

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2012

Summary of Findings: Financial Crime & Assets Recovery

April 2012



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



An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Financial Crime & Assets Recovery
April, 2012
© Kenexa|JRA

RESPONSE RATE

	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2012	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	46	48	9393
Response Rate	93.9%	92.3%	77.1%

Note: For the tables below **Green font** indicates that the Service Centre's score is statistically higher than the average score for NZ Police on that survey section/question, and/or that a score has improved since the 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 FINANCIAL CRIME & ASSETS RECOVERY AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2012	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	62.5	62.4 (+0.1)	67.7 (-5.2)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	63.2	59.9 (+3.3)	63.9 (-0.7)
2. My Supervisor	64.5	69.7 (-5.2)	75.6 (-11.1)
3. My Work Group	61.1	69.6 (-8.5)	76.7 (-15.6)
4. My Job	65.0	62.7 (+2.3)	65.7 (-0.7)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.5	69.3 (+0.2)	71.2 (-1.7)
6. Learning and Development	54.3	53.8 (+0.5)	62.7 (-8.4)
7. Performance and Feedback	54.2	60.9 (-6.7)	69.4 (-15.2)
8. Recognition	60.1	54.1 (+6.0)	58.0 (+2.1)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	68.8	66.8 (+2.0)	73.3 (-4.5)
10. The Survey - Your Views	48.1	43.2 (+4.9)	49.6 (-1.5)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN FINANCIAL CRIME & ASSETS RECOVERY

Question	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2012	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
4.8: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life	80.4	78.6 (+1.8)	69.3 (+11.1)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	79.3	80.7 (-1.4)	85.8 (-6.5)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	76.1	81.8 (-5.7)	80.0 (-3.9)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	75.5	74.0 (+1.5)	78.1 (-2.6)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	75.0	79.2 (-4.2)	76.2 (-1.2)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	74.5	77.1 (-2.6)	76.7 (-2.2)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	73.9	70.3 (+3.6)	79.3 (-5.4)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	72.8	72.9 (-0.1)	76.9 (-4.1)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	72.3	67.6 (+4.7)	71.1 (+1.2)
9.4: I feel inspired to go the extra mile to help NZ Police succeed	71.7	66.7 (+5.0)	73.1 (-1.4)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN FINANCIAL CRIME & ASSETS RECOVERY

Question	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2012	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	41.8	49.0 (-7.2)	60.4 (-18.6)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	44.6	38.6 (+6.0)	47.8 (-3.2)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	45.7	46.4 (-0.7)	48.2 (-2.5)
7.2: People are held accountable for their performance in my work group	46.7	63.5 (-16.8)	68.4 (-21.7)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	47.8	45.8 (+2.0)	58.9 (-11.1)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	47.8	49.5 (-1.7)	59.1 (-11.3)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	50.6	51.6 (-1.0)	62.2 (-11.6)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	51.6	47.9 (+3.7)	51.5 (+0.1)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	53.3	46.9 (+6.4)	51.3 (+2.0)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	53.3	49.5 (+3.8)	56.0 (-2.7)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN FINANCIAL CRIME & ASSETS RECOVERY SINCE 2011 - POSITIVE

Question	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2012	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	70.7	54.7 (+16.0)	63.6 (+7.1)
1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	69.6	55.7 (+13.9)	67.8 (+1.8)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	60.9	50.5 (+10.4)	58.8 (+2.1)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	64.1	55.2 (+8.9)	59.7 (+4.4)
8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	60.3	52.6 (+7.7)	59.0 (+1.3)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	53.3	46.9 (+6.4)	51.3 (+2.0)
4.11: My performance is fairly assessed	63.0	56.8 (+6.2)	63.6 (-0.6)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	44.6	38.6 (+6.0)	47.8 (-3.2)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	65.8	59.9 (+5.9)	62.8 (+3.0)
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	66.3	60.4 (+5.9)	65.6 (+0.7)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN FINANCIAL CRIME & ASSETS RECOVERY SINCE 2011 - NEGATIVE

