

# New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2013

## Summary of Findings Crime Service Centre



---

April 2013

**KeneXa**<sup>®</sup>  
an IBM Company

## RESPONSE RATE

	Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	251	199	8863
Response Rate	87.5%	76.5%	74.8%

Note: For tables in this report where comparisons are made between the Service Centre's 2013 and 2012 scores, as well as between the Service Centre and NZ Police (Total Org), **green font** indicates that the Service Centre'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 CRIME SERVICE CENTRE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	71.8	70.7 (+1.1)	63.6 (+8.2)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	66.7	65.5 (+1.2)	54.9 (+11.8)
2. Quality and Excellence	57.8	NA	48.1 (+9.7)
3. My Supervisor	78.6	74.7 (+3.9)	76.6 (+2.0)
4. My Work Group	84.4	80.5 (+3.9)	79.9 (+4.5)
5. My Job	72.2	73.6 (-1.4)	62.4 (+9.8)
6. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	74.8	75.2 (-0.4)	73.4 (+1.4)
7. Learning and Development	69.5	68.1 (+1.4)	58.9 (+10.6)
8. Performance and Feedback	75.2	68.2 (+7.0)	69.7 (+5.5)
9. Recognition	61.8	58.2 (+3.6)	48.1 (+13.7)
10. Final Thoughts (Engagement Index)	79.9	81.6 (-1.7)	71.1 (+8.8)
11. The Survey - Your Views (Change Index)	38.1	41.8 (-3.7)	28.9 (+9.2)

## SCORES ACROSS THE CRIME SERVICE CENTRE

Section	Crime	Metro Crime	Crime 2013
Performance Index	77.2	63.7	70.4
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	77.1	56.3	66.7
2. Quality and Excellence	71.0	44.7	57.8
3. My Supervisor	81.7	75.5	78.6
4. My Work Group	89.1	82.4	85.7
5. My Job	77.6	67.0	72.2
6. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	78.8	70.8	74.8
7. Learning and Development	68.9	61.5	65.2
8. Performance and Feedback	80.5	69.9	75.2
9. Recognition	70.7	53.1	61.8
10. Final Thoughts	85.6	74.2	79.9
11. The Survey - Your Views	56.1	25.2	40.6

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

## HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE CRIME SERVICE CENTRE?

**Engagement Index** (average of all six engagement questions)

Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
79.9	81.6 (-1.7)	71.1 (+8.8)

### Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Engaged	30.7	28.8 (+1.9)	24.5 (+6.2)
Ambivalent	59.7	62.6 (-2.9)	59.9 (-0.2)
Disengaged	9.6	8.6 (+1.0)	15.6 (-6.0)
Engagement Ratio	3.2:1	3.3:1	1.6:1

Proportion of Employees (%)

### Engagement Across the Service Centre

Engagement Group	Crime	Metro Crime	Crime 2013
Engaged	38.4	23.0	30.7
Ambivalent	56.0	63.5	59.7
Disengaged	5.6	13.5	9.6
Engagement Index	85.6	74.2	79.9
Engagement Ratio	6.9:1	1.7:1	3.2:1

## PERFORMANCE ENABLEMENT WITHIN THE CRIME SERVICE CENTRE?

**Performance Enablement Index** (average of all eight enablement questions)

Crime 2013	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
64.5	54.3 (+10.2)

### Enablement Questions

Concept	Question	Crime 2013	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Quality emphasis	Day-to-day decisions demonstrate that quality of services is a top priority for NZ Police	60.6	52.9 (+7.7)
Involvement	NZ Police encourages ideas and suggestions from employees on how to improve the way things are done	53.8	42.5 (+11.3)
	I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect my work	69.7	52.5 (+17.2)
Resource access	I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	61.4	52.6 (+8.8)
	NZ Police's systems and processes enable me to do my job well	55.0	42.8 (+12.2)
Training	NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	61.4	49.7 (+11.7)
Collaboration	People I work with cooperate to get the job done	92.4	87.1 (+5.3)
Customer Service	NZ Police delivers on the promises it makes to its customers	61.8	54.2 (+7.6)

## WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE CRIME SERVICE CENTRE?

	Key Driver Questions	Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
	9.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	65.3	58.8 (+6.5)	48.0 (+17.3)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	84.9	79.4 (+5.5)	66.8 (+18.1)
	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	73.2	74.9 (-1.7)	59.6 (+13.6)
	5.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	88.0	92.4 (-4.4)	81.7 (+6.3)
	5.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	86.1	85.8 (+0.3)	79.7 (+6.4)
	1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	68.9	68.3 (+0.6)	53.5 (+15.4)
	7.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	69.3	64.1 (+5.2)	53.9 (+15.4)
	2.2: Day-to-day decisions demonstrate that quality of services is a top priority for NZ Police	60.6	NA	52.9 (+7.7)
	1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	57.4	58.8 (-1.4)	40.1 (+17.3)
	1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	50.2	48.0 (+2.2)	34.8 (+15.4)

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

## PRIORITY AREAS – KEY DRIVER SCORES ACROSS KEY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

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

Question	Crime	Metro Crime	Crime
9.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	78.4	52.4	65.3
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	88.0	81.7	84.9
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	84.8	61.6	73.2
5.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	92.0	84.1	88.0
5.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	87.2	84.9	86.1
1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	80.0	57.9	68.9
7.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	78.4	60.3	69.3
2.2: Day-to-day decisions demonstrate that quality of services is a top priority for NZ Police	71.8	49.6	60.6
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	69.6	45.2	57.4
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	68.8	31.7	50.2

## TAKING ACTION WITHIN THE CRIME SERVICE CENTRE?

Question	Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
11.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	43.0	51.3 (-8.3)	34.9 (+8.1)
11.2: Changes in response to the 2012 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my work group	33.2	32.3 (+0.9)	22.9 (+10.3)
11.3: My supervisor has actively involved our work group in making changes as a result of the last survey	45.5	NA	34.0 (+11.5)

### Taking Action within the Service Centre

Area	Change Index	Crime
Crime	56.1	40.6 (+15.5)
Metro Crime	25.2	40.6 (-15.4)

## BIGGEST POSITIVE DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE CRIME SERVICE CENTRE SINCE 2012 - POSITIVE

Question	Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
3.6: I get regular feedback on my performance from my supervisor (formal/informal)	72.9	60.2 (+12.7)	67.4 (+5.5)
8.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	61.2	51.0 (+10.2)	52.6 (+8.6)
8.2: People are held accountable for their performance in my work group	75.1	66.2 (+8.9)	69.2 (+5.9)
9.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	65.3	58.8 (+6.5)	48.0 (+17.3)
4.5: The way work is allocated in my workgroup is fair	76.5	70.7 (+5.8)	71.6 (+4.9)
4.3: Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in my work group	78.9	73.4 (+5.5)	76.2 (+2.7)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	84.9	79.4 (+5.5)	66.8 (+18.1)
4.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	91.2	85.9 (+5.3)	86.4 (+4.8)
7.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	69.3	64.1 (+5.2)	53.9 (+15.4)
9.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	59.0	54.3 (+4.7)	48.1 (+10.9)

## BIGGEST NEGATIVE DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE CRIME SERVICE CENTRE SINCE 2012 - NEGATIVE

Question	Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
5.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	61.4	71.9 (-10.5)	52.6 (+8.8)
11.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	43.0	51.3 (-8.3)	34.9 (+8.1)
5.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	55.8	61.5 (-5.7)	41.9 (+13.9)
10.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	83.3	88.9 (-5.6)	79.2 (+4.1)
5.10: I understand how my performance is measured	64.9	69.5 (-4.6)	58.5 (+6.4)
5.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	88.0	92.4 (-4.4)	81.7 (+6.3)
7.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	61.4	65.6 (-4.2)	49.7 (+11.7)
10.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	82.5	85.8 (-3.3)	81.1 (+1.4)
6.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	79.6	81.8 (-2.2)	81.4 (-1.8)
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	73.2	74.9 (-1.7)	59.6 (+13.6)

