



Correctional Service Canada

Organizational Culture Research Among Correctional Service Canada Employees

Final Report

November 2023

Prepared for:

Correctional Service Canada

Supplier Name: Quorus Consulting Group Inc.

Contract Award Date: December 22, 2021

Delivery Date: November 17, 2023

Contract Amount (incl. HST): \$161,978.04

Contract #: 21120-229613/001/CY

POR Number: 082-21

For more information, please contact:

GEN-NAT-Strategic-Communications-Strategiques@CSC-SCC.GC.CA

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français.

Organizational Culture Research Among CSC Employees Final Report

Prepared for Correctional Service Canada
Supplier name: Quorus Consulting Group Inc.
November 2023

This public opinion research report presents the results of a national survey conducted with 3,413 CSC employees using an online survey. The survey was conducted from June 27 to October 4, 2022. It also presents the findings from 37 online focus groups and 122 telephone and online individual depth interviews in which 318 CSC employees participated between October 11, 2022 and October 18, 2023.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre : Recherche sur la culture organisationnelle chez les employés du Service correctionnel du Canada

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes only. Prior written permission must be obtained from Correctional Service Canada. For more information on this report, please contact Correctional Service Canada at GEN-NAT-Strategic-Communications-Strategiques@CSC-SCC.GC.CA

Correctional Service of Canada
340 Laurier Ave W.
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P9

Catalogue Number:
PS84-198/2021E-PDF

International Standard Book Number (ISBN):
ISBN 978-0-660-40221-5

Related publications (registration number: POR 082-21):
Catalogue Number PS84-198/2021F-PDF (Final Report, French)
ISBN 978-0-660-40222-2

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as represented by the Commissioner of Correctional Service Canada, 2023.




Political Neutrality Certification

I hereby certify as Senior Officer of Quorus Consulting Group Inc. that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the [Policy on Communications and Federal Identity](#) and the [Directive on the Management of Communications - Appendix C](#).

Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Signed:



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rick Nadeau", is written over a light gray, textured rectangular background.

November 17, 2023
Rick Nadeau, President
Quorus Consulting Group Inc.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	7
METHODOLOGY.....	8
<i>Quantitative research</i>	8
<i>Qualitative research</i>	8
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS	9
<i>Quantitative research results</i>	9
<i>Qualitative research results</i>	15
PURPOSE, STUDY OBJECTIVES AND ISSUES OF INTEREST	21
DETAILED RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	23
QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH RESULTS	23
A. <i>Overall perceptions of culture at CSC</i>	23
<i>Description of current culture</i>	23
<i>How culture has changed in recent years</i>	24
<i>Most appreciated aspects of organizational culture</i>	25
<i>Most liked aspects of working at CSC</i>	27
<i>Least liked aspects of working at CSC</i>	30
B. <i>Audit criteria drill-down</i>	32
<i>Perceptions of open dialogue</i>	32
<i>Perceptions of employee engagement</i>	35
<i>Perceptions of clear communication</i>	40
<i>Perceptions of recognition and consequences</i>	42
<i>Perceptions of engagement of middle management</i>	45
<i>Perceptions of tone from the top</i>	47
<i>Audit criteria index summary</i>	51
C. <i>Extent of impact of COVID-19 pandemic</i>	53
<i>Impact of pandemic-related changes on culture – perceived improvements</i>	54
<i>Impact of pandemic-related changes on culture – perceived deteriorations</i>	55
D. <i>Proposed changes to CSC’s culture</i>	58
QUALITATIVE RESEARCH RESULTS	61
A. <i>Overall perceptions of workplace culture</i>	61
B. <i>Exploring open dialogue and employee engagement</i>	66
C. <i>Exploring clear communication</i>	69
D. <i>Exploring employee recognition and consequences</i>	72
E. <i>Exploring engagement of middle managers</i>	76
F. <i>Exploring “tone from the top”</i>	79
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	81
QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	82
RESPONDENT PROFILE	84
QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	86
TARGET AUDIENCE AND SAMPLE FRAME	86
RESEARCH INSTRUMENT DESIGN.....	88
DESCRIPTION OF DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES	88
PILOTING THE QUALITATIVE APPROACH.....	98
APPENDICES.....	100
SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	101
FOCUS GROUP INVITATION SCRIPT TEMPLATE.....	109

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW INVITATION SCRIPT TEMPLATE	114
FOCUS GROUP AND INTERVIEW MODERATION GUIDE.....	117

Executive summary

Background and research objectives

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) is the federal government agency responsible for administering sentences of a term of two years or more, as imposed by the courts. During the past few years, CSC has undertaken several initiatives to better understand and improve on its organizational culture. One of the most important aspects of establishing a diverse, equitable and inclusive workspace is understanding an organization's unique workplace culture. **Workplace culture** refers to the shared values, beliefs and assumptions that characterize members of an organization and define its nature.

The Service has publicly stated understanding and improving its culture is a priority. At the heart of this effort, CSC undertook an audit of organizational culture, with the objective of determining whether its actual organizational culture is in line with its desired one. One source of evidence to be used for the engagement was employee research, occurring with staff from four areas of focus within Correctional Service Canada: National Headquarters (NHQ); Regional Headquarters (RHQ); Federal Institutions; and Community Offices.

The research was designed to align with the audit criteria which included:

1. **Tone from the top:** Senior management has defined CSC's values and emphasizes their importance while holding management accountable to appropriately execute their duties.
2. **Engagement of Middle Managers:** Managers ensure that the vision and mission of the organization are being respected by all employees by modelling appropriate behaviour and creating a culture of inclusiveness.
3. **Open Dialogue:** Management actively gathers and listens to feedback from employees at all levels and positions across the organization.
4. **Clear Communication:** Management reinforces the values and CSC's culture through clear communication of expectations across the organization.
5. **Employee Engagement:** All employees are engaged in discussions on how to fulfill CSC's mission, and all staff are working towards the same goal.
6. **Recognition and Consequences:** Management ensures employee recognition of successful events and outcomes and applies appropriate discipline when required.