Question	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2012	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
7.2: People are held accountable for their performance in my work group	46.7	63.5 (-16.8)	68.4 (-21.7)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	66.8	78.1 (-11.3)	80.0 (-13.2)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	57.1	67.7 (-10.6)	79.1 (-22.0)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	66.3	76.0 (-9.7)	79.2 (-12.9)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	69.6	79.2 (-9.6)	80.0 (-10.4)
3.5: I feel part of an effective work group	56.0	65.6 (-9.6)	76.7 (-20.7)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	66.8	75.5 (-8.7)	77.6 (-10.8)
2.2: My supervisor encourages, and is willing to act on suggestions and ideas from my work group	60.3	68.2 (-7.9)	74.7 (-14.4)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	41.8	49.0 (-7.2)	60.4 (-18.6)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	65.2	72.4 (-7.2)	77.5 (-12.3)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN FINANCIAL CRIME & ASSETS RECOVERY

Question	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	76.1	81.0 (-4.9)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	71.7	80.9 (-9.2)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	65.2	69.4 (-4.2)
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)	71.1	67.1 (+4.0)
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	63.0	63.5 (-0.5)

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?

	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	71.7	83.4 (-11.7)
Yes	4.3	4.6 (-0.3)
No	23.9	12.0 (+11.9)

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN FINANCIAL CRIME & ASSETS RECOVERY?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2012	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
68.8	66.8 (+2.0)	73.3 (-4.5)











Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2012	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Engaged	15.2	14.6 (+0.6)	27.8 (-12.6)
Ambivalent	67.4	68.7 (-1.3)	59.7 (+7.7)
Disengaged	17.4	16.7 (+0.7)	12.5 (+4.9)

Proportion of Employees (%)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN FINANCIAL CRIME & ASSETS RECOVERY?

	Key Driver Questions	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2012	Financial Crime & Assets Recovery 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	72.3	67.6 (+4.7)	71.1 (+1.2)
	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	70.7	67.7 (+3.0)	78.0 (-7.3)
	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	58.9	60.9 (-2.0)	65.5 (-6.6)
	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	66.3	60.4 (+5.9)	65.6 (+0.7)
	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	63.0	63.5 (-0.5)	71.0 (-8.0)
	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	59.2	58.3 (+0.9)	61.9 (-2.7)
	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	62.0	62.5 (-0.5)	61.6 (+0.4)
	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	50.6	51.6 (-1.0)	62.2 (-11.6)
	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	59.4	57.8 (+1.6)	60.3 (-0.9)
	6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	47.8	45.8 (+2.0)	58.9 (-11.1)

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 New Zealand Police (Total Org). These key drivers are rank ordered. The colour coding for each question reveals if a particular Service Centre 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.

ANATOMY OF A GREAT WORKPLACE™

Over a decade of research by JRA on what makes a great workplace in New Zealand reveals there are four common characteristics – Vision & Values, a strong sense of Community, a focus on employee Development, and a strong Performance Culture. The table below illustrates where the Service Centre's engagement drivers tend to fall and whether there is a specific pillar or more that should be targeted when looking for change targets.

	Vision and Values	Community	Development	Performance Culture
Organisation level		1.3: 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	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	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 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – FINANCIAL CRIME & ASSETS RECOVERY

When taking into account all responses within Financial Crime & Assets Recovery to all survey questions, the Performance Index is almost exactly the same as in 2011, and is significantly below the overall NZ Police average. The similarity in the Performance Index year-on-year however does not tell the full story, as there have been many significant increases and decreases in question scores for Financial Crime & Assets Recovery.

On the positive side, there has been a large 16% increase regarding satisfaction with physical work environment, along with other significant improvements in the areas of clarity of organisational vision, recognition, celebration of success, feeling valued and feeling that people's own performance assessments are fair. There has been a good increase in perceptions that changes made in response to the 2011 survey have positively impacted their workgroup, although the score for this question is still low.

Questions that have had a significant decrease in score are primarily related to aspects of teamwork including support, confidence in others, living the values, accountability for poor performance, and overall perceived team effectiveness. Notably almost a quarter of the Financial Crime & Assets Recovery team felt that issues of harassment or bullying over the past 12 months had not been dealt with effectively; twice the NZ Police average.

In terms of employee engagement levels, Financial Crime & Assets Recovery staff are slightly more engaged than in 2011, but the ratio of engaged to disengaged staff is still around 1:1, compared to the NZ Police average of more than 2:1. Notwithstanding the significant decrease in results relating to perceptions of workgroup effectiveness, some good improvements have been made in some areas that are known to be 'key drivers of engagement' for NZ Police staff – people feel that the organisation is a more enjoyable place to work, that their jobs give them a greater sense of achievement, and that the organisation is more effective than one year ago. Comments made to open-ended questions in the survey reinforce concerns relating to performance management, and the approach to hiring and promotion.

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 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.