New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2012

Summary of Findings: Human Resources

April 2012

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

© JRA

RESPONSE RATE

	Human Resources 2012	Human Resources 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	104	100	9393
Response Rate	83.9%	95.2%	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 HUMAN RESOURCES AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Human Resources 2012	Human Resources 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	72.4	69.0 (+3.4)	67.7 (+4.7)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	70.9	66.8 (+4.1)	63.9 (+7.0)
2. My Supervisor	74.2	71.3 (+2.9)	75.6 (-1.4)
3. My Work Group	72.4	69.6 (+2.8)	76.7 (-4.3)
4. My Job	75.5	73.9 (+1.6)	65.7 (+9.8)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	74.9	71.4 (+3.5)	71.2 (+3.7)
6. Learning and Development	67.1	62.2 (+4.9)	62.7 (+4.4)
7. Performance and Feedback	67.0	63.5 (+3.5)	69.4 (-2.4)
8. Recognition	67.2	60.9 (+6.3)	58.0 (+9.2)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	80.8	77.7 (+3.1)	73.3 (+7.5)
10. The Survey - Your Views	61.3	59.8 (+1.5)	49.6 (+11.7)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN HUMAN RESOURCES

Question	Human Resources 2012	Human Resources 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	85.8	82.8 (+3.0)	75.8 (+10.0)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	84.9	84.3 (+0.6)	78.1 (+6.8)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	84.4	82.8 (+1.6)	76.7 (+7.7)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	84.0	86.1 (-2.1)	85.8 (-1.8)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	82.9	86.3 (-3.4)	76.9 (+6.0)
9.4: I feel inspired to go the extra mile to help NZ Police succeed	82.3	79.3 (+3.0)	73.1 (+9.2)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	81.7	78.0 (+3.7)	78.0 (+3.7)
4.8: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life	81.6	81.8 (-0.2)	69.3 (+12.3)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	81.0	77.8 (+3.2)	76.2 (+4.8)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	78.8	75.5 (+3.3)	79.3 (-0.5)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN HUMAN RESOURCES

Question	Human Resources 2012	Human Resources 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	57.1	55.5 (+1.6)	47.8 (+9.3)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	58.3	52.0 (+6.3)	48.2 (+10.1)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	59.0	54.5 (+4.5)	60.4 (-1.4)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	59.1	49.2 (+9.9)	56.0 (+3.1)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	59.1	50.5 (+8.6)	62.2 (-3.1)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	59.7	56.0 (+3.7)	57.4 (+2.3)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	63.2	56.3 (+6.9)	59.1 (+4.1)
7.2: People are held accountable for their performance in my work group	63.3	60.5 (+2.8)	68.4 (-5.1)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	65.5	63.6 (+1.9)	51.5 (+14.0)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	65.7	58.8 (+6.9)	51.3 (+14.4)

© JRA

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN HUMAN RESOURCES SINCE 2011 - POSITIVE

Question	Human Resources 2012	Human Resources 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	68.9	58.6 (+10.3)	58.8 (+10.1)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	59.1	49.2 (+9.9)	56.0 (+3.1)
1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	76.7	67.5 (+9.2)	67.8 (+8.9)
6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police	70.1	61.0 (+9.1)	63.1 (+7.0)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	59.1	50.5 (+8.6)	62.2 (-3.1)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	63.2	56.3 (+6.9)	59.1 (+4.1)
3.6: The way work is allocated in my workgroup is fair	70.9	64.0 (+6.9)	70.4 (+0.5)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	65.7	58.8 (+6.9)	51.3 (+14.4)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	69.5	62.9 (+6.6)	62.8 (+6.7)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	58.3	52.0 (+6.3)	48.2 (+10.1)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN HUMAN RESOURCES SINCE 2011 - NEGATIVE

Question	Human Resources 2012	Human Resources 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	82.9	86.3 (-3.4)	76.9 (+6.0)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	84.0	86.1 (-2.1)	85.8 (-1.8)
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	73.1	75.0 (-1.9)	71.0 (+2.1)
4.10: I understand how my performance is measured	68.0	68.8 (-0.8)	63.9 (+4.1)
4.1: The responsibilities of my job are clearly defined	72.8	73.5 (-0.7)	73.2 (-0.4)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	71.1	71.5 (-0.4)	77.5 (-6.4)
3.5: I feel part of an effective work group	71.2	71.5 (-0.3)	76.7 (-5.5)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	75.7	76.0 (-0.3)	71.1 (+4.6)
4.8: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life	81.6	81.8 (-0.2)	69.3 (+12.3)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN HUMAN RESOURCES

Question	Human Resources	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	85.6	81.0 (+4.6)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	90.4	80.9 (+9.5)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	73.1	69.4 (+3.7)
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)	71.2	67.1 (+4.1)
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	68.0	63.5 (+4.5)

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?