CSC employees were provided an opportunity to participate in this engagement through an online survey, focus groups and individual interviews.

Methodology

Quantitative research

The research methodology consisted of an online survey with CSC employees. Quorus was responsible for coordinating nearly all aspects of the research project including advising on the design of the research instrument, coordinating specific aspects of data collection and delivering the required research report.

- The goal was to conduct a census of the CSC staff. The database of roughly 19,661 eligible survey candidates, provided by CSC, was used to distribute the individual links to each employee through an email survey invitation.
- Respondents had the choice to complete the survey in English or French and were informed of their rights under the Privacy and Access to Information Acts.
- The survey took on average 25 minutes to complete and consisting of both open and closed-ended questions. Data collection occurred between June 27 and October 4, 2022, which included a pretest of 16 surveys conducted in English and five in French.
- A total of 3,413 surveys were completed. The equivalent margin of error for a probability study of 3,413 cases would be +/-1.5%. The final participation rate for this study was 17%.

All research was conducted in accordance with the *Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research – Online Surveys*.

Qualitative research

The qualitative phase of this project consisted of online focus groups and 1-on-1 telephone and web-based depth interviews. In total, 37 online focus groups and 122 telephone and online individual depth interviews were completed, in which 318 CSC employees participated between October 11, 2022 and October 18, 2023. All focus groups and depth interviews were held with employees within Correctional Service Canada, targeting various occupational groups and work locations to be as reflective of the target audience as possible.

Quorus was responsible for coordinating all aspects of the research project including working with CSC in designing and translating the invitation scripts and the moderation guide, coordinating all aspects of participant recruitment, managing the data collection platforms and related logistics, moderating all sessions and interviews, and delivering required reports at the end of data collection.

- The online focus groups typically lasted 1.5 to 2 hours each, and the depth online and telephone interviews were each approximately 60 minutes.
- Employees were contacted and invited to attend by email by Quorus. CSC took additional measures to promote participation.
- Employees could participate in the official language of their choice.
- All online focus groups and interviews were done via MSTeams while those participating in an interview had the choice to participate by telephone or online via MSTeams.
- Research participants were not offered an incentive for their participation.

All research was conducted in accordance with the *Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research – Qualitative Research*.

Summary of research findings

Quantitative research results

A. Overall perceptions of culture at CSC

Workplace culture

When asked to rate the quality of the current workplace culture at CSC, more than two in five staff members (41%) described the current culture as poor or very poor, while more than one in five (21%) provided very good or excellent ratings.

More than a third of employees (37%) felt that not much had changed when asked to reflect on the direction in which the workplace culture they have experienced has changed over the past few years. Results were mixed with 33% feeling culture has been headed in the wrong direction and 27% feeling it has generally been headed in the right direction.

Most appreciated aspects of organizational culture

Employees were asked to describe which aspects of current organizational culture they appreciated or felt positive towards. Results reveal that 36% of staff referenced elements related to employee engagement – this was by far the most common theme. This was followed by 13% of respondents referring to aspects of open dialogue, and 11% touching on recognition and consequences.

Within each of these themes, employees more specifically referred to the following:

- Under employee engagement, employees most commonly described elements of teamwork and morale in the workplace (16%) as well as having a diverse and inclusive work environment (13%).
- Under open dialogue, employees more specifically referred to appreciation for involving employees in the change in culture (4%), informed communication with managers (4%), and importance placed on well-being and support check-ins (3%).
- Comments related to recognition and consequences mostly focused on feeling proud about the work they do and that their contribution is appreciated (8%).

Most liked aspects of workplace environment

When asked to describe what they like the most about working at CSC, roughly two in three staff referred to aspects related to employee engagement (66%). Aspects that were a distant second and third related to tone from the top (19%) and benefits and compensation (18%).

Within these themes, employees referred to the following:

- Specific comments related to employee engagement included a sense of teamwork (26%), a belief that their work is fulfilling (19%) and challenging (13%), general job satisfaction (8%) and employment stability (8%).
- When referring to tone from the top, employees focused mostly on the importance placed on organizational mission including rehabilitation and public safety (19%).
- Feedback related to benefits and compensation focused mostly on various benefits including health, vacation, and sick leave among others (12%), as well as receiving a good salary and getting paid on time (11%).

Least liked aspects of work environment

When asked to describe their least liked aspects of their work environment, more than a third of staff (35%) cited issues related to employee engagement, while 25% referred to aspects related to recognition and consequences, 23% referred to engagement of middle management, and 21% referred to tone from the top.

Within each of the themes, employees more specifically referred to the following:

- Under employee engagement comments included a toxic work environment (14%), no sense of teamwork (14%), a lack of dedicated staff (6%), and a lack of diversity (4%).
- Under recognition and consequences comments included a lack of appreciation in the workplace (13%) as well as systemic issues of racism, harassment, and sexism (12%).
- References to middle management included mostly issues with a lack of support, accountability, and leadership from managers or supervisors (22%).
- References to tone from the top mostly focused on unfair promotions and hiring practices (10%), a lack of focus on meaningful work (4%), and a lack of focus on organizational mandates and mission (4%).

