

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: Waitemata District

June 2011



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



RESPONSE RATE

	Waitemata 2011	Waitemata 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	621	678	9503
Response Rate	71.1%	76.4%	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 WAITEMATA DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Waitemata 2011	Waitemata 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index	62.9	64.0 (-1.1)	64.2 (-1.3)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	56.3	57.2 (-0.9)	59.2 (-2.9)
2. My Supervisor	74.9	74.0 (+0.9)	72.3 (+2.6)
3. My Work Group	75.3	76.4 (-1.1)	74.7 (+0.6)
4. My Job	60.1	62.2 (-2.1)	62.7 (-2.6)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.2	67.7 (+1.5)	68.1 (+1.1)
6. Learning and Development	57.7	61.0 (-3.3)	60.1 (-2.4)
7. Performance and Feedback	68.7	70.7 (-2.0)	66.7 (+2.0)
8. Recognition	49.8	51.5 (-1.7)	53.1 (-3.3)
9. Final Thoughts	67.0	68.6 (-1.6)	70.5 (-3.5)
10. The Survey - Your Views	38.9	39.1 (-0.2)	42.8 (-3.9)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE WAITEMATA DISTRICT

Section	Waitemata 2011	Waitemata 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	85.8	86.9 (-1.1)	85.3 (+0.5)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	80.7	77.0 (+3.7)	78.6 (+2.0)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	80.2	79.1 (+1.1)	77.1 (+3.1)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	79.4	80.5 (-1.1)	78.3 (+1.1)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	78.8	79.8 (-1.0)	77.5 (+1.3)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	78.6	78.8 (-0.2)	76.3 (+2.3)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	78.4	78.3 (+0.1)	77.0 (+1.4)
2.6: I have confidence in my supervisor	77.9	77.5 (+0.4)	74.5 (+3.4)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	77	76.4 (+0.6)	74.7 (+2.3)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	75.3	76.1 (-0.8)	75.5 (-0.2)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE WAITEMATA DISTRICT

Section	Waitemata 2011	Waitemata 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	37.5	42.6 (-5.1)	43.7 (-6.2)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	37.5	39.6 (-2.1)	40.8 (-3.3)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	40.3	38.7 (+1.6)	44.8 (-4.5)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	40.5	39.1 (+1.4)	50.8 (-10.3)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	41.2	40.9 (+0.3)	45.3 (-4.1)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	44.6	45.5 (-0.9)	51.9 (-7.3)
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	46.5	50.3 (-3.8)	52.0 (-5.5)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	48.9	50.1 (-1.2)	53.5 (-4.6)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	50.6	51.0 (-0.4)	54.1 (-3.5)
8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	50.7	50.7 (0.0)	54.5 (-3.8)

SCORES ACROSS THE WAITEMATA DISTRICT

Section	Auckland Motorways Area	North Shore Area	Rodney Area	Waitakere Area	Waitemata Area	Waitemata Dist
Performance Index	62.3	67.3	61.5	59.3	64.5	62.9
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	56.1	62.5	55.9	49.4	60.8	56.3
2. My Supervisor	75.6	77.6	75.1	73.6	70.5	74.9
3. My Work Group	75.2	77.3	75.7	74.6	71.7	75.3
4. My Job	59.7	65.4	58.9	54.5	64.6	60.1
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	68.1	71.4	67.4	67.0	73.8	69.2
6. Learning and Development	56.6	62.6	54.8	56.0	56.9	57.7
7. Performance and Feedback	67.1	71.3	67.6	67.9	68.7	68.7
8. Recognition	48.8	54.2	45.3	47.3	54.0	49.8
9. Final Thoughts	65.4	73.8	65.0	62.4	68.6	67.0
10. The Survey - Your Views	38.9	42.1	32.8	35.8	47.6	38.9

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 WAITEMATA DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Waitemata District 2011	Waitemata District 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
67.0	68.6 (-1.6)	70.5 (-3.5)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Waitemata 2011	Waitemata 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	16.4	18.6 (-2.2)	21.3 (-4.9)
Ambivalent	63.6	62.2 (+1.4)	63.2 (+0.4)
Disengaged	20.0	19.2 (+0.8)	15.5 (+4.5)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE WAITEMATA DISTRICT?

