**New Zealand Police
Workplace Survey 2011**
Summary of Findings:
Police National Headquarters

June 2011

JRA
surveys ⟍ analysis ⟍ insight
a **Kenexa**® company

NEW ZEALAND
**POLICE**
*Nga Pirihimana O Aotearoa*

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

**RESPONSE RATE**

| | PNHQ 2011 | PNHQ 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Responses | 300 | 298 | 9503 |
| Response Rate | 86.5% | 86.4% | 79.2% |

Note: For the tables below **Green font** indicates that the PNHQ's score is statistically higher than the average score for NZ Police on that survey section/question, and/or that a score has improved since the 2010 survey. **Red font** indicates the score is statistically lower, and/or has significantly declined since the 2010 survey. The scores in the tables, excluding the response rate, are weighted mean scores (unless otherwise stated). See the glossary on the last page of this report for definitions of all terms used.

**OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE POLICE NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AS A PLACE TO WORK**

| Section | PNHQ 2011 | PNHQ 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey) | 68.7 | 64.7 (+4.0) | 64.2 (+4.5) |
| 1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation | 65.1 | 62.3 (+2.8) | 59.2 (+5.9) |
| 2. My Supervisor | 73.8 | 68.3 (+5.5) | 72.3 (+1.5) |
| 3. My Work Group | 71.7 | 66.5 (+5.2) | 74.7 (-3.0) |
| 4. My Job | 71.5 | 67.6 (+3.9) | 62.7 (+8.8) |
| 5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace | 69.8 | 67.0 (+2.8) | 68.1 (+1.7) |
| 6. Learning and Development | 63.8 | 59.2 (+4.6) | 60.1 (+3.7) |
| 7. Performance and Feedback | 64.0 | 60.0 (+4.0) | 66.7 (-2.7) |
| 8. Recognition | 61.5 | 57.4 (+4.1) | 53.1 (+8.4) |
| 9. Final Thoughts (Engagement) | 77.5 | 74.1 (+3.4) | 70.5 (+7.0) |
| 10. The Survey - Your Views | 55.3 | 50.7 (+4.6) | 42.8 (+12.5) |

**HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE POLICE NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS**

| Section | PNHQ 2011 | PNHQ 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police | 83.1 | 79.5 (+3.6) | 76.2 (+6.9) |
| 9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police | 82.8 | 79.9 (+2.9) | 74.8 (+8.0) |
| 4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police | 81.0 | 76.0 (+5.0) | 75.6 (+5.4) |
| 1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months | 79.9 | 76.8 (+3.1) | 85.3 (-5.4) |
| 2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect | 79.7 | 75.3 (+4.4) | 77.1 (+2.6) |
| 9.4: I feel inspired to go the extra mile to help NZ Police succeed | 79.4 | 76.4 (+3.0) | 70.3 (+9.1) |
| 2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police | 78.4 | 74.2 (+4.2) | 76.3 (+2.1) |
| 5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity | 78.3 | 73.9 (+4.4) | 73.3 (+5.0) |
| 2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job | 77.2 | 72.2 (+5.0) | 74.7 (+2.5) |
| 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement | 76.4 | 74.7 (+1.7) | 76.1 (+0.3) |

**LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE POLICE NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS**

| Section | PNHQ 2011 | PNHQ 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together | 48.5 | 47.5 (+1.0) | 51.9 (-3.4) |
| 10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup | 50.5 | 45.2 (+5.3) | 40.8 (+9.7) |
| 8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit | 51.2 | 48.1 (+3.1) | 43.7 (+7.5) |
| 6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police | 54.6 | 52.9 (+1.7) | 61.1 (-6.5) |
| 7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group | 55.0 | 49.8 (+5.2) | 56.5 (-1.5) |
| 1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff | 57.7 | 55.0 (+2.7) | 45.3 (+12.4) |
| 1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest | 58.4 | 55.8 (+2.6) | 52.0 (+6.4) |
| 6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police | 59.4 | 54.0 (+5.4) | 57.9 (+1.5) |
| 8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement | 59.4 | 55.3 (+4.1) | 52.9 (+6.5) |
| 10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey | 59.8 | 56.5 (+3.3) | 44.8 (+15.0) |