B. Audit criteria drill-down

Open dialogue

Results revealed that 50% of employees strongly disagreed or disagreed that employee feedback is considered when making decisions. A similar proportion (47%) also strongly disagreed or disagreed that management gathers feedback from employees throughout the organization. A third of staff strongly disagreed or disagreed that they are provided with sufficient opportunities to be heard through activities like team meetings, town halls, etc. (34%), while 26% would not feel comfortable asking questions and speaking up in team meetings and town halls.

Employee engagement

The area that warrants the most attention relates to whether all staff are on the same page when it comes to working towards CSC's mission and priorities, as nearly half of employees (47%) strongly disagreed or disagreed that staff are on the same page.

Equal proportions of staff (38%) agreed and disagreed that management clearly communicates its expectations to employees to reinforce the type of culture it is looking to achieve.

Half of employees (50%) feel supported in the work they do and a slim majority (56%) feel they are part of the team. While these findings are certainly positive for CSC, the findings that also reveal that one in three staff members do not feel supported in the work they do and that one in four do not feel like they are part of the team cannot be overlooked.

The most positive results related to employee engagement pertain to whether staff know how they can contribute to achieving CSC's mission and priorities (74%) and when it comes to understanding (89%) and agreeing (81%) with CSC's mission and priorities. Nearly seven times as

many employees strongly agreed that they understand how they can contribute towards achieving CSC's mission and priorities compared to strongly disagree results (27% vs. 4%).

Clear communication

Results revealed that nearly half of staff strongly disagreed or disagreed that the communication approaches CSC employs are efficient and work well (47%). A lower although still notable proportion (40%) also strongly disagreed or disagreed that CSC's organizational culture is clearly defined and understood.

Recognition and consequences

A slight majority of staff either strongly disagreed or disagreed that management is consistent when disciplining employees when it is required (53%) while half strongly disagreed or disagreed that CSC provides appropriate recognition for a job well done (50%). As well, over twice as many staff strongly disagreed or disagreed that disciplinary consequences that staff face for their actions were fair as there are who strongly agreed or agreed that they are fair (42% vs. 20%).

If there is something on which staff generally agree is that they have a clear understanding of the types of performance and behaviours that will lead to being disciplined (70%).

Engagement of middle management

While 30% of employees strongly agreed or agreed that middle management is empowered to do their job and support the culture, a greater proportion strongly disagreed or disagreed (44%). The trend is reversed when it comes to managers and supervisors at CSC encouraging employees to respect the vision and mission of the organization by modelling the appropriate behaviour (44% generally agree while 33% generally disagree).

Tone from the top

For nearly all statements considered, a greater proportion of staff disagreed than agreed. Nearly half of all employees (46%) either strongly disagreed or disagreed that senior management consistently demonstrates the desired culture through their actions. Similar results (43%) were obtained when staff were asked if they felt that senior management holds managers and supervisors accountable for their actions. Similarly, 43% either strongly disagreed or disagreed that they are kept informed of the actions that are being taken to obtain the culture senior management would like to see at CSC.

The balance tips slightly in favour of agreement when staff were asked whether senior management effectively communicates the type of culture it would like to see at CSC. For this metric, 41% generally agreed while 37% generally disagreed.

Average score summary

The resulting index scores revealed that CSC is performing highest at employee engagement (3.5), with moderately negative neutral scores observed for all other criteria.

Favourable scores:	Moderately negative neutral scores:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Employee engagement (3.5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Open dialogue (2.9)• Engagement of middle management (2.9)• Recognition and consequences (2.9)• Tone from the top (2.8)• Clear communication (2.8)

Extent of impact of COVID-19 pandemic

Employees were asked to consider whether any changes at CSC resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic have influenced the organizational culture at CSC, and if so, in which manner.

A quarter of staff (25%) believe that the changes made have worsened CSC's organizational culture, while 13% believe that the changes made have improved culture. Most of the remaining employees (40%) described the changes as having mixed results on the organizational culture. More than one in ten employees (15%) did not notice any impact of the changes on culture at CSC, while 7% preferred not to provide an answer.

Perceived improvements to culture during the pandemic

Employees who noticed changes to the culture were then asked to describe specific examples of changes that have worsened the culture at CSC. Results reveal that a slight majority of employees mentioned an aspect related to workload and hybrid work (52%). This was by far the most common theme on which employees touched. The next two themes most commonly raised included the following: 22% of staff referred to an aspect related to employee engagement, while 18% focused on various improvements to operations.

Within each of the themes, employees referred to the following:

- Comments related to workload and hybrid work mainly focused on the option to work from home (44%), as well as flexibility and accommodation in the schedule (21%).
- When referring to an aspect of employee engagement, employees touched on improvements to employee morale and teamwork (8%), engagement via virtual meetings (8%), as well as an improved sense of productivity and autonomy (7%).

- Improvements to operations mostly referred to an increase in the use of new initiatives and technology (9%), implementing best practices for COVID safety (4%), improved cleanliness (3%), as well as improvements to service and population control (3%).

Nearly one in five employees could not think of any positive impact on culture because of pandemic-related changes at CSC (17%).

Perceived deteriorations to culture during the pandemic

Staff raised a variety of ways in which culture changed for the worse with four particular themes representing the bulk of responses. First, 31% referred to negative changes related to workload and hybrid work. This was then followed by aspects of work related to tone from the top (25%), open dialogue (24%), and employee engagement (21%).

Within each of these themes, employees referred to the following:

- Comments related to workload and hybrid work included excessive workload (15%), frustration with the manner in which work from home was rolled out and with the negative impact of this policy (13%), and the sense that CSC does not see the benefit of hybrid work options (5%).
- Issues related to tone from the top primarily focused on perceptions of inadequate response to the pandemic (19%), and a lack of focus on CSC's mission and mandates (5%).
- Issues related to open dialogue primarily revolved around a greater sense of division both within and between groups, and increased sciolism (22%).
- Comments related to employee engagement included the impact on teamwork and productivity caused by staff working at home (6%), a lack of in-person interactions (6%), a lack of dedication among staff (4%) and feelings of isolation both at home and at the office (4%) among others.

