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ACKNOWLEDGEMENT/FOREWORD

Prince William County Community,

As we stand at the precipice of a new era in organizational development, we must embrace the full spectrum of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) as a human-centered systems approach.

The Prince William County Government, a beacon of civic responsibility and community engagement, embarked on this journey through a comprehensive DEI Review.

This review reflects our commitment to a transformative roadmap of continuous improvement and inclusive excellence; it represents our collective aspiration to acknowledge and celebrate the rich tapestry of identities, perspectives, and experiences that comprise our workforce and community.

The journey towards an inclusive culture is ongoing and requires intentional commitment with thoughtful introspection and persistent action.

This review lays the foundation for this journey, offering insights into current practices, identifying areas for growth, and charting a course for a future where every voice is heard, every individual is valued, and every decision is made with an eye towards equity and inclusion.

Creating a culture and climate that embraces inclusion is vital to the well-being and growth of our community. Inclusion fosters an environment where everyone benefits from diverse perspectives and feels valued and empowered to contribute.

This is not only a moral imperative but also a practical one. Diverse viewpoints and experiences enrich our collective understanding and drive innovation by challenging conventional approaches and sparking creative solutions to complex problems. An inclusive community is more resilient as it leverages the strengths and insights of all its members, leading to more effective decision-making and a deeper sense of belonging and connectedness.

Moreover, by actively promoting inclusion, we set a standard for equity and respect, which can help to mitigate conflicts and build a foundation of mutual understanding and cooperation. In essence, embracing inclusion is not just about enhancing the present; it is about investing in a more harmonious, dynamic, and prosperous future for everyone in the community.

We commend the Prince William County Government for undertaking this significant step. Through this process, we aim to inspire other organizations to follow suit, fostering environments where DEI is not just recognized but is the foundational framework of innovation, growth, and communal harmony.

Special acknowledgment and gratitude to the PWC Project Team for their support, time, and leadership during this process.

- PWC EI Team: Maria Burgos, Brian Cook and Pamela Jones
- PWC HR Leaders: Quentin Haynes, Joe Gilkerson, Susan Washington, Theresa Kimble and Stacey Allen
- PWC Department/Agency Leadership Team
- DLS Team: Pamela McElvane, Dr. Suri Surinder, Anita Garcia-Scott, Larissa Williams and Kelvin Scott as well as the rest of the DLS support team.

In solidarity,

Diversity Learning Solutions (DLS) Review Team
The Office of Executive Management, Equity, and Inclusion hired a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) consultant team to utilize on-site assessments, analyze relevant information, and identify organizational behaviors, practices, and procedures that impede inclusion in the following areas: policies and practices about recruitment/selection, performance management, pay and numeration, talent identification as well as understanding leadership development, employee levels of inclusion, and career structures.

The DEI organizational review addressed the following areas of understanding:
1. Effective, short-term actions and identification of long-term organizational cultural changes within agencies.
2. Compliance with government and client directives.
3. Improved employee and community satisfaction levels, including those from protected groups.

DLS conducted a 6-step process to assess the state of the environment in terms of the below drivers and domains. Multiple reports were provided at the end of every phase so that there is a continuous feedback loop during the assessment/review. The insights derived from each phase are leveraged to inform the next phase.

This report reflects data gathered from Indicator 1 and Indicator 2 of the PWC EI Process.
The Prince William County Office of Equity and Inclusion, in partnership with Diversity Learning Solutions, an IDEAL (Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Access, and Leadership) consulting firm, conducted a comprehensive diversity, equity, and inclusion review. The year-long assessment included both quantitative and qualitative analyses, alongside a survey asking employees to evaluate their inclusion needs and the county’s performance in these areas.

Findings:
- **Cultural and Social Engagement:** A strong sense of cultural engagement and social connectivity permeates the workforce, with employees demonstrating pride in public service and active community involvement.
- **Financial Concerns:** Employee feedback highlights that compensation is not reflective of job responsibilities or local living costs, posing a risk to employee retention and morale.
- **Professional Development and Career Advancement:** Opportunities for growth and promotion are perceived as limited, affecting long-term career satisfaction.
- **Involvement in Decision-Making:** Employee involvement in decision-making processes is desired, yet current engagement levels indicate substantial room for improvement.
- **Access to Information:** The county’s performance in disseminating information is neutral, suggesting a mix of efficiency and communication gaps.
- **Development and Recognition:** Developmental opportunities and employee recognition, while present, require better communication and accessibility across the workforce.

Recommendations:
- **Leadership and Management Engagement:** The SLT has shown commitment to modeling improvements in equity and inclusion. To actualize the SLT’s commitment to equity and inclusion, it is essential to enhance communication and training for middle management to effectively convey these values to front-line employees across Prince William County.
- **Communication and Understanding:** A revamp of the communication strategy is essential to foster a clear understanding of DEI initiatives across the organization. Electronic communications are not effective, and many employees did not understand the strategy, the larger definition of diversity, or the drive for improving it at Prince William County.
- **Progress Measurement:** Establish clear metrics to track the advancement towards strategic goals linked to DEI within all departments.
- **Addressing Bias and Discrimination:** The review uncovered concerns about fair pay, bias, discrimination, and respect for women, which are critical issues that need to be addressed to retain a diverse workforce.

Strategic Response:
To address the findings effectively, Prince William County should consider the following strategic actions:
- **Enhance Psychological Safety:** Develop strategies to improve employees’ sense of security in their physical and psychological workplace environment.
- **Foster Belonging:** Create initiatives that extend the sense of belonging from immediate teams to the broader organization.
- **Improve Work-Life Balance:** Encourage telework, respect personal time, and promote the use of PTO.
- **Integrate Diverse Perspectives:** Value diverse opinions at all organizational levels and ensure transparency in diversity commitments, engagement and collaboration.
- **Leadership Evolution:** Encourage leaders to adopt mentorship roles and prioritize personal development and teamwork.
- **Strategic Prioritization:** Transition from rigid hierarchy to a more collaborative and innovative approach.
- **Success Metrics:** Expand success metrics to include community engagement and employee involvement.

Conclusion: The evaluation of Prince William County’s diversity, equity, and inclusion practices has revealed both strengths and areas for improvement. By implementing the recommendations provided, the county can enhance employee satisfaction, foster a more inclusive workplace, and set a new standard for public service organizations.

Contact Information: Maria Burgos, Equity and Inclusion Director, mburgos@pwcgov.org
PHASE 1
EVALUATION
CAVEATS: Observations are made based on reviewing documents provided by departments within Prince William County, OCAI organization survey(s), and Glint employee survey evaluation(s). Suggestions for implementation are based upon benchmarks and best practices in DEI for non-profits, government, and other industries; feasibility in the Prince William County government environment must be evaluated. The most impactful and consistent trends and themes have been chosen for this report from all the observations. Observations here should be considered in conjunction with leader experiences and knowledge of their organization to arrive at a true picture.
PHASE 1: EVALUATION

PERFORMANCE – WORKPLACE CLIMATE & CULTURE
REVIEW - EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT/ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

GLINT EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT REVIEW

REVIEW OF 2022 GLINT SURVEY RESULTS
EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT KEY OBSERVATIONS IN FOUR (4) BUCKETED AREAS OF EVALUATION:

PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY
- **Physical Safety Concerns:** Employees express feeling safer in remote work settings than at their physical workplace due to the political climate in 2021/2022, indicating concerns about open spaces and interactions with the public.
- **Fear of Retaliation:** There is a reluctance to voice opinions due to fear of retaliation or lack of action on feedback, suggesting that employees do not feel psychologically safe to express themselves.
- **Lack of Transparency:** Employees perceive a lack of transparency from leadership, leading to mistrust and feelings of insecurity within the workplace.
- **Health Safety Concerns:** The pandemic has heightened concerns about health safety, further impacting employees' sense of security.

BELONGING
- **Inclusion in Sub-Cultures vs. Broader Organization:** Employees feel a sense of belonging within their immediate teams but not with PWC as a whole.
- **Perceived Disrespect and Undermining:** There are feelings of being undervalued, especially by leadership, which undermines the sense of belonging.
- **Recognition Tied to Compensation:** The lack of consistent and meaningful recognition contributes to a reduced sense of belonging.

WORKLIFE BALANCE
- **Telework:** Employees feel that telework options are not adequately supported or encouraged by management. (2022 Telework policy and process implemented to address concerns)
- **Long Work Hours:** There is a culture of working long hours without sufficient consideration for personal time, which impairs work-life balance.
- **Impact of Leadership on Time Off:** Supervisors' attitudes towards time off may deter employees from utilizing their PTO, affecting work-life balance.

INTEGRATING DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES
- **Value of Diverse Perspectives:** Employees believe that their opinions are valued within their teams but not beyond, indicating a need for broader integration of diverse perspectives.
- **Inclusion and Advancement Opportunities:** There are concerns about biases and favoritism in advancement opportunities, which can hinder the integration of diverse perspectives.
- **Discrimination Concerns:** Reports of discrimination and a lack of accountability for diversity commitment suggest a need for improvement in integrating and valuing diverse perspectives.
- **Fear of Expressing Diverse Opinions:** Employees feel uncomfortable being honest in diversity training due to fear of retaliation, indicating a lack of psychological safety in integrating diverse perspectives.

To address these areas effectively, PWC may consider developing and implementing targeted strategies that aim to improve psychological safety, foster a stronger sense of belonging, enhance work-life balance, and integrate diverse perspectives into all levels of the organization. These strategies should include clear communication, transparent processes, and inclusive practices to ensure that all employees feel safe, valued, and supported.
REVIEW OF 2022 PWC ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT (OCAI)

**Observations:** Based on the OCAI survey results, the desired culture using the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) is to move away from a Hierarchy/Control culture towards a Clan/Collaborate culture, with elements of Adhocracy/Create also showing importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>DESIRED CULTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Dominate: Hierarchy/Control</td>
<td>Overall Dominate: Clan/Collaborate (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Culture: Market/Compete</td>
<td>Sub-Culture: Adhocracy/Create (+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Organizational Characteristics:**
   - Dominate: Hierarchy/Control (-)
   - Sub 1: Clan/Collaborate (+)
   - Sub 2: Market/Compete (-)
   - Sub 3: Adhocracy/Create (+)

2. **Organizational Leader:**
   - Dominate: Clan/Collaborate (+)
   - Sub 1: Hierarchy/Control (+)
   - Sub 2: Market/Compete (-)
   - Sub 3: Adhocracy/Create (+)

3. **Management of Employees:**
   - Dominate: Clan/Collaborate (+)
   - Sub 1: Hierarchy/Control (-)
   - Sub 2: Market/Compete (-)
   - Sub 3: Adhocracy/Create (+)

4. **Organizational Glue:**
   - Dominate: Clan/Collaborate (+)
   - Sub 1: Hierarchy/Control (-)
   - Sub 2: Market/Compete (=)
   - Sub 3: Adhocracy/Create (+)

5. **Strategic Emphasis:**
   - Dominate: Hierarchy/Control (-)
   - Sub 1: Clan/Collaborate (+)
   - Sub 2: Adhocracy/Create (+)
   - Sub 3: Market/Compete (-)

6. **Criteria of Success:**
   - Dominate: Clan/Collaborate (+)
   - Sub 1: Hierarchy/Control (-)
   - Sub 2: Market/Compete (=)
   - Sub 3: Adhocracy/Create (=)

**Recommendations for PWC Leadership & Planning**

1. **Leadership Evolution:** County leaders are encouraged to transition from traditional command-and-control roles to positions of mentorship, fostering an environment where teamwork and personal development are prioritized, alongside a willingness to innovate and embrace new ideas.

2. **Management Approach:** Managers in the County should focus on cultivating a team-oriented atmosphere that values employee input and creative problem-solving, while also providing clear structures and expectations to maintain order and efficiency.

3. **Cultural Bonding:** The ethos of the County’s work environment should be one of mutual trust and loyalty, akin to a community or family, where tradition is honored but innovation and adaptability are also key cohesive forces.

4. **Strategic Prioritization:** Strategically, the County should aim for a balance that moves away from a rigid hierarchy towards a more collaborative, adaptable, and innovative approach, allowing for responsiveness to new opportunities and community needs.

5. **Success Metrics:** Success for Prince William County should not only be measured in terms of efficiency and control but also by how well it fosters community engagement, customer service, employee involvement, and the unique value brought to the community through innovative services and programs.
PHASE 1: EVALUATION

PERFORMANCE – WORKPLACE CLIMATE & CULTURE REVIEW - EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT/ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

RECOMMENDATIONS: Each department within PWC has their own OCAI results. Strategizing how to transition from a current culture that may be perceived as hierarchical and controlled to one that is more collaborative, inclusive, and innovative. Here are some steps that could be taken to initiate this cultural shift within PWC County.

Organizational Characteristics:

Embrace Flexibility and Innovation (Adhocracy):
- Encourage innovation and risk-taking by providing a safe environment for experimentation.
- Implement an "innovation lab" where employees can work on projects outside their regular duties.

Organizational Leader:

Foster a Clan Culture:
- Leadership should be approachable and act as mentors rather than just supervisors.
- Organize leadership training programs focusing on emotional intelligence, servant leadership, and effective communication.

Management of Employees:

Promote Teamwork and Collaboration (Clan):
- Encourage a team-oriented approach to projects, with leaders facilitating rather than directing.
- Recognize and celebrate collaborative efforts and team successes regularly.

Organizational Glue:

Cultivate Commitment and Cohesion:
- Develop a sense of unity by aligning individual goals with the organization’s mission and values.
- Establish trust through consistent and transparent communication.

Strategic Emphasis:

Balance Stability with Innovation:
- While promoting innovation, maintain core systems that ensure stability and reliability in services.
- Set strategic goals that are adaptable to change and encourage proactive problem-solving.

Criteria of Success:

Define Success Broadly:
- Include metrics for measuring teamwork, employee engagement, and satisfaction, alongside traditional performance metrics.
- Recognize and reward not only outcomes but also the innovative processes that lead to those outcomes.

Communication and Feedback:

Establish Open Communication Channels:
- Implement regular feedback mechanisms where employees can contribute ideas and express concerns.
- Leaders should model transparency and openness in all communications.

Training and Development:

Encourage Continuous Learning and Development:
- Offer training programs that are aligned with the desired culture of collaboration and innovation.
- Provide opportunities for cross-training and interdepartmental rotations to broaden perspectives.
PHASE 1: EVALUATION

PERFORMANCE – WORKPLACE CLIMATE & CULTURE
REVIEW - EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT/ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Documents were then organized into the following categories:
- Workplace – HR policies and practices that support employees in the workplace;
- Workforce – Workforce data and/or employee survey and feedback results;
- Community – Practices and/or policies for supporting the customer and local community; and
- Marketplace – Annual reports and/or shareholder and community/external communications

OBSERVATIONS: Overall, PWC policies and documented practices define and support the organization’s current commitment to DEI and are highlighted within applicable policies, where necessary.

Listed below are four (4) areas identified where more support is needed for accelerating DEI priorities:
- Organizational Structure and Process
- Recruitment and Selection Aligned to Community Priorities
- Culture Alignment and Behaviors
- Accountability and DEI Champions

OBSERVATIONS ON DIVERSITY:

Strategic Integration:
• There is a need to apply a diversity lens to strategic shifts, ensuring that diversity considerations are integral to county strategy development.

Public Commitment:
• A robust public stance on DEI is essential for community trust and internal validation of the county’s commitment to these principles.

Recruiting and Retention:
• The current recruitment practices require reconstruction with an intentional focus on not just attracting but also retaining a diverse workforce.

OBSERVATION ON EQUITY:

Communication Practices:
• There is a prevalent use of deficit language and micro-messaging, which necessitates a shift towards more transparent and inclusive communication.

Advancement Clarity:
• Performance management lacks clear advancement paths, highlighting the need for performance measures that support equity in career progression.

Policy Alignment:
• Policies and procedures need to be closely connected with the Equity Impact Screening Assessment tool created by the Office of Equity and Inclusion to ensure that county operations have equitable outcomes.

OBSERVATION ON INCLUSION:

Leadership Development:
• Professional development programs are crucial for cultivating inclusive leadership skills throughout all organizational levels.

Collaboration and Accountability:
• There is an opportunity to improve cross-organizational collaboration and enhance accountability in DEI efforts.

Employee Engagement:
• Increased opportunities for employee input are necessary, with a focus on translating feedback into action planning and transparent communication.
PHASE 2
EXAMINATION
Creating A Workforce of Choice that Values Diversity, Equity & Inclusion
Evaluating equity in the employee life cycle - Hiring, Supporting, Developing and Promoting

ALIGNING PEOPLE PRACTICES TO EI INDICATORS
Indicator 1 – Organizational Culture and Climate
Indicator 2 – Organizational Infrastructure

AREAS OF REVIEW FOR HR PEOPLE PRACTICES
1. Recruiting and Hiring
2. Supporting and Development
3. Advancement and Promoting

RECRUITMENT AND HIRING
The Candidate’s Experience From Attraction to Onboarding

• OBSERVATION: There’s a need to implement more consistency for attracting a diverse candidate pool by creating inclusive hiring practice standards with goals to ensure alignment and compliance with EEOC.
• RECOMMENDATION: Create hiring tools with inclusive behavioral practices that hold hiring managers accountable. This will ensure standardization of hiring practices for every open position.

SUPPORTING AND DEVELOPMENT
Building employees’ strength and supporting their development

• OBSERVATION: While there’s an opportunity to develop a comprehensive performance management process, PWC will launch a newly enhanced Performance Management tool in Q4 2023.
• RECOMMENDATION: Ensure performance management enhancements are built on a platform with a transparent view of the workforce, including the DEI team as collaborators.

ADVANCEMENT AND PROMOTION
Preparing for the next steps in the employee journey through career advancement

• OBSERVATION: There’s an opportunity to develop a succession planning program to ensure equitable advancement.
• RECOMMENDATION: Provide transparency into the current methodology for selecting employees, ensuring that all hiring managers participate in formal mentoring and succession planning programs that lead to career advancement.
PHASE 2: EXAMINATION

PROCESS REVIEW – WORKPLACE CLIMATE & CULTURE
ASSESSMENT - DOCUMENT REVIEW / INTERNAL EVALUATION / EQUITY IN PERFORMANCE

Creating A Workforce of Choice that Values Diversity, Equity & Inclusion
Evaluating equity in the compensation – DEI Pay Equity Review

ALIGNING PEOPLE PRACTICES TO EI INDICATORS
Indicator 2 – Organizational Infrastructure

AREAS OF REVIEW FOR DEI PAY EQUITY
INDICATOR II: Organizational Infrastructure
1. Demographic Data Review for Equity
2. DEI Pay Equity
3. Compensation Bias in Performance
4. Benefit Enhancements
5. Workplace Discrimination

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA REVIEW FOR EQUITY
• OBSERVATION: Data Demographic Review by Race/Ethnicity and Gender to ensure compensation and advancement are equitable across the county.
• RECOMMENDATION: Clearly define essential functions and pay progression by gender and ethnicity to reviews annually.

DEI PAY EQUITY
• OBSERVATION: The DEI pay equity review assessed the opportunities Prince William County has for DEI integration into performance management practices. This area of concern was raised as one of the top areas in the inclusion survey conducted.
• RECOMMENDATION: Conduct a pay equity study and establish a monitoring structure to ensure consistent practices in advancement and pay with annual reviews with metrics that align with DEI equity guidelines.

COMPENSATION BIAS IN PERFORMANCE
• OBSERVATION: Compensation bias in performance reviews was conducted to identify bias in making decisions for pay increases and advancement.
• RECOMMENDATION: Frequent compensation analysis every two to three years by department, gender, generation, and ethnicity to identify bias and inequities related to the rate of advancement. Also, consider semi-annual reviews.

BENEFIT ENHANCEMENTS
• OBSERVATION: Benefit enhancements were made due to post-COVID conditions. Companies assessed existing benefits for full-time, part-time, and temp employees to employ equity for every employee.
• RECOMMENDATION: Assess the benefits structure every two years to ensure equity at all levels within the county based on tenure and position.

WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION
• OBSERVATION: Reviewed practices in the marketplace that are influencing discrimination lawsuits.
• RECOMMENDATION: Ensure PWC pay equity practices are aligned with DEI strategy. DEI pay equity processes inform EEOC and support organizational compliance.
Benchmark information below represents the 2022 DMBA Inclusive Leadership Index and how Prince William County ranks among the leading organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>PWC</th>
<th>2022 DMBA ILI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from Sr. Leadership</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process to Correct Pay Equity Issues</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Equity Policy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Gender Pay Equity</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Racial and Ethnicity Pay Equity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process to Identify Pay Equity Issues</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Analysis by gender, ethnicity &amp; identity</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Team to Conduct Comp Reviews</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR System Identify Pay Gaps by Gender</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual HR DEI Review for Disparities</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Equity Audit (2-3 years)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Structure Review for Diversity</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor for Comp Disparities by Job Function</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE 3
ESTIMATION
PHASE 3: ESTIMATION

PWC DIVERSITY, EQUITY & INCLUSION REVIEW
PERCEPTIONS REVIEW – WORKPLACE CLIMATE & CULTURE
SURVEY – 20 FORMS OF INCLUSION

BACKGROUND
We hear a lot about inclusion, and how it is critical to harness the power of diversity. We know that diversity is being invited to the dance, and inclusion is being asked to dance. We realize that diversity is what we see, and inclusion is how we feel. We understand that diversity may be about counting heads, but inclusion is about making the heads count. We say to each other that diversity is the mix, and inclusion is making the mix work. Yet, when people are asked exactly what inclusion is, how we know it exists, and what forms it takes, many are hard-pressed to answer. The reality is that inclusion is a nuanced concept. It comes in various forms, and people prefer to be included in different ways, depending upon whether they are extrinsically or intrinsically driven. Everyone is looking for a different combination of inclusion strategies depending upon their unique inclusion needs. This survey assessment identifies if the organization is executing the right inclusion strategies to meet the varying needs of individuals within Prince William County.

