

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2012

Summary of Findings: Central District

April 2012



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



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

RESPONSE RATE

	Central District 2012	Central District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	610	571	9393
Response Rate	73.3%	72.5%	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 CENTRAL DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Central District 2012	Central District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	68.0	61.3 (+6.7)	67.7 (+0.3)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	63.6	55.9 (+7.7)	63.9 (-0.3)
2. My Supervisor	76.4	70.2 (+6.2)	75.6 (+0.8)
3. My Work Group	78.4	73.2 (+5.2)	76.7 (+1.7)
4. My Job	66.2	60.5 (+5.7)	65.7 (+0.5)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	70.9	63.5 (+7.4)	71.2 (-0.3)
6. Learning and Development	63.1	56.1 (+7.0)	62.7 (+0.4)
7. Performance and Feedback	69.9	63.7 (+6.2)	69.4 (+0.5)
8. Recognition	58.9	49.3 (+9.6)	58.0 (+0.9)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	73.4	68.4 (+5.0)	73.3 (+0.1)
10. The Survey - Your Views	49.3	38.9 (+10.4)	49.6 (-0.3)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT

Question	Central District 2012	Central District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	88.4	86.0 (+2.4)	85.8 (+2.6)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	81.8	76.4 (+5.4)	80.0 (+1.8)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	81.1	76.1 (+5.0)	79.1 (+2.0)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	80.8	74.9 (+5.9)	80.0 (+0.8)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	80.7	76.3 (+4.4)	80.0 (+0.7)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	80.7	76.8 (+3.9)	78.0 (+2.7)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	80.0	74.7 (+5.3)	79.2 (+0.8)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	79.8	74.4 (+5.4)	79.3 (+0.5)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	79.5	73.7 (+5.8)	77.5 (+2.0)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	78.5	72.5 (+6.0)	77.6 (+0.9)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT

Question	Central District 2012	Central District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	46.8	37.0 (+9.8)	47.8 (-1.0)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	50.2	40.4 (+9.8)	48.2 (+2.0)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	51.6	40.7 (+10.9)	51.5 (+0.1)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	51.7	41.2 (+10.5)	51.3 (+0.4)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	53.7	49.3 (+4.4)	53.0 (+0.7)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	55.5	46.9 (+8.6)	56.9 (-1.4)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	56.1	46.0 (+10.1)	57.4 (-1.3)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	56.3	46.7 (+9.6)	58.9 (-2.6)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	56.6	48.5 (+8.1)	59.0 (-2.4)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	58.7	47.4 (+11.3)	58.8 (-0.1)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT SINCE 2011 - POSITIVE

Question	Central District 2012	Central District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	58.7	47.4 (+11.3)	58.8 (-0.1)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	51.6	40.7 (+10.9)	51.5 (+0.1)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	51.7	41.2 (+10.5)	51.3 (+0.4)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	60.5	50.1 (+10.4)	59.7 (+0.8)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	56.1	46.0 (+10.1)	57.4 (-1.3)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	50.2	40.4 (+9.8)	48.2 (+2.0)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	46.8	37.0 (+9.8)	47.8 (-1.0)
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)	68.5	58.9 (+9.6)	68.2 (+0.3)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	56.3	46.7 (+9.6)	58.9 (-2.6)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	69.4	60.0 (+9.4)	69.3 (+0.1)

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

SCORES ACROSS THE CENTRAL DISTRICT

Section	Central District Dhq	New Plymouth Area	Palmerston North City	Palmerston North Rural Area	Ruapehu Area	Taranaki Rural Area	Traffic Services Central Dist	Wanganui Area	Central District
Performance Index	72.0	70.2	67.0	65.7	71.7	72.7	71.3	61.7	68.0
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	68.6	66.0	62.1	59.9	71.4	66.9	66.0	57.8	63.6
2. My Supervisor	75.2	78.5	76.3	74.5	77.8	83.6	80.0	70.6	76.4
3. My Work Group	77.1	82.2	79.5	74.9	79.0	83.8	82.5	72.1	78.4
4. My Job	70.9	68.7	65.1	65.1	69.3	69.2	71.9	57.5	66.2
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	78.9	72.8	68.7	70.5	72.6	74.1	75.6	62.8	70.9
6. Learning and Development	66.0	63.1	61.1	62.3	68.5	67.8	67.7	57.9	63.1
7. Performance and Feedback	72.1	71.1	70.2	67.7	71.4	75.8	70.7	65.5	69.9
8. Recognition	67.9	62.6	54.3	55.2	62.1	64.7	58.9	55.3	58.9
9. Final Thoughts	78.3	73.4	74.2	71.8	76.7	79.8	73.7	66.2	73.4
10. The Survey - Your Views	59.6	53.3	45.8	43.1	56.0	51.0	52.3	45.2	49.3

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 CENTRAL DISTRICT

Question	Central District	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	80.6	81.0 (-0.4)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	81.5	80.9 (+0.6)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	69.2	69.4 (-0.2)
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)	67.5	67.1 (+0.4)
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	60.1	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?