Proposed changes to workplace culture

When asked to specify one thing they would change about CSC's culture, the two most popular themes were employee engagement and open dialogue (29% respectively). The next most common set of recommendations related to improvements in job recognition and consequences (16%).

Within each of these themes, employees referred to the following:

- When touching on employee engagement, employees are more specifically seeking changes to foster a more positive work environment (13%), changes that promote

camaraderie (10%), as well as changes to improve equity and inclusiveness (7%), among other suggestions.

- Changes related to open dialogue primarily focused on a need for improved communication and interaction between managers and employees (18%). Additional suggestions included consulting with employees when making changes (5%), and engaging employees in decisions (4%).
- Suggestions related to recognition and consequences included addressing the lack of accountability or of a clear process to address incidents (10%), as well as a need for equal accountability in job performance (7%).

Qualitative research results

Overall perceptions of workplace culture

Each interview and focus group gave staff an opportunity to describe what they liked the best about the work they do at CSC and, if anything, what they are most proud of in their work at CSC. They also highlighted what they considered most challenging about their work at CSC.

The two most common themes that surfaced when describing what they liked the best included the type of work they do and the people with whom they work. Beyond the work and the people, other aspects of working at CSC that were mentioned as highlights for some staff included job security, good compensation, and the benefits package.

When discussing what they are most proud of in their work at CSC, a variety of themes emerged. Common themes included specific accomplishments (such as having participated on special assignments or in special projects), having successfully progressed through the organization, and the work they have done with their clients, whether those are offenders or staff. Managers, especially senior managers, would often say they are proud of their team and what their team has been able to accomplish.

While most participants were proud of the work they do and that they liked certain aspects of the work they do, they all face challenges. In some cases, one or two specific challenges overshadow all others and in other cases, the variety and number of challenges were too many to list. Some of the more common challenges faced by staff can best be summarized as follows:

- Excessive workload / too few resources.

- Constantly changing priorities / the organization is reactive and not proactive / the organization is overly reactive to external forces (e.g., political, public opinion, media, labour partners, etc.).
- Rather than creating teachable moments, the organization focuses on “the blame game.”
- A “toxic” work environment: working with offenders is difficult / working with other staff is difficult / managers are not managing / there is too much favouritism.
- Accountability without authority / too much centralization / too much upwards delegation.
- Prioritizing process over purpose / losing sight of the mandate.
- Lack of emphasis on staff wellbeing / too little staff recognition.
- Inadequate attention paid to departments outside of “operations.”
- Staff do not feel as though their voice is being heard.
- Lack of good managers and/or genuine leadership at multiple levels.
- Lack of a cohesive and concerted effort to achieve the mandate / the organization is fractured in many ways / everyone works in silos / departments do not collaborate / there is a divide between staff and management and between NHQ and many other parts of the organization.

Finally, to get a quick sense of overall culture at CSC, respondents were asked to select one or two words that they feel best describes the current culture. Many participants felt that trying to describe the overall culture at CSC was quite impossible – they tended to feel that CSC was an agglomeration of many sub-cultures. This led many to suggest that the overall culture is multi-faceted, complex, incoherent, broken and divided.

By focusing on the culture they experience on a regular basis, participants tended to use a variety of terms which more often than not reflected or captured some of the main challenges they encounter in their workdays. Some of the more common ways in which culture was described was toxic, challenging, thankless, hierarchical, reactive, lacking accountability, risk-averse, unchanging, and process-driven. Some do see the culture in a positive light, in which case terms such as professional, team-focused, dedicated, and hard-working were used.

Exploring open dialogue and employee engagement

Participants were invited to share their thoughts on how well they feel management performs in terms of actively gathering and listening to feedback from employees at all levels and positions in the organization. Participants were fairly unified in thinking that the organization is quite effective

at gathering feedback from employees, but performs quite poorly when it comes to actively listening to that feedback.

There is widespread belief that efforts aimed at open dialogue and employee engagement are artificial. As well, employees feel that while they are invited to share feedback, they do not believe this feedback is taken into consideration and probably not even heard.

For the most part, the discussion around open dialogue and employee engagement leaves most employees feeling like the manner in which decisions are taken at CSC is best described as top-down rather than collaborative.

Exploring clear communication

Communication at CSC represented somewhat of a paradox for staff – on the one hand it was considered plentiful if not excessive and on the other hand it was also seen as lacking and ineffective.

When assessing corporate communication, employees would focus almost exclusively on the emails they receive. These were seen as professional and comprehensive, however their volume was almost always considered overwhelming, and their relevance often deemed lacking. This has compelled many to be very selective in reading these emails.

The various challenges related to email communication at CSC lead many to value verbal communication, especially at the team level. Those who feel that communication overall is working well at CSC also tend to be employees who believe that team-level communication is strong.

Certain changes that happened at CSC because of the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on communications. Employee views of those changes are mixed. The increase in videoconference meetings was seen by some as an opportunity for their team to meet more often and more efficiently. On the other hand, the fact that some staff were working from home hindered opportunities for some teams to meet as often as they used to or even to meet as needed.

The weekly messages from the Commissioner received mixed reviews. Many staff appreciated that the Commissioner is communicating directly with them, they liked that this communication showcases what is happening in other parts of the organization and that it conveys and reinforces the organization's values. Those who connected less well with this communication felt that it consistently overlooked challenges with which they contend regularly and instead, focuses on "priorities" and storylines that they consider quite secondary.

