

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: Tasman District

June 2011



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



RESPONSE RATE

	Tasman District 2011	Tasman District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	302	293	9503
Response Rate	78%	77.5%	79.2%

Note: For the tables below **Green font** indicates that the District'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 TASMAN DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Tasman District 2011	Tasman District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	62.8	59.1 (+3.7)	64.2 (-1.4)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	56.8	50.3 (+6.5)	59.2 (-2.4)
2. My Supervisor	71.2	69.1 (+2.1)	72.3 (-1.1)
3. My Work Group	75.0	73.2 (+1.8)	74.7 (+0.3)
4. My Job	60.7	57.4 (+3.3)	62.7 (-2.0)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.1	65.4 (+3.7)	68.1 (+1.0)
6. Learning and Development	57.4	56.2 (+1.2)	60.1 (-2.7)
7. Performance and Feedback	66.5	66.8 (-0.3)	66.7 (-0.2)
8. Recognition	52.1	47.3 (+4.8)	53.1 (-1.0)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	68.4	63.3 (+5.1)	70.5 (-2.1)
10. The Survey - Your Views	41.8	31.6 (+10.2)	42.8 (-1.0)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT

Section	Tasman District 2011	Tasman District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	85.9	84.5 (+1.4)	85.3 (+0.6)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	80.4	76.1 (+4.3)	78.6 (+1.8)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	78.5	76.9 (+1.6)	77.5 (+1.0)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	78.3	78.7 (-0.4)	78.3 (0.0)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	76.8	78.0 (-1.2)	77.0 (-0.2)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	75.6	72.4 (+3.2)	76.3 (-0.7)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	75.4	76.5 (-1.1)	75.5 (-0.1)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	75.1	72.5 (+2.6)	73.4 (+1.7)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	74.9	74.6 (+0.3)	76.1 (-1.2)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	74.3	73.3 (+1.0)	77.1 (-2.8)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT

Section	Tasman District 2011	Tasman District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	39.3	30.5 (+8.8)	40.8 (-1.5)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	42.7	34.1 (+8.6)	45.3 (-2.6)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	42.9	42.2 (+0.7)	43.7 (-0.8)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	44.5	33.0 (+11.5)	44.8 (-0.3)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	47.6	37.5 (+10.1)	51.9 (-4.3)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	48.8	41.2 (+7.6)	53.5 (-4.7)
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	50.2	44.2 (+6.0)	52.0 (-1.8)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	50.8	50.2 (+0.6)	54.8 (-4.0)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	51.3	39.1 (+12.2)	51.9 (-0.6)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	51.5	46.3 (+5.2)	50.8 (+0.7)

SCORES ACROSS THE TASMAN DISTRICT

Section	Marlborough Area	Nelson Bays Area	Tasman DHQ	West Coast Area	Tasman District
Performance Index	62.5	58.7	67.9	67.9	62.8
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	56.5	51.6	59.2	65.1	56.8
2. My Supervisor	67.7	68.9	76.7	76.6	71.2
3. My Work Group	77.5	72.7	76.9	74.6	75
4. My Job	59.0	56.2	68.5	66.7	60.7
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	72.5	64.7	72.1	70.6	69.1
6. Learning and Development	56.9	52.1	63.8	63.8	57.4
7. Performance and Feedback	68.2	63.1	71.4	67.7	66.5
8. Recognition	50.9	47.6	58.3	58.3	52.1
9. Final Thoughts	68.1	64.5	73.1	73.1	68.4
10. The Survey - Your Views	38.4	36.2	50.7	51.2	41.8

Weighted Mean Scores (%)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the District 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 TASMAN DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Tasman 2011	Tasman 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
68.4	63.3 (+5.1)	70.5 (+2.1)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Tasman 2011	Tasman 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	16.9	11 (+5.9)	21.3 (-4.4)
Ambivalent	65.2	61.9 (+3.3)	63.2 (+2.0)
Disengaged	17.9	27.1 (-9.2)	15.5 (+2.4)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT?

Question	Tasman 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	76.2	75.9 (+0.3)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	83.7	77.6 (+6.1)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	66.2	64.7 (+1.5)
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)	63.1	62.4 (+0.7)
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	59.9	57.8 (+2.1)

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?

