

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: Wellington

June 2011



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



RESPONSE RATE

| | Wellington District 2011 | Wellington District 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Number of Responses | 739 | 724 | 9503 |
| Response Rate | 77.6% | 73.1% | 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

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE WELLINGTON DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

| Section | Wellington District 2011 | Wellington District 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey) | 64.4 | 64.7 (-0.3) | 64.2 (+0.2) |
| 1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation | 59.5 | 58.9 (+0.6) | 59.2 (+0.3) |
| 2. My Supervisor | 72.2 | 74.5 (-2.3) | 72.3 (-0.1) |
| 3. My Work Group | 73.6 | 75.0 (-1.4) | 74.7 (-1.1) |
| 4. My Job | 61.3 | 62.2 (-0.9) | 62.7 (-1.4) |
| 5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace | 68.0 | 67.7 (+0.3) | 68.1 (-0.1) |
| 6. Learning and Development | 62.5 | 62.7 (-0.2) | 60.1 (+2.4) |
| 7. Performance and Feedback | 68.5 | 69.4 (-0.9) | 66.7 (+1.8) |
| 8. Recognition | 54.2 | 54.3 (-0.1) | 53.1 (+1.1) |
| 9. Final Thoughts (Engagement) | 71.0 | 70.2 (+0.8) | 70.5 (+0.5) |
| 10. The Survey - Your Views | 44.8 | 41.6 (+3.2) | 42.8 (+2.0) |

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE WELLINGTON DISTRICT

| Section | Wellington District 2011 | Wellington District 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months | 86.2 | 88.0 (-1.8) | 85.3 (+0.9) |
| 7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people | 78.7 | 79.2 (-0.5) | 77.0 (+1.7) |
| 3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police | 78.6 | 76.4 (+2.2) | 78.6 (0.0) |
| 9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police | 77.4 | 76.7 (+0.7) | 76.2 (+1.2) |
| 3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group | 76.7 | 79.4 (-2.7) | 78.3 (-1.6) |
| 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement | 76.5 | 77.3 (-0.8) | 76.1 (+0.4) |
| 2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect | 76.5 | 79.4 (-2.9) | 77.1 (-0.6) |
| 2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police | 76.3 | 78.4 (-2.1) | 76.3 (0.0) |
| 3.1: Staff in my work group work well together | 75.7 | 77.9 (-2.2) | 77.5 (-1.8) |
| 9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police | 75.4 | 73.2 (+2.2) | 74.8 (+0.6) |

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE WELLINGTON DISTRICT

| Section | Wellington District 2011 | Wellington 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 | 43.2 | 41.5 (+1.7) | 40.8 (+2.4) |
| 8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit | 45.3 | 46.9 (-1.6) | 43.7 (+1.6) |
| 1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff | 45.8 | 43.6 (+2.2) | 45.3 (+0.5) |
| 10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey | 46.6 | 41.7 (+4.9) | 44.8 (+1.8) |
| 4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do | 46.8 | 44.9 (+1.9) | 50.8 (-4.0) |
| 4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job | 49.5 | 49.6 (-0.1) | 53.5 (-4.0) |
| 1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff | 52.4 | 51.5 (+0.9) | 51.9 (+0.5) |
| 1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together | 52.5 | 54.8 (-2.3) | 51.9 (+0.6) |
| 1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest | 53.0 | 50.6 (+2.4) | 52.0 (+1.0) |
| 8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement | 54.1 | 53.7 (+0.4) | 52.9 (+1.2) |

SCORES ACROSS THE WELLINGTON DISTRICT

| Section | Kapiti- Mana Area | Lower Hutt Area | Upper Hutt Area | Wairarapa Area | Wellington Area | Wellington DHQ | Wellington District |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Performance Index | 65.1 | 67.4 | 61.3 | 60.1 | 65.0 | 64.0 | 64.4 |
| 1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation | 60.7 | 63.2 | 51.3 | 55.7 | 60.2 | 59.3 | 59.5 |
| 2. My Supervisor | 73.0 | 74.7 | 71.4 | 70.8 | 72.8 | 69.9 | 72.2 |
| 3. My Work Group | 74.8 | 77.3 | 74.7 | 70.2 | 74.9 | 69.5 | 73.6 |
| 4. My Job | 62.5 | 62.9 | 58.0 | 56.3 | 59.9 | 64.4 | 61.3 |
| 5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace | 70.3 | 71.9 | 68.7 | 64.3 | 68.8 | 63.9 | 68.0 |
| 6. Learning and Development | 64.0 | 64.2 | 61.3 | 56.6 | 63.5 | 62.3 | 62.5 |
| 7. Performance and Feedback | 66.5 | 73.9 | 64.5 | 64.2 | 70.2 | 66.8 | 68.5 |
| 8. Recognition | 54.3 | 56.4 | 50.8 | 47.7 | 54.8 | 55.9 | 54.2 |
| 9. Final Thoughts (Engagement) | 71.5 | 73.2 | 66.8 | 65.2 | 72.7 | 71.1 | 71.0 |
| 10. The Survey - Your Views | 37.8 | 53.5 | 37.2 | 40.7 | 44.5 | 47.3 | 44.8 |