Exploring employee recognition and consequences

Employee recognition was seen through two lenses – formal and informal recognition. While many believe that the means for formal recognition are adequate and realistic, there remain many weaknesses including lack of awareness and use of these mechanisms, and if they are used, they are not given to the employee in a timely fashion. Ultimately, the way formal recognition is managed at CSC leaves many with the feeling that employee recognition is an afterthought and a low priority at CSC.

Informal recognition at CSC received mixed reviews. Many, especially but not exclusively frontline employees, seem to believe that this is not part of CSC's culture. Others, especially those with good working relationships with their immediate supervisor, believe that they receive informal recognition in a timely and authentic manner which leaves them feeling that recognition is well done at CSC.

Ultimately, employees almost always conclude that how well employee recognition is done depends on the supervisor or manager.

Employee discipline also received mixed reviews although the general sense is that CSC's performance is lacking. Although there is consensus that the policies are clear in terms of what should lead to discipline and that discipline does follow a progression in line with policy, many argue that there remains too much latitude for managers and the overall process at CSC is flawed on many fronts. Some of the more frustrating aspects as noted by employees included the following:

- Some feel that managers in general are held to a different standard.
- Favouritism was seen as responsible for sparing certain staff from discipline when it was warranted and it was seen as responsible for disciplining others unnecessarily.
- The disciplinary process is seen as taking far too long.
- The disciplinary process is considered cumbersome for managers.
- Some believe that staff who should be disciplined are often either moved to a different team or location or they are promoted.
- Discipline is too quickly administered for what some might consider relatively minor "errors" or "oversights" while discipline is not adequately or consistently administered for more severe actions.

That said, not everyone who participated in this research believes that employee discipline at CSC is flawed. Although there were exceptions, a general trend seemed to emerge that the higher in the hierarchy one worked, the more positive discipline in the organization was seen.

All things considered, a common sentiment among staff in various positions and levels of the organization is that CSC is seen as quick to discipline and slow to recognize employees.

Exploring engagement of middle managers

There was widespread agreement that the culture that an employee experiences is largely determined by their manager or supervisor. While many believe that it would be impossible for all CSC managers to fit the mold of what they consider an “ideal”, there is also a common belief that there is room for improvement. A common weakness seen in CSC managers is that while they might be good “managers” they are not necessarily well equipped to lead.

An important part of the discussion regarding managers focused on what the organization could do to develop managers that are more likely to meet staff expectations and who foster the ideal workplace culture. Some of the more common suggestions included:

- Many seem to believe that there are too many acting managers which in turn weakens management at CSC overall.
- Favouritism too often results in individuals without management skills being selected for key positions.
- The competition process for management positions should take a more holistic view of the individual’s skillset.
- There seems to be inadequate time for shadowing and mentorship which leads to too much “trial by fire”.
- There are still too many managers who adhere to and believe in an archaic, paramilitary form of management which is anchored in a “command and obey” approach rather than what many consider a more modern holistic approach to management.
- Finally, both staff and managers explained that managers are overworked and under-resourced and do not have enough time to follow management training.

A role that many agree a manager should play is to foster a culture of inclusiveness. Feedback would suggest that there has been progress on this front over the years, especially in terms of gender inclusiveness, but there remains quite a bit of work ahead.

Exploring “tone from the top”

Employees also all agreed that the culture that an organization experiences is in many ways set by what is said and done by that organization’s leadership team. For the most part, the focus of this discussion was on the Commissioner since few staff knew or had heard of anyone else at the executive level.

Employees believe leadership is contributing to an ideal workplace culture through the following:

- Communicating the organization’s values and priorities.
- Messaging from the Commissioner highlighting key achievements and struggles experienced at all levels of the organization.
- The audit on organizational culture and the associated research with employees was seen as overdue, necessary and a step in the right direction in terms of understanding culture at CSC.

What tends to be frustrating for staff is that many of the priorities and values at the heart of communications “from the top”, while nice to hear, important and honorable, come across as largely disconnected from what is happening on the frontlines. There is a widespread belief, especially as one gets closer to the frontline, that CSC is “not walking the talk.”

Qualitative research disclaimer

Qualitative research seeks to develop insight and direction rather than quantitatively projectable measures. The purpose is not to generate “statistics” but to hear the full range of opinions on a topic, understand the language participants use, gauge degrees of passion and engagement and to leverage the power of the group to inspire ideas. Participants are encouraged to voice their opinions, irrespective of whether or not that view is shared by others.

Due to the sample size, the special recruitment methods used, and the study objectives themselves, it is clearly understood that the work under discussion is exploratory in nature. The findings are not, nor were they intended to be, projectable to a larger population.

Specifically, it is inappropriate to suggest or to infer that few (or many) real world users would behave in one way simply because few (or many) participants behaved in this way during the sessions. This kind of projection is strictly the prerogative of quantitative research.

Supplier Name: Quorus Consulting Group Inc.

Contract #: 21120-229613/001/CY

Contract award date: December 22, 2021

Contract amount (incl. HST): \$161,978.04

For more information, please contact Correctional Service Canada at: GEN-NAT-Strategic-Communications-Strategiques@CSC-SCC.GC.CA

Purpose, study objectives and issues of interest

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) is the federal government agency responsible for administering sentences of a term of two years or more, as imposed by the courts. During the past few years, CSC has undertaken several initiatives to better understand and improve on its organizational culture. As part of CSC's response to the Office of the Auditor General's 2018 Respect in the Workplace Audit, the Service has undertaken several initiatives, including;

- Launching a Respectful Workplace Campaign;
- Tabling Workplace Climate and Employee Well-being Annual Reports;
- Launching a National Comprehensive Strategy on Workplace Wellness and Employee Wellbeing; and,
- Continuing with the Ethical Risk Assessment Initiative.