	Human Resources	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	76.9	83.4 (-6.5)
Yes	9.6	4.6 (+5.0)
No	13.5	12.0 (+1.5)

© JRA

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN HUMAN RESOURCES?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Human Resources 2012	Human Resources 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
80.8	77.7 (+3.1)	73.3 (+7.5)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Human Resources 2012	Human Resources 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Engaged	46.2	36.0 (+10.2)	27.8 (+18.4)
Ambivalent	47.1	57.0 (-9.9)	59.7 (-12.6)
Disengaged	6.7	7.0 (-0.3)	12.5 (-5.8)

Proportion of Employees (%)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN HUMAN RESOURCES?

	Key Driver Questions	Human Resources 2012	Human Resources 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	81.7	78.0 (+3.7)	78.0 (+3.7)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	75.7	76.0 (-0.3)	71.1 (+4.6)
	4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	76.2	74.5 (+1.7)	63.6 (+12.6)
	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	77.2	72.0 (+5.2)	65.6 (+11.6)
	4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	71.8	69.0 (+2.8)	53.0 (+18.8)

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 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. NOTE: in 2011 key driver analysis was not run for the Human Resources as it was part of the Service Centre Police National Headquarters. This means that providing a 'Rank from 2011' for the above key drivers is not appropriate.

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		1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation 4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do
Team level		4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment		
Individual level			4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	

© JRA

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – HUMAN RESOURCES

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

Response Rate

There was an excellent response to the 2012 staff survey from within Human Resources. 104 employees responded, representing a response rate of 83.9%. This high response rate ensures the results presented in this report provide a very accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the department.

How Employees Perceive Human Resources as a Place to Work

In terms of how staff perceive Human Resources as a place to work, the average score across all survey questions (the Performance Index) is 4.7% points higher than NZ Police overall, at 72.4%. There has been a 3.4% improvement in survey scores overall, since 2011.

When looking at scores around specific areas, Human Resources employees are significantly more positive than the NZ Police average in most areas. The greatest improvements were in Recognition (up 6.3% points to 67.2%) and Learning & Development (up 4.9% points to 67.1%). Overall, there were 28 questions that had statistically significant improvement since 2011 (more than 3.5% points). The Service Centre is on par with NZ Police overall in the sections about 'My Supervisor' and 'Performance and Feedback' and somewhat less positive with regard to 'My Workgroup'.

Digging further, we can examine item level scores within these areas to determine what is driving the more positive results. Within 'Recognition' we see particularly improved impressions regarding how NZ Police recognise outstanding achievement (up 10.3 points to 68.9%). Further, staff are much more positive about the encouragement they receive to develop (up 9.1 points to 70.1%), and seeing career and personal development opportunities – although it should be noted that this is still an area for further improvement at 59.1% (up 8.6 points). Although a number of questions saw decreases in scores from 2011, none of these differences are statistically significant.

The highest rated questions indicate a strong sense of care and respect that exists in Human Resources with questions regarding respect for employee diversity, work-life balance, understanding of workplace harassment/bullying/discrimination procedures, and feeling a sense of achievement all represented in strongest scores for Human Resources. In addition to this, three of the highest rated questions were found to be Key Drivers of Engagement for the Service Centre.

When examining Human Resources' lowest rated questions we note a theme of wanting more accountability for performance and improvement coming through, although all the lowest questions have seen good improvements from 2011. Despite scores improving, we can see that people in Human Resources want to see more accountability from leaders in NZ Police for working on survey results, and involving employees in this process.

It is important to recognise that not all low scoring areas in a survey are necessarily engaging to employees. This report includes the results of a key driver analysis that highlight what things assessed in the survey actually have an impact on how engaged staff members are in the workplace.

Employee Engagement within Human Resources

Employee engagement levels within Human Resources are significantly higher than those of NZ Police as a whole, at 80.8% - an increase of 3.1% points since 2011. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies what engages the team the most – information which serves as a means for increasing current engagement levels.

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

Possible leverage points are those key drivers of employee engagement identified via statistical analysis. Due to the smaller number of staff in Human Resources, only five key drivers have emerged that are common to the group as a whole. These include factors related to the job they do – getting a sense of personal achievement, having a good work environment, and ensuring that they are paid fairly. Also coming through as drivers of engagement for Human Resources are being able to enjoy working at NZ

© JRA

Police and being able to see the connection between what NZ Police is trying to do and progress in the community.

