





Build the Business Case

Identify Engagement Gaps

Design and Implement Strategy


Overall Commitment in DoD-IG

The chart below presents DoD-IG's overall emotional commitment, rational commitment, discretionary effort, and intent to stay scores. Detailed results for each focal point are presented on the following pages. In addition, your results are benchmarked against the overall engagement dataset.



Total
Respondent
Count = 800

Distribution of Overall Commitment in DoD-IG








Overall Commitment “At Risk” Segments for DoD-IG

The chart below presents segments within DoD-IG that score "red" on the relevant index, indicating a score of one-half standard deviation below DoD-IG's average scores. These segments of your employee base are at risk. Segments below are at risk relative to DoD-IG average; not the aggregate average.

Emotional Commitment Overall (DoD-IG: 5.54, Benchmark: 5.66)	Rational Commitment Overall (DoD-IG: 3.79, Benchmark: 4.09)	Discretionary Effort (DoD-IG: 5.82, Benchmark: 5.84)	Intent to Stay (DoD-IG: 4.78, Benchmark: 5.15)
Female (5.45)	Female (3.62)	Female (5.78)	Administration & Management (A&M)-ALSD (4.22)
A&M-ISD (5.48)	Auditing- DFS (3.61)	A&M-ISD (5.74)	A&M-HCAS (4.4)
Auditing- ACM (5.17)	Auditing- J&OO (2.95)	Auditing- Front office (including Corporate Analysis & QA) (5.66)	A&M-ISD (3.72)
Auditing- DFS (5.15)	Auditing- ROS (3.59)	Auditing- ACM (5.32)	Auditing- ACM (4.43)
Auditing- J&OO (4.75)	Intelligence (3.51)	Auditing- DFS (5.63)	Auditing- J&OO (4.31)
Auditing- ROS (5.21)	Investigations- Administrative Investigations (3.56)	Auditing- J&OO (5.41)	Auditing- ROS (4.51)
Policy and Oversight-APO (5.42)	Policy and Oversight-APO (3.19)	Auditing- ROS (5.61)	Policy and Oversight-APO (4.52)
Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (5.37)	Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (3.62)	Intelligence (5.62)	Policy and Oversight-Other (4.21)
Headquarters (5.48)	303,305,318,326,344 Administrative Technician and Related Se (3.55)	Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (5.65)	Headquarters (4.44)
341,342 Mission Support (5.27)	341,342 Mission Support (3.17)	511 Auditor (5.54)	2210 Information Technology Spec. (4.11)
511 Auditor (5.18)	511 Auditor (3.65)	Other not listed above (5.73)	Other not listed above (4.19)
YA1 (5.28)	1801 Administrative Investigator (3.48)	YA1 (5.56)	YA2 (4.37)
YA2 (5.23)	YA2 (3.52)	YA2 (5.58)	YC2 (4.15)
YC2 (5.2)	YC2 (3.62)	YC2 (5.69)	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (4.48)
Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (5.34)	YK3 (3.38)	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (5.64)	
	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (3.63)		
	First Line supervisor (sign performance evaluations) (3.62)		

Emotional Commitment in DoD-IG

The charts below presents DoD-IG's overall emotional commitment scores. In addition, scores for emotional commitment to day-to-day work, team, manager, and organization are also presented.



Council benchmark scores are 5.66 for emotional commitment overall, 5.76 for emotional commitment to day-to-day work, 5.77 for emotional commitment to the team, 5.48 for emotional commitment to the manager, and 5.64 for emotional commitment to the organization.





Emotional Commitment “At Risk” Segments for DoD-IG

The chart below presents segments within DoD-IG that score "red" on the relevant index, indicating a score of one-half standard deviation below DoD-IG's average scores. These segments of your employee base are at risk. Segments below are at risk relative to DoD-IG average; not the aggregate average.