Culture change does not occur quickly, however the Service has publicly stated understanding and improving its culture is a priority. In the Commissioner's 2018 Mandate Letter from the then Minister of Public Safety, it was encouraged that the Service instills within CSC a culture of on-going self-reflection.

The Correctional Service Canada undertook an audit of organizational culture, with the objective of determining whether its actual organizational culture is in line with its desired one. One source of evidence to be used for the engagement was employee research, occurring with staff from four areas of focus within Correctional Service Canada: National Headquarters (NHQ); Regional Headquarters (RHQ); Federal Institutions; and Community Offices.

One of the most important aspects of establishing a diverse, equitable and inclusive workspace is understanding an organization's unique workplace culture. **Workplace culture** refers to the shared values, beliefs and assumptions that characterize members of an organization and define its nature. While, the **Audit of Organizational Culture** will be an examination of an organization's current culture, it will also assist the organization in re-envisioning its desired culture.

In addition to the audit objective, individual audit criteria explored included:

1. **Tone from the top:** Senior management has defined CSC's values and emphasizes their importance while holding management accountable to appropriately execute their duties.
2. **Engagement of Middle Managers:** Managers ensure that the vision and mission of the organization are being respected by all employees by modelling appropriate behaviour and creating a culture of inclusiveness.

3. **Open Dialogue:** Management actively gathers and listens to feedback from employees at all levels and positions across the organization.
4. **Clear Communication:** Management reinforces the values and CSC's culture through clear communication of expectations across the organization.
5. **Employee Engagement:** All employees are engaged in discussions on how to fulfill CSCs mission, and all staff are working towards the same goal.
6. **Recognition and Consequences:** Management ensures employee recognition of successful events and outcomes and applies appropriate discipline when required.

CSC employees were provided an opportunity to participate in this engagement through an online survey, focus groups and individual interviews.

Detailed research findings

Quantitative research results

Notes for the reader:

- Subgroup findings were primarily focused on comparing results across the four areas of focus. The data tables in this section indicate the number of respondents that belong in each area of focus, the sum of which may not add to the “total” number of respondents for a given question because not all respondents volunteered this information when completing the questionnaire.
- Some results may not add exactly to 100% due to rounding or the question allowed for multiple responses.

A. Overall perceptions of culture at CSC

Description of current culture

Employees were asked to rate the quality of the current workplace culture at CSC. The following definition of workplace culture was provided as context:

An organization’s culture refers to all the values, expected behaviours and beliefs that all staff share. These will influence the interactions between management, employees and other groups of individuals with whom the organization might interact, such as offenders, stakeholders, partners, contractors, etc. Ideally, an organization’s culture supports its mission.

More than two in five staff members (41%) described the current culture as poor or very poor, while more than one in five (21%) provided very good or excellent ratings. The remaining 38% rated current culture as fair (the mid-point on the rating scale).

Areas of focus

Results vary significantly across areas of focus. Whereas results are very consistent in terms of those who rate culture fair, noticeable trends emerge when considering positive and negative sentiments.

At 52%, staff working in institutions were the most likely to provide poor ratings and the least likely to consider CSC culture very good (11%) or excellent (1%).

Among Community staff, the proportion who feel culture is poor decreases to 37% while those who have positive views of culture increases to a combined 23%.

Positive sentiments increase further among RHQ staff where we see one third rating culture as either excellent or very good and 25% who consider it poor or very poor.

Finally, culture is seen in the most positive light at NHQ, where 38% believe it to be either excellent or very good and 19% feel it is poor or very poor.

Table 1 – Ratings of current culture by areas of focus

Response	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	41%	52%	37%	25%	19%
Very poor	19%	27%	12%	9%	7%
Poor	22%	26%	25%	16%	13%
Fair	38%	36%	39%	40%	42%
Very good	18%	11%	21%	30%	34%
Excellent	2%	1%	2%	3%	4%
Top-2 Box	21%	12%	23%	33%	38%
Prefer not to say	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%

Q1. Generally, how would you describe the culture at CSC these days? Base: All respondents, n=3413.

How culture has changed in recent years

Employees were asked to reflect on the direction in which the workplace culture they have experienced has changed over the past few years. National results were mixed, with more than a third of staff feeling that not much had changed (37%), 33% feeling culture has been headed in the wrong direction and 27% feeling it has generally been headed in the right direction.

Areas of focus

Employees working in institutions (45%) were more likely to say that culture has been heading in the wrong direction in recent years compared to those working at the community level (25%), RHQ (17%), or NHQ (13%). The opposite trend can be noticed when focusing on those who feel culture has been heading in the right direction – in other words, results are strongest at NHQ (44%), and gradually decrease as we consider results at RHQ (41%), at the community level (27%), and then in institutions (19%).

Table 2 – How culture has changed in recent years by areas of focus

Response	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
It has generally been headed in the wrong direction	33%	45%	25%	17%	13%
Not much has changed	37%	33%	46%	38%	40%
It has generally been headed in the right direction	27%	19%	27%	41%	44%
Prefer not to say	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%

Q2. Overall, how has the culture at CSC been changing over the past three or four years? If you have worked at CSC for a shorter period of time, consider from the moment you started your employment at CSC. Base: All respondents, n=3413.

Most appreciated aspects of organizational culture

Employees were asked to describe which aspects of current organizational culture they appreciated or felt positive towards. Survey participants entered their response using an open-ended text box. Responses were then grouped thematically.

Results reveal that 36% of staff referenced elements related to employee engagement – this was by far the most common theme. This was then followed by 13% of respondents referring to aspects of open dialogue, 11% touching on recognition and consequences, 8% touching on workload and hybrid work, 8% referring to engagement of middle management, and 7% referring to tone from the top.