#### BIGGEST POSITIVE DIFFERENCES TO NZ POLICE TOP 25%

Question	Crime 2013	NZ Police Top 25%
5.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	69.7	62.8 (+6.9)
7.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	69.3	62.6 (+6.7)
5.8: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life	79.3	73.9 (+5.4)
5.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	71.3	66.4 (+4.9)
9.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	50.2	45.7 (+4.5)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	84.9	80.4 (+4.5)
5.11: My performance is fairly assessed	68.1	63.6 (+4.5)
5.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	55.8	52.7 (+3.1)
8.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	61.2	58.2 (+3.0)
4.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	91.2	88.3 (+2.9)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	56.2	53.3 (+2.9)
9.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	65.3	62.4 (+2.9)

#### BIGGEST NEGATIVE DIFFERENCES TO NZ POLICE TOP 25%

Question	Crime 2013	NZ Police Top 25%
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	61.0	69.3 (-8.3)
10.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	82.5	89.0 (-6.5)
11.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	43.0	49.4 (-6.4)
10.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	83.3	89.6 (-6.3)
7.5: There are career development opportunities for me in NZ Police	52.2	58.4 (-6.2)
6.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	79.6	85.1 (-5.5)
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	65.1	70.3 (-5.2)
1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	71.7	76.7 (-5.0)
2.2: Day-to-day decisions demonstrate that quality of services is a top priority for NZ Police	60.6	65.4 (-4.8)
3.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	81.6	85.9 (-4.3)

## RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE CRIME SERVICE CENTRE

Question	Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
6.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	83.2	82.9 (+0.3)	82.9 (+0.3)
6.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	79.6	81.8 (-2.2)	81.4 (-1.8)
6.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	72.1	72.9 (-0.8)	70.2 (+1.9)
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)	74.0	73.4 (+0.6)	68.4 (+5.6)
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	65.1	64.8 (+0.3)	64.2 (+0.9)

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?

	Crime 2013	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2013 (Total Org)
Not Applicable	82.1	82.4 (-0.3)	84.0 (-1.9)
Yes	3.6	3.5 (+0.1)	3.9 (-0.3)
No	14.3	14.1 (+0.2)	12.1 (+2.2)

### Gender Differences Within the Service Centre

Question	Crime - Female	Crime - Male
6.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	82.9	83.3
6.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	85.5	77.0
6.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	75.0	70.9
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)	70.7	75.4
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	62.7	66.1
Respect & Integrity in the Workplace (Overall Section Score)	75.4	74.5

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?

	Crime - Female	Crime - Male
Not Applicable	76.3	84.6
Yes	5.3	2.9
No	18.4	12.6

## SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – CRIME SERVICE CENTRE

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

### Response Rate

The Crime Service Centre had an excellent response with 251 out of 287 people responding to the survey. This gives them a response rate of 87.5% indicating that the data is truly representative of the opinions of people within the Crime Service Centre.

### How Employees Perceive the Crime Service Centre as a Place to Work

The average score across all survey questions (the Performance Index) is 71.8%, an increase of 1.1 points from 2012. This is not a statistically significant difference. In fact, there is only one score across all the survey sections that is statistically significantly different from 2012, which is 'Performance and Feedback'. The score has improved by 7.0 indicating that, on average, this year 75.2% of people agreed with statements in the 'Performance and Feedback' section. There were no other significant differences and only four sections saw small decreases in their scores this year compared to last year.

Looking a little deeper at the item level it is clear that the significant improvement in score for the 'Performance and Feedback' section could be partially due to the increase in scores for the perception that poor performance is dealt with effectively (+10.2) and that people are held accountable for their performance (+8.9). Other questions related to performance management that have seen significant improvement are around having more regular feedback (+12.7), fairer work allocation (+5.8) and clearer role responsibilities (+5.5). Although feeling poor performance is dealt with effectively has had one of the largest increases since last year, it is still an area that can be improved upon with only 61.2% of people in the Crime Service Centre agreeing with this statement. Nine questions have had a statistically significant improvement in scores since last year. Three of them are key drivers in the 2013 survey: feeling valued for the contribution people make to NZ Police (+6.5), finding NZ Police an enjoyable place to work (+5.5) and feeling encouraged to be innovative (+5.2).