OBJECTIVES
• Conducted an assessment and analysis of current state inclusion needs for Prince William County and examined the 5 extrinsic and 5 intrinsic needs of employees, the 20 forms of inclusion that can meet those needs, and the impact of inclusion on engagement.
• Understand the 5 extrinsic and 5 intrinsic needs that employees have and assess our individual profile on those needs.
• Identify the 20 different forms of inclusion that can help us meet those needs and assess our organization on those types of inclusion.
• Estimate our engagement level based upon how well we perceive the organization does on the forms of inclusion needed to meet our specific needs.

DEFINITIONS
• Inclusion is the feeling of being empowered, enabled, and encouraged to bring our whole selves to work as a result of our diverse needs being met.
• Engagement is the level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

SCOPE
• 20 forms of inclusion assessed
• Importance and performance scores on a scale of 0 to 10
• Importance & performance scales:
  • Optional for you: 0
  • Relevant for you to be comfortable: 2
  • Desirable for you to be engaged: 4
  • Important for you to be satisfied: 6
  • Necessary for you to be effective: 8
  • Critical for you to stay: 10
• Gaps (surpluses and deficits) on each form of inclusion
• Sum of the gaps across all inclusion forms is good engagement indicator
• Scorecards included for every department and constituency

CAVEATS
• Results based on employee perceptions, may not objective reality
• Situational assessment; scores can change over time
• Communication issues might exist vs real issues
• 36% response rate - 5718 survey recipients/2037 survey respondents
**OBSERVATIONS:**

**Strong Cultural, Social, and Community Engagement:** Positive engagement scores in Cultural (Recognition), Social (Affiliation), and Causal (Community) inclusion forms indicate that employees feel recognized and valued within the company culture, enjoy strong social connections, and sense a strong community bond.

**Financial and Professional Challenges:** Despite strong cultural and social engagement, the significant negative scores in Financial (Compensation) and Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment) suggest dissatisfaction with compensation and talent management practices.

**Neutral Decisional and Informational Involvement:** Employees are neutral about their influence on decision-making and access to information, which may indicate potential areas for increased engagement and participation.

**Areas for Improvement in Development and Recognition:** While not as negative as financial and professional categories, Developmental (Growth) and Promotional (Advancement) have room for improvement, as indicated by their negative engagement scores.
**PHASE 3: ESTIMATION**

**PERCEPTIONS REVIEW – WORKPLACE CLIMATE & CULTURE**

**DEMOGRAPHIC ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS**

PWC Predictive Engagement Index (PEI) scores by self-disclosed and self-identified workforce demographics. Areas highlighted in red indicate workforce demographic breakouts with predictive engagement index scores lower than the overall average PWC predictive engagement index score of -18.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>-21.8</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Y</td>
<td>-29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Z</td>
<td>-21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalists</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERATION</th>
<th>A/A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B/AA</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>N/P</th>
<th>T/MR</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N/D</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
<td>-23.6</td>
<td>-25.6</td>
<td>-38.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-39.1</td>
<td>-15.1</td>
<td>-19.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Y</td>
<td>-29.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Z</td>
<td>-21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalists</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE/ETHNICITY</th>
<th>A/A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B/AA</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>N/P</th>
<th>T/MR</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N/D</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
<td>-23.6</td>
<td>-25.6</td>
<td>-38.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-39.1</td>
<td>-15.1</td>
<td>-19.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEXUALITY</th>
<th>Heterosexual</th>
<th>LGBTQIA+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-18.5</td>
<td>-29.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VETERAN</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Veteran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-19.2</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFERENTLY-ABLED</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>Less than 1</th>
<th>1 to 3 yrs.</th>
<th>3 to 5 yrs.</th>
<th>5 to 10 yrs.</th>
<th>10 to 20 yrs.</th>
<th>20+ yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>-22.0</td>
<td>-23.2</td>
<td>-26.1</td>
<td>-22.6</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>-19.9</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Non-Exempt</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>-19.5</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
<td>-17.6</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow columns above indicate the top five engagement deficit(s) with "1" being the highest deficit.
**PHASE 3: ESTIMATION**

**PERCEPTIONS REVIEW – WORKPLACE CLIMATE & CULTURE**

**DEMOGRAPHIC ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS**

PWC Predictive Engagement Index scores by self-disclosed and self-identified workforce demographics.

Each column has the intrinsic and extrinsic inclusion needs listed with the blue highlighted areas ranking the lowest 5 deficit areas starting with “1” being the lowest ranked inclusion form to “5” being the fifth lowest ranked deficit inclusion need.

1. Financial (Compensation) Inclusion
2. Decisional (Input) Inclusion
3. Professional (Recruitment/Performance) Inclusion
4. Promotional (Advancement) Inclusion
5. Informational (Intelligence) Inclusion

- **Yellow columns** above indicate the top five engagement deficit(s) with “1” being the highest deficit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Segment</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>INTRINSIC INCLUSION NEEDS</th>
<th>EXTRINSIC INCLUSION NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalist(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native (A/A)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (N/P)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races (T/MR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQA+</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differently-Abled</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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PWC Predictive Engagement Index scores by self-disclosed and self-identified workforce demographics.

Each column has the intrinsic and extrinsic inclusion needs listed with the blue highlighted areas ranking the lowest 5 deficit areas starting with “1” being the lowest ranked inclusion form to “5” being the fifth lowest ranked deficit inclusion need.

1. Financial (Compensation) Inclusion
2. Professional (Recruitment/Performance) Inclusion
3. Decisional (Input) Inclusion
4. Informational (Intelligence) Inclusion
5. Promotional (Advancement) Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Segment</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>INTRINSIC INCLUSION NEEDS</th>
<th>EXTRINSIC INCLUSION NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ to 3 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ to 5 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ to 10 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ to 20 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Exempt</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow columns above indicate the top five engagement deficit(s) with “1” being the highest deficit.
## Phase 3: Estimation

### Perceptions Review – Workplace Climate & Culture

**Demographic Engagement Indicators**

PWC Predictive Engagement Index scores by self-disclosed and self-identified workplace demographics.

Each column has the intrinsic and extrinsic inclusion needs listed with the blue highlighted areas ranking the lowest 5 deficit areas starting with “1” being the lowest ranked inclusion form to “5” being the fifth lowest ranked deficit inclusion need.

1. Financial (Compensation) Inclusion
2. Professional (Recruitment/Performance) Inclusion
3. Decisional (Input) Inclusion
4. Promotional (Advancement) Inclusion
5. Developmental (Growth)

### Department Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>成人拘留中心</th>
<th>机构执行官</th>
<th>民事司法服务</th>
<th>县检察官</th>
<th>经济发展</th>
<th>设施及车队管理</th>
<th>经济发展</th>
<th>设施及车队管理</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-35.0</td>
<td>-8.8</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-21.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>-20.7</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Tax Admin</td>
<td>-23.9</td>
<td>-42.3</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-21.4</td>
<td>-12.6</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>-29.7</td>
<td>-18.7</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
<td>-20.0</td>
<td>-20.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intrinsic Inclusion Needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Sum of Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Segment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extrinsic Inclusion Needs**

|                      | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T |
|                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Yellow columns above indicate the top five engagement deficit(s) with “1” being the highest deficit.

Green rows indicate departments that have a better engagement score than the PWC average of -18.5.

---
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PHASE 3: ESTIMATION

ROLE-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUSION FORMS</th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Non-Exempt</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition (Rewards)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENGAGEMENT INDEX SCORE: 9.3 3.0 -17.6 -19.5 -25.0 -6.1

ROLE-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

- There is a clear hierarchy in perceived inclusion, with Executives feeling the most included and Non-Exempt employees feeling the least included.
- "Behavioral," "Consequential," and "Professional" forms of inclusion seem to be the most problematic, as they consistently show negative scores across different job positions.
- "Situational" and "Ideational" forms of inclusion tend to have higher scores, suggesting these are areas where the organization is doing relatively well.
- There is a large discrepancy between the scores of Executives and all other categories, highlighting potential disparities in perceptions of inclusion within the organization.
- Overall, the organization might want to address the significant negative perceptions among Non-Exempt, Exempt, and Supervisory roles, especially in areas where there is the greatest sense of exclusion, to improve their overall engagement and sense of inclusion.

RECOMMENDATIONS/STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS DISPARITIES:

- **Establish equitable compensation practices:** Review and adjust compensation structures to ensure they are fair and transparent across all levels of the organization.
- **Foster inclusive decision-making:** Create more opportunities for employees at all levels to be involved in decision-making, and ensure information is shared transparently.
- **Enhance professional development:** Offer targeted development and advancement opportunities, particularly for those in Non-Exempt and Exempt roles.
- **Leverage cultural and social strengths:** Use the positive aspects of Cultural and Social inclusion as a foundation to address areas of disparity, such as through team-building initiatives and recognition programs that reinforce a sense of belonging and value.
GENDER-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

INCLUSION FORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Female (F)</th>
<th>Male (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional (Rewards)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENGAGEMENT INDEX SCORE: -21.8 - 14.0

GENDER-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

- Females have a significantly lower overall engagement index score (-21.8) compared to males (-14.0). This suggests a broader disparity in the sense of inclusion or engagement experienced by females in the assessed environment.
- There are several categories where females have lower (more negative) scores than males, most notably in the category with scores of -3.3 for females and -3.2 for males. These categories might represent areas where females are feeling particularly excluded or disadvantaged.

RECOMMENDATIONS/STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS DISPARITIES:

- **Address major negative disparities**: Implement initiatives specifically designed to address the areas where females are most negatively impacted. This could include policy changes, support programs, or targeted interventions to promote equity.
- **Promote overall engagement**: Since the overall engagement index is negative for both genders, though more so for females, strategies should be developed to increase engagement across the board, with particular attention to the needs and experiences of females.
- **Further research**: Conduct qualitative research to understand the reasons behind the disparities. This might include interviews, focus groups, or surveys to gain insights into the experiences of individuals within these categories.
- **Monitor and evaluate**: After implementing changes, it’s crucial to monitor the outcomes and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions. Regular assessments can help determine if the gap in engagement scores is narrowing and if the sense of inclusion is improving.
- **Comparative analysis requirement**: It’s important to compare these patterns with other demographic data to understand if these challenges are unique to women or part of broader inclusion issues within the organization or context.
SEXUAL ORIENTATION-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

Both 'Heterosexual' and 'LGBTQIA+' groups report negative engagement index scores across all categories, suggesting widespread issues with inclusion that affect all individuals.

The 'LGBTQIA+' group’s overall engagement index score is substantially lower (-29.0) compared to that of the 'Heterosexual' group (-18.5), indicating that the LGBTQIA+ community experiences a more significant sense of exclusion or barriers to inclusion.

The trends across the categories show that the 'LGBTQIA+' group has lower scores in nearly all forms of inclusion measured, pointing to systemic challenges that need to be addressed.

RECOMMENDATIONS/STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS DISPARITIES:

- **Develop an inclusive culture:** Foster an organizational culture that values diversity and inclusion through ongoing education and awareness programs. This includes regular training sessions on unconscious bias, inclusive communication, and allyship.

- **Enhance support systems:** Create support networks and resources specifically for underrepresented and marginalized groups. This can involve setting up employee resource groups, mentoring programs, and access to counseling services.

- **Review and revise policies:** Conduct a comprehensive review of existing policies and practices to identify and eliminate barriers to inclusion. Update recruitment, retention, promotion, and compensation practices to ensure they are equitable and inclusive.

- **Engage and listen:** Actively engage with employees from both groups to solicit feedback on their experiences and involve them in the co-creation of solutions. This could be facilitated through surveys, focus groups, and inclusive leadership councils.

- **Monitor and report:** Implement a system to regularly measure and report on inclusion metrics. Use this data to continually refine strategies and ensure that the organization is moving towards a more inclusive environment for all members.
GENERATION-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

- **Gen Y** show the most significant negative engagement index score, which indicates they feel the least included or are facing the most barriers to inclusion.
- **Traditionalists** have notably higher positive scores across almost all categories, whereas **Gen Y** exhibit negative scores in the same areas.
- **Gen X** and Baby Boomers also have negative overall scores but to a lesser extent than Gen Y.
- The data suggest varied experiences with inclusion forms across generations, with Traditionalists on the positive end of the spectrum and Gen Y on the negative end.

**RECOMMENDATIONS/STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS DISPARITIES:**

- **Customized engagement initiatives:** Develop targeted initiatives to address the specific inclusion needs of Gen Y, as they show the most significant negative engagement index scores.
- **Mentorship programs:** Leverage the positive engagement of Traditionalists through mentorship programs, where the experience and satisfaction of Traditionalists can be shared with younger generations.
- **Cross-generational dialogue:** Facilitate cross-generational dialogues to understand the diverse needs and to foster mutual understanding and collaboration across different age groups.
- **Flexible work policies:** Implement flexible work policies that cater to the diverse needs of each generation, such as flexible hours, remote work options, and customized benefits packages.
- **Inclusion training and awareness:** Roll out comprehensive inclusion training that addresses generational differences and promotes an understanding of each generation's unique perspectives and contributions.
PHASE 3: ESTIMATION

RACE/ETHNICITY-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUSION FORMS</th>
<th>African American/Black (A/A)</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaskan Native (A/A)</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino (H)</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (N/P)</th>
<th>White (W)</th>
<th>Two or More Races (T/MR)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional (Rewards)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENGAGEMENT INDEX SCORE: -23.6 -8.3 -14.0 -25.6 16.5 -15.1 -39.1 8.9

RACE/ETHNICITY-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

- African American/Black (AA/B) and Hispanic or Latino (H) groups have notably low overall engagement index scores, indicating significant challenges in their experience of inclusion.
- Two or More Races (T/MR) group has the lowest overall engagement index score, suggesting this group feels the least included.
- Asian (A) and White (W) groups are moderate engagement levels but are still showing as negative overall engagement index scores.
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (N/P) group having the highest overall engagement index score.

RECOMMENDATIONS/STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS DISPARITIES:

- **Focused support for groups with lower engagement:** Implement targeted programs and policies that address the specific needs and barriers faced by African American/Black, Hispanic or Latino, and Two or More Races groups.
- **Cultural competency training:** Provide cultural competency training for all employees to foster an environment of understanding and respect for different racial and ethnic backgrounds.
- **Inclusive policy review:** Conduct a thorough review of all organizational policies to ensure they are equitable and do not inadvertently disadvantage certain racial or ethnic groups.
- **Enhanced representation:** Strive for greater representation of underrepresented groups in leadership positions and decision-making bodies to ensure diverse perspectives are included.
- **Regular inclusion assessments:** Conduct regular assessments of inclusion and engagement, disaggregated by racial and ethnic categories, to monitor progress and ensure that inclusion efforts are effective and equitable.
VETERAN-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

- Civilians have a lower overall engagement index score (-19.2) compared to Veterans (-11.5), suggesting civilians feel less included or face more barriers to inclusion than the Veterans who work at PWC.
- Veterans score even though negative overall they feel a moderate sense of inclusion and engagement.
- Veterans have positive scores in a few categories, which may suggest areas where their experiences or skills are particularly valued or recognized within the organization.

RECOMMENDATIONS/STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS DISPARITIES:

- **Targeted strategies**: Develop targeted inclusion strategies to address the areas where Veterans experience the most significant areas of negative impact like Financial and Decisional inclusion.
- **Leverage Veteran strengths**: Utilize the areas where veterans score positively to inform broader inclusion policies, possibly through mentorship programs where veterans can share their experiences and strengths.
- **Inclusive policy review**: Conduct a comprehensive review of policies and practices to ensure they are equitable and do not inadvertently disadvantage any groups.
- **Recognition and support programs**: Implement recognition programs that value the diverse experiences Veterans bring to the table and support programs that help bridge any gaps between civilian and veteran experiences.
- **Regular monitoring and feedback**: Establish a system for regular monitoring of engagement scores and solicit feedback from both groups to ensure that inclusion efforts are effective and equitable.
DIFFERENTLY ABLED-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

- Differently-abled individuals have a significantly lower overall engagement index score (-36.9) compared to those who are not (-17.0). This suggests that differently-abled individuals face more substantial barriers to inclusion.
- The scores indicate that in almost all categories, differently-abled individuals experience more negative impacts than their non-differently-abled counterparts.
- There are a few categories where the disparity between the groups is less pronounced, though the experience of differently-abled individuals is still negative.

RECOMMENDATIONS/STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS DISPARITIES:

- **Accessibility and accommodation:** Ensure that the workplace or environment is fully accessible, providing necessary accommodations that enable differently-abled individuals to participate fully and equally.
- **Inclusive communication:** Adopt inclusive communication practices, such as providing materials in accessible formats and using assistive technologies, to ensure differently-abled individuals can access information and services.
- **Awareness and training:** Conduct awareness and training programs to educate all members of the organization about different abilities and the importance of inclusion.
- **Engagement and feedback:** Actively engage with differently-abled individuals to understand their unique perspectives and needs. Use their feedback to improve policies and practices.
- **Diverse representation:** Promote diverse representation at all levels of decision-making, ensuring that differently-abled individuals have a voice in the processes that affect them.
PHASE 3: ESTIMATION

TENURE-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUSION FORMS</th>
<th>Less than 1 yr.</th>
<th>1 to 3 yrs.</th>
<th>3 to 5 yrs.</th>
<th>5 to 10 yrs.</th>
<th>10 to 20 yrs.</th>
<th>20+ yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional (Rewards)</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENGAGEMENT INDEX SCORE: -5.4 -22.0 -23.2 -26.1 -22.6 -6.4

TENURE-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

- The engagement scores decrease progressively with tenure, showing that individuals with 5 to 10 years of service feel less included compared to those with less tenure. Individuals with 20+ years of service have a slightly better engagement score than those with 10 to 20 years but still have a negative score overall.
- There appears to be a trend where individuals with mid-range tenure (3 to 5 years and 5 to 10 years) experience the most negative scores across various inclusion forms.
- Newcomers (less than 1 year) and veterans (20+ years) tend to have higher scores than other groups, suggesting they feel more included or engaged.

RECOMMENDATIONS/STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS DISPARITIES:

- **Targeted retention strategies:** Implement retention strategies that address the specific concerns of employees with mid-range tenure, including career development and advancement opportunities.
- **Recognition programs:** Create recognition programs that acknowledge the contributions and value of employees throughout their tenure, with special attention to those in the mid-range category who show significant disengagement.
- **Mentorship and leadership development:** Establish mentorship and leadership development programs that engage employees with 3 to 10 years of service, offering them a clear path for growth and involvement in the organization.
- **Regular engagement surveys:** Conduct regular engagement surveys with a focus on tenure-specific issues to identify and address the factors contributing to decreased engagement among employees with 3 to 10 years of service.
- **Flexible Work Arrangements:** Offer flexible work arrangements to cater to the evolving needs of employees as they progress through different tenure stages, ensuring that the organization adapts to their changing life circumstances.
**EMPLOYMENT STATUS-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUSION FORMS</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional (Rewards)</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENGAGEMENT INDEX SCORE:** -19.9 - 8.9 - 8.3 29.9

**EMPLOYMENT-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)**

- Contractors report significantly higher engagement scores compared to other employment classifications, indicating a sense of inclusion or satisfaction with their work environment and conditions.
- Full-time employees have the lowest overall engagement index score, suggesting that they may be experiencing feelings of exclusion or barriers to inclusion more intensely.
- Part-time and temporary workers have negative overall engagement scores, although they are not as low as those for full-time employees, indicating some challenges with inclusion but to a lesser extent.

**RECOMMENDATIONS/STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS DISPARITIES:**

- **Evaluate full-time employee policies:** Assess the policies impacting full-time employees to identify factors contributing to low engagement. This could involve reviewing workload, work-life balance, career development opportunities, and recognition programs.
- **Leverage contractor practices:** Understand what contributes to the high engagement scores of contractors, such as flexibility or project variety, and consider how these elements can be integrated into the roles of other employment types.
- **Enhance inclusion for all classifications:** If and where possible, develop inclusive policies that ensure part-time and temporary workers have access to available benefits, professional development, and support similar to full-time employees.
- **Regular engagement surveys:** Conduct regular engagement surveys tailored to each employment classification to gather direct feedback on inclusion experiences and identify areas for improvement.
- **Communication and community building:** Foster better communication channels and community-building activities that include all employment classifications, promoting a shared organizational culture and sense of belonging.
**PHASE 3: ESTIMATION**

**DEPARTMENT-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)**

PWC Predictive Engagement Index scores by self-disclosed and self-identified workplace department demographics.

