

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2012

Summary of Findings: Tasman District

April 2012

KeneXa® | JRA



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

KeneXa® | JRA

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Tasman District
April, 2012
© JRA

RESPONSE RATE

	Tasman District 2012	Tasman District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	339	302	9393
Response Rate	86.5%	78.0%	77.1%

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 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 TASMAN DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Tasman District 2012	Tasman District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	68.6	62.8 (+5.8)	67.7 (+0.9)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	65.8	56.8 (+9.0)	63.9 (+1.9)
2. My Supervisor	75.2	71.2 (+4.0)	75.6 (-0.4)
3. My Work Group	76.1	75.0 (+1.1)	76.7 (-0.6)
4. My Job	65.6	60.7 (+4.9)	65.7 (-0.1)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	73.5	69.1 (+4.4)	71.2 (+2.3)
6. Learning and Development	63.8	57.4 (+6.4)	62.7 (+1.1)
7. Performance and Feedback	71.4	66.5 (+4.9)	69.4 (+2.0)
8. Recognition	61.4	52.1 (+9.3)	58.0 (+3.4)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	73.7	68.4 (+5.3)	73.3 (+0.4)
10. The Survey - Your Views	52.8	41.8 (+11.0)	49.6 (+3.2)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT

Question	Tasman District 2012	Tasman District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	88.2	85.9 (+2.3)	85.8 (+2.4)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	81.6	76.8 (+4.8)	79.3 (+2.3)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	80.6	80.4 (+0.2)	80.0 (+0.6)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	79.7	78.3 (+1.4)	80.0 (-0.3)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	79.1	74.9 (+4.2)	78.0 (+1.1)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	78.5	78.5 (0.0)	79.1 (-0.6)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	78.3	74.1 (+4.2)	78.1 (+0.2)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	78.0	75.1 (+2.9)	75.8 (+2.2)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	77.9	74.3 (+3.6)	80.0 (-2.1)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	77.9	75.6 (+2.3)	79.2 (-1.3)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT

Question	Tasman District 2012	Tasman District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	49.4	39.3 (+10.1)	47.8 (+1.6)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	55.0	42.9 (+12.1)	48.2 (+6.8)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	55.6	42.7 (+12.9)	51.3 (+4.3)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	55.9	51.5 (+4.4)	53.0 (+2.9)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	56.9	44.5 (+12.4)	51.5 (+5.4)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	57.0	51.3 (+5.7)	56.0 (+1.0)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	57.3	48.8 (+8.5)	59.0 (-1.7)
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	58.4	55.2 (+3.2)	61.6 (-3.2)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	58.5	47.6 (+10.9)	56.9 (+1.6)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	58.6	50.8 (+7.8)	58.9 (-0.3)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT SINCE 2011 - POSITIVE

Question	Tasman District 2012	Tasman District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	55.6	42.7 (+12.9)	51.3 (+4.3)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	56.9	44.5 (+12.4)	51.5 (+5.4)
1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	69.2	57.0 (+12.2)	67.8 (+1.4)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	55.0	42.9 (+12.1)	48.2 (+6.8)
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	67.9	56.4 (+11.5)	65.5 (+2.4)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	61.4	50.2 (+11.2)	57.4 (+4.0)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	58.5	47.6 (+10.9)	56.9 (+1.6)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	49.4	39.3 (+10.1)	47.8 (+1.6)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	62.7	52.6 (+10.1)	58.8 (+3.9)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	65.9	56.2 (+9.7)	62.8 (+3.1)

NOTE: all questions showed an improvement in score since the 2011 survey

SCORES ACROSS THE TASMAN DISTRICT

Section	Tasman Dhq	Marlborough Area	Nelson Bays Area	West Coast Area	Tasman District
Performance Index	71.4	68.5	65.2	73.8	68.6
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	66.7	65.9	61.9	72.8	65.8
2. My Supervisor	79.0	73.5	72.3	79.9	75.2
3. My Work Group	78.8	78.9	72.2	78.6	76.1
4. My Job	71.5	65.8	61.4	69.2	65.6
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	75.1	73.1	70.6	78.8	73.5
6. Learning and Development	65.7	63.2	60.3	70.3	63.8
7. Performance and Feedback	72.9	70.3	70.3	74.0	71.4
8. Recognition	63.9	60.6	58.3	67.0	61.4
9. Final Thoughts	75.6	73.7	70.5	78.9	73.7
10. The Survey - Your Views	55.7	47.3	48.9	65.2	52.8

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.