Question	Waitemata 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	75.8	75.9 (-0.1)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	77.6	77.6
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	67.3	64.7 (+2.6)
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)	64.0	62.4 (+1.6)
5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	61.2	57.8 (+3.4)

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?

	Waitemata 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	80.8	82.1 (-1.3)
Yes	5.5	4.6 (+0.9)
No	13.7	13.3 (+0.4)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE WAITEMATA DISTRICT?

	Rank From 2010	Key Driver Questions	Waitemata 2011	Waitemata 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	3	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	74.4	76.3 (-1.9)	76.1 (-1.7)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	65.4	66.8 (-1.4)	68.3 (-2.9)
	NA	4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	60.3	61.5 (-1.2)	59.7 (+0.6)
	8	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	66.5	69.0 (-2.5)	68.9 (-2.4)
	NA	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	54.3	57.2 (-2.9)	57.8 (-3.5)
	5	1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	44.6	45.5 (-0.9)	51.9 (-7.3)
	2	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	57.2	60.4 (-3.2)	61.7 (-4.5)
	10	6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	56.9	60.2 (-3.3)	57.9 (-1.0)

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 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		1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	
Team level		4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	
Individual level		1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	

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.

Key Driver Questions	Auckland Motorways Area	North Shore Area	Rodney Area	Waitakere Area	Waitemata Area	Waitemata Dist	NZ Police (Total Org)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	73.0	79.9	72.1	71.7	73.6	74.4	76.1
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	64.9	72.7	68.2	55.4	71.2	65.4	68.3
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	56.2	78.4	53.4	50.1	60.3	60.3	59.7
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	63.5	72.5	68.3	62.4	65.1	66.5	68.9
6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	52.0	59.4	47.4	52.8	59.2	54.3	57.8
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	43.0	52.1	41.5	37.0	53.4	44.6	51.9
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	57.9	65.1	59.5	46.5	62.7	57.2	61.7
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	57.1	62.7	52.6	55.6	52.7	56.9	57.9

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS –WAITEMATA 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

The Waitemata District has a good response rate for the 2011 survey. This year's survey finished with a total of 621 people participating from the District. This represents 71.1% of those invited to participate from the District. This is down on last year's response rate of 76.4%. 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 Waitemata District as a Place to Work

The 2011 results indicate that staff in the Waitemata District tend to perceive their region in a less positive light than they did in 2010. This year the District's 'Performance Index' – the average score across all questions across all employees – is 62.9%, which is down on the 2010 Performance Index of 64.0%.

Looking at scores across the survey we see significant decreases from 2010 in a number of sections; 'My Job', 'Learning and Development', 'Performance and Feedback', 'Recognition', and 'Final Thoughts (Engagement)' have all had significant decreases of over -1.5%. Additionally over half of the survey sections trail the NZ Police overall results significantly, with 'Recognition', 'Final Thoughts (Engagement)', and 'The Survey – Your Views' having the largest differences from NZ Police overall. On a positive note, 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' has increased significantly on last year, while 'My Supervisor' and 'Performance and Feedback' are significantly higher than NZ Police overall.

On examination of the District's highest rated questions we see intention to stay at NZ Police remains the top ranked question for the District at 85.8%, which is similar to the NZ Police (overall) result of 85.3%. Of particular interest, 8 of the 10 highest ranked questions for the District come from the 'My Supervisor' and 'My Work Group'. Most questions score similar to last year, but 'People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected of NZ Police' has increased significantly by 3.7%, and half the highest scoring questions are performing significantly better than NZ Police overall.

All of the District's lowest rated 10 questions are significantly below NZ Police overall scores. Differences range from -3.3 weighted mean points up to a substantive -10.3 weighted mean points (for pay and benefits as being fair for the work performed).

Biggest departures from NZ Police norms suggest the Waitemata District may have issues in relation to merit based promotion, being valued and rewarded fairly, and acting upon survey results (or perhaps not communicating how actions are related to the staff survey). Either way results are quite telling with regards to the District's lowest rated questions – for example, 'Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup'; 'I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey'; 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff', 'NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff' and 'The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do' are all significantly below the NZ Police overall results. As noted later in this report, one of these lowest scoring questions 'NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff' is identified as a key driver of engagement.