**JRA**
surveys · analysis · insight
a **kenexa** company

An Analysis of Employee Engagement  –  Police National Headquarters
July, 2011
© JRA

**SCORES ACROSS THE POLICE NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS**

| Section | Executive and Support | Finance | Human Resources | Operations | Other PNHQ | Public Affairs | Road Policing | Strategy, Performance and Planning | Police National Headquarters |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Index | 70.5 | 71.1 | 69.0 | 66.1 | 68.1 | 67.5 | 72.8 | 65.5 | 68.7 |
| 1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation | 67.6 | 67.3 | 66.8 | 62.4 | 61.3 | 64.2 | 69.4 | 62.0 | 65.1 |
| 2. My Supervisor | 76.9 | 80.6 | 71.3 | 72.6 | 75 | 80.7 | 77.5 | 66.6 | 73.8 |
| 3. My Work Group | 73.4 | 75.6 | 69.6 | 67.6 | 76.6 | 68.1 | 76.8 | 68.1 | 71.7 |
| 4. My Job | 71.4 | 74.1 | 73.9 | 66.7 | 69.2 | 70.1 | 75.2 | 67.5 | 71.5 |
| 5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace | 72.1 | 72.3 | 71.4 | 69.2 | 67.2 | 67.9 | 66.8 | 68.8 | 69.8 |
| 6. Learning and Development | 64.1 | 63.5 | 62.2 | 64.7 | 64.6 | 64.5 | 69.6 | 62.6 | 63.8 |
| 7. Performance and Feedback | 67.7 | 67.3 | 63.5 | 59.3 | 69 | 51.5 | 66.7 | 60.2 | 64 |
| 8. Recognition | 64.6 | 64.4 | 60.9 | 58.3 | 59.3 | 60.3 | 68.8 | 60.6 | 61.5 |
| 9. Final Thoughts (Engagement) | 78.3 | 75.8 | 77.7 | 75.3 | 76.7 | 78.2 | 84.0 | 76.4 | 77.5 |
| 10. The Survey - Your Views | 58.2 | 57.9 | 59.8 | 52.6 | 52.9 | 41.9 | 58.1 | 48.4 | 55.3 |

Weighted Mean Scores (%)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the PNHQ 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 POLICE NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS?

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

| PNHQ 2011 | PNHQ 2010 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|---|---|---|
| 77.5 | 74.1 (+3.4) | 70.5 (+7.0) |

Weighted Mean Score (%)

**Engagement Profile**

| Engagement Group | PNHQ 2011 | PNHQ 2010 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Engaged | 36.7 | 25.2 (+11.5) | 21.3 (+15.4) |
| Ambivalent | 54.6 | 65.7 (-11.1) | 63.2 (-8.6) |
| Disengaged | 8.7 | 9.1 (-0.4) | 15.5 (-6.8) |

Proportion of Employees (%)

### RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE POLICE NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS?

| Question | PNHQ | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|---|---|---|
| 5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity | 83.3 | 75.9 (+7.4) |
| 5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination | 78.6 | 77.6 (+1.0) |
| 5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal | 66.3 | 64.7 (+1.6) |
| 5.4: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had about other inappropriate conduct in the workplace without fear of reprisal (inappropriate conduct may include any actions or behaviours that make you feel uncomfortable in the workplace) | 64.8 | 62.4 (+2.4) |
| 5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately | 59.1 | 57.8 (+1.3) |

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?

| | PNHQ | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|---|---|---|
| Not Applicable | 76.0 | 82.1 (-6.1) |
| Yes | 7.0 | 4.6 (+2.4) |
| No | 17.0 | 13.3 (+3.7) |

**WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE POLICE NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS?**

| | Rank from 2010 | Key Driver Questions | District 2011 | District 2010 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 8 | 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement | 76.4 | 74.7 (+1.7) | 76.1 (+0.3) |
| | 1 | 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work | 73.6 | 68.8 (+4.8) | 68.3 (+5.3) |
| | N/A | 8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police | 65.0 | 63.3 (+1.7) | 54.5 (+10.5) |
| | 2 | 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills | 73.8 | 71.4 (+2.4) | 68.9 (+4.9) |
| | 6 | 6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things | 67.0 | 59.8 (+7.2) | 57.8 (+9.2) |
| | N/A | 4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police | 81.0 | 76.0 (+5.0) | 75.6 (+5.4) |
| | 3 | 1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre | 69.1 | 65.9 (+3.2) | 61.7 (+7.4) |
| | 5 | 1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation | 68.6 | 65.1 (+3.5) | 59.7 (+8.9) |
| | N/A | 1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police | 65.4 | 63.1 (+2.3) | 58.1 (+7.3) |
| | N/A | 4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job | 70.5 | 65.7 (+4.8) | 53.5 (+17.0) |

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 PNHQ. These key drivers are rank ordered. The colour coding for each question reveals if a particular key driver is scoring higher (green), lower (red), or the same (orange) as NZ Police overall. Red key drivers are important to your employees' engagement levels but score poorly compared to the rest of the organisation and hence represents a particularly useful leverage point when attempting to further engage employees. The rank of key drivers that were identified in 2010 is shown in the column headed "Rank from 2010".

**ANATOMY OF A GREAT WORKPLACE™**

Over a decade of research by JRA on what makes a great workplace in New Zealand reveals there are four common characteristics – Vision & Values, a strong sense of Community, a focus on employee Development, and a strong Performance Culture. The table below illustrates where the PNHQ 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** | | 1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police<br><br>1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work | | 1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation |
| **Team level** | | | 6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things | |
| **Individual level** | 4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police | 1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre<br><br>8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police | 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills<br><br>4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement | 4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job |

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

Reading across the table, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the PNHQ 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 | Executive and Support | Finance | Human Resources | Operations | Other PNHQ | Public Affairs | Road Policing | Strategy, Performance and Planning | Police National Headquarters | Total Organisation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement | 75.0 | 76.8 | 78.0 | 75.0 | 76.0 | 76.5 | 85.0 | 68.8 | 76.4 | 76.1 |
| 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work | 76.0 | 75.0 | 76.0 | 70.2 | 69.8 | 72.1 | 76.3 | 71.1 | 73.6 | 68.3 |
| 8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police | 64.6 | 69.6 | 64.5 | 61.5 | 60.4 | 69.1 | 78.8 | 62.5 | 65.0 | 54.5 |
| 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills | 68.8 | 72.3 | 75.0 | 71.2 | 72.6 | 77.9 | 77.5 | 74.2 | 73.8 | 68.9 |
| 6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things | 69.8 | 71.4 | 68.0 | 63.5 | 65.6 | 64.7 | 71.3 | 61.7 | 67.0 | 57.8 |
| 4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police | 79.2 | 81.3 | 86.3 | 77.9 | 74.5 | 77.9 | 88.8 | 75.8 | 81.0 | 75.6 |
| 1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre | 69.8 | 71.4 | 69.5 | 66.3 | 67.9 | 76.5 | 72.5 | 63.3 | 69.1 | 61.7 |
| 1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation | 75.0 | 66.1 | 72.0 | 61.5 | 64.2 | 72.1 | 70.0 | 65.6 | 68.6 | 59.7 |
| 1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police | 65.6 | 60.7 | 69.4 | 60.6 | 58.5 | 72.1 | 70.0 | 66.4 | 65.4 | 58.1 |
| 4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job | 78.1 | 75.0 | 73.5 | 62.5 | 65.9 | 69.1 | 77.5 | 61.7 | 70.5 | 53.5 |

Weighted Mean Score (%)

The following summary provides insight into how employees perceive Police National Headquarters (PNHQ) as a place to work and how it fares to the rest of NZ Police. Engagement levels within PNHQ 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 PNHQ that would likely provide it with the greatest improvement leverage when attempting to make PNHQ a truly great – and engaging – place to work.