Inclusion forms listed for each respective department are listed in alphabetical order. Departments listed do not include “state” agencies as this report only reflects “county” agencies governed by Prince William County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT REPORT #1</th>
<th>INCLUSION FORMS</th>
<th>Adult Detention Center</th>
<th>Agency on Aging</th>
<th>Clerk of the Circuit Court</th>
<th>Community Services</th>
<th>County Attorney</th>
<th>Criminal Justice Services</th>
<th>Development Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional (Rewards)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENGAGEMENT INDEX SCORE:**

-35.0  -8.8  -4.0  -21.5  19.1  -20.7  19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT REPORT #2</th>
<th>INCLUSION FORMS</th>
<th>DoIT</th>
<th>Economic Developmen t</th>
<th>Facilities &amp; Fleet Mgmt.</th>
<th>Finance &amp; Tax Admin</th>
<th>Fire &amp; Rescue</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Human Rights</th>
<th>Housing &amp; Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional (Rewards)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENGAGEMENT INDEX SCORE:**

-1.8  -16.3  -26.3  -23.9  -42.3  -16.5  -21.4  -12.6
PHASE 3: ESTIMATION

DEPARTMENT-BASED FINDINGS (AS INDICATED BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS)

PWC Predictive Engagement Index scores by self-disclosed and self-identified workplace department demographics.

Inclusion forms listed for each respective department are listed in alphabetical order. Departments listed do not include “state” agencies as this report only reflects “county” agencies governed by Prince William County.

**DEPARTMENT REPORT #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUSION FORMS</th>
<th>Juvenile Court Service Unit</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Mgmt. &amp; Budget</th>
<th>OEM</th>
<th>Parks, Rec. &amp; Tourism</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Public Safety Comm.</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Social Services</th>
<th>Transport ation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional (Rewards)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENGAGEMENT INDEX SCORE:** -25.2 -10.6 2.5 -21.4 -20.5 -29.7 -18.7 -23.0 -20.0 -20.5 25.5

Observations and recommendations listed on the next page for pages 32 and 33 department findings.
OBSERVATIONS:

• **Varied Engagement Levels:** There's significant variability in engagement scores across departments, with some (like the County Attorney’s office, Transportation and Management and Budget) showing positive scores, indicating a more inclusive environment, while others (like the Adult Detention Center and Fire and Rescue) show very low scores, suggesting challenges with inclusion.

• **Concerning Scores in Specific Departments:** Adult Detention Center, Fire and Rescue, and Planning show extremely low engagement index scores, highlighting urgent concerns about the inclusivity of this environment. Management & Budget and Transportation departments have positive engagement index scores, which may reflect effective inclusion practices or positive workplace environments.

• **Overall Departmental Health:** Fire & Rescue and other public-facing or interacting departments typically have negative scores, suggesting areas within these services that require attention to improve inclusion. Some departments appear to have mixed results, indicating variability within these departments that warrants a closer look.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

• **Focused Inclusion Initiatives:** For departments like the Adult Detention Center and Fire and Rescue, implement targeted inclusion initiatives, potentially including diversity and inclusion training, enhanced communication, and staff support programs.

• **Benchmarking Best Practices:** Identify best practices from departments with high scores, such as Transportation and Management & Budget, and benchmark these practices across other departments.

• **Department-Specific Strategies:** Develop tailored strategies for each department based on their specific needs and challenges. This could involve addressing unique stressors or creating specialized programs that resonate with the department’s culture.

• **Engagement and Feedback:** Regularly collect and analyze employee feedback to understand the drivers of engagement and disengagement within each department, and adjust policies and practices accordingly.

• **Inclusivity Audits:** Conduct inclusivity audits, particularly in departments with the lowest engagement scores, to identify systemic issues and implement necessary reforms to create a more inclusive environment.
PHASE 4
CONVERSATIONS
ALIGNING PEOPLE PRACTICES TO EI INDICATORS
Indicator 2 – Organizational Infrastructure

INDICATOR II: Organizational Infrastructure
1. Financial
2. Decisional
3. Professional
4. Promotional
5. Informational
6. Developmental

FINANCIAL: Ensure that base compensation for the individual reflects the value that they add, in keeping with everyone else.

Compensation Transparency and Equity:
• Implement a transparent compensation determination process that aligns with practices for new hires.
• Regularly conduct and disclose pay equity studies to ensure fair compensation across all roles.
• Address compensation for lead roles performing supervisory duties and consider adjustments where necessary.
• Reform the structure for compensation upon promotions to avoid always starting at the bottom end of the new range.
• Tackle compression issues and ensure that compensation adjustments reflect inflationary trends.

Recognition and Reward Enhancement:
• Establish performance-based merit awards that truly reflect above-and-beyond contributions.
• Introduce stipends or bonuses for exemplary employees, such as "Employee of the Year" or "Employee of the Quarter," with clear benchmarks for eligibility.
• Ensure that administrative bands are appropriately differentiated, such as creating a separate Legal Admin band, to reflect distinct job functions.

Benefits and Work-Life Balance:
• Evaluate and potentially enhance health insurance benefits.
• Introduce or improve paid parental leave policies for both maternity and paternity.
• Allow for more flexibility in salary negotiations upon hiring and when part-time employees transition to full-time roles.

Employee Empowerment and Engagement:
• Advocate for greater autonomy in compensation decisions at the county level, such as hiring bonuses for roles in high demand.
• Foster a culture of empowerment by enabling the use of county facilities for staff mental and physical wellness.
• Engage with county staff in various formats beyond traditional meetings to discuss and act on compensation and policy issues.

Performance and Development:
• Implement a tenure, performance, experience, and credential-driven advancement process that allows for compensation increases even without title changes.
• Develop clear, attainable goals for performance reviews to ensure employees can meet expectations without being set up for failure.
Please note that these recommendations are synthesized ideas and aspirational action planning thoughts and verbatims that are directly from the employees at PWC to address various forms of inclusion. These items were extracted during our conversations and focus groups with the departments.

ALIGNING PEOPLE PRACTICES TO EI INDICATORS
Indicator 2 – Organizational Infrastructure

INCLUSION FORMS – ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING

DEcisionAL: Solicit and use the employee's input and opinions in making business decisions.

Establish a Transparent Feedback Response Process:
• Create a clear and documented procedure for addressing employee concerns, ensuring that feedback is acknowledged, considered, and responded to, with clear communication back to the employees about the outcomes.
• Develop a feedback mechanism, such as an anonymous suggestion box or digital platform like Slack/Teams, that maintains confidentiality and allows for continuous feedback throughout the year.

Enhance Employee Participation in Decision-Making:
• Set up a structured committee system, possibly with an emphasis on standing committees, where employees at different levels can contribute to policy-making and decision-making processes.
• Implement an "Innovation Council" consisting of employees from various levels and workgroups to pilot-test new technologies and provide input on organizational changes.

Improve Workload Management for Greater Engagement:
• Address high caseloads by hiring additional staff to alleviate the workload, enabling more employee participation in committees and policy-building efforts.
• Explore options for work redistribution or support mechanisms that allow for realistic engagement without overburdening employees.

Leadership and Managerial Development:
• Roll out a comprehensive acclimation program for new leaders, including mentorship from more tenured leaders.
• Train supervisors and leaders in the "Leadership at all levels" philosophy, emphasizing listening and collaborative decision-making skills.
• Schedule regular visits by leaders to various branches and departments to interact with employees and community members, ensuring a direct feedback loop.

Communicate and Leverage Technology Effectively:
• Continuously evaluate and refine communication strategies for effectiveness, ensuring that key decisions and technology rollouts are well understood by employees.
• Maintain a bulletin board or digital platform for posting updates and collecting feedback, ensuring that lessons learned are applied and leveraged across the organization.
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PEOPLE REVIEW – WORKFORCE CLIMATE & CULTURE
INTERACTIONS / DEPARTMENT FOCUS GROUPS / ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING

Please note that these recommendations are synthesized ideas and aspirational action planning thoughts and verbatims that are directly from the employees at PWC to address various forms of inclusion. These items were extracted during our conversations and focus groups with the departments.

ALIGNING PEOPLE PRACTICES TO EI INDICATORS
Indicator 2 – Organizational Infrastructure

INCLUSION FORMS – ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING

PROFESSIONAL: Support the individual equitably through unbiased processes to enter the business & get appropriate roles.

Standardized Disciplinary Process Training:
- Develop and implement a standardized approach to disciplinary actions across all programs, ensuring consistency and fairness. Provide training for program managers to align on these practices.

Internal Talent Development and Succession Planning:
- Create a robust internal development program focused on assessing clinical skills and identifying employees with potential for supervisory roles. This includes succession planning, cross-training, and sharing success stories to inspire growth.

Inclusive and Diverse Skill Development Opportunities:
- Establish internship programs aimed at increasing diversity within the workforce.
- Implement a peer mentoring program to help employees navigate opportunities and prepare for advancement.
- Offer trial supervisory experiences and support learning new skills within current departments.

Comprehensive Training and Cross-Functional Exposure:
- Allow staff designated work hours for training and professional development.
- Introduce cross-functional shadowing experiences, such as nurses shadowing therapists, to foster mutual understanding and appreciation of different roles.
- Include medical staff in crisis and Narcan training to enhance interdisciplinary competencies.

Enhanced Job Mobility and Role Flexibility:
- Encourage lateral moves and promotions internally before seeking external candidates, and consider job swap programs to give employees a broader organizational perspective.
- Rework the GOALS framework to include both standard expectations for all employees and role-specific requirements.
- Offer customized development paths and consider job rotations within Finance and other departments to demonstrate and develop financial acumen.

Mentoring and Inclusion Programs:
- Accelerate the implementation of a mentoring program that pairs more tenured attorneys with those less tenured, focusing on areas such as land use.
- Focus on the inclusion of part-time and seasonal workers in decision-making, development, and professional growth opportunities.

Empowerment and Accountability:
- Continue the expectation of quarterly check-ins for employee performance and development, adding accountability measures to ensure regularity and effectiveness.
- Emphasize “Leadership at all levels” training to empower employees to take initiative and demonstrate leadership qualities in their roles.
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INTERACTIONS / DEPARTMENT FOCUS GROUPS / ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING

Please note that these recommendations are synthesized ideas and aspirational action planning thoughts and verbatims that are directly from the employees at PWC to address various forms of inclusion. These items were extracted during our conversations and focus groups with the departments.

ALIGNING PEOPLE PRACTICES TO EI INDICATORS
Indicator 2 – Organizational Infrastructure

INCLUSION FORMS – ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING

PROMOTIONAL: Establish processes and support mechanisms to help the individual progress to positions of greater responsibility.

Promotion Recognition:
• Implement a system to recognize and promote staff who demonstrate exceptional performance, leadership, and attitude, without requiring them to undergo the standard interview process. This would reward internal talent and foster a culture of recognition.

Compensation for Special Projects:
• Offer additional compensation for staff undertaking specialized work, such as language translation or specialty docket management. This recognizes the extra effort and skills brought to unique projects.

Professional Development Assistance:
• Provide resources and training, such as resume-writing workshops and mock interviews, to prepare entry-level employees for internal job opportunities and promotion processes.

Supervisor Experience Bridge Program:
• Revive or create programs like the Supervisor Equivalency Program to provide employees lacking formal supervisory experience with opportunities to gain and demonstrate leadership capabilities.

Job Shadowing Opportunities:
• Establish a job shadowing program that allows individual contributors to gain insight into supervisory roles, fostering understanding and preparation for future leadership positions.

Clear Advancement Pathways:
• Review and revise job classifications to ensure there is a transparent and accessible path for advancement from one position to another, facilitating clear career progression.

Succession Planning:
• Develop a robust succession planning strategy for critical roles, ensuring that the organization is prepared for transitions and that employees understand the pathways for advancement.

Experience Acknowledgment:
• Recognize and credit the experience gained by employees who act in higher roles temporarily, ensuring this experience is factored into future promotion considerations.

Equitable Succession Processes:
• Ensure that succession processes are equitable by advertising positions and opportunities as they become available, allowing all qualified candidates to apply.

Credential-Based Title Changes:
• Establish criteria for automatic title changes based on the attainment of specific certifications or credentials, acknowledging the professional development efforts of employees.

‘Ready Now’ Classifications:
• Identify and classify high-performing and high-potential employees as ‘Ready Now’ or ‘Ready in 1/2 Years’ for advancement, preparing a talent pipeline for critical roles.

Part-Time to Full-Time Promotion Timelines:
• Set timelines and criteria for promoting part-time staff to full-time positions, providing growth opportunities, and retaining talent within the organization.
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PEOPLE REVIEW – WORKFORCE CLIMATE & CULTURE
INTERACTIONS / DEPARTMENT FOCUS GROUPS / ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING

Please note that these recommendations are synthesized ideas and aspirational action planning thoughts and verbatims that are directly from the employees at PWC to address various forms of inclusion. These items were extracted during our conversations and focus groups with the departments.

ALIGNING PEOPLE PRACTICES TO EI INDICATORS
Indicator 2 – Organizational Infrastructure

INCLUSION FORMS – ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING

INFORMATIONAL Provide relevant and appropriate information transparently to the employee as context for their efforts

Integrate Employee Engagement Team:
• Regularly include the Employee Engagement Liaison Team in leadership meetings to ensure employee concerns and ideas are heard at the highest level.

Leadership Accessibility:
• Implement a “walk-about” schedule for top leadership to attend staff meetings and trainings across the organization, enhancing visibility and approachability.

Customized Communication Strategies:
• Develop and maintain tailored communication approaches that suit different divisions, empowering senior managers to effectively share information both vertically and horizontally.

Comprehensive Communication Channels:
• Adopt a multi-pronged communication strategy, utilizing various formats and media to ensure messages reach all employees.

Anonymous Feedback Mechanisms:
• Provide opportunities for anonymous and confidential feedback during meetings to promote open and honest communication.

Divisional Leader Accountability:
• Analyze and respond to divisional leader scores from inclusion surveys to address any gaps and hold leaders accountable for fostering an inclusive environment.

State of the Parks Address:
• Host an annual event to share updates and celebrate achievements within the parks department, along with regular social events to build community.

Consistent Information Sharing:
• Continue to deliver regular newsletters and updates to keep all staff informed about policy changes, new initiatives, and organizational developments.
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Please note that these recommendations are synthesized ideas and aspirational action planning thoughts and verbatims that are directly from the employees at PWC to address various forms of inclusion. These items were extracted during our conversations and focus groups with the departments.

ALIGNING PEOPLE PRACTICES TO EI INDICATORS
Indicator 2 – Organizational Infrastructure

INCLUSION FORMS – ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING

DEVELOPMENTAL Meet the unique learning needs of the individual to enable professional growth

Mentorship and Professional Growth:
• Implement a Formal Mentorship Program: Pair employees with experienced mentors for guidance and support in their career paths within the county.
• Create Individual Development Plans: Encourage employees to develop personal growth plans with clearly defined training goals that are assessed during annual performance reviews.

Training and Skills Development:
• Utilize PWC University Resources: Curate development tracks from PWC University courses, incorporating both core and elective learning options to enhance employee skills.
• Establish Leadership Development Tracks: Offer specialized training in leadership and soft skills for managers and supervisors to foster a culture of effective leadership.

Succession Planning and Talent Management:
• Formalize Succession Planning: Identify critical positions and develop a succession plan that includes 'Ready Now' and future-ready candidates, ensuring inclusivity and diversity.
• Incorporate Career Ambition Inquiries: During annual reviews, inquire about employees' career ambitions to allow self-selection into development opportunities.

Inclusive Training Access:
• Assess Training for All Employee Tiers: Ensure that part-time, seasonal, and hourly employees have access to relevant PWC University courses and create a curriculum that meets their specific needs if it does not already exist.

Innovation and Job Rotation:
• Promote Job Rotation: Identify job families suitable for rotation to provide employees with a broader range of experiences and responsibilities.
• Enhance Innovation Receptiveness: Develop strategies to improve the organization’s openness to innovation and change.

Performance Evaluations and Feedback:
• Refine Quarterly Evaluations: Conduct honest evaluations that accurately reflect employee strengths and weaknesses to guide development efforts.
• Supervisory Role in Development: Expect supervisors to actively engage with their direct reports in creating and following through on training plans, integrating this into their evaluation process.
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LEADING DEI PRACTICE INSIGHTS FOR GOVERNMENT COUNTIES
BENCHMARKING / BEST PRACTICES

Below are recognized best practices and benchmarks for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) within recognized county governments into the categories of workplace, workforce, marketplace, and community. These practices and benchmarks are not exhaustive but provide a clear framework for Prince William County to assess its DEI efforts against leading standards.

**Workplace (Environment and Culture)**

**Benchmarks:**
- High completion rates for DEI training sessions.
- Positive employee feedback from climate surveys indicates an inclusive culture.
- Visible leadership commitment to DEI practices.

**Best Practices:**
- Ongoing DEI training and workshops for all staff.
- Regular employee climate surveys to assess the inclusivity of the work environment.
- Transparent communication about DEI policies and initiatives.
- Establishment of a DEI council with representatives from various job levels.

**Workforce (Employee Composition and Development)**

**Benchmarks:**
- Workforce demographics reflective of the county’s population.
- Equitable promotion rates for employees from underrepresented groups.
- Pay equity across all demographics.

**Best Practices:**
- Inclusive leadership training programs.
- Equitable hiring processes with diverse panels and blind recruitment techniques.
- ERGs that support diverse employee populations.
- Clear pathways for the career advancement of underrepresented groups.

**Marketplace (Economic Participation and Supplier Diversity)**

**Benchmarks:**
- Percentage of county contracts awarded to minority-owned, women-owned, and other diverse businesses.
- Positive reputation in the business community regarding DEI practices.

**Best Practices:**
- Supplier diversity programs to support businesses owned by underrepresented groups.
- Equitable procurement processes and policies.
- DEI considerations in economic development initiatives.

**Community (External Engagement and Impact)**

**Benchmarks:**
- Community feedback and satisfaction with county DEI efforts.
- Participation rates in DEI-focused public programs and events.
- Community perception of the county as an inclusive service provider.

**Best Practices:**
- Community feedback and satisfaction with county DEI efforts.
- Participation rates in DEI-focused public programs and events.
- Community perception of the county as an inclusive service provider.
Prince William County can ensure that DEI is woven into the fabric of its operations, creating a government that truly reflects and serves the interests of its diverse constituents. These are customized best practices from leading and recognized practices that Prince William County should consider implementing in the following four pillars of Workplace, Workforce, Marketplace, and Community.

Additional recommendations are listed on the next page for consideration.

**Workplace**

**Benchmarks:**
- Inclusion Score based on annual employee surveys.
- Completion rates of DEI training programs.
- Transparency in grievance resolution outcomes.

**Best Practices:**
- Bias and sensitivity training for all employees.
- Regular DEI assessments and policy reviews.
- Flexible work arrangements to support diverse work-life needs.

**Workforce**

**Benchmarks:**
- Representation metrics aligning with community demographics.
- Equitable retention and promotion rates across all demographics.
- Comprehensive pay equity reviews with corrective actions.

**Best Practices:**
- Community-centric recruitment strategies.
- Clear career progression paths and mentorship programs.
- Accountability measures for meeting DEI goals within human resources practices.

**Marketplace**

**Benchmarks:**
- DEI metrics in procurement and contracting.
- Participation rates in DEI-focused business outreach programs.
- Feedback scores from vendors and partners on DEI practices.

**Best Practices:**
- Ensuring diverse vendors and contractors have equal opportunity in county procurement processes.
- Promoting DEI principles in economic development initiatives.
- Regular reviews of procurement policies to align with DEI goals.

**Community**

**Benchmarks:**
- Community engagement metrics on DEI initiatives.
- Public participation rates in county-run DEI programs and events.
- Community perception scores of county government’s inclusivity.

**Best Practices:**
- Active engagement with community leaders and groups to inform DEI strategies.
- Public-facing DEI dashboard showcasing progress and accountability.
- Community events and programs that reflect and celebrate the county’s diversity.
We recommend that Prince William County implement the following benchmarks and best practices to continue to strengthen the County’s position as an inclusive employer and community leader ensuring that all residents, employees, and community partners feel valued, understood, and empowered by County leadership.

**DEI Benchmarks for Prince William County:**

1. **Workforce Demographics:** Ensure the county government’s workforce demographics align with those of Prince William County’s relative rate ratios to workforce demographics in PWC that including examining the representation of different demographic groups in the workforce.

2. **Equitable Retention:** Aim for retention rates that do not vary significantly between different demographic groups within the county workforce.

3. **Transparent Performance and Promotion Metrics:** Develop a system to track performance evaluations, promotions, and career advancements, ensuring underrepresented groups of all forms of diversity represented in the county have equitable opportunities.

4. **Comprehensive Pay Equity Reviews:** Continue to conduct biennial pay equity reviews, with results informing adjustments to compensation structures to maintain equitable pay within the county. Ensure results are comprehensively communicated to employees.

5. **Prince William Inclusion Score:** Implement an annual survey to gauge the Inclusion Score among county employees, using the inclusion survey findings to improve workplace culture.

6. **DEI Training Completion:** Achieve a 100% completion rate for DEI training among county employees, with specialized modules for different departments depending on their specific needs.

7. **Resolution Reporting:** Report the resolution of discrimination grievances in a timely and transparent manner, maintaining fairness and accountability.

8. **Language Accessibility:** Ensure language-accessible options for community residents and ensure they reflect the surrounding communities.

**DEI Best Practices for Prince William County:**

1. **Strategic DEI Planning:** Craft a strategic plan for Prince William County that addresses specific local needs and sets clear, measurable objectives tied to EI goals and aspirations.

2. **Community-Centric Recruitment:** Leverage community partnerships to create a diverse talent pipeline for county positions and use inclusive language in all job postings.

3. **Bias and Sensitivity Training:** Mandate comprehensive bias decision-making and inclusive communication training for all county leadership employees.

4. **Supportive ERGs:** Foster ERGs that reflect the county’s diverse population, supporting their initiatives and integrating their insights into county policies.

5. **DEI Dashboard for Transparency:** Introduce a DEI dashboard that tracks the county’s progress on DEI initiatives, available for both internal review and public accountability.