	Central District	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	82.8	83.4 (-0.6)
Yes	5.1	4.6 (+0.5)
No	12.1	12.0 (+0.1)

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Central District 2012	Central District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
73.4	68.4 (+5.0)	73.3 (+0.1)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Central District 2012	Central District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	27.5	19.1 (+8.4)	27.8 (-0.3)
Ambivalent	60.3	62.7 (-2.4)	59.7 (+0.6)
Disengaged	12.2	18.2 (-6.0)	12.5 (-0.3)

Proportion of Employees (%)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2011	Key Driver Questions	Central District 2012	Central District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	71.6	66.0 (+5.6)	71.1 (+0.5)
	3	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	63.1	54.7 (+8.4)	65.5 (-2.4)
	4	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	80.7	76.8 (+3.9)	78.0 (+2.7)
	NA	8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	59.7	50.6 (+9.1)	59.0 (+0.7)
	NA	1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	55.5	46.9 (+8.6)	56.9 (-1.4)
	NA	4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	77.1	74.4 (+2.7)	76.9 (+0.2)
	NA	8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	58.7	47.4 (+11.3)	58.8 (-0.1)
	5	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	73.2	66.8 (+6.4)	71.0 (+2.2)
	NA	8.1: I get recognition when I do a good job	65.1	57.8 (+7.3)	64.2 (+0.9)
	NA	8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	50.2	40.4 (+9.8)	48.2 (+2.0)

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 1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement
Team level				
Individual level	4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre 8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	8.1: I get recognition when I do a good job

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	Central District Dhq	New Plymouth Area	Palmerston North City	Palmerston North Rural Area	Ruapehu Area	Taranaki Rural Area	Traffic Services Central Dist	Wanganui Area	Central District	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	75.5	75.7	71.3	69.5	76.8	76.0	71.7	62.8	71.6	71.1
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	68.6	64.5	59.5	57.3	75.6	70.8	72.2	55.5	63.1	65.5
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	79.9	79.9	80.4	82.5	82.7	86.2	83.9	74.4	80.7	78.0
8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	65.5	63.0	55.8	56.1	63.1	66.8	65.0	53.9	59.7	59.0
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	70.6	56.4	52.7	50.9	64.9	58.3	54.9	49.1	55.5	56.9
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	78.4	77.5	77.1	76.8	78.6	80.6	81.1	71.9	77.1	76.9
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	68.6	62.1	55.0	54.1	60.7	62.8	58.9	56.7	58.7	58.8
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	77.5	74.8	71.5	72.5	76.2	79.2	75.0	66.6	73.2	71.0
8.1: I get recognition when I do a good job	69.6	70.6	59.1	62.0	64.9	75.0	67.8	61.6	65.1	64.2
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	62.3	53.0	49.4	44.4	60.1	55.2	40.0	45.8	50.2	48.2

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – CENTRAL 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

There was a good response to the 2012 staff survey from within the Central District. 610 employees responded, representing a response rate of 73.3%. This high response rate ensures the results presented in this report provide a very accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the District.

How Employees Perceive Central District as a Place to Work

In 2012, we see there has been a significant change in the way Central District staff perceive their respective workplaces. The Performance Index – representing the average score across all survey questions – has increased significantly this year to 68.0%. This is an increase of 6.7%, from a result of 61.3% in 2011. The District is now on par with the NZ Police Performance Index of 67.7%. Last year the District was lagging behind the NZ Police overall scores significantly, so this improvement is to be celebrated.

Whereas in 2011 the Central District had lower results in each of the ten sections within the survey, compared to the rest of the organisation, this year all section results are now on par with NZ Police overall scores.

Every section score has improved significantly since 2011. We see section score increases between 5.0% and 10.4% for the Central District. The Sections with the greatest increases are 'The Survey – Your Views' (+10.4% to 49.3%), and 'Recognition' (+9.6% to 58.9%). The sections with the highest results are 'My Workgroup' with a score of 78.4% (+5.2%), and 'My Supervisor' with a score of 76.4% (+6.2%).

The highest rated questions show the strong team dynamic that exists in the District with four of the ten questions coming from the 'My Work Group' section, and three coming from the 'My Supervisor' section. Staff are also particularly positive about their intent to continue working for NZ Police longer term and their overall commitment to NZ Police. As it was last year, 'I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months' is the Central District's highest rated question, with a score of 88.4%.

When examining the District's lowest rated questions we note that the District is on par with NZ Police overall in most of these questions, however is significantly below the NZ Police overall score regarding satisfaction with the training provided to do their job and having the tools and resources needed to do their job. It is important to note that while the scores for the lowest questions are indeed low, they have all significantly improved since 2011. Four of the ten lowest scoring questions have had increases greater than 10%, and a further five have had increases greater than 8%.

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 how engaged staff members are in the workplace.