	Tasman	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	83.4	82.1 (+1.3)
Yes	6	4.6 (+1.4)
No	10.6	13.3 (-2.7)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2010	Key Driver Questions	Tasman 2011	Tasman 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	64.8	57.1 (+7.7)	68.3 (-3.5)
	3	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	74.9	74.6 (+0.3)	76.1 (-1.2)
	NA	8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	53.4	47.2 (+6.2)	54.5 (-1.1)
	2	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	56.4	53.2 (+3.2)	61.7 (-5.3)
	NA	1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	54.9	49.1 (+5.8)	58.1 (-3.2)
	NA	8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	42.9	42.2 (+0.7)	43.7 (-0.8)
	NA	4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	55.4	50.0 (+5.4)	59.7 (-4.3)

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 District. 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 District'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		1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	
Team level		4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment		
Individual level		1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre 8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	4 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	

PRIORITY AREAS – KEY DRIVER SCORES ACROSS KEY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

Reading across the table, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the District 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	Marlborough Area	Nelson Bays Area	Tasman DHQ	West Coast Area	Tasman District	NZ Police (Total Org)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	65.5	60.0	66.4	71.8	64.8	68.3
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	74.4	71.1	78.8	80.2	74.9	76.1
8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	53.6	48.3	59.6	58.7	53.4	54.5
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	58.3	47.1	62.5	67.1	56.4	61.7
1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	58.1	48.0	51.3	65.5	54.9	58.1
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	39.6	37.3	50.6	52.4	42.9	43.7
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	56.0	46.7	69.2	61.9	55.4	59.7

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – TASMAN DISTRICT

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

Response Rate

Building on last year's excellent response rate the 2011 staff survey for the Tasman District finished with a total of 302 people participating in the survey. This represents 78.0% of all those invited in the district and is up on 77.5% from 2010. A high response rate like this again ensures that the results presented in this report provide an accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the District.

How Employees Perceive the Tasman District as a Place to Work

From the outset it is clear that Tasman District's staff have a much more positive view of the District compared to that of a year ago. Almost across the board there are substantive improvements in scores at the total District level, across most survey sections, and in terms of employee engagement. Whilst several areas still fall below NZ Police norms, the significant momentum the District has shown thus far suggests continued efforts will reap further substantive improvements in employee opinion and engagement levels.

In more detail, the District's 'Performance Index' – the average score across all questions across all employees is 62.8% which is a significant increase on 59.1% in 2010. Compared to NZ Police overall the Tasman District now performs on par on most sections. However, the District is significantly below on 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' and 'Learning and Development', which are behind NZ Police overall by -2.4% and -2.7% respectively.

Over half the District section scores improved significantly since the 2010 survey, with remaining sections scoring similar to 2010. The sections with most improvement include 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation'; 'My Job'; 'Respect & Integrity in the Workplace'; 'Recognition'; 'Final Thoughts (Engagement)' and 'The Survey – Your Views', with increases ranging from 3.3% to 10.2%, the latter being particularly substantive in terms of change in employee opinion.

On examination of the District's highest rated questions we see intention to stay at NZ Police remains the top ranked question within the District at 85.9%. The next 3 highest ranked items relate directly to 'The Work Group'. In total almost half the top 10 items are from this 'The Work Group' section. Within the highest ranked questions the largest increases come from 'People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police' (up 4.3%), 'My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police' (up 3.2%) and 'I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination' (up 2.6%). Of the District's top questions 'My supervisor treats staff with respect' is significantly behind NZ Police overall by -2.8%

For the lowest ranked questions in the District there have been large and significant increases across almost every question. Despite this the District remains significantly lower than NZ Police overall on about half of these. 'Work groups in NZ Police work well together', 'I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey', and 'NZ Police cares about the well being of its staff' had the greatest improvements with increase of 10% for each of them – again, very large increases in an employee survey. All up there were 4 low ranking questions that the District improved on greatly but that still lag significantly behind NZ Police overall. The third lowest ranked question from the survey 'People here are appointed to positions based on merit' is an item that analysis has identified as a key driver of employee engagement.

As with most organisation surveys, there is evidence of quite some variability in terms of employee perceptions of the workplace depending on the Area in which they work. This naturally may reflect, amongst other things, management quality, nature of the work performed, comparative conditions, and so on. In particular the Tasman DHQ outperforms all other areas across most survey sections, where last year it was the Marlborough Area that was stronger. As with 2010 it is the Nelson Bays Area that scores lowest across most sections, however good progress has been against most sections from 2010.