6. **Targeted Mentorship:** Create mentorship programs that support the development of employees from underrepresented groups, aligning with the county’s demographic profile.

7. **Promotion Equity:** Standardize promotion processes to eliminate bias and create equal opportunities for advancement within the county workforce.

8. **Ongoing DEI Evaluations:** Regularly evaluate DEI efforts to ensure they meet the evolving needs of Prince William County’s diverse community.

9. **Active Community Dialogue:** Engage in continuous dialogue with community leaders and residents to inform and adjust DEI strategies.

10. **Inclusive Policy Reform:** Review county policies through a DEI lens, updating them to ensure they support equity and inclusivity.

11. **DEI Accountability:** Hold county departments accountable for meeting DEI benchmarks, incorporating these into performance evaluations.

12. **Work-Life Balance Initiatives:** Offer and promote flexible work arrangements that consider the diverse needs of the county’s employees, such as telecommuting and flexible hours.
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EI PROGRAM NEXT STEPS
RECOMMENDATION / EI PROGRAM ACTIONS

The organization is assessed as a result of the above process as being in one of 4 different phases as shown below. This will serve as a good starting point for Prince Williams County’s future DEI journey. The outlined “orange” box below identified the maturity stage that Prince William County currently represents.

Subsequent recommendations will focus on how specifically to get to the next phase of maturity. By moving through these stages, Prince William County can create a culture that not only supports diversity and practices equity but also lives and breathes inclusion at every level and in every aspect of its operations.

Foundational: Laying the Groundwork for Inclusion

✓ Comprehensive DEI Assessment: Conduct a review of current DEI status in all county operations, identifying areas of strength and opportunities for growth.
✓ DEI Policy Development: Establish a foundational set of DEI policies that guide recruitment, retention, promotion, and compensation.
✓ Initial DEI Training: Implement mandatory or voluntary DEI training for all county employees, focusing on awareness and sensitivity.
✓ Creation of DEI Council or Committee: Form a DEI council composed of diverse members from various county departments to oversee DEI efforts.

Enlightened: Building Awareness and Understanding

✓ Expanded DEI Curriculum: Develop an ongoing DEI education program that covers topics such as unconscious bias, cultural competence, and anti-discrimination practices.
✓ Employee Resource Groups (ERGs): Support the creation of ERGs for various demographic groups to provide support networks and advise on DEI strategies.
✓ Community Outreach: Initiate community listening sessions to understand the diverse needs and perspectives of the county’s residents.
✓ Benchmarking Against Best Practices: Compare the county’s DEI efforts with recognized best practices and established benchmarks from leading county governments.

Integrating: Implementing DEI into Operations

✓ Inclusive Hiring Practices: Revise job descriptions and hiring practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates and reduce bias.
✓ Equitable Compensation Structures: Regularly review and adjust compensation structures to ensure equity across all levels and demographics within the county pay bands.
✓ Transparent Career Pathways: Communicate career development opportunities and criteria for advancement within the county government.
✓ DEI Metrics and Strategic Plan Dashboard: Track DEI initiatives, and PWC Strategic Plan using quantifiable metrics and a public dashboard to keep the county residents informed.

Optimized: Sustaining and Enhancing Inclusion

✓ Continuous Improvement: Implement a system for continuous feedback and improvement of DEI initiatives based on data and employee input.
✓ Leadership Development: Establish leadership programs that prioritize a system of inclusion, preparing a pipeline of leaders who champion inclusivity.
✓ DEI in Decision-Making: Ensure DEI considerations are embedded in all county government decision-making processes as aligned to the EI Policy.
✓ Recognizing and Celebrating DEI: Regularly recognize and celebrate DEI milestones and the contributions of diverse individuals and teams.

✓ Are areas that have been accomplished through the EI strategy at Prince William County
APPENDIX A FOR PHASE 1: EVALUATION

PERFORMANCE – WORKPLACE CLIMATE & CULTURE
REVIEW - EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT/ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

APPENDIX A
Scope:
• Reviewed internal documents to assess effectiveness of the current inclusion & diversity language.
• Identify strengths and address opportunities for improvement in inclusion and diversity through selected interviews.
• Generate insights and inputs based on the full assessment that can lead to a potential roadmap for inclusion and diversity at Prince William County, including a review of the following:
  • What HR policies, processes or practices (PPP) currently exist that support PWC’s E&I policy?
  • Are all HR PPP in alignment? If not, which of these PPP will have a high impact on the PWC organization?
• Compensation Study Review (Gallagher Findings) for diversity, equity and inclusive practices in pay and performance. The intent is to identify potential gaps in equity.

EI Action Plan: Data Gathered:

Indicator 1 – Organizational Culture & Climate
• Organizational Employee Survey
• Current Culture
• Future Culture
• Employee Demographics
• Other Data Relevant to Your Department

Indicator 2 – Organizational Infrastructure
• EI Policy/Vision/Mission
• PWC Strategic Plan
• Personnel Policy Manual
• The employee cycle forms and processes for hiring, promoting, exit performance evaluation
• Professional development in PWC University
• Understanding leadership at all levels of each agency

Indicator 3 – Community Engagement & Partnership
• Translation/Interpretation Survey
• List of collaborative community organizations/businesses informing the work,
• Communication guidelines by departments (in-person, phone, or email correspondence),
• Copy of the last annual survey conducted to assess needs, customer service, and/or input from the community,
• List of annual public programs or yearly events held with community partnerships

QUESTIONS AS PART OF THE ASSESSMENT
1. What policies and processes currently exist that support PWC’s E&I Policy and align with EI Action Plan 1, 2 and 3
2. Are any HR policies and practices not in alignment?
3. Which of these policies and processes will be easy to change? Which will be difficult?
4. Which of these changes will have a high impact on PWC organization? Which will be less impactful?
5. Are these practices aligned with the Prince William County Future Commission 2030 report.
## APPENDIX A FOR PHASE 1: EVALUATION

### PERFORMANCE – WORKPLACE CLIMATE & CULTURE

**REVIEW - EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT/ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE**

### QUALITATIVE REVIEW – GLINT RESULTS 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>vs Comp.</th>
<th>Cha...</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>% Favora...</th>
<th>Comme...</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>My direct supervisor provides me with feedback that helps me improve my performance. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best interests - Manager</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>My direct supervisor makes me feel they have my best interests in mind. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Safety</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel safe at my workplace. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I am able to successfully balance my work and personal life. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful Treatment</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I am treated with respect and dignity. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion - Team</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>My team has a climate in which diverse perspectives are valued. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel empowered to make decisions regarding my work. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI - Expression</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>While at work, I am comfortable expressing opinions that diverge from my team. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Commitment</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>The Leadership Team (Department Directors) demonstrate a visible commitment to diversity. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I have the resources I need to do my job well. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with the recognition or praise I receive for my work. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Teams in my Department collaborate effectively to get things done. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I have good opportunities to learn and grow at Prince William County Government. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the benefits offered at Prince William County Government (e.g., health, dental, leave, retirement). Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2 Questions Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Purpose</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Working for Prince William County Government gives me a sense that I am part of something with a larger purpose. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I have good career opportunities at Prince William County Government. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Prince William County Government has a great culture. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership - Department</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>I have confidence in my Department's leadership team. Nov 1, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualitative Review – GLINT Results 2021 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>vs Comp.</th>
<th>Cha.</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>% Favora.</th>
<th>Comme.</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Leaders</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Leaders in my Department value different perspectives. Nov 1, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Prince William County Government communicates openly and honestly. Nov 1, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>I am fairly compensated for the work that I do. Nov 1, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership – County</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>I have confidence in the Executive Leadership Team (County Executive &amp; Deputy County Executives). Nov 1, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Taking</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I believe meaningful action will be taken as a result of this survey. Nov 1, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BELONGING

Gaps Identified:
• Benchmarks indicate a significant portion of employees do not feel a sense of belonging, primarily due to unresolved historical workplace issues, creating a trust deficit across the county.
• Employee sentiment of inclusion is heavily influenced by the sensitivity and approach of immediate supervisors.

Opportunities for Improvement:
• Initiate a robust communication plan to inform employees about positive organizational changes and progress from past feedback.
• Implement organizational goals to advance as a more inclusive and trusted workplace.
• Address team-level issues with a consistent approach to foster fairness and resolution.

OBSERVATIONS:

Inclusion of Sub-Cultures:
• Within smaller team units, employees feel a sense of belonging, but this sentiment does not extend to feeling part of the larger PWC organization.
• Employees in satellite locations or distant from the central county hub report feeling excluded.
• There is an opportunity to recognize and leverage the unique strengths of subcultures within the larger organizational structure.

Workplace Culture Post-COVID:
• Employees have noticed a shift in workplace culture since returning post-COVID, with communication about changes not effectively reaching all levels.
• There is a perception that PWC does not value employees, informed by the behavior of leadership.

Lack of Belonging:
• A general feeling of being undervalued leads to difficulty in fostering a sense of belonging.
• Generational divides contribute to an “us versus them” mentality.
• Some employees report bitterness due to strained relationships with supervisors, while others feel disconnected from leaders.

Initiatives Supporting Belonging:
• Cross-departmental functions are seen as beneficial for fostering engagement and positive interactions.
• Mental health resources provided by PWC are well-regarded and contribute to a support system.
• Positive feedback from co-workers enhances the sense of belonging for some employees.

Navigating Organizational Changes:
• Longer-tenured employees may face challenges adapting to changes within the county, affecting their sense of connection.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Sense of Belonging: There is a clear division in the sense of belonging, with employees feeling connected to their peers but alienated from management. This dichotomy highlights a social disconnect that impacts team cohesion and overall organizational culture.
• Employee Engagement and Value: A significant number of employees view their roles as merely a source of income, lacking a deeper personal investment in their work. This detachment is attributed to a perceived indifference from higher-ups, suggesting that employees do not feel valued for their individuality or unique contributions.
• Leadership and Well-being: Leadership is perceived as being self-centered, focusing on their own agendas without fostering an inclusive and supportive atmosphere. This approach, coupled with high workload demands, reinforces the sentiment that the organization prioritizes job performance over the well-being of its employees.
LEADERSHIP IN DEPARTMENT
Gaps identified:
• The benchmark results reveal a pronounced impact from unfavorable responses centered around perceived transparency and communication deficiencies.
• Department heads are seen as struggling with direct communication with their teams, leading to staff feeling undervalued and a broader erosion of trust.
Opportunity for improvement:
• There’s an urgent need to develop a communication plan that allows executive leaders to effectively disseminate information about changes and improvements. This plan should prioritize establishing clear and open lines of communication promptly.

OBSERVATIONS:
Effective Communication & Feedback:
• Team members express a desire for leadership to solicit their input before making significant decisions.
• The frequency and clarity of communication need improvement, especially with regular regulatory changes.
• There’s a general consensus that department leaders, while competent, fall short in transparency and valuing staff feedback.
Training for Effective Management:
• There’s a call for enhanced supervisory training focusing on people management to support more effective leadership.
Regression of Compensation:
• Trust issues are further aggravated by compensation concerns.
• There’s a need for clear communication about pay parity, particularly whether it’s limited to leadership positions.
Engagement of Staff:
• Remote workforce members report feeling disconnected from leadership.
• A lack of communication transparency is noted across various departments.
• Some department heads are recognized for their caring and effective leadership.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Eroding Trust: Trust and confidence in the leadership of some departments have significantly diminished due to perceived miscommunication and indecisiveness, affecting employees’ faith in their leaders.
• Communication and Vision: Inconsistent communication of the departmental vision has led to delays and inefficiencies, causing frustration and confusion about project directions and expected outcomes.
• Leadership Priorities: There is a sentiment among employees that leadership priorities are self-serving, focusing on job security for themselves rather than providing genuine support for lower-level staff.
• Contrast in Confidence Levels: While direct supervisors garner notable confidence from employees, there is a stark lack of trust in senior leadership. This discrepancy draws attention to the need for a more unified and supportive approach across management levels.
LEADERSHIP PERCEPTION

Gaps Identified:
• The benchmark results highlight a critical impact from unfavorable responses primarily linked to employees' perceptions of executive leaders, which are largely based on the visibility of initiatives that directly benefit the workforce. Communication gaps are leading to misunderstandings, affecting overall trust. However, employees tend to view inclusive and open executive leaders more favorably.

Opportunity for Improvement:
• There’s an opportunity to rebuild trust and confidence through regular, direct communication channels such as town halls, assemblies, or an internal roadshow that brings executive leaders face-to-face with employees.

OBSERVATIONS:

Current State of Employee Perspectives:
• There are mixed feelings among employees about the competence, commitment, and trustworthiness of executive leadership, particularly regarding the leadership's interest in employees' well-being.

Misinformation and Resentment:
• Unspent or unreturned merit raise funds from pre-Covid times have fostered resentment, with employees feeling that leadership may be using the funds for self-interest.
• Public statements made by some executive leaders are perceived as disconnected from the actual work and challenges, fueling a belief that their decisions do not adequately protect employees.

Confidence in Leadership:
• A portion of the workforce believes in the leaders' good intentions but desires greater transparency and forthrightness.
• Employees express a stronger sense of trust and confidence in leaders who are transparent and open.

Financial Prioritization Over Employees:
• There's a sentiment that executive leadership prioritizes cost savings, sometimes at the expense of employee benefits, especially during economically challenging times.

Leadership Visibility:
• County leadership is perceived as distant, often reduced to impersonal email communications rather than physical visibility and direct interaction.

Lack of Grievance Procedures:
• Employees feel there is no safe or trustworthy avenue for voicing grievances to the Executive Leadership Team.

Decision Accountability:
• There is a perception that county leaders are reluctant to take responsibility for poor hiring decisions and the consequent issues with employee retention and attraction.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Trust in Leadership: There is a perceived lack of trust and confidence in the leadership, fueled by specific incidents and an overarching sentiment of disconnect between the executive team and other employees.
• Decision-Making Concerns: Employees express a desire for leadership to make decisions based on the genuine needs of the workforce and the county, rather than choices that merely serve to improve optics.
• Need for Leadership Engagement: There is a strong call for the executive leaders to increase their presence and engagement with the employees, suggesting a shift from virtual communication to more direct and meaningful interactions.
ACTION PLANNING _ EMPLOYEE SENTIMENT & ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE

Gap Identified:
• The benchmark reveals a significant trend of unfavorable responses, stemming from a historical skepticism about the efficacy of surveys and subsequent action. Employees harbor hope but are wary due to perceived systemic issues that they feel have remained unaddressed.

Opportunity for improvement:
• There is a crucial need for a detailed communication plan that articulates the county’s strategic direction and the role of employees in shaping the future. Addressing the disconnection between employees and the vision of leadership is imperative. Transparently showcasing actions taken in response to previous surveys could rekindle employee faith in the system.

OBSERVATIONS:
Lack of Trust:
• There is a prevalent sentiment of skepticism regarding the translation of feedback into action.
• Employees are doubtful about PWC’s ability to enact meaningful change due to perceived external pressures and historical inaction.
• There is a pronounced distrust in the executive management team, influenced by past performance issues.

Hope and Belief:
• Amidst skepticism, some employees maintain optimism that feedback will lead to positive change.
• The effort to collect feedback is seen as a brave step by PWC, indicating to some that leadership values change.
• Recollections of effective responses to the 2010 and 2013 surveys serve as a basis for some employees' hopefulness.

Communication to Clarify Intent:
• There is a desire for more transparent communication about negative findings to focus on future improvements.
• Employees are patient with the analysis of actionable items but seek assurance that the process is underway.
• Questions linger about the outcomes of previous surveys, specifically regarding pay reviews and retention, which were not adequately communicated.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• General Sentiment: There is widespread skepticism among employees who view the survey as a procedural formality rather than a catalyst for change.
• Belief in Intentions vs. Execution: A segment of the workforce credits leadership with good intentions but notes a historical pattern of inadequate follow-through on initiatives.
• Cynicism about Survey Outcomes: The survey is recognized as a valid method for gathering opinions, yet there is a prevalent belief that the feedback provided is likely to be ignored.
• Importance of Leadership Drive: Employees underscore the critical role of leadership in championing these initiatives, cautioning that without strong advocacy, no significant change is anticipated.
• Trust Deficit: Trust in the survey process and in leadership is minimal, primarily due to perceived inaction on feedback from past surveys.
CULTURE & CLIMATE

Gap Identified:
• The benchmark reveals a dichotomy in responses, reflecting mixed emotions about the immediate group versus the broader county culture. There is confusion among employees about what ‘culture’ fundamentally means, with prior negative experiences influencing their perceptions. Reminiscence of a pre-pandemic sense of belonging and caring highlights a shift in cultural climate.

Opportunity for improvement:
• Leadership has the chance to rekindle the previous cultural climate by launching a transparent communication campaign. Employees are seeking authentic responses and follow-up actions, even if the messages might be difficult to hear. Implementing mandatory training on cultural understanding could prove beneficial.

OBSERVATIONS:
Impact of Pandemic on Culture:
• The culture has suffered due to the pandemic, with diminished opportunities for connection and collaboration.
• A perceived culture of secrecy from upper management has disrupted communication and feedback mechanisms.
• Notably, feelings of exclusion are shared across racial lines, with both white employees and people of color feeling marginalized.

Connecting Employees to Build Culture:
• Enhanced organizational communication could foster a greater sense of connectivity.
• There is a lack of cultural awareness among employees, with some unaware of the existing culture or its implications.
• The existing culture is characterized by control and hierarchy, which contrasts with the interests of the community and workforce.
• Vision and mission exist, but employees feel disconnected from these concepts.
• There’s a belief that more should be done to promote cultural awareness and engagement.
• Collaboration tends to happen on an individual rather than organizational level.

Development and Sustaining Sub-cultures:
• Culture is often developed at the department level rather than as a county-wide initiative.
• Employees are seeking engagement with optimistic and positive initiatives.
• While cultural training is provided, it is not effectively integrated into daily routines.
• Some employees perceive the county’s culture to be more positive than that of their department’s sub-culture.
• White employees who support diversity and inclusion initiatives express fear of repercussions for speaking out.
• It’s emphasized that it’s vital for white employees to feel part of the change to ensure inclusivity.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Out of Touch Leadership: A disconnect is perceived between county leadership and the workforce, creating a challenging work environment.
• Presence of Cliques: Instead of a unified culture, there’s a prevalence of cliques within groups.
• Increasing Negativity: The culture is becoming more negative as employee burnout rises, contributing to a detrimental work environment.
• Impact on Retention: Current policies, such as the absence of a retention policy and the removal of performance incentives, are seen as factors that demotivate employees and encourage top performers to leave.
• Management’s Indifference: There is a sentiment that management is indifferent to employees’ personal challenges and its impact on their professional life, with mental health and family issues being overlooked.
INCLUSIVE LEADERS
Gap Identified:
• The benchmark underscores a significant trend of negative responses regarding inclusive leadership. While there are instances of leaders who appreciate diverse opinions, the prevailing sentiment among employees is that their voices are not genuinely heard or considered, impacting the overall perception of inclusivity.

Opportunity for improvement:
• Leaders across the county could benefit from refresher training on modeling inclusive behaviors, particularly focusing on active and intentional listening. The goal is not necessarily to act on every opinion but to ensure that employees feel their perspectives are acknowledged and valued.

OBSERVATIONS:
Models of Inclusive Behavior:
• Certain action teams and leaders demonstrate inclusivity by actively seeking and considering employee input.
• Employees notice and appreciate leaders who consistently exhibit strong, inclusive behaviors.
• Some employees perceive attempts at inclusion, but feel there is no systematic process to sustain it.
• A feeling exists that some leaders prioritize their opinions over others, discouraging open dialogue.
• Positive examples of inclusivity are observed where leaders are genuinely committed to hearing diverse ideas.
• While there is acknowledgment of differing opinions, employees question whether these are truly valued.
• The Prince William County Department of Transportation (PWCDOT) is noted for having an inclusive model where employees feel valued.
• New supervisors are perceived as more patient and receptive to diverse viewpoints.

Perceptions of Not Being Valued:
• Many employees feel their voices are not valued, particularly those outside of leadership roles.
• There is a sentiment that directors and senior leaders are the only ones whose opinions are considered meaningful.
• Different perspectives are often met with hostility rather than recognition as valuable feedback.

Barriers to Trust:
• Committees purportedly formed for inclusion are seen as superficial due to perceived inaction.
• Decisions appear to be pre-determined, with the solicitation of employee input viewed as a façade.
• Communication deficiencies and inadequate customer service further erode trust.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Lack of Diverse Perspectives: Different perspectives are reportedly neither sought nor welcomed in some departments, with a culture of conformity encouraged.
• Tenure-Based Valuation of Opinions: Opinions of lesser-tenured employees are often undervalued compared to those from senior management.
• Supervisors Favoring Own Perspectives: There is a perception that some supervisors are inflexible and prefer their perspectives to be the only ones followed.
• Situational Valuation of Perspectives: Different perspectives may be tolerated but not always genuinely valued, with employees discerning the difference between token acknowledgment and true consideration.
• Consequences for Dissent: Employees who offer differing viewpoints can be subjected to ridicule or targeting, particularly in the Fire and Rescue Department.
PHYSICAL SAFETY

Gap Identified:
• Benchmark results reveal a positive response regarding physical safety in the workplace, with many employees feeling secure among coworkers and in protected work environments. However, there is a notable concern about open spaces and public areas within work settings, which are causing anxiety related to physical safety due to the external atmosphere.

Opportunity for improvement:
• There is an opportunity to enhance safety training, focusing on harassment prevention and effective communication regarding policy updates. Additionally, establishing neighborhood safety committees could further support community security.

