

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: Counties/Manukau District

June 2011



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



An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Counties/Manukau District
June, 2011
© JRA

RESPONSE RATE

	District 2011	District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	1106	921	9503
Response Rate	86.6%	77.6%	79.2%

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 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 COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	District 2011	District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	67.6	65.3 (+2.3)	64.2 (+3.4)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	64.6	60.4 (+4.2)	59.2 (+5.4)
2. My Supervisor	76.2	74.4 (+1.8)	72.3 (+3.9)
3. My Work Group	77.3	76.4 (+0.9)	74.7 (+2.6)
4. My Job	64.3	61.6 (+2.7)	62.7 (+1.6)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.5	68.4 (+1.1)	68.1 (+1.4)
6. Learning and Development	65.4	64.4 (+1.0)	60.1 (+5.3)
7. Performance and Feedback	69.5	70.9 (-1.4)	66.7 (+2.8)
8. Recognition	54.3	51.9 (+2.4)	53.1 (+1.2)
9. Final Thoughts	74.6	71.5 (+3.1)	70.5 (+4.1)
10. The Survey - Your Views	48.3	43.2 (+5.1)	42.8 (+5.5)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT

Section	District 2011	District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	89.5	88.9 (+0.6)	85.3 (+4.2)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	80.6	76.7 (+3.9)	78.6 (+2.0)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	80.5	80.3 (+0.2)	77.1 (+3.4)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	80.2	80.5 (-0.3)	78.3 (+1.9)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	79.9	79.5 (+0.4)	77.5 (+2.4)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	79.6	78.3 (+1.3)	76.3 (+3.3)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	79.5	77.2 (+2.3)	76.2 (+3.3)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	78.6	79.5 (-0.9)	77.0 (+1.6)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	78.6	77.6 (+1.0)	74.7 (+3.9)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.6	76.3 (+2.3)	76.1 (+2.5)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT

Section	District 2011	District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	43.9	43.6 (+0.3)	43.7 (+0.2)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	45.9	41.6 (+4.3)	50.8 (-4.9)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	47.5	43.7 (+3.8)	40.8 (+6.7)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	49.1	42.8 (+6.3)	44.8 (+4.3)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	49.9	44.3 (+5.6)	45.3 (+4.6)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	53.9	50.8 (+3.1)	51.9 (+2.0)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	53.9	50.9 (+3.0)	52.9 (+1.0)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	55.5	51.4 (+4.1)	51.9 (+3.6)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	55.9	51.6 (+4.3)	53.5 (+2.4)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	56.2	51.1 (+5.1)	54.1 (+2.1)

SCORES ACROSS THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT

Section	Counties/ Manukau District	Counties/ Manukau Central	Counties/ Manukau District HQ	Counties / Manukau East	Counties/ Manukau Operations and Support	Counties/ Manukau Prevention	Counties/ Manukau South	Counties / Manukau West	Counties Manukau Invest's
Performance Index	67.6	65.6	77.0	70.3	62.7	67.6	67.4	70.5	66.9
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	64.6	62.7	78.5	66.4	60.4	65.6	63.0	68.8	63.9
2. My Supervisor	76.2	75.0	94.3	80.4	66.0	71.8	79.0	78.2	76.5
3. My Work Group	77.3	75.3	79.3	79.8	72.4	75.4	79.1	79.1	76.6
4. My Job	64.3	61.0	82.3	65.8	63.7	67.6	61.7	65.5	65.1
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.5	67.9	66.0	73.7	64.3	68.9	70.2	71.7	68.1
6. Learning and Development	65.4	66.4	67.5	67.5	55.4	65.0	67.3	70.7	62.6
7. Performance and Feedback	69.5	68.7	50.0	72.3	65.7	68.2	72.5	69.4	68.0
8. Recognition	54.3	49.3	69.0	57.9	49.1	56.0	54.4	59.2	52.5
9. Final Thoughts	74.6	73.3	84.2	77.6	70.6	74.2	73.0	78.3	73.6
10. The Survey - Your Views	48.3	43.5	67.5	52.3	47.6	49.9	44.1	52.3	47.9

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.

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Counties/Manukau 2011	Counties/Manukau 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
74.6	71.5 (+3.1)	70.5 (+4.1)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Counties/Manukau 2011	Counties/Manukau 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	28.4	24.0 (+4.4)	21.3 (+7.1)
Ambivalent	61.0	61.8 (-0.8)	63.2 (-2.2)
Disengaged	10.6	14.2 (-3.6)	15.5 (-4.9)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT?

Question	Counties/Manukau 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	80.3	75.9 (+4.4)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	75.7	77.6 (-1.9)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	66.8	64.7 (+2.1)
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)	64.8	62.4 (+2.4)
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	60.5	57.8 (+2.7)

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?