Respect and Integrity within the Tasman District

The Tasman District results are generally the same as the overall NZ Police results for 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items. One question however, 'I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying, or discriminations' at 83.7% is significantly higher than the NZ Police average of 77.6%. Staff confidence in raising concerns in regard to workplace harassment, bullying, discrimination or inappropriate conduct without fear of reprisal, and having those concerns dealt with

appropriately, is similar to NZ Police overall. For those people who had witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace, they perceived the handling of those incidents to be better than that of NZ Police overall, with less people believing issues had not been dealt with effectively.

Employee Engagement within the Tasman District

Employee engagement levels for the District have increased this year with 16.9% of the District ticking agree and strongly agree to the six engagement questions, up significantly from 11.0% in 2010. Whilst a positive increase, this result is still significantly below NZ Police overall, which has 21.3% of the organisation agreeing to these engagement questions. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies the issues that engage the District's employees the most – information which serves as a targeted means for increasing current engagement levels.

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

Key driver analysis identifies via statistical analysis those survey items that have the greatest impact on employee engagement, while at the same time determining how NZ Police is performing against those same items.

In 2011 there are seven survey items that particularly important to Tasman District staff, coming from the sections 'Vision and Purpose', 'My Job' and 'Recognition'. It is pleasing to see that for these seven drivers of engagement there have been statistical improvements across all of them from last year, with a majority of them being significant increases. Despite these positive increases, the District still performs significantly below NZ Police overall on 4 key driver items; 'NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work'; 'I feel a sense of belonging to my District'; 'There is a sense of common purpose in NZ Police' and 'I am satisfied with my physical work environment'. Interestingly, the first two of these were the identified as underperforming key drivers in 2010. Given their importance to employee engagement levels within the District, and their lower score when compared to NZ Police norms, they reflect potentially very useful leverage points for improving engagement scores, and the Districts survey scores more generally.

When placed in the 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' model we see that these items highlight just how important a 'sense of community' is to the Tasman District staff. Considering that the District has made significant gains across these 4 low items from 2010, it is likely that the District can leverage of initiatives from the last survey for continued improvements in these areas.

'Training and development' also feature this year as being important for staff in the District. Compared to NZ Police overall, the District performs about the same on the items that fall into this category. But as can be seen when looking at Areas within the District there is variability across these items, highlighting that there are definite opportunities for improvement.

Employee Comments

Similar to the 2010 survey comments, many staff make specific reference to the people that they work with. Comments such as camaraderie, team work, colleagues, the people and the work they for the public are frequently made as things that make working for NZ Police great. Many people take real pride and have a real belief in the work that they do for NZ Police.

Among the things that people felt NZ Police could do better included more frontline staffing, and paying more attention to the opinions of those doing frontline police work. Having access to other tools and resources is mention a number of times, as well as the administrative and compliant based tasks that take up peoples' time, and things that staff would like to change.

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

Summary

The Tasman District has made great improvements over the past year, and the District should take time to recognise the efforts that they have made since the 2010 survey. Levels of 'Engagement' however remain below NZ Police overall – but it is important to note that realistic expectations would permit the District time to improve its survey scores and corresponding engagement levels. In one year the District has made noteworthy gains and is encouraged to maintain the momentum. A potentially useful leverage point lies in examining the low scoring drivers that fall into the 'sense of community' pillar of a Great Workplace. We know that these items are important to staff, and the survey comments given by staff back this up, particularly when many comments make specific reference to the sense of belonging that they get by being a part of NZ Police.

This year the Tasman DHQ Area performed the best across the District, and has obviously made improvement from 2010. The District should look at the initiatives that have been in place since last year, and see what 'best practice' initiatives can be implemented in other areas. In comparison the Nelson Bays Area scores lower across most sections, as it did in 2010. Some assistance may be required to uncover the dynamics of the area that see it scoring lower than the others.

It should be noted that the survey from 2010 has had a positive impact on how staff think about NZ Police listening to them, with all Areas within the District having significantly improved scores for 'I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey'. Last year's initiatives will have had a big impact on this, and it can be reinforced again this year through sound and effective 'action planning'.

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. Districts 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 event, 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.