**Response Rate**

There was a very good response to the 2011 survey from within PNHQ of 86.5% (well above the NZ Police average of 79.2%). This response rate ensures the results presented in this report provide an accurate indication of employee opinion and attitude towards working at NZ Police.

**How Employees Perceive Police National Headquarters as a Place to Work**

On average, survey results indicate that PNHQ staff are significantly more positive about their workplace compared to the overall NZ Police results (the Performance Index score of PNHQ is 4.5% above the average at 68.7%), with a 4% point improvement since 2010. Executive and Support, and Finance have a Performance Index higher than the NZ Police average, although have declined from 2010. Operations is lower than NZ Police overall, however have improved strongly from 2010 by 14.5% to 66.1%. Other areas of PNHQ are on a par with the NZ Police average, at an overall level.

When we look at the Section Summary for PNHQ, we can see that most section scores of PNHQ as a whole are significantly higher than the NZ Police average, however, there are two sections that score significantly lower than the NZ Police average. These are 'My Work Group', which is 3.0% lower at 71.7%, and 'Performance and Feedback' which is 2.7% lower at 64.0%. All section scores have increased significantly from 2010.

When examining PNHQ's 10 highest rated questions we note that three of the top ten are from the 'Final Thoughts (Engagement)' section, and these questions also score significantly above the NZ Police average. As we will see below, this indicates an above-average level of engagement within PNHQ. There are also three questions related to 'My Supervisor'. Two of the highest rated questions relate to how people feel about their jobs, these are also key drivers of engagement.

In the 10 lowest rated questions list, two questions are from the 'Recognition' section, although the questions still score significantly above the NZ Police average, and have improved from 2010. Two of the questions relate to 'Learning & Development' , however these have improved from 2010. Two of PNHQ's lowest rated questions related to the survey - 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff' and 'Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup.' However it is worth noting that PNHQ scored significantly above average on both these questions (15% and 9.7% higher respectively), and both scores have improved from 2010. This indicates that PNHQ staff are much more optimistic that the survey will result in change than other parts of NZ Police. There are two lowest rated question where PNHQ score significantly below NZ Police. These are 'Work Groups in NZ police work well together' (3.4% below NZ Police, at 48.5%) and 'There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police', 6.5% below NZ Police at 54.6%. This question may be rated low because of the specialist nature of the roles in PNHQ, meaning articulated traditional career paths are not always obvious for people in these roles.

While none of the key driver questions specific to PNHQ are in the 10 lowest rated questions, there are two questions relating to 'learning and development', and learning and development does come through as a key driver for PNHQ staff.

**Respect and Diversity**

Staff in PNHQ are significantly more positive than the NZ Police average about their workgroup's respect for employee diversity, increasing 5.4% this year to 83.3%. There has also been improvement this year in confidence that people can report incidents of discrimination, bullying, or harassment without fear of reprisal. The only item that showed a slight decrease was knowing who to contact to report an instance of discrimination, bullying or harassment, however the level still sits above the NZ Police average.

**Employee Engagement with Police National Headquarters**

Employee engagement levels within PNHQ are significantly higher than that of NZ Police overall at 77.5% (compared to 70.5% for NZ Police), and have improved since 2010 by 3.4%. 36.7% of PNHQ's employees can be considered to be 'Engaged,' compared to 21.3% across NZ Police as a whole. This is an improvement of 11.5% from 2010. On the other end of the spectrum, PNHQ has a significantly smaller

proportion of 'disengaged' employees than the NZ Police average – 8.7% vs 15.5%. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies what engages PNHQ'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 PNHQ's results, and this process has highlighted which questions in the survey have the greatest impact on employee engagement levels. It is important to recognise that not all low scoring areas in a survey have the same impact when wanting to better engage your employees.

All of PNHQ's key driver questions are scoring above the NZ Police average, and all have improved from 2010.