Emotional Commitment Overall (DoD-IG: 5.54, Benchmark: 5.66)	Emotional Commitment to Day-to-Day Work (DoD-IG: 5.66, Benchmark: 5.76)	Emotional Commitment to the Team (DoD-IG: 5.58, Benchmark: 5.77)	Emotional Commitment to the Manager (DoD-IG: 5.29, Benchmark: 5.48)	Emotional Commitment to the Organization (DoD-IG: 5.63, Benchmark: 5.64)
Female (5.45)	Female (5.55)	Female (5.44)	Administration & Management (A&M) ALSD (4.85)	A&M-ISD (5.47)
A&M-ISD (5.48)	Auditing- ACM (5.05)	A&M-ISD (5.52)	A&M-ISD (5.12)	Auditing- ACM (5.23)
Auditing- ACM (5.17)	Auditing- DFS (5.25)	Auditing- ACM (5.36)	Auditing- Front office (including Corporate Analysis & QA) (5.18)	Auditing- DFS (5.32)
Auditing- DFS (5.15)	Auditing- J&OO (4.77)	Auditing- DFS (4.94)	Auditing- ACM (5.04)	Auditing- J&OO (4.66)
Auditing- J&OO (4.75)	Auditing- ROS (5.24)	Auditing- J&OO (4.95)	Auditing- DFS (5.08)	Auditing- ROS (5.24)
Auditing- ROS (5.21)	Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (5.52)	Auditing- ROS (5.31)	Auditing- J&OO (4.61)	Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (4.89)
Policy and Oversight-APO (5.42)	Headquarters (5.61)	Headquarters (5.55)	Auditing- ROS (5.05)	341,342 Mission Support (5.27)
Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (5.37)	341,342 Mission Support (5.52)	341,342 Mission Support (5.19)	Intelligence (5.02)	511 Auditor (5.28)
Headquarters (5.48)	511 Auditor (5.21)	511 Auditor (5.25)	Policy and Oversight-APO (4.83)	YA1 (5.48)
341,342 Mission Support (5.27)	YA1 (5.19)	YA1 (5.24)	132 Intelligence Operations (5.18)	YA2 (5.36)
511 Auditor (5.18)	YA2 (5.45)	YA2 (5.17)	341,342 Mission Support (5.08)	YC2 (4.81)
YA1 (5.28)	YC2 (5.2)	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (5.33)	511 Auditor (5)	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (5.52)
YA2 (5.23)	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (5.55)	I am not a supervisor (5.47)	Other not listed above (5.21)	
YC2 (5.2)			YA2 (4.94)	
Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (5.34)			YC2 (5.18)	
			YK3 (4.88)	
			Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (4.95)	
			Manager (supervise supervisors) (5.17)	

Rational Commitment in DoD-IG

The charts below presents DoD-IG's overall rational commitment scores. In addition, scores for rational commitment to team, manager, and organization are also presented.



Council benchmark scores are 4.09 for rational commitment overall, 4.13 for rational commitment to the team, 4.02 for rational commitment to the manager, and 4.12 for rational commitment to the organization.



Rational Commitment “At Risk” Segments for DoD-IG

The chart below presents segments within DoD-IG that score "red" on the relevant index, indicating a score of one-half standard deviation below DoD-IG's average scores. These segments of your employee base are at risk. Segments below are at risk relative to DoD-IG average; not the aggregate average.

Rational Commitment Overall (DoD-IG: 3.79, Benchmark: 4.09)	Rational Commitment to the Team (DoD-IG: 3.89, Benchmark: 4.13)	Rational Commitment to the Manager (DoD-IG: 3.72, Benchmark: 4.02)	Rational Commitment to the Organization (DoD-IG: 3.77, Benchmark: 4.12)
Female (3.62)	Female (3.72)	Female (3.58)	Female (3.55)
Auditing- DFS (3.61)	Auditing- DFS (3.6)	Auditing- J&OO (2.88)	A&M-HCAS (3.48)
Auditing- J&OO (2.95)	Auditing- J&OO (3.09)	Intelligence (3.56)	Auditing- J&OO (2.88)
Auditing- ROS (3.59)	Auditing- ROS (3.45)	Investigations- Administrative Investigations (3.43)	Intelligence (3.45)
Intelligence (3.51)	Intelligence (3.51)	Policy and Oversight-APO (2.81)	Policy and Oversight-APO (3.37)
Investigations- Administrative Investigations (3.56)	Investigations- Administrative Investigations (3.64)	341,342 Mission Support (3.1)	Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (3.18)
Policy and Oversight-APO (3.19)	Policy and Oversight-APO (3.4)	1801 Administrative Investigator (3.4)	201 Human Resource Management (3.58)
Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (3.62)	132 Intelligence Operations (3.7)	YA2 (3.47)	303,305,318,326,344 Administrative Technician and Related Se (3.41)
303,305,318,326,344 Administrative Technician and Related Se (3.55)	303,305,318,326,344 Administrative Technician and Related Se (3.61)	YC3 (3.58)	341,342 Mission Support (3.03)
341,342 Mission Support (3.17)	341,342 Mission Support (3.37)	YK3 (3.1)	1801 Administrative Investigator (3.43)
511 Auditor (3.65)	511 Auditor (3.7)	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (3.56)	YA2 (3.48)
1801 Administrative Investigator (3.48)	1801 Administrative Investigator (3.6)	First Line supervisor (sign performance evaluations) (3.53)	YC2 (3.47)
YA2 (3.52)	YA2 (3.62)	Manager (supervise supervisors) (3.57)	YK3 (3.56)
YC2 (3.62)	YC2 (3.69)		First Line supervisor (sign performance evaluations) (3.57)
YK3 (3.38)	YK3 (3.48)		
Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (3.63)	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (3.63)		
First Line supervisor (sign performance evaluations) (3.62)			

