

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: National Intelligence Centre

June 2011



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



RESPONSE RATE

	National Intelligence Centre 2011	National Intelligence Centre 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	50	46	9503
Response Rate	94.3%	93.9%	79.2%

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. **Red font** indicates the score is statistically lower. 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 NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	National Intelligence Centre 2011	National Intelligence Centre 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index	67.6	66.9 (+0.7)	64.2 (+3.4)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	64.0	61.5 (+2.5)	59.2 (+4.8)
2. My Supervisor	76.1	74.7 (+1.4)	72.3 (+3.8)
3. My Work Group	72.3	73.8 (-1.5)	74.7 (-2.4)
4. My Job	66.0	65.4 (+0.6)	62.7 (+3.3)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	68.9	71.7 (-2.8)	68.1 (+0.8)
6. Learning and Development	65.4	67.2 (-1.8)	60.1 (+5.3)
7. Performance and Feedback	66.7	63.4 (+3.3)	66.7 (0.0)
8. Recognition	60.1	59.7 (+0.4)	53.1 (+7.0)
9. Final Thoughts	74.2	72.1 (+2.1)	70.5 (+3.7)
10. The Survey - Your Views	52.5	47.7 (+4.8)	42.8 (+9.7)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the NIC 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.

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE

Section	National Intelligence Centre 2011	National Intelligence Centre 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	84.5	84.2 (+0.3)	77.1 (+7.4)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	83.5	83.2 (+0.3)	85.3 (-1.8)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	82.0	82.6 (-0.6)	76.3 (+5.7)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	79.5	83.7 (-4.2)	78.3 (+1.2)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	78.0	79.3 (-1.3)	77.5 (+0.5)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	77.5	70.1 (+7.4)	75.6 (+1.9)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	77.5	78.8 (-1.3)	76.2 (+1.3)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	77.5	78.3 (-0.8)	74.7 (+2.8)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	77.0	82.2 (-5.2)	78.6 (-1.6)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	77.0	75.5 (+1.5)	73.3 (+3.7)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE

Section	National Intelligence Centre 2011	National Intelligence Centre 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	43.0	44.6 (-1.6)	51.9 (-8.9)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	50.5	46.5 (+4.0)	40.8 (+9.7)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	52.5	54.3 (-1.8)	43.7 (+8.8)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	54.5	50.5 (+4.0)	44.8 (+9.7)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	57.0	57.1 (-0.1)	54.8 (+2.2)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	57.0	49.5 (+7.5)	45.3 (+11.7)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	57.5	62.8 (-5.3)	50.8 (+6.7)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	58.5	53.3 (+5.2)	56.5 (+2.0)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	59.0	56.0 (+3.0)	52.9 (+6.1)
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	59.0	51.6 (+7.4)	52.0 (+7.0)

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

National Intelligence Centre 2011	National Intelligence Centre 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
74.2	72.1 (+2.1)	70.5 (+3.7)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	National Intelligence Centre 2011	National Intelligence Centre 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	22.0	23.9 (-1.9)	21.3 (+0.7)
Ambivalent	68.0	63.1 (+4.9)	63.2 (+4.8)
Disengaged	10.0	13.0 (-3.0)	15.5 (-5.5)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE?

Question	National Intelligence Centre	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	86.0	75.9 (+10.1)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	78.0	77.6 (+0.4)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	68.0	64.7 (+3.3)
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)	64.0	62.4 (+1.6)
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	54.0	57.8 (-3.8)

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?

	National Intelligence Centre	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	80.0	82.1 (-2.1)
Yes	2.0	4.6 (-2.6)
No	18.0	13.3 (+4.7)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE?

	Key Driver Questions	National Intelligence Centre 2011	National Intelligence Centre 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	73.5	71.2 (+2.3)	68.3 (+5.2)
	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	75.0	71.2 (+3.8)	76.1 (-1.1)
	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	69.5	62.5 (+7.0)	61.7 (+7.8)
	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	68.5	63.6 (+4.9)	59.7 (+8.8)
	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	67.0	75.0 (-8.0)	68.9 (-1.9)
	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	67.0	68.5 (-1.5)	57.8 (+9.2)
	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	63.5	56.5 (+7.0)	58.3 (+5.2)
	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	70.5	70.1 (+0.4)	61.1 (+9.4)
	6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	57.0	57.1 (-0.1)	54.8 (+2.2)

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 New Zealand Police (Total Org). These key drivers are rank ordered. The colour coding for each question reveals if a particular Service Centre/District 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		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 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 – THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE

When taking into account all responses within the National Intelligence Centre, the results indicate that the service centre is scoring on par with NZ Police overall. There are however several areas where the National Intelligence Centre is scoring significantly higher than the total organisation: Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation, Learning and Development, Recognition, and The Survey – Your Views. The only section which has seen a significant improvement in score since 2010 is The Survey – Your Views. Although this does indicate that there is an increased feeling of optimism within this service centre that the survey process will result in workplace improvements, given time.

All other sections have scores which have stayed relatively consistent over the past year. This in terms of the highest and lowest questions for the National Intelligence Centre, for the majority, the service centre is scoring on par with the total organisation. Several questions have seen a significant decline in score since 2010, with one scoring significantly below the total organisation. The majority of the highest rated questions tend to come from either the My Supervisor or My Work Group sections, while the lowest rated tend to come from a range of sections. A positive sign for this service centre is that seven of the lowest rated questions have scored significantly above the total organisation.

With regard to respect and integrity in the organisation. A greater proportion of staff do not feel that occurrences of negative behaviour are dealt with effectively, but there does appear to be a large degree of respect for employee diversity within this service centre.

The employee engagement levels within the National Intelligence Centre are very similar to those that exist across the rest of the organisation. A positive sign for this service centre is the decrease in disengaged staff since 2010, however the proportion of engaged staff has also decreased slightly. In order to prevent any further declines in the proportion of engaged staff, greater focus needs to be placed on the area of 'Development' within the Anatomy of a Great Workplace, and in particular, at the individual level. Providing further training for staff, as well as creating jobs which make better use of individual skills and knowledge will enable a greater sense of achievement within employees. Focus should however not be taken away from those areas where the National Intelligence Centre are currently performing above par.

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 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 recognition communication, performance,)	Action Agreed	Progress/completion measured by?	Timeframe for agreed actions	Person Responsible	Outcomes/ Benefits Expected	Relate to existing initiatives? Yes/No	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.