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT

Question	Tasman District	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	83.4	81.0 (+2.4)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	86.1	80.9 (+5.2)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	75.1	69.4 (+5.7)
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)	72.0	67.1 (+4.9)
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	69.4	63.5 (+5.9)

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 District	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	87.9	83.4 (+4.5)
Yes	3.3	4.6 (-1.3)
No	8.9	12.0 (-3.1)

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Tasman District 2012	Tasman District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
73.7	68.4 (+5.3)	73.3 (+0.4)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Tasman District 2012	Tasman District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	26.5	16.9 (+9.6)	27.8 (-1.3)
Ambivalent	63.2	65.2 (-2.0)	59.7 (+3.5)
Disengaged	10.3	17.9 (-7.6)	12.5 (-2.2)

Proportion of Employees (%)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE TASMAN DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2011	Key Driver Questions	Tasman District 2012	Tasman District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	69.8	64.8 (+5.0)	71.1 (-1.3)
	4	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	67.9	56.4 (+11.5)	65.5 (+2.4)
	2	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	79.1	74.9 (+4.2)	78.0 (+1.1)
	NA	1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	58.5	47.6 (+10.9)	56.9 (+1.6)
	5	1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	63.2	54.9 (+8.3)	62.8 (+0.4)
	NA	1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	69.2	57.0 (+12.2)	67.8 (+1.4)
	NA	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	62.7	55.5 (+7.2)	60.3 (+2.4)
	NA	4.10: I understand how my performance is measured	65.3	59.8 (+5.5)	63.9 (+1.4)
	NA	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	73.8	69.4 (+4.4)	71.0 (+2.8)
	NA	4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	76.9	73.4 (+3.5)	76.9 (+0.0)

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 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 2011 is shown in the column headed "Rank from 2011".

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	1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work 1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff 1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police		
Team level				
Individual level	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job 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 or my Service Centre	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	4.10: I understand how my performance is measured

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	Tasman Dhq	Marlborough Area	Nelson Bays Area	West Coast Area	Tasman District	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	71.1	70.3	66.5	75.0	69.8	71.1
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	73.6	68.1	60.3	78.7	67.9	65.5
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	76.9	78.8	78.3	82.7	79.1	78.0
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	63.7	57.5	54.3	64.3	58.5	56.9
1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	60.6	65.6	58.3	72.1	63.2	62.8
1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	68.8	65.0	68.5	75.7	69.2	67.8
4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	70.2	64.1	54.9	71.0	62.7	60.3
4.10: I understand how my performance is measured	71.2	65.3	61.8	67.8	65.3	63.9
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	74.0	72.8	71.8	79.1	73.8	71.0
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	78.8	78.8	73.7	79.4	76.9	76.9

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

Tasman District has an exceptional response rate this year with 339 people participating representing 86.5% of all invited in Tasman District, up on an already strong response rate in 2011. At 86.5% this ensures a very representative set of results in this report providing an accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the District. The growing response rate year on year also indicates the strong traction the survey has in the District and the value people place in providing their feedback knowing it is acknowledged and actioned.

How Employees Perceive the Tasman District as a Place to Work

The momentum seen in 2011 is clearly seen in this year results. 2011 results showed a strong positive trend on 2010. In 2012, this positive trend has accelerated. There are substantial increases in nearly all sections of the survey including employee engagement. In fact, all questions showed an improvement in score over the 2011 survey.

Examining the results more closely, the District's 'Performance Index' – the average score across all questions across all employees – is 68.6%, up significantly from 62.8% in 2011 and on par overall with NZ Police average.

Looking at the survey sections, the District is significantly ahead of NZ Police average in two sections (being 'Recognition' and 'The Survey – Your Views') and on par in all other sections. For nearly all sections there have been significant improvements since 2011. The biggest improvements are in 'The Survey – Your Views' (+11.0), 'Recognition' (+9.3), and 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' (+9.0). These improvements are substantial and often difficult to achieve in one year in terms of change in employee opinion.

The District's highest rated questions remain mostly unchanged (albeit in a different order) from 2011 and all are on par with NZ Police averages. Endorsing the strong intent for people to stay at NZ Police (top rated at 88.2%) is the inclusion of the engagement related question of commitment to NZ Police this year. 'My Work Group' continues to feature strongly along with the strong sense of the NZ Police values being lived both at team and supervisor level. As well as being one of the highest rated areas, 'My job gives me a sense of personal achievement' is a key driver for Tasman District and has significantly improved over 2011. As a key driver it is worthwhile leveraging this strong focus area for the District and continuing to improve perceptions in this area.

The lowest rated questions in the District have all experienced positive shifts since 2011. The one question the District underperforms NZ Police overall is 'The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable'.