OBSERVATIONS:

Physical Safety in Immediate Worksite:
• A preference for the safety of teleworking from personal homes over being in the office has emerged.
• Employees appreciate the telework option for its contribution to their sense of physical safety.

Safety Concerns Regarding Public Interactions:
• Employees express feeling unsafe when the public can freely enter clinics or other workspaces.
• Encounters with irate or potentially mentally ill members of the public raise safety concerns.
• A need for enhanced security measures and training to handle public harassment is highlighted.
• Updates and changes in safety procedures are not communicated effectively, leading to uncertainty.

Personal Health Safety Post-Covid:
• Concerns about health exposure due to the absence of a vaccine mandate for all employees.
• The Covid-19 pandemic has intensified health safety concerns among employees.
• The presence of an active safety committee in neighborhood services is commended, with a recommendation for every department to have a similar committee.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:

• Physical Security Needs: Some county buildings are perceived as lacking adequate physical security.
• Mask and Vaccination Policies: The absence of mask mandates and vaccination requirements for county employees has caused discomfort for some staff.
• Need for De-escalation Training: Frontline staff express a need for additional de-escalation training to better manage security concerns, especially in shelter settings.
• Communication and Expression Concerns: Employees feel hesitant to voice their opinions at work, suggesting a need for a more open and communicative environment.
FEEDBACK
Gap Identified:
- The benchmark showcases that while most employees receive feedback, there’s a significant disparity in its quality and frequency. Poor communication from leaders and supervisors, or the lack thereof, is adversely affecting employee morale, mental well-being, and retention at PWC.

Opportunity for improvement:
- There appears to be a systemic issue in performance management, particularly among supervisors who fail to support their teams effectively. This indicates a pressing need for comprehensive training for supervisors and managers to enhance their communication skills and feedback delivery.

OBSERVATIONS:
Types of Feedback:
- Feedback is commonly provided by direct supervisors, yet the method and frequency of feedback vary greatly.
- Feedback ranges from constructive and growth-oriented to solely negative, which can demoralize the team.

Supervisor’s Perceived Performance:
- Certain job roles experience a lack of feedback, potentially due to the nature of their work.
- Some supervisors are perceived as unapproachable, which hinders trust-building.
- Instances of supervisors neglecting their communication responsibilities altogether have been noted.

Need for Supervisor Training:
- A deficit in effective communication skills among some supervisors calls for targeted training.
- There is a perception that the county is top-heavy with supervisors, lacking uniform standards for employee treatment.
- Pressures from upper management are believed to influence how supervisors relay feedback.

Value and Recognition:
- A sentiment exists that employees are undervalued and their efforts go unrecognized, contributing to distrust in leadership.
- Delays in action and a lack of transparent communication from leadership exacerbate this distrust.

Compensation Concerns:
- Feedback frequently touches on compensation issues, with threats of resignation from otherwise content employees.
- Unfulfilled promises of pay adjustments are contributing to plummeting morale.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
- Limited Feedback Dialogue: Feedback is often restricted to evaluations with minimal interim communication.
- Management Training Needs: Supervisors are in need of training to manage their teams more effectively and cultivate better results.
- Prevalence of Negative Feedback: Some supervisors are noted for providing mostly negative feedback, which is counterproductive to growth.
- Communication Gaps: There is a disconnect in communication from some direct supervisors, impacting the overall feedback loop.
RESPECTFUL TREATMENT

Gap Identified:
- There is an identified discrepancy between the positive surface-level perceptions of respect and the underlying belief that respect is not a universally upheld value. While immediate work teams may exhibit trust and respectful behaviors, there is a broader cultural tolerance for disrespect that goes unchecked due to a lack of consequences for poor behavior.

Opportunity for improvement:
- There is an urgent need to review feedback mechanisms and implement policies that can swiftly reinforce a culture of respect and trust. By focusing on ‘quick wins’ that affirm respect as a core value and giving priority to first responders, the county can enhance community impact and internal trust.

OBSERVATIONS:

Superficial Positive Perception of Respect:
- Employees generally feel respected within their immediate teams but observe that respect as a core value is not consistently practiced beyond these boundaries.
- There is an opportunity to reinforce respectful treatment as a core competency for all employees, not just within teams.

Training on Equality and Identity:
- The county could benefit from specialized training on pronouns, gender identity, and gender equality to foster a deeper understanding and respect among employees.

Mixed Feelings on Overall Respectful Treatment:
- Responses indicate that while employees feel respected by peers and direct supervisors, they often feel disrespected by higher leadership.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMs:

- **Senior Management’s Inaction on Harassment:** There is a perceived failure by senior management to address harassment and complaints, leading to a decline in feelings of respect and dignity.
- **Respect Limited to Immediate Supervisors:** Employees note that while direct supervisors treat them with respect, this experience does not extend to interactions with higher management.
- **Internal Power Struggles and Decision-Making Influence:** Power dynamics within the agency are contributing to a disconnection, where employees feel their voices and opportunities for decision-making input are not respected.
- **Unaddressed Cultural Tensions:** Inadequate cultural consciousness training has led to misunderstandings and a reduced sense of belonging and respect.
- **Work-Life Balance and Recognition:** A lack of work-life balance, compounded by insufficient recognition for personal time sacrificed, diminishes employees' feelings of respect and dignity.
INCLUSION TEAM

Gap Identified:
• Employees perceive inclusivity and respect for diverse perspectives to be limited to their immediate workgroups, with a notable decline when considering broader organizational integration. There’s a sense of respect within teams but a lack of value placed on individual contributions and feedback, especially from minority groups or when it involves challenging conversations.

Opportunity for improvement:
• There is an imperative to incorporate inclusivity initiatives across all organizational levels, ensuring that leadership, management, and staff participate in culture work simultaneously. This approach can help create an environment where everyone feels valued and included.

OBSERVATIONS:
Valuation of Diverse Perspectives at the Employee Level:
• Employees report feeling respected but not necessarily valued for their unique contributions.
• There is a noted disparity between feeling included within diverse communities and within the workplace.
• Fear of retaliation inhibits open expression and the contribution of diverse perspectives.

Leadership’s Approach to Diverse Perspectives:
• Employees feel their perspectives are valued within their immediate teams but not beyond that level.
• There is a perceived tolerance, rather than active respect, for diverse viewpoints by leadership.
• Managers struggle with inclusivity and how to facilitate discussions on challenging topics.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Value Within Teams: Within the confines of direct teams, there is a strong sense of inclusion and collective decision-making. However, this inclusivity does not appear to extend to departmental or county-wide levels.
• Impact of Personal Beliefs on Inclusivity: There are concerns that some supervisors’ personal beliefs negatively impact their ability to embrace diversity and inclusivity.
• Lack of Workforce Diversity: Employees observe a lack of diversity in new hires and question the inclusivity of the recruitment process.
• Perception of Leadership: There is a sentiment among employees that leadership does not genuinely value or seek out diverse perspectives.
DEI EXPRESSION
Gap Identified:
• There is a notable lack of trust permeating the organization, which stifles open expression among employees. The fear of retaliation or being disregarded creates an environment where authenticity is compromised, and silence is often the chosen recourse.

Opportunity for improvement:
• The implementation of forums such as empathy circles or courageous conversations could cultivate trust within departments and teams. This also presents an opportunity to guide leaders toward humility and provide them with the necessary training to foster open communication.

OBSERVATIONS:
Retaliation Concerns:
• Employees harbor a fear of speaking up due to potential retaliation.
• Disagreement with leadership might result in punitive actions or negative consequences, discouraging open expression.

Authenticity Comes at a Price:
• Honesty can lead to demeaning responses, suggesting a lack of psychological safety within the workplace.

Leadership’s Indifference to Expression:
• Opinions offered by employees are often met with indifference, leading to a belief that their voices are unheard and unvalued.

Safe Environments for Expression:
• The presence of subcultures within agencies provides safe spaces for some employees to speak openly.
• The manager’s leadership style significantly influences the comfort level of employees in sharing their opinions.
• Long-tenured employees tend to feel more at ease and courageous in expressing themselves.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Fear of Reprisal: Employees feel comfortable sharing opinions with immediate coworkers but are reluctant to express dissenting views to higher management due to fear of being labeled as troublemakers or non-team players.
• Ineffective Communication: There is a prevalent culture of silence due to indifference from leadership. Employees often withhold their input during meetings, feeling that their suggestions are ignored or that there is no follow-through on ideas presented.
• Leadership Unavailability: Managers are perceived as too busy to address issues or listen to employees’ opinions, with a tendency to prioritize emails and new projects over direct engagement with staff concerns.
• Suppressive Department Culture: Despite some level of comfort in expressing divergent opinions, the broader department culture does not encourage or value such honesty, leading to a lack of genuine discourse.
• Societal Sensitivities: There is a belief that the current societal climate is overly sensitive, causing hesitation to express strong opinions for fear of being misconstrued, leading to a "gotcha" culture rather than one seeking positive solutions.
DIVERSITY COMMITMENT

Gap Identified:
• Leadership’s approach to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) appears superficial and not fully aligned with the diverse needs of the community. There is a disconnect between the current structural and systemic understanding of DEI and what it should truly represent.

Opportunity for improvement:
• Leaders need to be equipped with a deeper understanding and practical tools to effectively navigate the change process towards a genuine DEI commitment. This includes aligning tangible goals with accountable outcomes.

OBSERVATIONS:

Leadership Diversity:
• There is a perception that leadership diversity doesn’t adequately reflect the communities served.
• Visible workforce diversity does not translate into perceived opportunities for all.
• Concerns exist about the impact of DEI efforts on job security and progression, especially among white employees.

Discrimination Concerns:
• Discrimination in hiring and advancement disproportionately affects African American/Black and Hispanic individuals.
• Feelings of reverse discrimination are reported among some white male employees.

Accountability for DEI Goals:
• There is a lack of accountability tied to clear DEI goals and outcomes, leading to questions about the sincerity of the commitment to change.

Understanding DEI Fundamentals:
• A significant number of employees express indifference due to a lack of understanding of DEI principles and their importance.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:

• Misunderstanding of DEI Commitment: Confusion abounds about the role of diversity in hiring, with some employees mistaking it for a reduction in standards. Efforts to increase diversity are sometimes viewed as reactionary measures to social tension rather than strategic organizational development.
• Disparity in Leadership Diversity: While diversity efforts are visible at lower levels, there is a notable absence of diversity in higher management.
• Commitment to Diversity in Management Practices: Mixed emotions prevail regarding senior management’s commitment to diversity, particularly when addressing employee complaints and concerns.
• Broadening the DEI Focus: Questions arise about how the leadership’s commitment to diversity extends to gender, LGBTQ+ individuals, older candidates, and other diverse groups beyond race and ethnicity.
LARGER PURPOSE
Gap Identified:
• Employees in Prince William County are motivated by a personal sense of mission and value their roles as public servants. However, there is a notable disconnect when aligning their individual purposes with the broader objectives of the county. This misalignment is partly due to a lack of recognition from their employer and a clear understanding of the county’s mission and values.

Opportunity for improvement:
• Forming a diverse task force to devise a communication strategy could help bridge the gap between individual employee missions and the county’s larger purpose. This group would gather insights to shape key messages that resonate with the workforce's diverse values and the county’s mission.

OBSERVATIONS:
Personal Mission Connection:
• Employees find a personal connection to a larger purpose through their service impact and direct community engagement.
• A strong sense of public service inherently ties employees to a larger purpose.

County Mission Disconnection:
• Some employees struggle to see how their work ties into the county’s mission, leading to feelings of disunion.
• There is a perception of leadership being out of touch with what drives employees' sense of mission.

Organizational Value Gap:
• Employees often feel more aligned with their department’s mission than with the county at large.
• An employee’s sense of value and connection to a larger purpose is influenced by their relationship with direct managers.

Environmental Impact on Perceived Value:
• Changes in valuation and transparency have been noted since the onset of the pandemic, affecting employees’ connection to the county’s larger purpose.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Senior Leadership Interaction: Negative experiences and a lack of interaction with senior leaders have led to feelings of insecurity and detachment.
• Operational Disconnect: There’s a need for clarity in how daily operations connect to the county’s goals, with many employees desiring more involvement in conversations and decisions.
• Community Service as Purpose: Serving the public is a primary source of alignment with the county’s larger purpose, but diminishing resources and public engagement opportunities have hindered this connection.
• Impact of Current Events: Employees call for management to recognize the pandemic's impact on their capacity to contribute meaningfully to their roles and the community.
BEST INTERST - MANAGER

Gap Identified:
• While many employees feel their managers and supervisors have their best interests at heart, a notable portion of negative responses points to a need for enhanced training and development for supervisors. The feedback suggests that some supervisors might prioritize their interests or adhere to minimal requirements, leading to perceptions of unequal support.

Opportunity for improvement:
• Addressing performance management issues among supervisors who may not be adequately supporting their teams is crucial. Both supervisors and team members could benefit from targeted training, particularly in areas of leadership, empathy, and diversity.

OBSERVATIONS:

General Feedback on Managerial Support:
• The majority of employees feel that their managers and direct supervisors are considerate of their best interests.

Supervisor Performance and Training Needs:
• There’s a disparity in expectations, with high-performing employees held to their standards while others are not pushed beyond minimal requirements.
• Some employees feel unsupported by their supervisors.
• There is sympathy for supervisors who are perceived as being influenced by the political environment in their decision-making.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Self-Interested Supervisors: Concerns are raised about supervisors who prioritize their interests over those of their team members.
• Compliance Over Advocacy: Instances are noted where supervisors are seen as overly compliant, following directives without considering the impact on team members.
• Focus on Operational Needs Over Team Well-being: Some supervisors are perceived as being more concerned with operational needs than with the well-being and interests of their team.
• Personal Beliefs Affecting Managerial Decisions: Personal beliefs of supervisors are seen as interfering with their ability to act in the best interest of diverse team members.
• Lack of Diversity Awareness: Concerns about a lack of commitment to diversity within the department, coupled with the expression of personal political beliefs by supervisors, highlight a need for greater sensitivity and inclusivity.
EMPOWERMENT

Gap Identified:
• Employees generally feel empowered by their supervisors’ confidence and trust, yet a significant number drive their own empowerment, suggesting a lack of consistent, enabling environments. The managerial styles that inhibit positive engagement are perceived as barriers to an inclusive and empowering culture.

Opportunity:
• There’s a significant chance for leaders to mentor and develop supervisors whose styles are seen as obstructive. It’s crucial to clarify acceptable practices and prevent the perception of a culture driven by fear. Identifying and promoting best practices from empowering leaders can serve as a model for others.

OBSERVATIONS:

Desired Culture of Empowerment:
• While employees feel empowered to make recommendations, there’s a lack of confidence that their input will lead to action.
• Empowerment varies depending on job roles and the presence of direct supervisors.
• Positive team leader interactions contribute significantly to feelings of empowerment.

Empowerment Tied to Supervisor Confidence:
• Supervisors who facilitate open communication and set standards for autonomous decision-making enhance employee empowerment.
• The ability to contribute to final decisions is appreciated, though action processes are sometimes seen as overly cumbersome.

Obstacles to Empowerment from Supervisor Styles:
• Micromanagement by supervisors hampers the sense of empowerment.
• A culture of fear in some departments restricts decision-making autonomy.
• Past experiences of criticism and chastisement have left a lasting impact on decision-making confidence.

Controlled Decision-Making Environment:
• Decision-making processes are often rigid and top-down, leaving little room for employee input.
• Employees feel that significant decisions are reserved for higher ranks, leading to a climate of scrutiny rather than empowerment.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• **Police Discretion and Empowerment:** Police officers express a sense of limited discretion in their enforcement roles, with concerns about repercussions for decision-making.
• **Supervisor Reluctance to Delegate:** Some supervisors require employees to consult them for even minor decisions, limiting empowerment.
• **Procedure-Bound Roles:** Certain positions are heavily governed by standard procedures, limiting the scope for individual empowerment.
WORK LIFE BALANCE

Gap Identified:
• The overall scores indicate a significant discrepancy between the existing work culture and the ideal of work-life balance. The current environment in Prince William County does not prioritize work-life balance as a fundamental aspect of productivity and employee well-being.

Opportunity:
• There's an opportunity to act on employee feedback and implement practical policies that enhance cultural trust and work-life balance. Quick, impactful changes can foster trust, especially for first responders whose work has immediate community impact.

OBSERVATIONS:

Telework Program Utilization:
• While a telework program is in place, its implementation is inconsistent, with some managers lacking training on integrating telework into weekly schedules effectively.
• Certain employees find it challenging to take advantage of teleworking opportunities due to their workload.

Culture of Tirelessness:
• A prevailing culture expects employees to work long hours, often without compensation or consideration for personal time, leading to a lack of self-care.
• Employees struggle to balance family life with work demands, as work is seen as the top priority.

Ideas for Enhancing Work-Life Balance:
• Employees suggest reasonable adjustments like remote work, flexible hours, and manageable workloads to prevent burnout.
• Departments are encouraged to seriously consider restructuring to support work-life balance.

Leadership’s Approach to Work Hours:
• Some leaders and managers work extended hours but limit their time off, aiming to set a positive example, yet inadvertently contributing to a culture of overworking.

First Responders’ Health Concerns:
• The mental and physical health of first responders is increasingly at risk due to long work hours and reduced family time.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Telework and Management Support: Telework programs are in place but are underutilized due to managers not integrating them effectively into the weekly work schedule. There's a lack of training for managers on how to incorporate telework, and employees struggle to find time to take advantage of it due to their workload.
• Culture of Overwork: Employees are working long hours, often extending into their personal time without additional compensation or options for work-life balance. This culture pressures employees to prioritize work over family, causing difficulty in managing a healthy balance between the two.
• Health and Well-being: The intense work hours and the prioritization of work over personal time are causing mental and physical health concerns, particularly among first responders. There is a growing imbalance in ensuring physical and psychological safety, with stress and marginalized family life being significant issues.
GROWTH
Gap Identified:
• While employees generally feel good in their physical work environments, there is a significant gap in growth and professional development opportunities. Many employees express a desire for more training and development, but face barriers in accessing these resources. The discontinuation of education reimbursement programs and uneven access to training contribute to feelings of undervaluation and hinder professional growth.

Opportunity:
• Enhancing training and development opportunities, including revisiting the education reimbursement program and ensuring equitable access to training, presents a significant opportunity. Forming input groups among supervisors to focus on balanced workload management and team development can also facilitate growth.

OBSERVATIONS:
Underutilization of Training Resources:
• There’s a recognized need for more effective engagement training for supervisors and managers.
• Employees desire current offerings in computer skills, communication, and team building.
• While PWC University provides valuable training, participation is not widely supported or encouraged.

Impact of Discontinued Education Reimbursement:
• The removal of the education reimbursement program has negatively impacted employee morale and perceived value in professional development.
• This decision is seen as a signal that leadership does not prioritize developing all talent, pushing potential talent out.

Barriers to Professional Growth:
• Supervisors often deny training opportunities due to immediate job demands, creating a barrier to employee development.
• The overall culture is perceived as not supportive of training for growth or skill enhancement.
• Overworked supervisors are seen as impediments to accessing PWC’s training resources.

Inequitable Access to Training:
• Not all employees have equal access to necessary training, creating disparities in development opportunities.

Funding Cuts and Personal Time Constraints:
• Funding for training and advancement has been reduced, and available training often requires personal time commitment, which is challenging for many employees.

Limited Course Availability:
• Difficulty in enrolling in courses offered by PWC University due to high demand and limited slots.

Time and Work Restraints:
• Employees find it challenging to utilize PWC University’s tools due to time constraints and workload.

Inconsistency in Tuition Reimbursement:
• Disparity exists in tuition reimbursement availability across departments, with unclear policies.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Inequitable Access to Training: Employees are noticing disparities in access to necessary training, which impedes equitable professional development across the workforce.
• Limited Funding and Time: Budget cuts have reduced funding for training and advancement opportunities, and the available training often requires personal time investment, which is challenging for many employees.
• Barriers to Utilizing Resources: While PWC University offers learning tools, work and time constraints prevent employees from taking advantage of these resources. Moreover, inconsistencies in tuition reimbursement policies among departments create confusion and perceived unfairness.
COLLABORATION
Gap Identified:
• The benchmark indicates a substantial number of unfavorable responses centered around collaboration issues within the county government. A significant concern is the lack of transparency, honesty, and effective communication, leading to varied perceptions of department heads and an overall trust deficit.

Opportunity:
• To enhance collaboration and communication, consider hosting regular town halls, both in-person and virtually. These forums can provide employees opportunities to learn from and directly engage with leadership, fostering a culture of openness and transparency.

OBSERVATIONS:

Barriers to Team Collaboration:
• Many employees feel that the county government operates in silos, hindering effective collaboration.
• Remote work has exacerbated the sense of disconnection among teams.
• The structure of work seems to dictate the necessity of teamwork rather than a culture of collaboration.
• There’s a desire for better collaboration tools and resources.

Inherent Structures Promoting Collaboration:
• Certain roles, like first responders, naturally require team collaboration.
• Technological advancements have improved collaborative efforts.
• Unions are cited as examples of effective collaboration protocols.