Shifting focus to comparisons of the Crime Service Centre against the NZ Police average, the Performance Index score for this service centre is statistically significantly higher (+8.2) than the NZ Police average. This indicates that on average, the Crime Service Centre is one of the higher performing teams in this survey. All scores across survey sections are higher for the Crime Service Centre than the NZ Police average (ranging from +1.4 to 13.7) with eight out of the 11 sections being statistically significant. The greatest difference between the Crime Service Centre and the NZ Police average is in the 'Recognition' section (+13.7).

A new analysis conducted in 2013 is a comparison of the ICT Service Centre's results against a 'NZ Police Top 25%' benchmark (a 'best practice' group that demonstrates what good results look like within the NZ Police context). Looking at the biggest positive differences between the Crime Service Centre and the Top 25% there are three differences that are statistically significant: feeling sufficiently involved in decisions that affect an individual's work (+6.9), being encouraged to try new ways of doing things (+6.7) and being able to maintain a work-life balance (+5.4). It is positive to note that five of the questions from the 'My Job' section are within the top ten positive differences to the Top 25%. Despite being in the top ten positive differences to the Top 25%, the perception that people are appointed to positions based on merit (50.2%), that pay and benefits are fair (55.8%) and that groups in NZ Police work well together (56.2%) are still areas for improvement given their lower scores. Eight questions scored significantly below the Top 25%, with the lowest questions score for the perception that action will be taken based on the results of the 2013 survey (43.0%).

Focusing on scores across the two teams within the Crime Service Centre (Crime and Metro Crime) there are some fairly large differences. Crime has higher scores across every survey section with differences ranging from 6.2 to 30.9 points. The largest differences between the two groups are in the section 'The Survey – Your Views' (+30.9), 'Quality and Excellence' (+26.3) and 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' (+20.8). Metro Crime could benefit from improvements across the board, in particular around communicating the vision and purpose, and taking action on the survey results.



## **Respect and Integrity within the Crime Service Centre**

Scores across the Respect and Integrity section have not seen significant changes since last year. Compared to the NZ Police average, people in the Crime Service Centre are more confident about raising concerns around harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal. Seventy-four percent of people within the Crime Service Centre (that is, +5.6 points more than the NZ Police average) agree that they feel confident about raising concerns about inappropriate behaviour in the workplace without fear of reprisal.

Scores between males and females are fairly similar across the five questions in this section. However, females responded more positively regarding knowing who to contact to report instances of harassment, bullying or discrimination (+8.0).

## **Employee Engagement within the Crime Service Centre**

The Crime Service Centre achieved an Engagement Index score of 79.9% which is similar to their score from 2012, however, it is significantly higher (+8.8) than the NZ Police average. The service centre also has a higher proportion of engaged staff (+6.2) and a lower proportion of disengaged staff (-6.0) compared to the NZ Police average.

Looking at the teams within the Crime Service Centre it is clear that Crime has a higher proportion of engaged (+15.4) and a lower proportion of disengaged people (-7.9) when compared with Metro Crime. The engagement ratios for each group show a striking difference with Crime being 6.9:1 (that is, almost seven engaged people to one disengaged person) and Metro Crime being 1.7:1.

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

## **Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement**

Key driver analysis was performed on the Crime Service Centre's results, and this process has highlighted which questions in the survey have the strongest relationship with employee engagement scores. These are the most influential to drive improvement in engagement levels. In total, ten key drivers were identified, three of which scored significantly higher compared to last year. Five of the key drivers come from the 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' section of the survey. The main themes coming through in the key drivers is a feeling that the organisation is fun, effective and has a sense of common purpose. People are also driven by feeling valued by the organisation, knowing how the work 'I' do contributes and having a sense of personal achievement.