Three of the District's lowest rated questions were found to have a strong impact upon employee engagement levels – 'NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff', 'NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement', and 'People here are appointed to positions based on merit'. If an intervention or improvement strategy is going to be based solely around the District's lowest rated questions, strong consideration should be afforded to these three issues – they have been shown statistically to have a strong and predictable connection to employee attitudes and behaviour (i.e., 'employee engagement').

Respect and Integrity within the Central District

Central District's results for the 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items are mostly on par with the NZ Police overall, with the exception of 'I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately', which at 60.1%, is significantly lower than the NZ Police average of 63.5%.

Employee Engagement within Central District

Employee engagement levels within the District are on par with those of NZ Police as a whole. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies what engages the 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

When reviewing the Central District's key driver questions in 2012 compared to 2011, we see that these questions have changed considerably since last year, with six of these questions being new this year. There is a definite theme emerging with the questions being predominantly focused on the individual and what they personally get from being a part of NZ Police. Being valued, recognised, cared for are particularly important to employees within the Central District, as is a sense of personal achievement and knowing how what they do contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police.

There is one key driver question in which the Central District scores significantly lower than NZ Police overall, 'I feel a sense of belonging to my District or Service Centre'. The District's score for this question is 63.1% compared to 65.5%.

The District should reinforce the two key drivers in which it is performing better than the NZ Police average, 'My job gives me a sense of personal achievement' (80.7%), and 'The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills' (73.2%). These both have a positive impact on engagement and the District is already on the right track with its current activities.

When we examine the District's Area scores across the Key Drivers we see that the Wanganui Area continues to be significantly less positive in 2012, scoring significantly lower in seven of the ten areas. Unlike 2011, when the Ruapehu Area dominated the high scores in the key driver questions, this year we see pockets of high scores across several areas, including Taranaki, Central District DHQ, Traffic Services CD, along with Ruapeha. A standout is Taranaki's result in the question 'My job gives me a sense of personal achievement' which has a score of 86.2%, compared to 74.4% for Wanganui, and 80.7% for the Central District overall.

Employee Comments

As with previous years, the Central District had many high scoring questions from the 'My Work Group' section of the survey. Many comments this year reflect these high scores, with specific reference made to the people that they work with. Comments about the sense of camaraderie, work mates and team work featured prominently. People like the variety of their work, the diversity of experiences, and a number make mention of job security being of importance to them. Comments about catching criminals and helping the victims of crime feature frequently in the comments, with many employees believing their ability to make a difference in their community and impact people's lives are reasons why NZ Police is a great place to work. The comments suggest that many people take real pride in the work that they do for NZ Police.

Among the things that people felt NZ Police could do better included improved resourcing, in particular more frontline staffing, and that they are effectively trained to do their job. Comments about senior leadership appear frequently, and suggest a perception among staff that senior leaders don't understand and appreciate the challenges of those who are out on the frontline policing every day. There are comments that refer to poor performance not being dealt with effectively, and many employees want to see outstanding performance being better recognised, and those who are not performing being held accountable. Other common comments seek a fair, transparent appointment process which is based on merit. Comments about pay, in particular the need for it to stay in line with inflation, also appear frequently.

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

Summary

The Central District have had considerable improvements in results this year, and while last year the District was significantly behind the NZ Police overall, it is now on par. It is important to note that this increase comes on top of the fact that NZ Police overall have increased scores in 2012, making that shift even more significant.

Looking at engagement, the proportion of staff who are considered 'engaged' has risen from 19.1% in 2011 to 27.5% in 2012 (+8.4%), and those who are 'disengaged' have declined from 18.2% in 2011 to 12.2% (-6.0%). Close to two-thirds of District staff can be considered Ambivalent (neither fully engaged but not disengaged either). The large size of this group represents a significant opportunity to shift people

into the Engaged category. Key Driver analysis suggests that a significant leverage point exists for the District in developing the areas of recognition, and creating a sense of belonging. To achieve this you can, by way of example:

- Explore with staff how they are currently recognised for their efforts, and how – with the resources available – they would like to be valued. While pay featured in the comments section, this didn't come through in the key drivers, so what other non-monetary, yet meaningful ways are there to recognise employees?
- Challenge leaders to following up on these finding and provide further recognition of the contributions of their staff
- Implement initiatives that show you care for the well-being of your staff. Some of these are not so easy (e.g., resourcing), but listening to staff members, demonstrating that the District values its employees' contributions (no matter how small the gesture), and developing a strong sense of community will aid this end goal
- Place greater emphasis on managing performance, in particular responding to poor performance

Despite significant improvement to overall results in 2012, District staff felt that little positive impact occurred after the last survey. Exploring why this is may give valuable insights to help you plan next steps. While the opportunity exists to make a concerted effort this year to improve perceptions of the value of the survey, it is also useful to link efforts and initiatives back to the survey, and tell staff why changes are bring made. Involve staff in action planning on the survey results, ensure actions are followed through on, and clearly communicate outcomes and changes that have occurred as a result.

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.