Issues Around Accountability and Leadership Influence:
• There is a lack of confidence in leadership, with employees feeling pressured to follow directives without question.
• Perceptions of decreased teamwork and growing indecisiveness among leaders contribute to discomfort and distrust.
• Remote workers are perceived as less accountable in some instances.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Communication Barriers: Ineffective communication is a significant barrier to collaboration within the county. While collaboration at the officer level is noted as effective, department-wide collaboration suffers due to poor communication and differing agendas.
• Decline in Collaboration: There has been a noticeable decline in inter-team communication and collaboration over the past few years.
• Impact of COVID on Collaboration: The COVID pandemic has posed challenges to maintaining the same level of collaboration, particularly with the shift to remote work.
RECOGNITION
Gap Identified:
• The benchmark results highlight a significant disconnect in employee recognition, with many unfavorable responses. Employees perceive recognition as closely tied to compensation, and existing non-monetary recognition programs are seen as inconsistent or lacking in meaningful impact.

Opportunity:
• There is a crucial opportunity to enhance and revitalize non-compensation recognition programs, making them more meaningful and widely embraced across PWC.

OBSERVATIONS:
Invisible Workforce:
• Certain employees, particularly in less visible roles or divisions like jails and public safety, feel unrecognized and undervalued.
• Upper management is perceived as failing to acknowledge the contributions of these ‘hidden’ employees.

Criticism of Existing Recognition Platforms:
• Current recognition systems, such as trophy or badge systems, are perceived as inadequate and not reflective of the hard work put in by employees.
• PWC’s recognition platform, while appreciated, is not frequently used or effectively implemented.

Preference for Pay Alignment with Performance:
• Some employees prioritize respectful treatment and fair pay over symbolic recognition.
• The performance rating structure is seen as ineffective, with no real incentives to excel due to uniform pay for different performance levels.
• Recognition programs lack consistency across different county departments.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• General Lack of Recognition: Employees feel that hard work is often overlooked, with little to no recognition forthcoming.
• Recognition Limited to Visible Roles: Direct managers may provide praise, but broader recognition from leadership is typically reserved for more visible positions.
• Perception of Recognition as Part of the Job: The prevailing sentiment is that the only recognition employees receive is during annual evaluations, reinforcing the perception that recognition is tied to job performance.
CAREER

Gap Identified:
• Employee responses indicate a significant dissatisfaction with career advancement opportunities within Prince William County. Many employees feel confined to their current departments with limited chances for progression. Additionally, there is a perception that PWC lacks a culture of talent development and promotion, prompting employees to seek opportunities in other counties or government entities.

Opportunity:
• There’s an opportunity to leverage the results of retention and pay-for-performance reviews, applying a DEI lens to initiate actionable changes. Communicating these results and subsequent plans for change can address these concerns and improve perceptions of career development within PWC.

OBSERVATIONS:
Limited Career Advancement Opportunities:
• Employees observe a scarcity of advancement opportunities within their departments and across the county.
• There is a belief that open positions are not consistently advertised internally.
• Many employees feel compelled to seek advancement opportunities in other departments or outside PWC.

Training and Development for Advancement:
• There is a need for more robust training and development programs to equip employees with the necessary skills for available positions.
• Opportunities often require college degrees, limiting advancement for non-degree employees.
• A shift in mindset is needed regarding the types of skills and qualifications valued for advancement.

Bias in Advancement and Promotion:
• Instances of promotions without corresponding pay increases contribute to employee discontent.
• Perceptions of bias, favoritism, and an “old boys’ network” are seen as barriers to fair advancement.
• Veteran employees feel overlooked in favor of new hires.
• Interview processes are perceived as biased, especially against international employees.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• External Hiring vs. Internal Promotion: There is a belief among employees that the county has a preference for external hiring over promoting existing employees, leading to a sense of limited internal mobility and growth opportunities.
• Stagnant Career Progression: Certain roles, notably librarians, experience a particular lack of advancement opportunities, feeling that their career paths are stagnant within the organization.
• Recognition of Qualifications: Employees feel that their experience and education are not sufficiently recognized or rewarded when it comes to career advancement, which impacts their perception of PWC as an employer that supports professional growth.
REWARDS
Gap Identified:
• The benchmark results reveal a significant concern among employees about inadequate compensation and reward systems. The perception is that the county lacks a fair and competitive compensation structure, particularly when considering the workload and comparison with surrounding areas. The lack of action following a class and compensation study has contributed to these unfavorable responses.

Opportunity:
• This situation presents an opportunity for HR to develop and implement a comprehensive performance plan that addresses these concerns. It’s essential to communicate the outcomes of compensation studies and subsequent actions to the workforce to enhance transparency and trust.

OBSERVATIONS:
Overworked without Adequate Compensation:
• Employees report increased workloads without corresponding pay increases, including for roles like Policy Chiefs and Battalion leaders not paid for overtime.
• There’s a sense that pay equity issues persist and salary adjustments based on experience and position are needed.

Discontinued Education and Compensation Programs:
• The discontinuation of education reimbursement programs has negatively impacted morale and the perceived value of employee development.
• Cost-of-living adjustments have been insufficient, lagging behind comparable positions in other counties.

Salary Compression and Reviews:
• New hires often start on a higher pay scale, leading to salary compression issues.
• There’s a need for thorough salary reviews to address compression by job function.

Morale and Leadership Issues:
• Discussions about pay disparities are common among employees, contributing to morale issues.
• There are concerns about poor leadership and a lack of training opportunities.

Performance and Incentive Discrepancies:
• The lack of rewards for additional education, certifications, or exceptional job performance is noted.
• The merit system is seen as ineffective, offering no real incentive for exceeding performance expectations.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• General Sentiment of Being Underpaid: Employees feel severely underpaid compared to the increasing workloads and the growth of the county. There’s a mass exodus in departments like the police due to uncompetitive pay.
• Workload and Compensation Discrepancies: The workload is perceived as disproportionate to the compensation, with technical and dynamic job demands not adequately accounted for. Comparisons with other counties show a mismatch in employee workload and staffing levels.
• Pay Freezes and New Hire Compensation: Pay freezes have been a longstanding issue, affecting scheduled pay increases. New hires often receive higher compensation than long-tenured employees, leading to dissatisfaction.
• Hourly Work Week Adjustments: The shift from a 40-hour to a 37.5-hour workweek without adjusting compensation has been a point of contention.
BENEFITS (SOCIAL STRUCTURES/OUTCOMES)
Gap Identified:
• While Prince William County (PWC) offers competitive health benefits, there are notable areas of concern, particularly around retirement healthcare costs, dental coverage, and the inclusivity of benefit plans. The high cost of healthcare in retirement is causing employees to delay retirement, impacting the advancement opportunities for others.

Opportunity:
• Regularly reviewing and communicating updates on healthcare plans can enhance employee appreciation and competitiveness in the marketplace. Additionally, exploring benefit packages for part-time employees could align PWC with evolving market trends.

OBSERVATIONS:
Comprehensive Health Benefits:
• Employees appreciate PWC’s medical benefits and wellness offerings.
• There is a call for the introduction of paid family leave.

Areas for Improvement in Benefits:
• Dental coverage is perceived as inadequate.
• The cost of healthcare in retirement is prohibitively expensive for some, influencing retirement decisions.
• Missed opportunities for 401k enrollment pose challenges for long-term financial planning.
• Lack of incentives for employees who proactively manage their health.

Retirement Benefits Concerns:
• While pension plans are valued, the inability to re-enroll in 401k plans is a limitation.
• Healthcare costs during retirement are a significant concern.
• There are calls to reinstate retirement matching programs.

Benefits as a Retention Tool:
• Benefits like tuition reimbursement and PTO/holidays contribute to employee retention.
• However, the lack of competitive salaries undermines the value of these benefits.

Barriers to Utilizing Benefits:
• Employees feel discouraged from taking PTO due to workplace culture.
• Dependence on spousal retirement benefits indicates gaps in PWC’s offerings.
• The current retirement structure may inadvertently encourage longer tenures, limiting advancement for others.

SUMMARY OF VERBATIMS:
• Cost Concerns with Health Benefits: Employees find health benefits increasingly expensive, especially for family coverage. Retirement healthcare costs are notably high, necessitating additional income sources post-retirement.
• Dental Benefits and Leave Policy Reevaluation: Dental coverage is seen as insufficient, with high premiums and limited coverage. There is a need for a more generous and flexible leave policy, including considerations for paid family leave.
• Impact of Work Hour Adjustments: Changes to work hours without corresponding adjustments in benefits have led to disparities, particularly in annual and sick leave accruals.
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Strategic Benchmarking & Insights
DMBA Benchmarking tools are designed to support making informed business decisions. We have expanded the services to provide industry reporting, cultural insights, and infographics that allow for quick reference to real-time data.

The combination of the listed reports below provides a snapshot of DMBA marketplace and industry trends and data sets to help develop metrics to support organizational strategic positioning.

- Inclusive Leadership Index (ILI)
- Diversity Benchmarking Index (DBI)
- Disability Equity & Inclusion Index (DEII) (New)
- Industry DEI Special Reports
- Diversity Business Review (DBR)
- Research Slip Sheets (Info Data Snapshots per Topic)

DMBA INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP INDEX

RESEARCH BASIS & DATA SETS

1500 Unique Companies

Gov’t: Municipalities, Counties, State & Federals

35,000 Data Insights

38,000 Average Employee Base for Multi-National Companies

6,000 Average Employee Base for Regional Companies

17 years collecting data on annual basis

Research Categories used to gather data: Inclusive Leadership Index

- Business Strategy
- Talent Acquisition Strategy
- Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Strategy
- Accountability
- CEO Commitment
- Leadership Accountability
- Representation
- Recruitment & Board Diversity
- Succession Planning
- Advancement & Pipeline
- Executive Leadership Development
- Workplace Inclusion
- Equity & Retention
- Social Responsibility
- Supplier Diversity
- ESG & DEI

2023 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - DIVERSITY, EQUITY & INCLUSION REVIEW
Managing Pay Equity Process
Percent of Companies

Source: 2022 DMBA Inclusive Leadership Index (ILI)

Commitment from Sr. Leadership: 62%
Process to Correct Pay Equity Issues: 81%
Pay Equity Policy: 35%
Focus on Gender Pay Equity: 81%
Focus on Racial and Ethnicity Pay Equity: 69%
Process to Identify Pay Equity Issues: 81%

Source: 2022 DMBA Inclusive Leadership Index (ILI)

Comp Analysis by gender, ethnicity & Identity: 72%
Internal Team to Conduc Comp Reviews: 76%
HR System Identify Pay Gaps by Gender: 58%
Annual HR DEI Review for Disparities: 57%
Pay Equity Audit (2-3 years): 62%
Pay Structure Review for Diversity: 48%
Monitor for Comp Disparities by Job Function: 20%
### BEST PRACTICES FOR CONSIDERATION

**Data Review By Race/Ethnicity and Gender**
- Review current employees with similar performance to ensure compensation is equitable.
- After reviews it is a good practice to make equity adjustments on base salary by job category.
- Self Audit twice a year to review job requirements to ensure everyone is position receives equal pay. (Federal requirement)
- Review of Advancement by gender, ethnicity/race and by generation.
- Review rate of advancement by gender and ethnicity/race.
- Address compression issues left over from the last compensation update working with HR.
- Review salary offers by ethnicity, gender, generation and job grade at point of hire.

### BEST PRACTICES FOR CONSIDERATION

**Assess the Dimensions of Diversity to ensure equity in Identity Advancement**
- Identifying person with disabilities at point of hire to accommodate for both visible and invisible disabilities.
- Identification Persons with Disabilities pay progression.
- Identify essential functions within every position.
- Analyze compensation bias comparing specifically diversity dimensions of disability, veterans and Identified LGBTQIA+.

### BEST PRACTICES FOR CONSIDERATION

**Consistent Monitoring of Pay Equity, Policy and Procedures**
- Annual compensation reviews with standard organizational policies and procedures.
- Clearly defined cost of living increases by level, tenure, gender, and ethnicity/race.
- Merit increase analysis as compared to marketplace increases.
- Establish business aligned objectives with measures/metrics to reflect county and department commitment that captures experiences of employees and community that is served.
- Must establish consistent performance review process with a measurable performance rating system that drives results and reduces inequities; along with reviewing inequities by job category. Every 1-2 years adequate review period.
- Practice that restrict compensation information from candidates during hiring process to ensure review is based on qualifications and not previous compensation. It is similarly adjusted for internal applicants.
- Formal written Pay Equity Policy reviewed annually for updates.
**BEST PRACTICES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### Measures to Identify Bias in Compensations Reviews

- HR compensation team should conduct regular pay equity reviews with respect to race and gender.
- Establish annual goals and objectives that are aligned with HR Function and then executed at each department level. Schedule quarterly calibration meetings with local, divisional and HR department for alignment and accountability.
- Equity review adjustments for all employees below the 25th percentile of job’s external benchmark; add dimension of diversity to check for age, gender and racial disparities.
- Establish measures/metrics for accountability for all managers to adhere to.
- Establish outside firm to review compensation (Gallagher completed for PWC), must include process on how decisions are made.
- Pay and Performance are “watch indicators” on a Diverse Dashboard which is updated quarterly.
- Frequent compensation analysis every two-three years by department, by gender, generation and ethnicity to identify bias and inequities related to rate of advancement.

### Structure to Monitor Compensation Disparities

- Compensation analysis every 2-3 years by department; breaking down review by gender, generation, and ethnicity/race to identify bias and inequities by rate of advancement.
- Identify where employees are based on pay structures across all levels and dimensions of diversity.
- Market study conducted by Gallagher for PWC identified gaps in pay, however, HR and internal review team must assess for salary inequities, reviewing base pay, annual increases, merit, promotion adjustments by gender, race and ethnicity.
- Engage external regulated methodology (i.e., EDGE) to minimize gaps across gender, race/ethnicity.
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### BEST PRACTICES FOR CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity Enhancements and Improvements Post COVID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Pandemic related inequities identified in areas of base/bonus compensation, benefits (continuing education credits, full time/part time status, FMLA leave inconsistencies by individual situations of inequity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased long-term disability benefits for FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Upgraded mental health care with experience professionals available for consultations; provided webinars; online mental health support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provided care giver stipends and back-up childcare, adult/elder care and/or reimbursable expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extended Paternal leave for maternity that included adopted parents and partnered parents (not married)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offered flexible working hours for part-time, full-time and temp employees while working remotely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Created job sharing among administrative teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessed PTO and vacation for equity among tenured employees; offered PTO advances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positions that allowed effective work from home were offered to all employees; as well as choice of remote, in office or hybrid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offered additional wellness day to established PTO benefit to facilitate balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing Employee Assistance Programs enhanced to include virtual engagement; added talk to healthcare provider; prior to Doctor office visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Insurance plans reviewed to include increased prescription coverage; reduced co-pays; telehealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- COVID Leave instituted for FTE up to 80 hours and PTE up to 40 hours with full pay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BEST PRACTICES FOR CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace practices must be expanded to ensure policies are current with Increased EEOC Bias Litigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discrimination policy and procedures in hiring annual orientations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sexual Harassment policy, practices and procedures refresh to ensure not leaning towards women working from home more often than required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased litigation around wage and hour and overtime pay disparities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Race and Identity Bias (person with disabilities, LGBTQIA+ and veterans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Misrepresentation of LGBTQIA+ employees gender affirming health care benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weight discrimination when accommodations are denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of Artificial Intelligence in employment hiring (new regulations coming out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure anti racism bias is , suits have increased based on microaggressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age Bias is 33 percent of EEOC law suites and rising due to violation of Federal Age Bias Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ADA discrimination cases for persons with disabilities around long term COVID and Mental Health are the top claims for persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be mindful of increased Union Labor Relation Issues involving bias in wage increases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Once inequities are identified immediate correction action plans should be developed for execution within 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Train managers to be intentional on understanding pay scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HR performance management system should accurately guide leaders on how much to increase for merit by level and by various diverse dimensions (race and gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incentives for short-term and long-term goal achievement among leaders and employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pay equity with performance incentives are a standard part of the HR review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance and pay are not currently aligned for PWC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Actions for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implement steps into action plan with monitoring tools</th>
<th>1. Recruitment and Hiring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Train HR and hiring managers on inclusive hiring practices</td>
<td>• Establish diverse representation hiring goals for leadership positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Train managers to be intentional on understanding pay scales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Supporting and Development

• Include DEI Team as collaborators to ensure integration of equity and inclusion business priorities

• Create a standardized process with leadership accountability across the county that’s consistent for all with job performance indicators, and reporting capabilities for equity and inclusion priorities

• Pay equity with performance incentives should be a standard part of the HR review process.

• Consider Incentives for short-term and long-term goal achievement among leaders and employees

3. Advancement and Promotion

• Create a formalized mentoring program to include an established process and support mechanisms

• Create structure for informal sponsorship program that includes selection criteria and leadership exposure strategy

• Train managers on how to increase transparency with their direct reports about how sponsors are assigned

• HR performance management system should accurately guide leaders on how much to increase for merit by level and by various diverse dimensions (race and gender)
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APPENDIX C
BACKGROUND
We hear a lot about inclusion, and how it is critical to harness the power of diversity. We know that diversity is being invited to the dance, and inclusion is being asked to dance. We realize that diversity is what we see, and inclusion is how we feel. We understand that diversity may be about counting heads, but inclusion is about making the heads count. We say to each other that diversity is the mix, and inclusion is making the mix work. Yet, when people are asked exactly what inclusion is, how we know it exists, and what forms it takes, many are hard-pressed to answer. The reality is that inclusion is a nuanced concept. It comes in various forms, and people prefer to be included in different ways, depending upon whether they are extrinsically or intrinsically driven. Everyone is looking for a different combination of inclusion strategies depending upon their unique inclusion needs. This survey assessment identifies if the organization is executing the right inclusion strategies to meet the varying needs of individuals within Prince William County.

OBJECTIVES
• Conduct an assessment and analysis of current state inclusion needs for Prince William County and examine the 5 extrinsic and 5 intrinsic needs of employees, the 20 forms of inclusion that can meet those needs, and the impact of inclusion on engagement.
• Understand the 5 extrinsic and 5 intrinsic needs that employees have and assess our individual profile on those needs.
• Identify the 20 different forms of inclusion that can help us meet those needs and assess our organization on those types of inclusion.
• Estimate our engagement level based upon how well we perceive the organization does on the forms of inclusion needed to meet our specific needs.

DEFINITIONS
• Inclusion is the feeling of being empowered, enabled, and encouraged to bring our whole selves to work as a result of our diverse needs being met.
• Engagement is the level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

SCOPE
• 20 forms of inclusion assessed
• Importance and performance scores on a scale of 0 to 10
• Importance & performance scales:
  • Optional for you: 0
  • Relevant for you to be comfortable: 2
  • Desirable for you to be engaged: 4
  • Important for you to be satisfied: 6
  • Necessary for you to be effective: 8
  • Critical for you to stay: 10
• Gaps (surpluses and deficits) on each form of inclusion
• Sum of the gaps across all inclusion forms is good engagement indicator
• Scorecards included for every department and constituency

CAVEATS
• Results based on employee perceptions, may not objective reality
• Situational assessment; scores can change over time
• Communication issues might exist vs real issues
• 36% response rate - 5718 survey recipients/2037 survey respondents
# Gender Based Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gender Binary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Generational Based Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen Z (1997-2012)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Y (1981-1996)</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X (1965-1980)</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalist</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Constituency Based Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People of Color</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Ability Based Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differently Abled</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abled</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Employment Status Based Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Based Analysis</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Tenure Based Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Based Analysis</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ to 3 years</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ years to 5 years</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ years to 10 years</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years to 20 years</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Role Based Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Based Analysis</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Cabinet Leadership</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Department Leadership</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Leadership with Direct Reports</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Salaried Employees with No Direct Reports</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Exempt Hourly Employees with No Direct Reports</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Based Analysis</td>
<td># of Respondents</td>
<td>0% of Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Detention Center</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency on Aging</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Circuit Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Attorney</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Services</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoIT</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Management (OEM)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Fleet Management</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Tax Administration</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Rescue</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (VDH)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Community</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Budget</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Elections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Recreation &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Communications</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Cooperation Extension (VCE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Wealth Attorney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Court Service Unit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile &amp; Domestic Relations Court</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C – SURVEY BACKGROUND

PHASE 3 – ESTIMATION / PERCEPTIONS REVIEW
QUANTITATIVE REVIEW – SURVEY QUESTIONS

SECTION 1 – DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
See respondent’s data for this information

SECTION 2 – NEEDS ASSESSMENT
How IMPORTANT is it for you that your organization does the following consistently on this scale?

0 - Optional for you
2 - Relevant for you to feel comfortable
4 - Desirable for you to be engaged
6 - Important for you to be satisfied
8 - Necessary for you to be effective
10 - Critical for you to stay at the company

Please note that it is easy to rate all the needs very high in importance. For the purposes of this survey, it is critical that you think carefully about which of these are of maximum importance and which ones may be of lesser significance for you.

How IMPORTANT is it for you that your organization demonstrates the following behaviors consistently?

11. Values and uses my individual personality, working style and professional abilities.
12. Accommodates the challenges that are part of my specific life situation and circumstances
13. Supports me with tools, training, people and expense approval, whichever is relevant, in a fair manner
14. Welcomes my culture, constituency and background, regardless of what it might be
15. Offers networking opportunities to interact with others who might be similar to me and/or different from me
16. Provides the same opportunity for me to advance in my career and take on new roles as it does for others
17. Affirms me for who I am and the unique value that I add to the organization
18. Ensures that my leaders and managers dedicate one-on-one time and attention to me and my team (if applicable)
19. Provides me fair and appropriate compensation for the job I am performing
20. Provides me with additional rewards and recognition when I do a great job
21. Encourages management to communicate relevant and appropriate information to me in a timely manner
22. Asks for and uses input from me in making decisions that impact my job and/or my area of the organization
23. Enables me to offer innovative ideas and, when appropriate, acts on them to improve the organization
24. Allows me the flexibility to contribute to projects that can make a significant impact on organization results
25. Promotes mutual understanding and respect between me and hierarchy of that in the management chain
26. Creates an emotionally connected environment in which I feel like I belong to a work family
27. Helps me understand how my personal goals and values connect with the organization’s vision and mission
28. Contributes meaningfully to social causes and communities that are dear to my heart
29. Empowers me with opportunities for continuous growth, learning and development over my career
30. Establishes effective processes and programs that help me progress to positions of greater responsibility
31. Please add any comments regarding the IMPORTANCE of inclusion for you. (optional)
How FREQUENTLY do you think your organization demonstrates the following on this scale?