Of the largest positive changes, five of the ten questions relate directly to considerable changes in perceptions around communications and acting on staff feedback. This would indicate purposeful action being taken in these areas and it is perceived favourably by staff. There are strong links between 'sense of belonging' and 'common purpose' to good communications and that appears to be the case at Tasman District with the key driver 'I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre' increasing from 56.4% in 2011 to 67.9% in 2012.

Looking at scores in the District Area we see the variability in employee perceptions of the workplace depending on where they work, possibly reflecting the different management styles, type of work performed, working conditions, and communities. While Tasman DHQ continues to perform well, it is West Coast that has the strongest results overall. Nelson Bays, although having the lowest scores across nearly all sections, have made some of biggest gains on their 2011 results. To take advantage of these strong results that continue to improve at pace, we encourage understanding the actions and behaviours behind these results and sharing them across the District and beyond to the wider organisation.

Respect and Integrity within the Tasman District

The Tasman District results outperform the overall NZ Police results for 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items with good increases across the board on 2011 results. Proportionally to NZ Police norms, the Tasman District had more people who witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace and their perceptions on the handling of those incidents to being on par with that of NZ Police norms.

Employee Engagement within the Tasman District

The Engagement Index for Tasman District has improved to 73.7%. Over a quarter of all District staff identify as Engaged, up from 16.9% in 2011 - and there is a sizable decline in the number identified as Disengaged (down to one in ten). 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 2012 there are a number of new key drivers that have come through the statistical regression analysis as being particularly important to Tasman District staff. They come primarily from the sections 'Vision and Purpose + Communications and Cooperation', and 'My Job'. The new Key Driver items reflect the evolution of the growing engagement in the District.

All of the drivers have had significant improvements from last year and are on par with 2012 NZ Police norms, bar one which is higher than NZ Police - 'The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills'. Looking closer, four of the top five key drivers are carried forward from 2011 and, given their sustained importance to employee engagement levels within the District, they reflect ongoing useful influencers for improving engagement scores. Additionally, five of the top six relate to 'Vision and Purpose' and again indicate strong points of influence.

Examining the District Areas we can see the variability in the Key Driver items, highlighting opportunities for improvement and sharing "best practice" where the items are scoring higher in one Area to one where they don't. A good example is 'I understand how my performance is measured' where there is 10 percentage points difference across the District in as aspect where one would ideally expect a consistent approach and therefore perception.

Employee Comments

Many District staff continue to comment on the strong value they place in the people they work alongside. As in 2011 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.

Among the things that people felt NZ Police could do better included more frontline staffing, staff competent in their roles and care taken in selection of those promoted, access to more tools and resources, and less administration based tasks taking people away from their core roles.

There are a number of positive references to leadership level changes over the past year in the District and the optimism this brings.

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

Summary

The Tasman District has gone from strength to strength in their engagement results over the past year. This is cause to celebrate and to acknowledge the significant improvements in all survey areas and the action taken across the District. It also time to reflect on the impact increased engagement is having in other key performance areas in the District, for example retention and effectiveness measures, with the intention that increased engagement is linked with improved results in these other areas.

To continue the momentum, keep doing what is already proving effective and build on that by referencing the key drivers as the priority areas for focus. An example of continued strength building is in the area of communication. The large increases this year alongside sizable impact on 'sense of belonging' and

'common purpose' demonstrate the positive reception by District staff the efforts in opening up communications and including their views is having.

Other clear actionable areas to consider building on include:

- Caring for staff wellbeing. As well as being a top rated key driver, it is one of the lower scoring items in the survey
- Bringing transparency to performance measures and how roles contribute to NZ Police effectiveness. Both key drivers enforced by comments made in the survey.

Understanding the gains made by Nelson Bays Area and what sustains the results from West Coast and the Tasman DHQ Areas may provide ideas, insight to 'best practice' initiatives, and ultimately leverage points across the District.

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

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

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

TOTAL ORGANISATION RESULTS

RESPONSE RATE

	NZ Police 2012	NZ Police 2011
Number of Responses	9393	9503
Response Rate	77.1%	79.2%

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE NZ POLICE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	NZ Police 2012	NZ Police 2011
Performance Index	67.7	64.2 (+3.5)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	63.9	59.2 (+4.7)
2. My Supervisor	75.6	72.3 (+3.3)
3. My Work Group	76.7	74.7 (+2.0)
4. My Job	65.7	62.7 (+3.0)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	71.2	68.1 (+3.1)
6. Learning and Development	62.7	60.1 (+2.6)
7. Performance and Feedback	69.4	66.7 (+2.7)
8. Recognition	58.0	53.1 (+4.9)
9. Final Thoughts	73.3	70.5 (+2.8)
10. The Survey - Your Views	49.6	42.8 (+6.8)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