	Counties/Manukau 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	81.1	82.1 (-1.0)
Yes	4.8	4.6 (+0.2)
No	14.1	13.3 (+0.8)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2010	Key Driver Questions	Counties/Manukau 2011	Counties/Manukau 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	73.1	69.7 (+3.4)	68.3 (+4.8)
	2	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	70.0	65.7 (+4.3)	61.7 (+8.3)
	3	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	65.7	60.4 (+5.3)	59.7 (+6.0)
	NA	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.6	76.3 (+2.3)	76.1 (+2.5)
	NA	1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	58.9	53.8 (+5.1)	52.0 (+6.9)
	NA	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	69.9	70.1 (-0.2)	61.1 (+8.8)
	NA	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	62.4	59.7 (+2.7)	57.8 (+4.6)
	NA	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	70.2	70.6 (-0.4)	68.9 (+1.3)
	NA	4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	77.2	73.7 (+3.5)	75.6 (+1.6)
	NA	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	61.5	56.9 (+4.6)	58.3 (+3.2)

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 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 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	1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation
Team level			6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	
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/Service Centre	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable

PRIORITY AREAS – KEY DRIVER SCORES ACROSS KEY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

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

Question	Counties/ Manukau Central	Counties/ Manukau Investigations	Counties/ Manukau District HQ	Counties/ Manukau East	Counties/ Manukau Operations and Support	Counties/ Manukau Prevention	Counties/ Manukau South	Counties/ Manukau West	Counties/ Manukau District	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	73.2	71.7	90.0	74.6	66.3	74.5	71.9	77.7	73.1	68.3
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	68.8	67.7	85.0	73.1	63.8	73.2	66.5	76.5	70	61.7
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	61.4	65.9	80.0	67.3	62.1	66.5	64.3	70.8	65.7	59.7
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.4	76.7	90.0	79.7	70.5	81.4	80.3	81.4	78.6	76.1
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	56.2	60.2	68.8	59.5	55.1	61.3	55.7	63.7	58.9	52
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	71.9	63.9	45.0	74	52.5	72.4	74.1	77.8	69.9	61.1
6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	62.7	60.9	85.0	63.9	51.8	61.3	64.6	66.8	62.4	57.8
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	70.1	68.9	85.0	70.7	64.7	69.6	71.5	73.8	70.2	68.9
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	75.4	78.3	95.0	77.9	75.7	80.4	74.6	78.2	77.2	75.6
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	56.7	61.4	75.0	65.6	58.3	66.1	59	63.5	61.5	58.3

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – COUNTIES/MANUKAU 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

Building on last year's excellent response rate the 2011 staff survey for the Counties/Manukau District finished with a total of 1106 people participating in the survey. This represents an impressive 86.6% of all those invited in the District and is well up on 77.6% from 2010. A impressive response rate like this well and truly ensures that the results presented in this report provide an accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the District.

How Employees Perceive the Counties/Manukau District as a Place to Work

Similar to the 2010 survey, the Counties/Manukau District is again a stand-out performer in the 2011 survey. It's survey scores and engagement levels have both improved significantly since the last survey, and are also typically above NZ Police norms.

This year the District's 'Performance Index' – the average score across all questions across all employees – is 67.6% (up from 65.3%). This result remains ahead of the NZ Police overall Performance Index of 64.2%. The increase from 2010 of +2.3 weighted mean points, and the positive difference over NZ Police of +3.4 points are substantive in nature.

Most section scores improved significantly since the 2010 survey with the biggest gains coming from 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' up 4.2%, 'The Survey – Your Views' up 5.1%, 'My Job' up 2.7%, 'Recognition' up 2.4% and 'Final Thoughts (Engagement)' up 3.1%. The only section to decrease in any way was 'Performance and Feedback' which has dropped significantly by -1.4%. 'Performance' however still performs significantly better than NZ Police overall, as do all other survey sections. 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation', 'Learning and Development' and 'The Survey – Your Views' for example are score more than 5% higher than NZ Police overall.

On examination of the District's highest rated questions we see that they are *all* significantly stronger when compared to the NZ Police overall results. Intention to stay at NZ Police is easily the top ranked question within the District at 89.5%, which is an impressive 4.2% above NZ Police overall. Of further interest, six of the top ten questions come from 'My Supervisor' and 'My Work Group', with questions around supervisors and people 'conducting themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police' significantly higher than in 2010. This year, half the top ten questions are significantly higher than last year, with the other five questions scoring about the same as 2010. Of particular note, one of these questions, 'My job gives me a sense of personal achievement' is also a key driver of employee engagement'.

Looking at the lowest ranked questions for the District it is pleasing to see that almost all of the lowest ranked questions have had a significant improvement on 2010. For example 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff', 'I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey', 'Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workplace' and 'New Zealand Police cares about the well-being of it's staff' have all improved significantly, ranging in increases of 3.1% to 6.3%. More s, only 1 lowest rated question 'The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do' is significantly behind NZ Police (-4.9%) while almost all other items score significantly better than NZ Police overall. As positive as these results are, the message should still not be lost that these questions are the lowest performing items for the District.

Results across the District are interesting in that there is great variability between areas. In particular the District HQ tends to outperforms all other areas across many survey sections. Interestingly the District HQ is an area where 'I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey' and 'Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workplace' perform far better than all other areas. Obviously they have had success with post survey initiatives from 2010 that have undoubtedly impacted on this year's results. For all other areas there may well be 'best practice' initiatives from District HQ that can be shared and implemented across the District, particularly for those areas such as Operations and Support that is scoring the lowest across most survey sections.