Discretionary Effort & Intent to Stay in DoD-IG

The chart below presents DoD-IG's overall discretionary effort and intent to stay scores.



Discretionary Effort & Intent-to-Stay “At Risk” Segments for DoD-IG

The chart below presents segments within DoD-IG that score "red" on the relevant index, indicating a score of one-half standard deviation below DoD-IG's average scores. These segments of your employee base are at risk. Segments below are at risk relative to DoD-IG average; not the aggregate average.

Discretionary Effort (DoD-IG: 5.82, Benchmark: 5.84)	Intent to Stay (DoD-IG: 4.78, Benchmark: 5.15)
Female (5.78)	Administration & Management (A&M)-ALSD (4.22)
A&M-ISD (5.74)	A&M-HCAS (4.4)
Auditing- Front office (including Corporate Analysis & QA) (5.66)	A&M-ISD (3.72)
Auditing- ACM (5.32)	Auditing- ACM (4.43)
Auditing- DFS (5.63)	Auditing- J&OO (4.31)
Auditing- J&OO (5.41)	Auditing- ROS (4.51)
Auditing- ROS (5.61)	Policy and Oversight-APO (4.52)
Intelligence (5.62)	Policy and Oversight-Other (4.21)
Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (5.65)	Headquarters (4.44)
511 Auditor (5.54)	2210 Information Technology Spec. (4.11)
Other not listed above (5.73)	Other not listed above (4.19)
YAI (5.56)	YA2 (4.37)
YA2 (5.58)	YC2 (4.15)
YC2 (5.69)	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (4.48)
Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (5.64)	

Build the Business Case

```
graph TD; A[Build the Business Case] --> B[Identify Engagement Gaps]; B --> C[Design and Implement Strategy];
```


Identify Engagement Gaps

Design and Implement Strategy

DoD-IG Risk Analysis

Average Engagement Level* at DoD-IG compared to Benchmark

The chart below shows how DoD-IG compares to all of the organizations that the Corporate Leadership Council has surveyed. In aggregate, DoD-IG is at a high level of risk in regards to employee engagement.








The table below indicates which employee segments are at the most risk across DoD-IG.

Emotional Commitment Overall	Rational Commitment Overall	Discretionary Effort	Intent to Stay
Auditing- J&OO (4.75)	Auditing- J&OO (2.95)	Auditing- ACM (5.32)	A&M-ISD (3.72)
Auditing- DFS (5.15)	341,342 Mission Support (3.17)	Auditing- J&OO (5.41)	2210 Information Technology Spec. (4.11)
Auditing- ACM (5.17)	Policy and Oversight-APO (3.19)	511 Auditor (5.54)	YC2 (4.15)
511 Auditor (5.18)	YK3 (3.38)	YA1 (5.56)	Other not listed above (4.19)
YC2 (5.2)	1801 Administrative Investigator (3.48)	YA2 (5.58)	Policy and Oversight-Other (4.21)
Auditing- ROS (5.21)	Intelligence (3.51)	Auditing- ROS (5.61)	Administration & Management (A&M)-ALSD (4.22)
YA2 (5.23)	YA2 (3.52)	Intelligence (5.62)	Auditing- J&OO (4.31)
341,342 Mission Support (5.27)	303,305,318,326,344 Administrative Technician and Related Se (3.55)	Auditing- DFS (5.63)	YA2 (4.37)
YA1 (5.28)	Investigations-Administrative Investigations (3.56)	Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (5.64)	A&M-HCAS (4.4)
Team Leader (do not have supervisory authority but direct wo (5.34)	Auditing- ROS (3.59)	Policy and Oversight-RF/GL (5.65)	Auditing- ACM (4.43)