- 0 - Never
- 2 - Rarely
- 4 - Sometimes
- 6 - Regularly
- 8 - Often
- 10 - Always

Please remember that though the organizational behaviors mentioned in this section are the same as in the first section, what is being asked here is how FREQUENTLY your organization exhibits these behaviors, NOT how IMPORTANT they are to you.

How FREQUENTLY do you think your organization demonstrates the following behaviors?

32. Values and uses my individual personality, working style and professional abilities
33. Accommodates the challenges that are part of my specific life situation and circumstances
34. Supports me with tools, training, people and expense approval, whichever is relevant, in a fair manner
35. Welcomes my culture, constituency and background, regardless of what it might be
36. Offers networking opportunities to interact with others who might be similar to me and/or different from me
37. Provides the same opportunity for me to advance in my career and take on new roles as it does for others
38. Affirms me for who I am and the unique value that I add to the organization
39. Ensures that my leaders and managers dedicate one-on-one time and attention to me and my team (if applicable)
40. Provides me fair and appropriate compensation for the job I am performing
41. Provides me with additional rewards and recognition when I do a great job
42. Encourages management to communicate relevant and appropriate information to me in a timely manner
43. Asks for and uses input from me in making decisions that impact my job and/or my area of the organization
44. Enables me to offer innovative ideas and, when appropriate, acts on them to improve the organization
45. Allows me the flexibility to contribute to projects that can make a significant impact on organization results
46. Promotes mutual understanding and respect between me and hierarchy of that in the management chain
47. Creates an emotionally connected environment in which I feel like I belong to a work family
48. Helps me understand how my personal goals and values connect with the organization’s vision and mission
49. Contributes meaningfully to social causes and communities that are dear to my heart
50. Empowers me with opportunities for continuous growth, learning and development over my career
51. Establishes effective processes and programs that help me progress to positions of greater responsibility
52. Please add any comments regarding the PERFORMANCE of the firm on inclusion in your opinion.
   (optional)
Intrinsic needs are those needs that are internal within individuals, driven by motivational triggers in the hearts and minds of people.

**Influence Needs**
The need for employees to have input into and influence on the direction of their job and the organization

**Influence Inclusion**
- **Informational inclusion**: Provide relevant and appropriate information transparently to the employee as context for their efforts
- **Decisional inclusion**: Solicit and use the employee’s input and opinions in making business decisions

**Impact Needs**
The need for employees to make a difference in terms of business results in their area of expertise

**Impact Inclusion**
- **Ideational inclusion**: Act upon innovative ideas from the employee and convert to successful initiatives
- **Consequential inclusion**: Enable the employee to contribute to significant projects of consequence within different parts of the company

**Interaction Needs**
The need for individuals to feel on the same page cognitively and affectively with their upstream hierarchy

**Interaction Inclusion**
- **Intellectual inclusion**: Ask for and act on opinions and inputs from the employee
- **Emotional inclusion**: Enable an emotional connection for the individual to you and to other team members, so that it feels like a work family

**Ideological Needs**
The need for alignment in values and causes between individuals and the organization

**Ideological Inclusion**
- **Congruential inclusion**: Ensure alignment between the individual values of the employee and the values of the business
- **Causal inclusion**: Support the social and community causes that are dear to the employee visibly

**Improvement Needs**
The need for continuous growth and learning over time for every employee at a pace that is appropriate for them

**Improvement Inclusion**
- **Developmental inclusion**: Meet the unique learning needs of the individual in order to enable professional growth
- **Promotional inclusion**: Establish processes and support mechanisms to help the individual progress to positions of greater responsibility
Extrinsic needs are those needs that exist in the external environment of the individual, driven by motivations and requirements outside the individual.

**Individual Needs**
The need for customized acceptance and adjustment to adapt to unique employee behaviors and situations.

**Individual Inclusion**
- **Behavioral inclusion**: Recognize and leverage the employee’s unique leadership and execution style.
- **Situational inclusion**: Accommodate unique constraints and requirements that apply for the employee.

**Institutional Needs**
The need for an equal opportunity to get any job that people are qualified for, and for resources necessary to do their current job.

**Institution Inclusion**
- **Infrastructural inclusion**: Support the individual fairly in terms of tools and resources to do their current jobs.
- **Professional inclusion**: Support the individual equitably through unbiased processes to enter the business & get appropriate roles.

**Identity Needs**
The need for individuals to feel that their culture is welcomed, and they are supported in building bonding and bridging capital.

**Identity Inclusion**
- **Cultural inclusion**: Welcome and integrate the person’s culture along their diversity dimensions in the organization.
- **Social inclusion**: Support the person to bond with other members of their own constituency and of other constituencies.

**Involvement Needs**
The need for genuine investment of effort and energy by people leaders in individuals on their teams.

**Involvement Inclusion**
- **Affirmational inclusion**: Affirm the person appropriately for being who they are and contributing the value they do.
- **Attentional inclusion**: Ensure that the person gets quality time and attention from you and their skip level leader.

**Incentive Needs**
The need for fair and appropriate compensation for every role, and additional rewards and recognition for a job well done.

**Incentive Inclusion**
- **Financial inclusion**: Ensure that base compensation for the individual reflects the value that they add, in keeping with everyone else.
- **Recognitional inclusion**: Reward the individual appropriately for quality work through bonuses, equity, and awards, like everyone else.
DEMOGRAPHIC INCLUSION ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH - > 1**
- **MODERATE - Between 0 and 1**
- **LOW - Between 0 and -1**
- **NEGATIVE - < -1**

**# of Respondents: 13**
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

**Engagement Index: 9.3**

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Social
- Causal
- Congruential
- Promotional
- Situational

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Decisional
- Consequential
- Infrastructural
- Affirmational
### Engagement Rating Key
Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH** - > 1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

### Engagement Index: 3.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement</th>
<th>Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>Decisional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs. Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.

# of Respondents: 55
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.
**Role – Supervisor(s)**

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition (Rewards)</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment)</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**# of Respondents:** 586
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

**Engagement Index:** -17.6

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Social
- Cultural
- Causal
- Emotional
- Attentional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Decisional
- Informational
- Professional
- Promotional
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH** - > 1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

**# of Respondents: 603**
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Engagement Index: -19.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Social
- Cultural
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Promotional
- Developmental
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Promotional
- Informational

**Engagement Index:** -25.0
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

### # of Respondents: 199
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

### Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Emotional
- Situational

### Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Decisional
- Informational
- Professional
- Ideational

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.

Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.

**Engagement Index:** -6.1
GENDER – FEMALE (F)

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Employees: 2937
# of Respondents: 1149
% of Responses: 39%

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional (Rewards)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.

Engagement Index: -21.8

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Social
- Cultural
- Causal
- Emotional
- Attentional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Promotional
- Informational
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Employees: 2781  
# of Respondents: 791  
% of Responses: 28%

Cultural (Retention)  
Social (Affiliation)  
Causal (Community)  
Attentional (Engagement)  
Emotional (Connection)  
Affirmational (Positivity)  
Situational (Accommodations)  
Congruential (Values)  
Recognitional (Rewards)  
Consequential (Impact)  
Behavioral (Uniqueness)  
Infrastructural (Resources)  
Intellectual (Opinions)  
Developmental (Growth)  
Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)  
Ideational (Innovation)  
Promotional (Advancement)  
Informational (Intelligence)  
Decisional (Input)  
Financial (Compensation)

Engagement Index: -14.0

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Decisional
- Informational
- Promotional
- Ideational

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
SEXUAL ORIENTATION - HETEROSEXUAL

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Respondents: 1698
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Engagement Index: -18.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Informational
- Promotional

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
SEXUAL ORIENTATION – LGBTQIA+

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Respondents: 130
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Engagement Index: -29.0

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
• Social
• Emotional
• Attentional
• Causal
• Congruential

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
• Financial
• Professional
• Promotional
• Decisional
• Infrastructural

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Cultural
- Emotional
- Causal
- Situational
- Social

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Professional
- Financial
- Decisional
- Developmental
- Ideational

**# of Respondents: 55**
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

**Engagement Index:** -21.5
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

**# of Respondents: 625**
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Professional
- Promotional
- Decisional
- Developmental
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**# of Respondents:** 836
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

**Engagement Index:** -16.7

- **Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
  - Social
  - Cultural
  - Causal
  - Emotional
  - Attentional

- **Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
  - Financial
  - Professional
  - Decisional
  - Promotional
  - Informational

Ratings in **"black"** are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in **"burgundy"** are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

**Engagement Index:** - 8.7

### Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Situational
- Attentional

### Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Decisional
- Informational
- Professional
- Ideational

# of Respondents: 394
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

### Engagement Index: 29.4

#### Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Causal
- Social
- Cultural
- Attentional
- Affirmational

#### Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Ideational
- Infrastructural
- Informational
- Decisional
- Consequential

# of Respondents: 12
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

Engagement Index: -8.3

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Recognitional
- Affirmational
- Attentional
- Congruential
- Causal

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Developmental
- Informational
- Infrastructural
- Decisional

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.

# of Employees: 25
# of Respondents: 9
% of Responses: 36%

Financial (Compensation)
Developmental (Growth)
Informational (Intelligence)
Infrastructural (Resources)
Decisional (Input)
Ideational (Innovation)
Promotional (Advancement)
Behavioral (Uniqueness)
Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)
Causal (Community)
Consequential (Impact)
Situational (Accommodations)
Behavioral (Uniqueness)
Cultural (Retention)
Intellectual (Opinions)
Consequential (Impact)
Situational (Accommodations)
Behavioral (Uniqueness)
Promotional (Advancement)
Ideational (Innovation)
Decisional (Input)
Infrastructural (Resources)
Informational (Intelligence)
Developmental (Growth)
Financial (Compensation)
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Employees: 246  
# of Respondents: 79  
% of Responses: 32%

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Causal
- Social
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Promotional
- Decisional
- Developmental

Engagement Index: -14.0
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Employees: 1209  
# of Respondents: 358  
% of Responses: 30%

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Attentional
- Social
- Causal
- Emotional
- Situational

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Promotional
- Developmental
- Decisional

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.  
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

**Engagement Index:** -25.6

### Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Social
- Cultural
- Situational
- Causal
- Attentional

### Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Promotional
- Decisional
- Developmental
**RACE/ETHNICITY – NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER**

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH** - > 1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

**# of Employees:** 10  
**# of Respondents:** 5  
**% of Responses:** 50%

---

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Informational
- Situational
- Affirmational
- Cultural
- Infrastructural

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Causal
- Ideational
- Developmental
- Promotional
- Financial

**Engagement Index:** 16.5

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.  
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**RACE/ETHNICITY – WHITE (W)**

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH:** > 1
- **MODERATE:** Between 0 and 1
- **LOW:** Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE:** < -1

# of Employees: 3309
# of Respondents: 1095
% of Responses: 33%

**Engagement Index:** -15.1

- **Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
  - Cultural
  - Social
  - Causal
  - Emotional
  - Attentional

- **Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
  - Financial
  - Decisional
  - Professional
  - Informational
  - Promotional

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Causal
- Emotional
- Social
- Cultural
- Attentional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Promotional
- Developmental
- Intellectual

# of Employees: 242
# of Respondents: 102
% of Responses: 42%

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
RACE/ETHNICITY - OTHER

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

Engagement Index: 8.9

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Cultural
- Recognitional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Developmental
- Ideational
- Promotional
- Professional

# of Respondents: 131
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

**VETERAN STATUS (SELF-DISCLOSED) - VETERAN**

- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **HIGH** - > 1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.

Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.

# of Respondents: 213
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Engagement Index: -11.5

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Causal
- Cultural
- Social
- Attentional
- Emotional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Decisional
- Professional
- Informational
- Promotional

-2.6
-1.8
1.1
0.9
0.9
0.5
0.3
0.1
-0.1
-0.1
-0.2
-0.8
-1.2
-1.3
-1.3
-1.3
-1.5
-0.8
-1.2
-1.3
-1.3
-1.3
-1.5
-1.8
0.1
0.3
0.5
0.9
1.1

2023 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - DIVERSITY, EQUITY & INCLUSION REVIEW
VETERANS STATUS (SELF-DISCLOSED) - CIVILIAN

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH - &gt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW - Between 0 and -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Respondents: 1786
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Informational
- Promotional

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Respondents: 126
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
• Causal
• Social
• Attentional
• Emotional
• Cultural

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
• Financial
• Professional
• Promotional
• Developmental
• Decisional
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

Engagement Index: -17.0

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Informational
- Promotional

# of Respondents: 1818
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.

Financial (Compensation)
Professio nal (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)
Decisional (Input)
Informational (Intelligence)
Promotional (Advancement)
Developmental (Growth)
Affirmational (Positivity)
Respectful (Community)
Situationally (Accommodations)
Causal (Community)
Attensional (Engagement)
Emotional (Connection)
Cultural (Retention)
Social (Affiliation)
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH - > 1**
- **MODERATE - Between 0 and 1**
- **LOW - Between 0 and -1**
- **NEGATIVE - < -1**

# of Respondents: 219
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Emotional
- Situational

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Developmental
- Promotional
- Decisional

Engagement Index: -5.4

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.

Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
TENURE – 1 TO 3 YEARS

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Respondents: 268
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Causal
- Social
- Emotional
- Situational

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Developmental
- Promotional
- Decisional

Engagement Index: -22.0
**TENURE – 3 TO 5 YEARS**

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH** - > 1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

**# of Respondents: 238**

Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

**Financial (Compensation)**

**Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)**

**Promotional (Advancement)**

**Informational (Intelligence)**

**Developmental (Growth)**

**Decisional (Input)**

**Intellectual (Opinions)**

**Ideational (Innovation)**

**Consequential (Impact)**

**Recognational (Rewards)**

**Infrastructural (Resources)**

**Behavioral (Uniqueness)**

**Congruential (Values)**

**Situational (Accommodations)**

**Convergent (Values)**

**Emotional (Connection)**

**Social (Affiliation)**

**Causal (Community)**

**Affirmational (Positivity)**

**Cultural (Retention)**

**Attentional (Engagement)**

**Engagement Index:** -23.2

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Attentional
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Emotional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Professional
- Promotional
- Informational
- Developmental

**Ratings in “**black**” are intrinsic inclusion needs.**

**Ratings in “**burgundy**” are extrinsic inclusion needs.**
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Respondents: 426
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Promotional
- Intellectual

Engagement Index: -26.1
TENURE – 10 TO 20 YEARS

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Respondents: 482
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Social
- Cultural
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Decisional
- Professional
- Informational
- Promotional

Engagement Index: -22.6

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

Engagement Index: -6.4

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Social
- Cultural
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Decisional
- Informational
- Ideational
- Professional

# of Respondents: 366
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**EMPLOYMENT STATUS – FULL TIME**

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Respondents: 1799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

---

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Promotional
- Informational
**EMPLOYMENT STATUS - PARTTIME**

*Engagement Rating Key:* Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Respondents: 136
Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

**Engagement Index:** -8.9

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Cultural
- Social
- Attentional
- Causal
- Emotional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Decisional
- Financial
- Informational
- Professional
- Intellectual

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**EMployment Status - Temporary**

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGEMENT LEVEL</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL</th>
<th>CAUSAL</th>
<th>ATTENTIONAL</th>
<th>CONGRUENTIAL</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIONAL</th>
<th>CULTURAL</th>
<th>INTELLECTUAL</th>
<th>SITUATIONAL</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENTAL</th>
<th>CONSEQUENTIAL</th>
<th>BEHAVIORAL</th>
<th>IDEATIONAL</th>
<th>RECOGNIZATIONAL</th>
<th>DECISIONAL</th>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURAL</th>
<th>INFORMATIONAL</th>
<th>PROMOTIONAL</th>
<th>FINANCIAL</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH &gt; 1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW - Between 0 and -1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**# of Respondents: 37**

Respondents are self-disclosed responses. Total PWC staff numbers not available for this constituency.

Ratings in "**black**" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in "**burgundy**" are extrinsic inclusion needs.

**Engagement Index:** -8.3

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Emotional
- Causal
- Attentional
- Congruential
- Affirmational

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Professional
- Financial
- Promotional
- Informational
- Infrastructural
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Emotional
- Causal
- Recognitional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Promotional
- Professional
- Informational
- Developmental
DEPARTMENT INCLUSION ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Employees: 5718  
# of Respondents: 2037  
% of Responses: 36%

PWC Engagement Index: -18.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Informational
- Promotional
ADULT DETENTION CENTER

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

HIGH - > 1  MODERATE - Between 0 and 1  LOW - Between 0 and -1  NEGATIVE - < -1

# of Employees: 343
# of Respondents: 112
% of Responses: 33%

Adult Detention Center Engagement Index: -35.0

PWC Engagement Index: -18.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Affirmational

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Decisional
- Ideational
- Informational
- Professional
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

Agency on Aging Engagement Index: -8.8
PWC Engagement Index: -18.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Causal
- Cultural
- Attentional
- Emotional
- Affirmational

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Promotional
- Developmental
- Intellectual

# of Employees: 41
# of Respondents: 35
% of Responses: 85%
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

**Clerk of Circuit Court Engagement Index:** -4.0

**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

### Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Causal
- Promotional
- Developmental
- Congruential
- Emotional

### Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Behavioral
- Affirmational
- Recognitional
- Ideational
- Situational

**# of Employees:** 57  
**# of Respondents:** 1  
**% of Responses:** 2%  
Note this group has county and state employees. Pending larger representation of full team.
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color:</td>
<td>Color:</td>
<td>Color:</td>
<td>Color:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Services Engagement Index:** -21.5

**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Causal
- Social
- Cultural
- Attentional
- Situational

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Professional
- Decisional
- Informational
- Promotional

**# of Employees:** 459

**# of Respondents:** 207

**% of Responses:** 45%

Ratings in **“black”** are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in **“burgundy”** are extrinsic inclusion needs.
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Employees: 29  
# of Respondents: 22  
% of Responses: 76%

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement  
- Social  
- Causal  
- Emotional  
- Attentional  
- Cultural

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement  
- Financial  
- Professional  
- Behavioral  
- Decisional  
- Situational
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

High - > 1  Moderate - Between 0 and 1  Low - Between 0 and -1  Negative - < -1

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Social
- Attentional
- Causal
- Emotional
- Congruential

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Decisional
- Ideational
- Professional
- Promotional
## Engagement Rating Key

Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Development Services Engagement Index:** 1.9
- **PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

### Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Causal
- Social
- Situational
- Attentional

### Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Promotional
- Informational
- Professional
- Decisional

# of Employees: 122  
# of Respondents: 55  
% of Responses: 45%

Ratings in **black** are intrinsic inclusion needs.  
Ratings in **burgundy** are extrinsic inclusion needs.
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

### Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Situational
- Emotional
- Causal

### Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Promotional
- Developmental
- Professional
- Decisional

# of Employees: 87
# of Respondents: 61
% of Responses: 70%

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.

**DoIT Engagement Index:** -1.8

**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5
**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

![Engagement Rating Key Chart](image)

**Economic Development Engagement Index: -16.3**

**PWC Engagement Index: -18.5**

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Social
- Cultural
- Affirmational
- Causal
- Attentional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Promotional
- Financial
- Professional
- Developmental
- Behavioral
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH** - > 1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

**Facilities and Fleet Engagement Index:** -26.3

**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Situational
- Attentional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Promotional
- Professional
- Developmental
- Intellectual
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings in “black”</th>
<th>Ratings in “burgundy”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic inclusion needs.</td>
<td>Extrinsic inclusion needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH - &gt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW - Between 0 and -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Employees: 193  
# of Respondents: 87  
% of Responses: 45%

**Finance Engagement Index:** -23.9  
**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Social
- Cultural
- Causal
- Emotional
- Situational

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Professional
- Promotional
- Developmental
- Decisional
### Engagement Rating Key
Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH** - > 1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

### Fire & Rescue Engagement Index
- **Index:** -42.3

### PWC Engagement Index
- **Index:** -18.5

#### Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Causal
- Social
- Cultural
- Attentional
- Emotional

#### Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Decisional
- Informational
- Intellectual
- Ideational

# of Employees: 755
# of Respondents: 178
% of Responses: 24%

Ratings in **“black”** are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in **“burgundy”** are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**HUMAN RESOURCES**

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>&gt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>Between 0 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Between 0 and -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>&lt; -1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings in **“black”** are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in **“burgundy”** are extrinsic inclusion needs.