Within each of these themes, employees more specifically referred to the following:

- Under the theme of employee engagement, employees most commonly described elements of teamwork and morale in the workplace (16%), as well as having a diverse and inclusive work environment (13%).
- Under open dialogue, employees more specifically referred to appreciation for involving employees in the change in culture (4%), informed communication with managers (4%), and importance placed on well-being and support check-ins (3%).
- Comments related to recognition and consequences mostly focused on feeling proud about the work they do and that their contribution is appreciated (8%).

- Workload and hybrid work considerations included a flexible and accommodating schedule (5%), as well as the option to work from home (4%).
- Engagement of middle management was entirely driven by perceptions of improved attitudes and leadership among managers (8%).
- References to tone from the top were centered on the importance placed on organizational missions including rehabilitation and public safety (5%).

It should also be noted that nearly one-third of employees could either only think of negative aspects of the current organizational culture (13%) or could not think of any positive aspects (18%).

Areas of focus

Not being able to think of a positive aspect of organizational culture or similarly, only being able to think of negative ones, was more common at the institution level (39%) and in the community (26%) compared to RHQ (18%) and NHQ (20%). Staff in all areas except in institutions were more likely to refer to most of the broad themes except when it comes to benefits and compensation, which institution staff were the most likely to mention (6%).

Table 3 – Most appreciated aspects of current organizational culture by areas of focus (NET)

NET response	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Employee engagement	36%	33%	37%	40%	41%
Open dialogue	13%	11%	14%	13%	16%
Recognition and consequences	11%	10%	13%	13%	13%
Workload and hybrid work	8%	5%	13%	13%	12%
Engagement of middle management	8%	7%	10%	9%	9%
Tone from the top	7%	6%	10%	9%	10%
Benefits and compensation	5%	6%	4%	4%	3%
Professional development	4%	3%	4%	6%	5%
Clear communication	1%	1%	2%	4%	1%
Improvements to operations	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
Working with offenders	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Other	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Can only think of negative comments	13%	16%	11%	7%	8%
Nothing/Can't think of any	18%	23%	15%	11%	12%
Prefer not to say	3%	4%	2%	3%	3%

Q3. What, if any, would be the one or two aspects of the current organizational culture that you appreciate or feel most positively towards? Base: All respondents, n=3413.

Most liked aspects of working at CSC

Employees were asked to describe what they liked the most about working at CSC. Survey participants entered their response using an open-ended text box. Responses were grouped thematically.

When asked to describe what they like the most about working at CSC, roughly two in three staff referred to aspects related to employee engagement (66%). Themes that were distant second and third were tone from the top (19%) and benefits and compensation (18%). The next most common themes were workload and hybrid work options (11%) and professional development opportunities (8%).

Within each of these themes, employees more specifically referred to the following:

- Specific comments related to employee engagement included a sense of teamwork (26%), a belief that their work is fulfilling (19%) and challenging (13%), general job satisfaction (8%), and employment stability (8%).
- When referring to tone from the top, employees focused mostly on the importance placed on the organizational mission, including rehabilitation and public safety (19%).
- Feedback related to benefits and compensation focused mostly on various benefits including health, vacation, and sick leave among others (12%). Another common sub-theme included receiving a good salary and getting paid on time (11%).
- Workload and hybrid work considerations included a flexible and accommodating schedule (9%) as well as the option to work from home (3%).
- Comments related to professional development focused entirely on opportunities for advancement, job flexibility, and growth (8%).

While nearly one-third of employees could not think of a positive aspect of workplace culture (as noted earlier in this report), far fewer could not think of an aspect of their work at CSC that they liked. More specifically, 6% could only think of negative aspects of their work at CSC and 3% could not think of any positive aspects.

Areas of focus

Staff working at NHQ (71%), the community or district level (70%), and RHQ (69%) were more likely to refer to aspects of their work related to employee engagement compared to those working in institutions (62%).

Conversely, those working in institutions (26%) were more likely to refer to benefits and compensation compared to those working in the community (13%), RHQ (10%), and NHQ (4%).

Comments related to tone from the top were especially common among staff in community offices (34%).

Table 4 – Most liked aspects of working at CSC by areas of focus (NET)

NET response	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Employee engagement	66%	62%	70%	69%	71%
Tone from the top	19%	17%	34%	14%	22%
Benefits and compensation	18%	26%	13%	10%	4%
Workload and hybrid work	11%	9%	15%	16%	11%
Professional development	8%	8%	5%	12%	10%
Engagement of middle management	4%	3%	5%	6%	7%
Recognition and consequences	3%	2%	2%	5%	5%
Open dialogue	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%
Clear communication	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Personal convenience	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%
Improvements to operations	<1%	<1%	-	1%	1%
Working with offenders	<1%	1%	-	-	<1%
Other	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%
Can only think of negative comments	6%	8%	6%	4%	3%
Nothing/can't think of any	3%	3%	2%	1%	3%
Prefer not to say	1%	1%	-	1%	1%

Q4. What do you like most about working at CSC and why? Base: All respondents, n=3413.

Least liked aspects of working at CSC

Employees were also asked to describe the least liked aspects of their work environment. Survey participants entered their response using an open-ended text box. Responses were grouped thematically according to the culture audit criteria.

More than a third of staff (35%) cited issues related to employee engagement, while 25% referred to aspects related to recognition and consequences, 23% referred to engagement of middle management, and 21% referred to tone from the top. Nearly one in five employees commented on potential improvements to operations (17%), and on issues with workload and hybrid work (17%). Aspects related to clear communication were raised by 14% of staff.