* Average Engagement is calculated as the average of Emotional Commitment, Rational Commitment, Discretionary Effort, and Intent to Stay

DoD-IG Action Plan

DoD-IG is at a High Risk of Employee Engagement; the Council Suggests a Series of Action Steps to Reduce this Risk.

Action Steps	1. Determine Root Causes of Disengagement Across the Organization	2. Build Drivers of Engagement Within the Organization	3. Continue to Measure and Monitor
	<p>Request CLC “onsite”. CLC will present research on key drivers of engagement and which strategies are most effective at improving engagement</p> 	<p>Lead Manager Development Sessions based on CLC Resources: <i>Managing for High Performance and Retention</i></p> 	<p>Conduct ESAT again in 6 months across the organization</p> 
Council Support	<p>Conduct detailed data analysis (either internally or partnered with an external consultancy) to uncover drivers of disengagement</p> 	<p>Access CLC employee engagement roadmaps to determine which strategies are most likely to be effective for your organization based on both budget and impact</p> 	

Note: All resources described above are part of your membership with the Council and are available at no additional cost


Additional Council Engagement Resources

In addition to the action plan described for DoD-IG, the following employee engagement related resources are available to members.


Register for Engagement Teleconferences




Access Employee Engagement Database




Read Employee Engagement Research




Register on CLC Website for Updates on Engagement



Receive Updates From the Employee Engagement Decision Support Center



Leverage Employee Engagement Presentation Builder



Member Exercise: Description

- The following pages feature a diagnostic workshop exercise designed to facilitate member discuss around potential engagement drivers. Instructions for this exercise are presented below.
- The group should assign a scribe and presenter.
- Each individual person should determine which drivers they feel that the organization is effective at or not. The list of drivers are presented on page 21 (5 minutes)
- The group should then discuss where the organization feels relatively weak or strong, and reach a consensus as to which 3 to 5 drivers the organization should then focus on. (15 minutes)
- Once these are selected, the group should fill out the worksheet on page 22 to develop an action plan for each of the major drivers. Here the group should document the specific actions that they feel the organization can take to promote/support these critical drivers. (30 minutes)
- Each group reports back on the three to five critical drivers it selected, why they selected them and discuss possible actions the organization can take. (10 minutes)

The diagnostic below provides the most powerful drivers of rational commitment and intent-to-stay. Each person filling out the survey should indicate whether or not they feel that DoD-IG is effective at this particular driver or not. For more information on the drivers, please see Driving Performance and Retention Through Employee Engagement.

Rational Commitment/Intent-to-Stay Root Cause

Organizational Characteristics

Are We Effective at This?

Yes No

Is internal communication effective?

Do we provide effective career advice?

Do employees understand the connection of their work to the organization?

How well do we adapt to changing circumstances?

Do we clearly articulate organizational goals?

Do we put employees in the right roles?

Do we break down projects into manageable goals?

Do our employees accept responsibility for success and failures?

Do we accurately evaluate potential?

Do we persuade employees to move in different career directions?

Manager Characteristics

Are We Effective at This?

Yes No

Do our managers encourage development?

Do our managers show a commitment to diversity?

Are we accurately evaluating potential?

Do our managers encourage innovation?

Do our employees have the right job skills?

Do our managers set realistic performance expectations?

Do our managers help find solutions to problems?

Do our managers provide good informal feedback?

Do our managers respect our employees as individuals?

Do our managers demonstrate a passion to succeed?

Engagement Improvement Strategy

The chart builds out an engagement action plan that DoD-IG can start implementing to improve employee engagement.

Driver	Suggested Action	Challenges to Overcome	Additional Parts of the Organization to Involve
<i>Example: Internal Communication Effectiveness</i>	<i>Have e-mails from the CEO sent on significant events.</i>	<i>How often should communications come?</i>	<i>Office of the CEO, internal communications team</i>