly Disagree' rating scale, the level of agreement score is calculated using the following steps:

1. Add up the number of 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree' responses
2. Divide this number by the number of valid responses.