Four of the key drivers come from the 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' section of the survey. These questions indicate that for PNHQ staff, feeling an emotional connection to the organisation is important, as is the belief that people within NZ Police are working together effectively with a clear 'common purpose'. It is also important for the people in PNHQ to feel they are doing a good job, and have a role where they can use their skills and knowledge to make a valuable contribution – and that this is recognised.

When we look at the 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' we see that 4 of the key drivers have been grouped together under the heading 'Community', referring to the common theme that these questions are about building a sense of community within PNHQ. Reinforcing the sense of community that already exists in PNHQ is something that should be a key outcome of this report, as analysis shows that this currently contributes most to current engagement levels, and therefore will help to strengthen engagement among staff who are more 'ambivalent' about their working experience at NZ Police. The second clear theme emerging from the key driver analysis and shown in the Anatomy of a Great Workplace model is around the development of employees in their current roles and for future roles. There may be more scope for improvement across the questions in this 'pillar', as 2 of the lowest rated questions – while not in the top 10 drivers, were expressing a desire for more learning and career development.

The strongest area of PNHQ with regard to key drivers is Road Policing, which have seen significant increases since 2010 – not only in key driver questions, but all areas of the survey. The Employee Engagement Index in Road Policing increased 15.5% to 84% this year, with 45% of staff engaged (compared to 20% last year) and zero staff disengaged (compared to 12% last year).

**Employee Comments**

For the open-ended question asking what makes NZ Police a great place to work, the dominant theme was around 'the people I work with,' teamwork and camaraderie, as is the case in most parts of NZ Police. Another important theme that emerged is around how important it is for them to feel like they are making a difference in NZ society.

When asked what needs to change to make NZ Police a great place to work, there were a large variety of responses. The desire for more training across all of NZ Police is voiced, as well as the need for more career development and opportunities for PNHQ staff. Another theme is around ensuring poor performers are being actively managed, and making sure that people are appointed to positions based on merit. Finally, a number of staff have highlighted a desire for better recognition for good performance.

**Summary**

Overall there has been considerable improvements across many areas within PNHQ this year, with corresponding increases in engagement levels.

The Key Driver Analysis for PNHQ indicates that for staff to feel engaged at work feeling an emotional connection to the organisation is important, as is the belief that they are working together effectively with a clear 'common purpose'. It is also important for the people in PNHQ to feel they are doing a good job, and have a role where they can use their skills and knowledge to make a valuable contribution – and that this is recognised. All the key drivers have seen good improvements this year, however reinforcing the sense of community that already exists in PNHQ will help to strengthen engagement among staff who are more 'ambivalent' about their working experience at NZ Police.

The second clear theme emerging from the key driver analysis and shown in the Anatomy of a Great Workplace model is around the development of employees in their current roles and for future roles. There may be more scope for improvement across the questions in this 'pillar', as 2 of the lowest rated questions – while not in the top 10 drivers, were expressing a desire for more learning and development, not just for their current role, but to give them the sense that they are growing their careers. Having discussions with

people on what internal career opportunities exist and what experience they need to pursue these opportunities can help people develop in the right direction for them. This is particularly important for people in Specialist roles, where a prescribed career path is not obvious. Lateral job movement, job secondments, and project participation can offer people in specialist roles further opportunities where upward movement isn't always possible.

Out of the areas within PNHQ, Road Policing has had some very strong improvement in all survey sections this year, and also have the highest ratings for believing that survey results will be actioned and result in positive changes for NZ Police. Understanding what communication and action planning processes they followed in 2010, may help other areas in working through results.

**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 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**
surveys \ analysis \ insight
a **KeneXa** company

An Analysis of Employee Engagement  –  Police National Headquarters
July, 2011
© JRA

9

**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 (%)

**JRA**
surveys ˎ analysis ˎ insight
a Kenexa company

An Analysis of Employee Engagement  –  Police National Headquarters
July, 2011
© JRA

10

# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

An Analysis of Employee Engagement  –  Police National Headquarters
July, 2011
© 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 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.