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 WELLINGTON DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

| Wellington District 2011 | Wellington District 2010 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 71 | 70.2 (+0.8) | 70.5 (+0.5) |

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

| Engagement Group | Wellington District 2011 | Wellington District 2010 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Engaged | 22.0 | 19.5 (+2.5) | 21.3 (+0.7) |
| Ambivalent | 62.9 | 64.9 (-2.0) | 63.2 (-0.3) |
| Disengaged | 15.1 | 15.6 (-0.5) | 15.5 (-0.4) |

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE WELLINGTON DISTRICT?

| Question | Wellington District | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity | 76.6 | 75.9 (+0.7) |
| 5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination | 76.7 | 77.6 (-0.9) |
| 5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal | 64.6 | 64.7 (-0.1) |
| 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) | 63.0 | 62.4 (+0.6) |
| 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 | 58.5 | 57.8 (+0.7) |

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?

| | Wellington District | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|----------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Not Applicable | 80.8 | 82.1 (-1.3) |
| Yes | 4.2 | 4.6 (-0.4) |
| No | 15.0 | 13.3 (+1.7) |

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE WELLINGTON DISTRICT?

| | Rank from 2010 | Key Driver Questions | Wellington District 2011 | Wellington District 2010 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|--|----------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | 1 | 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work | 67.7 | 68.4 (-0.7) | 68.3 (-0.6) |
| | 7 | 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement | 76.5 | 77.3 (-0.8) | 76.1 (+0.4) |
| | 2 | 1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre | 61.7 | 61.9 (-0.2) | 61.7 (+0.0) |
| | N/A | 6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police | 67.7 | 68.1 (-0.4) | 61.1 (+6.6) |
| | 9 | 6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things | 59.1 | 59.8 (-0.7) | 57.8 (+1.3) |
| | 8 | 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills | 69.5 | 69.9 (-0.4) | 68.9 (+0.6) |
| | 4 | 8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police | 55.4 | 54.1 (+1.3) | 54.5 (+0.9) |
| | N/A | 1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest | 53.0 | 50.6 (+2.4) | 52.0 (+1.0) |
| | N/A | 4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable | 55.3 | 55.2 (+0.1) | 58.3 (-3.0) |
| | N/A | 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do | 54.3 | 53.5 (+0.8) | 54.8 (-0.5) |

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 | 1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest | 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work | 6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police | |
| Team level | | | 6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things | |
| Individual level | | 1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre 8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police | 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do | 4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable |

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 | Kapiti-Mana Area | Lower Hutt Area | Upper Hutt Area | Wairarapa Area | Wellington Area | Wellington DHQ | Wellington District | Total Organisation |
|--|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work | 69.1 | 71.8 | 57.0 | 61.4 | 68.9 | 68.4 | 67.7 | 68.3 |
| 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement | 79.9 | 76.9 | 74.5 | 72.0 | 77.3 | 75.6 | 76.5 | 76.1 |
| 1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre | 67.8 | 67.4 | 51.0 | 52.1 | 63.5 | 58.8 | 61.7 | 61.7 |
| 6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police | 69.5 | 70.9 | 66.5 | 62.7 | 73.1 | 60.5 | 67.7 | 61.1 |
| 6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things | 59.9 | 61.5 | 56.0 | 53.3 | 57.7 | 62.2 | 59.1 | 57.8 |
| 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills | 71.2 | 69.5 | 70.0 | 65.7 | 68.8 | 70.9 | 69.5 | 68.9 |
| 8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police | 56.9 | 57.7 | 50.5 | 47.9 | 55.7 | 57.2 | 55.4 | 54.5 |
| 1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest | 54.9 | 57.7 | 39.0 | 49.1 | 53.5 | 53.8 | 53.0 | 52.0 |
| 4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable | 60.5 | 58.9 | 51.5 | 42.5 | 55.1 | 56.7 | 55.3 | 58.3 |
| 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do | 55.7 | 54.1 | 56.4 | 44.9 | 51.6 | 60.5 | 54.3 | 54.8 |

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – WELLINGTON 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 Wellington District finished with a total of 739 people participating in the survey. This represents 77.6% of all those invited in the district and is up on 73.1% 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 Wellington District as a Place to Work

Generally speaking it would be fair to say that the Wellington District has not seen much in the way of change in employee perceptions from the last survey. Similarly, the District scores pretty much the same as NZ Police overall. This year the District's 'Performance Index' – the average score across all questions across all employees – is 64.4%, which is statistically equivalent to its 2010 result of 64.7%. The NZ Police Performance Index has increased over the last year (from 63.1% to 64.2%) meaning Wellington District is now 'on par' with the organisation as a whole. If that pattern continues (NZ Police improves but the District does not), then it may find itself falling behind in terms of comparative employee attitude and opinion of the workplace.