Respect and Integrity within the Counties/Manukau District

The Counties/Manukau District results are better than the overall NZ Police result across most 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items. 'Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity' at an 83% level of agreement score is well ahead of NZ Police overall at 75.9%. Staff in the District have significantly greater confidence than NZ Police overall in raising concerns in regard to workplace harassment, bullying, discrimination or inappropriate conduct without fear of reprisal, and having those concerns dealt with appropriately.

For those people who had witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace, they perceived the handling of those incidents to be better than that of NZ Police overall.

Employee Engagement within the Counties/Manukau District

Employee engagement levels for the Counties/Manukau District are among the highest in NZ Police, with 28.4% of the District ticking agree and strongly agree to the six engagement questions. This result is up on what was an already strong 'Engaged' result in 2010 of 24.4%, and is well ahead NZ Police overall by 7.1%. Moreover, then increase in the proportion of 'Engaged' staff is matched mostly by a decrease in 'Disengaged' with the proportion of staff in this category down as low as 10.6%. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies the issues that engage the District's employees the most – information which serves as a targeted means for increasing current engagement levels.

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

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

A total of 10 survey items have been identified as key drivers of engagement for Counties/Manukau staff, the first 3 of which were the same 3 top ranked key drivers in 2010; 'NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work'; 'I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre' and 'I feel I am working for an effective organisation'. Not only are they in the same rank order as last year, but they are 3 out of 4 key drivers that come from 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation'. Meanwhile all other key drivers come from the two survey sections 'My Job' and 'Learning and Development'. As interesting as that may be, the obvious stand-out is that 9 key driver items are performing significantly above NZ Police overall which is quite simply excellent!

When placed in the 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' model, we clearly see that 'Development' is particularly important (and therefore engaging) to District staff. And the District performs well on most of these, a look across the District shows there are opportunities for some areas to score better on these items. With so many Areas doing well on these items, there should be plenty of leverage opportunities to share ideas for improvements.

We also see at the 'Organisation' level, the District in general doing a very good job of communicating to staff, making NZ Police an enjoyable place to work, providing career and personal development opportunities, and working in a way that is portrayed as being effective to staff. And we can see at the 'Individual' level how high performance in these key drivers is positively impacting on staff in their sense of belonging and achievement. As with 'Development' when looking across the District we do see some variability of results, which again offer areas of opportunity.

The challenge for the Counties/Manukau District will be to maintain good results for these 'engaging items', while at the same time helping out individual areas that are not performing as high as the rest of the District, and to understand the barriers that prevent them from doing so.

Employee Comments

As with last year, the Counties/Manukau District had high scoring questions from the 'My Work Group' section of the survey. As expected many comments this year reflect these high scores, with specific reference made to the people that they work with. Comments such as camaraderie, team work, colleagues, the people and the work they do for the public are frequently made as things that make working for NZ Police great. Many people take real pride in the work that they do for NZ Police. Many people like the variety of their work, and a good number make mention of job security being of importance to them.

Among the things that people felt NZ Police could do better included more frontline staffing, and paying more attention to the opinions of those at who are out on the frontline 'policing' on a daily basis. There are comments that refer to the standard people in management positions, as well as the appointment process for promotions as well as general recruitment of staff regarding the calibre of people. In general other

resources and more equipment are often mentioned, including cars and computers. Some respondents are frustrated by the levels of bureaucracy and paperwork that get in the way of them doing their job, whereas accountability and responsibility for addressing poor performance is also mentioned.

Summary

The results for the Counties/Manukau District are positive on many fronts. Not only is the overall Performance Index result well above NZ Police overall, but levels of 'Engagement' are significantly higher as well. It is particularly pleasing to see a low proportion of staff being deemed 'Disengaged'. There have been significant improvements from 2010 across many survey items, particularly with lower scoring questions.

Of all ten key drivers identified for the District, at worst 1 of them performs on par with NZ Police, while all others perform significantly above NZ Police overall. With so many high performing key drivers, the District has a great opportunity build even greater strength. The District has an advantage over other Districts in building engagement, in that it is coming from a position of strength.

Looking across Counties/Manukau the District HQ is an Area that scores particularly high on many key driver items. A closer examination revealed that the District HQ also scored higher than all other areas on 'The Survey – Your Views' indicating that it has had success with its post survey initiatives from 2010.

Considering that 'The Survey – Your Views' questions are still among the lowest scoring questions for the District, along with 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff' and 'NZ Police cares about the well being of its staff' post survey discussions and resulting initiatives have great potential for even stronger overall results.

With a little time and effort going into post survey action planning, and following through on post survey discussions with staff, the District has a great opportunity to improve on key driver items, while at the same time showing staff that their opinions do count, that doing the survey is worthwhile, and that NZ Police cares about making their workplace a better one.

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 event, 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 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., communication, performance, recognition, equipment, values etc)	Action Agreed	Does it relate to an existing Initiative or programme? Yes/No	Outcomes/Benefits Expected	Person Responsible	Timeframe	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.