The Crime Service Centre performs statistically significantly above the NZ Police average across all key driver questions with differences ranging from 6.3 to 18.1 points. The largest difference in scores is the perception that NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work with 84.9% of people within the Crime Service Centre agreeing with this item. These positive scores should be reinforced amongst people in this service centre.

Despite all the positive differences in scores there are still a couple of items scoring below 60% agreement indicating areas that could be improved upon: showing interest in the views and opinions of staff (50.2%) and caring for their wellbeing (57.4%).

Crime again achieves higher scores than Metro Crime. Differences between the two groups vary from 2.3 to 37.1 points. The largest differences in scores are related to the perception that the NZ Police are interested in views and opinions of their people (+37.1), care about their wellbeing (+24.4) and value their contribution (+26.0), suggesting that people in Metro Crime generally feel less valued. These questions also attained low scores (around 50% agreement) indicating that the demonstration of care and interest by NZ Police is a priority going forward for this team.

## **Performance Enablement within the Crime Service Centre**

'Performance enablement' is all 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. The Crime Service Centre has achieved a Performance Enablement Index score of 64.5%, which is 10.2 points above the NZ Police average. Encouraging ideas and suggestions (53.8%) and having systems and processes that enable people to do their jobs (55.0%) can be further improved despite the large differences to the NZ Police average.

## **Taking Action within the Crime Service Centre**

Looking at question scores around taking action following the 2012 survey, there has been a significant decrease (-8.3%) in the belief that action will occur following the results of the survey. Although the Crime Service Centre scored more positively than the NZ Police average across all the 'Taking Action' questions, there is still scope for improvement given that less than half of the people that completed the survey believe positive change/action will occur following the survey.

## **Employee Comments**

Examining the comments made by staff, some of the most commonly mentioned comments around what makes NZ Police a great place to work were around camaraderie and teamwork. Many people also mentioned that having a purpose and making a difference in NZ was what they enjoyed most about working at the Crime Service Centre.

A number of issues were raised as things that needed to change. Many of these were related to management and supervisors – specifically around having too many managers and not enough workers. Frequent mention was also made for improvements to technology and systems, accountability and increasing funding and pay.

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

## **Summary**

Overall the results for the Crime Service Centre have stayed on par with those achieved in 2012. One area that did experience a significant increase was 'Performance and Feedback' – specifically dealing with poor performance effectively, ensuring accountability for personal performance and getting regular performance feedback. Comparisons to the total organisation reveal a more positive story with the Crime Service Centre generally scoring significantly above the NZ police average.

Engagement levels in 2013 are on par with those achieved in 2012. However, when compared to the NZ Police average, the Crime Service Centre scores significantly higher. This can also be seen in the proportion of engaged and disengaged people within the Crime Service Centre – almost a third of people are considered 'engaged', this is higher than the NZ Police average.

Key drivers for the Crime Service Centre suggest that employees are driven by having a fun place to work, working for an effective organisation and feeling valued/cared for. These are all scoring above the NZ Police average indicating these are areas that the Crime Service Centre is performing well in. However, it is important to note that there are some areas where despite being above the total organisation the score attained are still below 60% agreement so are areas that could be improved upon – showing an interest in the views and opinions of staff and caring for their wellbeing.

Looking at the scores within the Crime Service Centre, Metro Crime consistently scores below Crime across the climate and engagement questions. Looking at the key drivers it is also clear that Metro Crime have a number of areas to improve in with perceptions that day-to-day decisions demonstrate quality service is a top priority (49.6%), NZ Police care about staff well-being (45.2%) and NZ Police are interested in views and opinions of staff (31.7%) having agreement of less than 50%. Analysing why Crime has scored so far ahead of Metro Crime could reveal initiatives that can be implemented in the Metro Crime group.

Another area where improvements can be made is around taking action following the survey. The NZ Police average achieved fairly low scores across this survey section with the Crime Service Centre performing significantly above the total organisation, but achieving scores below 50% agreement on each item. It will be important for the Crime Service Centre to ensure that action is taken as a result of the 2013 survey and that the actions are clearly communicated with people and connected back to the survey.

## 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. Service Centre'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 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.