Results across the District are interesting in that there is a distinct difference between the North Shore results compared to all other areas. The North Shore is the best performer for the District across almost all survey sections. Meanwhile the Waitakere and Rodney Areas either have survey sections scoring similar to, or below the overall District results.

Respect and Integrity within the Waitemata District

The Waitemata District scores either about the same or significantly better over the 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items compared to NZ Police overall. On a 'level of agreement' score 'I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal' and 'I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately' are two items that staff in the District score well ahead of NZ Police by 2.4% and 3.4% points respectively.

For 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 much the same as NZ Police overall.

Employee Engagement within the Waitemata District

Employee engagement levels for the District have decreased significantly compared to 2010. This year the proportion of people ticking agree and strongly agree to the six engagement questions is 16.4%, down from 18.6 % in 2010. More importantly the results show that the proportion of staff in the District who are 'Engaged' is significantly below NZ Police overall which has 21.3% of respondents ticking agree or strongly agree to the six engagement questions. Meanwhile the proportion of 'Disengaged' staff for the District is 20.0%, which way far higher than the NZ Police result of 15.5%. 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.

This year eight key drivers of engagement have been identified that centre on just 3 survey sections; 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation', 'My Job' and 'Learning and Development'. For 5 of these key drivers the Waitemata District performs below NZ Police overall, while the remaining 3 key perform on par with NZ Police.

As with 2010 'training and development' is very important to people in the District (i.e., particularly engaging). Of the eight identified key drivers for the Southern District, half of them fall into the 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' category of 'Development' This represents a significant leverage point for the district to focus on to improve employee engagement. While 2 of these questions perform on par with NZ Police, 'I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things' and 'The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills' performs below NZ Police overall, indicating an area where opportunities for improvement definitely exist.

A 'sense of community' is also important (and engaging) to Waitemata District staff. The other four (out of eight) key drivers of engagement all fall into this category, with the District significantly underperforming in 'NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff', 'NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work' and 'I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre' when compared to NZ Police. This again represents another area of significant opportunity. With so many key drivers falling just under two 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' categories the District has a great opportunity to implement initiatives that can leverage off each other to improve across all items.

Looking across the District we see that the North Shore is an area that does much better across these key drivers, and it would be worth investigating the dynamics of the area that allow it to score better than all other areas, to see what best practice initiatives can be shared and implemented across the District.

Employee Comments

As with last year, Waitemata District had many high scoring questions from the 'My Work Group' section of the survey. As expected many comments this year reflect these high scores, with specific reference made to the people that they work with. Comments such as camaraderie, team work, colleagues, loyalty of the people and the work they do for the public are frequently made as things that make working for NZ Police great. Many people take real pride in the work that they do for NZ Police. Many people like the variety of their work, and a few make mention of job security being of importance to them.

Among the things that people felt NZ Police could do better included more frontline staffing, and paying more attention to the opinions of those at who are out on the frontline 'policing' on a daily basis. There are comments that refer to there being too many of the wrong people in management positions, with people who are good at writing, or telling a story being promoted ahead of others who actually better. In general other resources and more equipment are often mentioned. Recognition for a job well done is another theme to come through. Some respondents are frustrated by the levels of bureaucracy and paperwork that get in the way of them doing their job.

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

Summary

For the overall Performance Index result the Waitemata District performs similar to that of NZ Police. However levels of 'Engagement' are significantly below NZ Police overall, and the District is behind NZ Police on many survey sections. There are also a good number of key driver items that fall under the 'Development' and 'Community' categories, but which perform significantly below those of NZ Police. These represent a significant area of opportunity for the District to implement initiatives to improve engagement. We know that these items are important to staff, and the survey comments back this up, particularly comments that show how much people care about being a part of NZ Police.

One particular area that the District should focus on is its handling of post survey initiatives resulting from this year's survey. Low scoring questions for the District indicate that this is a weak point from last year, and staff do not believe that their opinions and views will make a difference to their workplace.

With a little time and effort going into post survey action planning, and following through on post survey discussions with staff, the District has a great opportunity to improve on key driver items, while at the same time showing staff that their opinions do count, that doing the survey is worthwhile, and that NZ Police cares about making their workplace a better one.

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.