Whilst no great change has occurred at the total District level, there are nonetheless some changes at the section or question level that are noteworthy. First, scores around 'The Survey – Your Views' has increased significantly from last year (and making the District score above the NZ Police norm for this section). Thus, whilst no great change is perceptibly evident in survey scores, employees nonetheless feel things are happening because of the survey. In contrast, perceptions around 'My Supervisor' have retreated in 2011.

On examination of the District's highest rated questions we again see variability in results compared to 2010. Intention to stay at NZ Police is the top ranked question within the District at 86.2%. While statistically better than NZ Police overall result of 85.9%, it has fallen significantly from 88.0% in 2010. Increases worthy of special mention include 'police conducting themselves in accordance values expected of NZ Police' and 'having an active interest in what happens in NZ Police'. There are however 5 highest rated questions that have fallen significantly from 2010, with two of them from the 'My Work Group' section being significantly lower than NZ Police overall.

Looking at the lowest ranked questions for the District significant increases outweigh the decreases. In particular people have more confidence that 'actions will be taken based on the results of the survey' (up 4.9%), and more people believe changes resulting from the last survey 'have had a positive impact on my workgroup'. 'Pay and benefits' and 'tools and resources' are two items that the Wellington District score significantly below NZ Police overall (-4% each). It is important to note that only 1 of the lowest ranked questions, 'Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest', is a key driver of engagement, and is mentioned late in this report as a targeted area of opportunity.

Results across the District are interesting in that there is variability between areas. As with last year the Lower Hutt results outperform other areas across many survey sections, while the result for Wairarapa, Wellington DHQ and Upper Hutt tend to underperform compared to other areas. Wellington DHQ has a mixed bag, with some high, low and on average results compared to the District. Interestingly, both Kapiti-Mana and Upper Hutt score particularly low for the 'The Survey – Your Views' section, which would be worth further exploration.

Respect and Integrity within the Wellington District

The Wellington District results are very similar to the overall NZ Police result across all 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items. As with NZ Police overall, around three-quarters of District staff agree that colleagues 'respect employee diversity' and know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination. A lesser percentage feel confident that they can raise issues in confidence without fear of reprisal, or that appropriate actions will be taken in response. This is no different 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 similar to that of NZ Police overall.

Employee Engagement within the Wellington District

Employee engagement levels for the District are similar to that of NZ Police overall with 22.0% of the District ticking agree and strongly agree to the six engagement questions in the 'Final Thoughts (Engagement)' section. This is a significant increase upon last year's result for the District of 19.5%, with significant increases in people taking 'an active interest in what happens in NZ Police' and being inspired to do the very best I can in my job every day'. 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 'Training and Development' is very important to people in the District, with 5 of the 10 key drivers falling into this 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' category. This represents a significant area of opportunity. People can see that there are 'career and personal development opportunities' for them in NZ Police, and while the District performs on par with NZ Police overall in this category, there is plenty of potential for improvement in 'I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things', 'The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills', 'My job gives me a personal sense of achievement' and 'NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do'.

A strong 'sense of community' is the other theme that is engaging for people with an 'enjoyable place to work', 'a sense of belonging' and 'my contribution is valued' all being important factors that the District could turn into real strengths. One area that requires special attention is that of 'the level of work related stress I experience' which is performing significantly below that of NZ Police.

Employee Comments

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

Among the things that people felt NZ Police could do better were more frontline staffing, and paying more attention to the opinions of those at the 'coal face'. Other resources that are mentioned include computers, cars and other policing tools. Accountability and dealing with poor performance is again mentioned, as with last year.

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

Summary

As with last year there is an obvious sense of camaraderie within the Wellington District, and a great number of staff take great pride in serving their communities. Key Driver analysis shows that 'Development' and 'Sense of Community' are important to staff and with so many key drivers sitting within these 2 categories there are plenty of leverage points for improvement.

This year Lower Hutt Area again performed well, and attention should be paid to what has been happening in this area over the 2 years, to see what 'best practice' initiatives can be implemented in other areas. In comparison Upper Hutt and the Wairarapa in scored lower across many sections. For the Wairarapa this is similar to the 2010 year, and is an area they may need some assistance with initiatives resulting from the survey, as may other areas.

Overall there has been little shift in scores generally, although change is evident in one or two key areas (such as the belief that things are happening as a consequence of the staff survey). Although the District has scored on par with NZ Police overall there is great variability in employee perceptions within the District. This indicates that people within the District are having workplace experiences that are, in many instances, in contrast with colleagues in other Wellington District Areas. It is these variances that show where opportunities for improvement exist.

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 different it makes!

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

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.