ENGAGEMENT PROFILE

Engagement Group	NZ Police 2012	NZ Police 2011
Engaged	27.8	21.3 (+6.5)
Ambivalent	59.7	63.2 (-3.5)
Disengaged	12.5	15.5 (-3.0)

Proportion of Employees (%)

GLOSSARY

Anatomy of a Great Workplace: Research carried out by JRA over many years into the nature of great workplaces has revealed that best-practice organisations all share four common characteristics. We call these the 'four pillars' of JRA's Anatomy of a Great Workplace™. The four pillars are enduring organisational qualities that are the product of a variety of practices, each of which has been crafted by local leadership according to their organisation's unique circumstances. This model serves as a useful diagnostic and planning tool. In the Anatomy table, each of the key drivers of employee engagement within a particular demographic variable has been shown assigned to its applicable 'Pillar'. Additionally, each key driver has been positioned to indicate whether action should be focused at the individual, team, or organisation level. By examining the concentration of key drivers in each Pillar it is possible to gain further insight into areas where intervention strategies are most likely to deliver significant performance gains.

Employee Engagement: is a multi-dimensional concept that describes the extent to which employees mentally, emotionally and physically apply themselves at work. Engagement is measured by six questions in the survey and includes job satisfaction, organisational commitment, willingness to recommend the organisation as a great place to work, discretionary effort, taking an active interest in the organisation, and general effort.

Engagement Index: The average score across the six engagement questions, across all employees.

Engagement Profile: Employees are categorised as either engaged, ambivalent or disengaged according to their Engagement Index. Employees who score above 87.5% (weighted mean score) are classified as engaged given they respond very positively to most of the engagement questions. Employees above 50% but below 87.5% are classified as ambivalent given they respond with mostly 'neutral' or 'agree' questions (i.e., not *strong* responses to the engagement questions). Disengaged employees are those that score below 50%. These employees are not sufficiently motivated by the organisation to provide an agree to strongly agree response to any of the engagement questions.

Key Driver Analysis: is a statistical technique (multiple regression) that helps in the interpretation of survey data and enables an organisation to put together actionable responses to survey results. It is essentially a tool that allows us to identify what specific dimensions of organisational climate (assessed in a survey) have the greatest impact on engagement levels. By knowing this, managers can prioritise improvement opportunities and prepare a focused number of strategies that will maximise future employee engagement.

'Statistical Significance' versus 'Significance of the Result': A 'statistically significant' result indicates that there is a difference in scores between two groups of respondents. So if your District's weighted mean score was 72% on a particular question and the NZ Police average was 76%, then this is likely to be a large enough difference to reflect a true divergence in employee opinion across the two groups (not just 'random variation in scores'). One group sees things more positively than the other group, so much so that the difference would be identified as 'statistically significant' via statistical analysis. But it is important to recognise that statistical analysis is impacted by the size of the survey sample. Very large survey samples means there is sufficient 'statistical power' to detect even very small differences in scores. For example, if your survey sample had more than 800 respondents, then a difference of just 1% would be found to be 'statistically significant'. But clearly a difference of 1% is not particularly meaningful. In fact, it is probably too small to warrant any great change effort - regardless of whether it was identified as 'statistically significant'. As such, when viewing results online and thinking of 'what's important here', think of those things that represent *substantive* differences. That would likely be differences of around 3.5% or more for smaller groups (100 – 150 employees), and 2% or more for larger groups (above 450 employees).

The Questionnaire: The 2012 New Zealand Police Workplace Survey contained 67 statements designed to measure a workplace on a range of issues in the organisation. Respondents were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with each statement using a five point rating system. This rating system ranged from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Questions were separated into 11 sections according to statements that naturally cluster together and measure similar issues.

Weighted Mean Score: The survey scores reported herein are known as 'weighted mean scores'. They range between 0% and 100% and represent a 'strength of agreement' score. The weighted mean score is calculated by first converting each response option into a weighting (strongly agree = 100%, agree = 75%, neutral = 50%, disagree = 25%, and strongly disagree = 0%). All weighted responses are added together, and then divided by the total number of valid respondents (i.e., excluding all 'do not know' responses). A perfect score of 100% is achieved if respondents strongly agree with the statement, while 0% is scored if respondents strongly disagree. A score of around 75% is often desirable given that means most people have responded to a question with an 'agree'. But questions do vary and comparisons to your organisation's norms (the typical score) should be made.