# of Employees: 35  
# of Respondents: 24  
% of Responses: 69%

**Human Resources Engagement Index:** -16.5  
**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Causal
- Emotional
- Cultural
- Social
- Situational

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Professional
- Financial
- Informational
- Decisional
- Promotional
HUMAN RIGHTS

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

HIGH - > 1
MODERATE - Between 0 and 1
LOW - Between 0 and -1
NEGATIVE - < -1

# of Employees: 6
# of Respondents: 6
% of Responses: 100%

Human Rights Engagement Index: -21.4
PWC Engagement Index: -18.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Attentional
- Cultural
- Emotional
- Congruential
- Causal

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Intellectual
- Situational
- Professional
- Informational
- Decisional

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH** - > 1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

**Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.**

**Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.**

- **Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
  - Causal
  - Cultural
  - Congruential
  - Emotional
  - Attentional

- **Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
  - Financial
  - Professional
  - Ideational
  - Developmental
  - Infrastructural

- **Housing and Community Engagement Index: -12.6**
- **PWC Engagement Index: -18.5**
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Attentional (Engagement)       | -0.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| Situational (Accommodations)   | -0.8 |
| Ideational (Innovation)        | -0.8 |
| Causal (Community)             | -1.2 |
| Emotional (Connection)         | -1.2 |
| Social (Affiliation)           | -1.2 |
| Congruential (Values)          | -1.2 |
| Consequential (Impact)         | -1.2 |
| Decisional (Input)             | -1.2 |
| Recognitional (Rewards)        | -1.2 |
| Cultural (Retention)           | -1.2 |
| Intellectual (Opinions)        | -1.6 |
| Informational (Intelligence)   | -1.6 |
| Behavioral (Uniqueness)        | -1.6 |
| Infrastructural (Resources)    | -1.6 |
| Developmental (Growth)         | -2.0 |
| Financial (Compensation)       | -2.0 |
| Affirmational (Positivity)     | -2.0 |
| Promotional (Advancement)      | -2.4 |
| Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment) | -3.2 |

**JCSU Engagement Index:** -25.2  
**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Attentional
- Situational
- Ideational
- Causal
- Emotional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Professional
- Promotional
- Affirmational
- Financial
- Developmental

*Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs. Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.*
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social (Affiliation)</td>
<td>Emotional (Connection)</td>
<td>Cultural (Retention)</td>
<td>Attentional (Engagement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal (Community)</td>
<td>Congruential (Values)</td>
<td>Situational (Accommodations)</td>
<td>Infrastructural (Resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational (Positivity)</td>
<td>Consequential (Impact)</td>
<td>Developmental (Growth)</td>
<td>Behavioral (Uniqueness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional (Rewards)</td>
<td>Ideational (Innovation)</td>
<td>Intellectual (Opinions)</td>
<td>Promotional (Advancement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td>Informational (Intelligence)</td>
<td>Decisional (Input)</td>
<td>Financial (Compensation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Employees: 247
# of Respondents: 157
% of Responses: 64%

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Social
- Emotional
- Cultural
- Attentional
- Causal

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Decisional
- Informational
- Professional
- Promotional

Libraries Engagement Index: -10.6
PWC Engagement Index: -18.5

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**Management & Budget**

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

| HIGH - > 1 | MODERATE - Between 0 and 1 | LOW - Between 0 and -1 | NEGATIVE - < -1 |

Ratings in “**black**” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “**burgundy**” are extrinsic inclusion needs.

---

**# of Employees:** 12  
**# of Respondents:** 11  
**% of Responses:** 92%

**Management & Budget Engagement Index:** 2.5  
**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

- **Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
  - Cultural
  - Attentional
  - Situational
  - Emotional
  - Affirmational

- **Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
  - Promotional
  - Professional
  - Financial
  - Developmental
  - Decisional

---

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentional</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmational</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotional</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2023 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - DIVERSITY, EQUITY & INCLUSION REVIEW
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

# of Employees: 27  
% of Respondents: 21  
% of Responses: 78%

OEM Engagement Index: -21.4  
PWC Engagement Index: -18.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Recognitional
- Attentional
- Situational
- Emotional

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Decisional
- Financial
- Professional
- Informational
- Ideational

Ratings in “black” are intrinsic inclusion needs.  
Ratings in “burgundy” are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**PARKS, RECREATION & TOURISM**

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Cultural (Retention)
- Social (Affiliation)
- Causal (Community)
- Emotional (Connection)
- Attentional (Engagement)
- Affirmational (Positivity)
- Situational (Accommodations)
- Congruential (Values)
- Recognitional (Rewards)
- Consequential (Impact)
- Intellectual (Opinions)
- Ideational (Innovation)
- Promotional (Advancement)
- Infrastructural (Resources)
- Behavioral (Uniqueness)
- Developmental (Growth)
- Informational (Intelligence)
- Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)
- Decisional (Input)
- Financial (Compensation)

**Parks, Recreation & Tourism Engagement Index:** -20.5  
**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Emotional
- Attentional

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Decisional
- Professional
- Informational
- Developmental

Ratings in **“black”** are intrinsic inclusion needs.  
Ratings in **“burgundy”** are extrinsic inclusion needs.

# of Employees: 801  
# of Respondents: 102  
% of Responses: 13%

**2023 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - DIVERSITY, EQUITY & INCLUSION REVIEW**
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

PLANNING

# of Employees: 54
# of Respondents: 27
% of Responses: 50%

Planning Engagement Index: -29.7
PWC Engagement Index: -18.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Emotional
- Affirmational
- Situational
- Social
- Causal

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Informational
- Financial
- Developmental
- Infrastructural
- Professional

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH** - > 1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

**# of Employees:** 851  
**# of Respondents:** 180  
**% of Responses:** 21%

**Police Engagement Index:** -18.7  
**PWC Engagement Index:** -18.5

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Cultural  
- Social  
- Causal  
- Attentional  
- Situational

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial  
- Professional  
- Informational  
- Decisional  
- Promotional

Ratings in "**black**" are intrinsic inclusion needs.  
Ratings in "**burgundy**" are extrinsic inclusion needs.
Public Safety Communication

Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH - &gt; 1</th>
<th>MODERATE - Between 0 and 1</th>
<th>LOW - Between 0 and -1</th>
<th>NEGATIVE - &lt; -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

# of Employees: 117
# of Respondents: 48
% of Responses: 41%

Public Safety Communication Engagement Index: -23.0
PWC Engagement Index: -18.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Causal
- Social
- Emotional
- Consequential

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Infrastructural
- Developmental
- Promotional

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.

Financial (Compensation) -4.6
**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

- **HIGH** - > 1
- **MODERATE** - Between 0 and 1
- **LOW** - Between 0 and -1
- **NEGATIVE** - < -1

Ratings in “**black**” are intrinsic inclusion needs.
Ratings in “**burgundy**” are extrinsic inclusion needs.

- **# of Employees:** 171
- **# of Respondents:** 88
- **% of Responses:** 52%

### Public Works Engagement Index: -20.0

- **Cultural (Retention)**
- **Situational (Accommodations)**
- **Social (Affiliation)**
- **Emotional (Connection)**
- **Causal (Community)**
- **Attentional (Engagement)**
- **Consequential (Impact)**
- **Affirmational (Positivity)**
- **Behavioral (Uniqueness)**
- **Infrastructural (Resources)**
- **Intellectual (Opinions)**
- **Informational (Intelligence)**
- **Ideational (Innovation)**
- **Recognitional (Rewards)**
- **Decisional (Input)**
- **Professional (Recruitment/Performance Assessment)**
- **Promotional (Advancement)**
- **Developmental (Growth)**
- **Financial (Compensation)**

### Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- **Financial**
- **Developmental**
- **Promotional**
- **Professional**
- **Decisional**

### Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- **Cultural**
- **Situational**
- **Social**
- **Emotional**
- **Causal**
Engagement Rating Key: Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

SOCIAL SERVICES

- Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.
- Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.

Engagement Rating Key:

HIGH - > 1
MODERATE - Between 0 and 1
LOW - Between 0 and -1
NEGATIVE - < -1

# of Employees: 494
# of Respondents: 246
% of Responses: 50%

Social Services Engagement Index: -20.5
PWC Engagement Index: -18.5

Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Cultural
- Social
- Causal
- Attentional
- Situational

Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement
- Financial
- Professional
- Promotional
- Decisional
- Developmental
**Transportation Engagement Index: 25.5**

**PWC Engagement Index: -18.5**

**Highest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Social
- Cultural
- Emotional
- Affirmational
- Causal

**Lowest Scoring Dimensions of Engagement**
- Financial
- Decisional
- Infrastructural
- Professional
- Developmental

---

**Engagement Rating Key:** Level of identification with and involvement in the mission of the organization, and immersion in and commitment to the work that people do, which leads to an overall sense of satisfaction with their professional environment.

Ratings in "black" are intrinsic inclusion needs.

Ratings in "burgundy" are extrinsic inclusion needs.
APPENDIX D
### People Review – Workforce Climate & Culture

**Areas of Opportunity – What Can We Do Better to Get to Where We Want to Be?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Areas of Opportunity – What Can We Do Better to Get to Where We Want to Be?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Financial:** Ensure that base compensation for the individual reflects the value that they add, in keeping with everyone else. | • Review current employees using the same formula that we are using for new hires and educate those employees about the way their compensation is determined  
• Conduct periodic pay equity studies (internal and external benchmarks) and share results openly with employees  
• Examine lead roles that are doing supervisory work for potential compensation changes  
• Re-evaluate starting point of comp for transitions or promotions – why always at the bottom end of the new range  
• Become better connected and aligned with County leadership regarding compensation policy decisions, as well as pay treatment for performance or lack thereof  
• Explain the impact that CS makes on the community through the programs and services we provide relative to other agencies who might be paid more; more people work, own property, pay taxes as a result of our work  
• Lobbying for more empowerment and autonomy in terms of comp decisions with County eg hiring bonuses for in-demand roles like bilingual services  
• Connect with County staff who can take action on some of these issues vs just the leaders and do so in different formats, not just Let’s Talk  
• Exceed goals for reviews are set so high that they can be unattainable many times. Late on the financial section, my apologies.  
• Paid parental leave  
• Auto-promotion exists already; doing a pretty good job already  
• Admin band not separate for County Attorney – lobby for separate Legal Admin band  
• Attorneys (newer and longer tenure) and paralegals are accounted for in terms of compensation  
• Financial compensation associated with additional workload above and beyond regular job (eg special dockets)  
• Mechanism like stipends for admin team who are also doing extra work  
• Tenure, performance, experience, expertise, credential driven advancement process that may not result in title change but that may result in comp increases  
• Stipends or bonuses for Employee of the year or quarter. Agency could create certain benchmarks that could employees would have to reach to become eligible and then nominated by managers and or co-workers  
• Re-evaluate comp based on inflationary trends  
• Health insurance benefits need to be re-evaluated  
• Responses may not account for 9% pay increase this year and pay equity study done recently ($700k to dept budget to account for some enhancements to comp)  
• Benefits/holiday pay for PT emps  
• Paid maternity and paternity leave  
• Salary negotiation upon hiring; should be able to hire above the minimum of the pay range for a posted job  
• PT to FT conversion salary negotiation not allowed.  
• Address compression issues left over from the last compensation update working with HR  
• Continue to push for more empowerment in terms of administrative increases for employees who do exceptional work  
• Adding ability to use our facilities for our staff has potential for having an impact on mental and physical wellness (done)  
• Performance based merit awards for above-and-beyond performance  
• Auto-promotion exists already; doing a pretty good job already  
• Admin band not separate for County Attorney – lobby for separate Legal Admin band  
• Attorneys (newer and longer tenure) and paralegals are accounted for in terms of compensation |
## Inclusion

### Areas of Opportunity – What Can We Do Better to Get to Where We Want to Be?

#### Decisional:

- Solicit and use the employee's input and opinions in making business decisions.
- Clear process and training on process to address issues and concerns raised by employees so that they feel heard, understood, considered, and responded - close the loop, to circle back to let the person know what was or wasn't done and why.
- Process for responding to inputs and feedback so that the loop is closed; explain why we may not be acting on the suggestions and be open to the differential feedback from different teams.
- Manage our expectations around what is feasible and will be done regarding our suggestions.
- Employees are able to join working groups to help build policy but many 'feel' they don't have time at the end of the day to join.
- Caseloads are high and need to be addressed through hiring more staff so that more participation is possible.
- If the outcome is not doable it might be good to have a discussion on what could happen instead so people feel they are heard – compromise on outcomes.
- Set up a committee structure regarding key decisions within the department’s control (we tend to do more ad-hoc committees vs standing committees).
- Continue annual survey process for feedback that allows people to offer their opinions anonymously.
- Anonymous suggestions/opinion box or more frequent poll/pulse/flash surveys during the year (GLINT survey is an example) - allow for continuous feedback during the year.
- Committees led by supervisors, not staff, and sometimes staff feels like the outcomes are not supportive of their needs – Have committee with employees only but with a supervisor “mentor”.
- Anonymous suggestion box.
- Innovation Council composed of employees from different levels and different work groups (might be a challenge with under-staffing).
- Bulletin Board on PWC Connects.
- We tend to be a fairly flat and democratic organization – what kinds of decisions are we talking about here? Micolle’s videos are awesome! Working more closely with managers and supervisors on being more open to their employees’ inputs and opinions (how are messages being delivered outside of senior leaders eg at leadership levels xyz is being discussed).
- “Leadership at all levels” philosophy training and reinforcement.
- Acclimation program for first time leaders (might include more tenured leader as a mentor for them).
- Have a visit schedule from leaders to various branches during the course of the year (and speak to emps during those visits, work the desk for a period of time, talk to community members).
- Mix management levels more; include frontline staff more in management meetings and solicit their opinions.
- Pilot testing new technology with emps who might use it in advance before rolling it out (we do this today) – communicate this approach more to employees (make it part of weekly announcements).
- Anonymous suggestion box from employees and community members.
- Evaluate communication approaches used for effectiveness.
- Consider tweaking existing committee structure to get more inputs on key decision issues.
- Smaller branch public forums with patrons of various library locations to get direct feedback from community.
- Make sure that lessons learned from technology rollouts are applied and leveraged.
- Continue to leverage Employee Engagement Liaison Team (EELT) in leadership meetings; includes provisional emps.
- Train supervisors and leaders to listen more and engage in more collaborative decision making.
- Idea box/suggestion box that maintains anonymity and confidentiality.
- Slack/Teams approach to soliciting, offering and receiving suggestions and ideas.
- Refine talkback process that allows employees to work with their supervisors on executable ideas that align with the strat plan – push approach to providing information to employees and not relying on them to reach out to us.
- Clear procedure, guidelines and timelines on providing input and receiving responses to those inputs (follow up and follow through).
- Structured and scheduled listening sessions done by executives and leadership team (in small groups or individual crews).
- Assess supervisor level of engagement with their emps through more focused surveys and polls.
- Take this document to the Fall Meeting so that we can get inputs and inform people about the actions we are taking.
- Committee of junior attorneys to offer inputs and ideas to senior attorneys.
**APPENDIX D FOR PHASE 4: CONVERSATION**

**PEOPLE REVIEW – WORKFORCE CLIMATE & CULTURE**

**INTERACTIONS / DEPARTMENT FOCUS GROUPS / ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING**

### Inclusion

**Professional:** Support the individual equitably through unbiased processes to enter the business & get appropriate roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Opportunity – What Can We Do Better to Get to Where We Want to Be?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Have a common approach to disciplinary issues across 13 programs and program managers and train on that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritize internal talent in terms of lateral moves and promotions vs looking for external talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development program/ Succession planning for internal talent based on assessment of clinical skills and potential for supervisory roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cross-training for admin staff to develop them for lateral moves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Share stories of people who have taken on more responsibilities without additional pay and been promoted over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internship program to get more diverse POC to engage with CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer mentoring program that is led by CS (not County) on how to get additional opps and prep for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide supervisory experience on a trial basis so that Therapist II can move up eg 2 Therapist II charing an intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities and support to learn new skills within the same program / department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nurses shadow the therapist for a day, and vice versa. So that we can truly see the importance and value of each position. Also, truly utilizing all the wonderful knowledge and abilities of each side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include medical staff in crisis and Narcan training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allotting designated times during work hours for training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balancing caseload with developmental programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setting up training requirements for attaining supervisory positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More cross-training across functions within the department eg internal education by experts in their space within the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Soliciting interest in developmental topics from admins and finding ways to meet those needs (with the understanding that not all needs might be feasible or appropriate to meet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring program matching more tenured attorneys with lesser tenured ones in specific areas like land use (once staffing for open positions is done and caseloads are more manageable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incentives for going above and beyond as much we get “penalized” for making mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Considering Admin is overtasked, should CJS consider removing some Admin Positions and have POs enter their own assigned cases into PTCC. Those Admin position could be turned into a Probation Officer position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider intentional movement between 8 Finance organizations (job shadowing program, rotational program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider borrowing project contributors from other departments to demonstrate financial acumen and potentially convert to Finance employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Swap programs between Finance departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accelerate mentoring program (in the works)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Give greater consideration for existing staff more for open positions vs looking for external candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider enhancing existing evaluation process that is determined at a County level (just for Libraries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roles at a branch are highly specific and may not focus on employee strengths; re-evaluate roles and emphasize cross-training, identify individual and team strengths and assess how to leverage those strengths better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Customized development paths for people; those who want to stay in role should be allowed to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reworking annual GOALS framework to have some standard expectations for all employees (based on RICTER scale and our Beliefs/Expectations) and some role specific requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Leadership at all levels” training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue expectation of quarterly check-ins; add accountability to the mix so that it is happening regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on inclusion of part time and seasonal workers (80% of workforce) informationally, decisionally, developmentally and professionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More cross-training across functions within the department eg internal education by experts in their space within the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Soliciting interest in developmental topics from admins and finding ways to meet those needs (with the understanding that not all needs might be feasible or appropriate to meet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring program matching more tenured attorneys with lesser tenured ones in specific areas like land use (once staffing for open positions is done and caseloads are more manageable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Opportunity – What Can We Do Better To Get To Where We Want To Be?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotional:</strong> Establish processes and support mechanisms to help the individual progress to positions of greater responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Staff who are doing great work, good leadership in the office, great attitudes, etc be promoted like other companies do and not to have to go through the interview process.
- Special project work that is compensated like language stipends and specialty docket stipends (for people who don’t want to be necessarily promoted).
- Work with entry level employees to write their resumes in the right manner for HR screening (training at PWC U)
- Prep employees for the interview process (mock interviews)
- Bridge the gap for individuals who don’t have supervisory experience for their first supervisor role (revive Supervisor Equivalency Program)
- Job Shadowing Program for individual contributors with supervisors
- Evaluating how job classifications are written in terms of clear path to advance from one position to another
- Succession planning for critical positions and people
- Acknowledging time spent acting in certain roles for the experience that is gained
- More equitable succession process (advertising positions upon exits)
- Requirements for title changes in terms of certifications, credentials (like auto-promote for appraiser title)
- Ready Now, Ready in 1/2 years classifications for employees with high performance and high potential
- Promote PT staff to FT within a certain time frame
**APPENDIX D FOR PHASE 4: CONVERSATION**

**PEOPLE REVIEW – WORKFORCE CLIMATE & CULTURE**  
**INTERACTIONS / DEPARTMENT FOCUS GROUPS / ASPIRATIONAL ACTION PLANNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUSION</th>
<th>AREAS OF OPPORTUNITY – WHAT CAN WE DO BETTER TO GET TO WHERE WE WANT TO BE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATIONAL</td>
<td>• Continue to leverage employee engagement liaison team (EELT) in leadership meetings – attend once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Customized approaches that work for various divisions to communicate vertically and horizontally; continue to empower senior managers to do what works best for their units AND also hold division leaders accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State of the Parks address (1x a year) and annual picnics/department socials (4x a year) help to disseminate information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do we make it easy for division leaders to disseminate info like changes in policy, new parks, new programs by continuing to provide consistent newsletters and communication messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Multi-pronged approach to communication using different formats and media – “kitchen sink” communication approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Get divisional leader scores on various topics that have the biggest gaps in the inclusion survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Face to face time with leaders on a monthly basis department-wide (may have to do the meetings multiple times to accommodate various schedules) – expand that from leadership team to general staff and do it once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have a “walk-about” schedule for top leadership/executive team to attend staff meetings and trainings so that their presence can be felt across the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow for anonymous/confidential feedback during meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Inclusion

#### Developmental

- Meet the unique learning needs of the individual in order to enable professional growth
- Formal mentorship program with assigned mentors to mentees
- Formal development plan if performance and potential to transition to roles of greater responsibility within finance or outside finance
- Annual performance evaluations should have training goals on them that are developed collaboratively (more qualitative eg Excel skills)
- Curate development tracks from available courses at PWC University (core and elective options)
- Supervisor expectations to work with their direct reports on their training plans – make that part of the evaluation process
- Get transcripts of courses already taken by employees at PWC University
- Leadership soft skill development track for supervisors and managers
- Encourage employees to take the initiative for their own development – make a self-development plan part of requirements
- Improve receptiveness to innovation and change (how?)
- Focus more on job rotation (challenge of having too much to do) – identify job families that are synergistic and amenable to job rotation
- Assess what training/mentoring needs exist for part time and seasonal folks
- NRPA mentorship program underway – Young Professionals connected to mentors to Parks and Rec senior people through Association of Parks and Recreation
- Continue National Conference and local conference participation for employees
- Quarterly evaluations that honestly assess strengths and weaknesses of employees
- Develop a formal succession plan comprised of: a) critical positions b) candidates who are Ready Now, Ready in 1, ready in 2 years and c) a development path for future ready candidates (have to ensure that it is inclusive)
- Consider asking career ambitions during annual performance reviews so that people have a chance to self-select into the advancement/development processes
- Frontline/part-time/seasonal/hourly employee focus on training and development – assess if they have access to the relevant courses from PWC University; curate a relevant curriculum from PWC University; if it doesn’t exist, then create a curriculum that meets the need