Employee Comments

Examining the comments made by staff we see further support for the Key Drivers mentioned above. Many comments refer to camaraderie, teamwork and the sense of personal achievement they get from working in the District. Staff are also positive about the ability they have to made a difference in the community as well as the variety that the job offers.

A number of issues were raised as things that needed to change, and generally relate to what is seen in the lowest rated questions too, around need for more recognition, desire for greater accountability taken for performance, and consistency in merit and appointments. Communication and listening to people's ideas and suggestions was also a common topic for comment.

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

Summary

Human Resources has seen some good improvements across most survey sections this year, particularly in regard to Recognition and Learning & Development – although it should be noted that employees still want to see more opportunities for personal and career development. People who work in Human Resources indicate a strong sense of care and respect that exists with questions regarding respect for employee diversity, work-life balance, understanding of workplace harassment/bullying/discrimination procedures, and feeling a sense of achievement all having strongly positive scores.

Employee Engagement levels are quite high within Human Resources compared to other parts of NZ Police however there are two factors in particular that can help strengthen employee engagement further. Understanding how to make coming to work more enjoyable for these people, and also investigating what can be done to improve the physical work environment for Human Resources staff. Those people who rated these factors higher were more engaged, however the scores for these key driver questions have had negligible improvements year on year.

Another area for further improvement regards the theme of wanting to see more accountability for performance and improvement, and a better connection between promotions/merit increases and the reasons for them. Finally, people in Human Resources want to see leaders be more accountable for acting on survey results, and involving employees in this process.

© JRA

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 Centres that adopt a standard action planning approach, provide support to those involved, and review the quality of planning output are those far more likely to see greater improvement in their subsequent survey results.

The following are some of the strategies we suggest need to be kept in mind when using survey results to drive change. Whilst there can never be one 'best' approach to the post-survey process that will suit all organisations, there are nevertheless a range of strategies that experience has shown leads to the greatest likelihood of performance improvement.

Focus on a limited number of key issues. Look for themes that emerge from your set of key drivers, paying particular attention to your 'red zone' key drivers. Try to distil these themes down to two or three major goals (80/20 principle).

Communication is vital. Do your best to keep everyone fully informed at all stages of the process, from results reporting to issue prioritisation to progress reports. Communicate survey results quickly (staff know you have them). Communicate senior management's initial response and the process to be followed. People want to know what is going to happen, how they will be involved. Have members of the management team present the results to their teams, while encouraging feedback and contribution. Consider using facilitators to assist in the process, and don't overlook the contribution supervisors may make (employees often prefer to receive organisational information directly from their supervisors rather than via emails or newsletters).

Act quickly. Make sure you act on your survey results within three months of survey results being reported. Survey momentum can be short lived and employees will quickly begin to question the relevancy of interventions that come too long after the survey has been completed. Look for the obvious "low-hanging fruit" or "easy fixes," and target them early on. Don't waste time on things you can't change – focus on things you CAN change. More complex issues can be addressed progressively during the year.

Measure your progress. Often desired improvement goals are not met because the survey is regarded as a one-off events, rather than an essential business process and KPI. Sustaining performance improvement requires not only the formulation of relevant and realistic action plans, but also regular monitoring of the impact of those initiatives. On-going measurement not only provides essential feedback on what's working and what's not, it also creates a 'virtuous cycle' where improvement becomes a reinforcing thing. Measurement is also a critical to ensure those responsible for change are held accountable. And there must be consequences – consequences for no change, and consequences for positive change.

Recognise and celebrate success. Often one of the most overlooked aspects of the survey process! And one of the most important. Obviously 'red zone' drivers need urgent attention, but don't overlook those 'green zone' drivers where your above-benchmark performance is something to celebrate (and maintain). One of the features of truly great workplaces is the emphasis they place on celebrating success. And success is all around you – celebrate, and see the different it makes!

Reinforce the survey follow-up process. Once your post-survey initiatives start to happen, make sure you take every opportunity to communicate and update staff on progress regularly. Too often organisations introduce excellent initiatives post-survey, but forget to tell anyone! Consider a quarterly update, or a section in your staff newsletter where you recap on the goals that were set and provide updates on progress to-date. This, more than anything, will reinforce to staff the value of the survey – the organisation was interested in my views, they have listened, and now they're doing something about them.

© JRA

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 (%)

© JRA

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.

© JRA