Within each of the themes, employees more specifically referred to the following:

- Specific mentions related to employee engagement included a toxic work environment (14%), no sense of teamwork (14%), a lack of dedicated staff (6%), and a lack of diversity (4%).
- Specific mentions related to recognition and consequences included a lack of appreciation in the workplace (13%), as well as systemic issues of racism, harassment, and sexism (12%).
- References to middle management included mostly issues with a lack of support, accountability, and leadership from managers or supervisors (22%).
- References to tone from the top mostly focused on unfair promotions and hiring practices (10%), a lack of focus on meaningful work (4%), and a lack of focus on organizational mandates and mission (4%).
- Comments related to potential improvements to operations primarily focused on perceptions of too much bureaucracy (5%), and a lack of funding or resources (4%).
- Workload and hybrid work considerations included a lack of staff and excessive workload (13%), issues with work-life balance and flexibility (3%), as well as having no option to work from home (2%).
- Clear communication issues included a lack of clarity surrounding operating procedures and policies (8%), as well as a lack of feeling informed (6%).

Very few (4%) employees could not think of any negative aspects of working at CSC.

Areas of focus

Staff working in institutions were more likely to raise issues related to employee engagement (39%) compared to those working at RHQ (31%), NHQ (29%), and at the community or district level (26%). Those working at the community or district level (31%) were more likely to refer to issues related to workload and hybrid work issues compared to those working at NHQ (19%), RHQ (18%), and in institutions (13%).

Issues related to recognition and consequences were more likely to be raised among staff in institutions (29%) and in the community (25%) compared to staff at RHQ (19%) and NHQ (17%).

Table 5 – Least liked aspects of working at CSC by areas of focus (NET)

NET response	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Employee engagement	35%	39%	26%	31%	29%
Recognition and consequences	25%	29%	25%	19%	17%
Engagement of middle management	23%	24%	24%	17%	20%
Tone from the top	21%	22%	22%	20%	16%
Improvements to operations	17%	14%	22%	19%	22%
Workload and hybrid work	17%	13%	31%	18%	19%
Clear communication	14%	15%	16%	12%	14%
Open dialogue	9%	9%	12%	9%	9%
Benefits and compensation	6%	7%	11%	6%	2%
Professional development	6%	6%	7%	5%	8%
Working with offenders	3%	5%	2%	1%	<1%
Policy concerns	1%	2%	<1%	2%	1%
Other	5%	4%	6%	6%	5%
Dislikes everything	<1%	-	-	<1%	-
Haven't been here long enough to comment	<1%	-	-	<1%	1%
Nothing negative	4%	3%	3%	6%	8%
Unsure/don't know	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

Q5. What do you like the least about working at CSC and why? Base: All respondents, n=3413.

B. Audit criteria drill-down

After obtaining general feedback on workplace culture at CSC and the work they do, staff were asked the extent to which they agreed with a series of statements related to the following themes:

- Open dialogue
- Employee engagement
- Recognition and consequences
- Clear communication
- Engagement of middle management
- Tone from the top

Perceptions of open dialogue

A total of four statements were presented to gauge staff perceptions of open dialogue at CSC. Results revealed that 50% of employees strongly disagreed or disagreed that employee feedback is considered when making decisions. A similar proportion (47%) also strongly disagreed or disagreed that management gathers feedback from employees throughout the organization. Roughly a third of staff strongly disagreed or disagreed that they are provided with sufficient opportunities to be heard through activities like team meetings, town halls, etc. (34%) while 45% strongly agreed or agreed. Finally, 26% would not feel comfortable asking questions and speaking up in team meetings and town halls whereas the majority of staff (55%) would feel comfortable.

Areas of focus

Those who do not work at NHQ were more likely to disagree in general with all statements related to open dialogue compared to those working at NHQ:

- Consideration for employee feedback when making decisions (55% vs. 31%).
- Gathering feedback from employees throughout the organization (51% vs. 26%).
- Provided with sufficient opportunities to be heard (38% vs. 14%).
- Feel comfortable asking questions and speaking up (28% vs. 15%).

Table 6 – Perceptions of open dialogue by areas of focus

I feel that management takes employee feedback into consideration when making decisions	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	50%	59%	52%	37%	31%
Strongly disagree	25%	33%	23%	14%	12%
Disagree	25%	27%	29%	22%	19%
Neither agree or disagree	20%	19%	17%	23%	22%
Agree	21%	16%	23%	29%	32%
Strongly agree	6%	4%	6%	9%	13%
Top-2 Box	28%	20%	30%	37%	45%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	2%	1%	2%	3%	3%
Management makes efforts to gather feedback from employees at all levels and across the organization.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	47%	58%	44%	30%	26%
Strongly disagree	22%	30%	17%	11%	9%
Disagree	25%	28%	26%	19%	18%
Neither agree or disagree	18%	18%	19%	17%	19%
Agree	24%	18%	27%	36%	35%
Strongly agree	8%	5%	7%	13%	17%
Top-2 Box	32%	23%	35%	49%	51%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	2%	2%	3%	4%	3%

Table 6 – Perceptions of open dialogue by areas of focus (continued)

I am given enough opportunities to have my voice heard through activities like team meetings, town halls, etc.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	34%	45%	28%	17%	14%
Strongly disagree	15%	21%	12%	5%	4%
Disagree	19%	24%	16%	12%	10%
Neither agree or disagree	20%	21%	26%	19%	14%
Agree	31%	25%	34%	41%	41%
Strongly agree	13%	7%	11%	21%	30%
Top-2 Box	45%	32%	46%	62%	70%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	1%	2%	<1%	1%	1%
I feel comfortable asking questions and speaking up in team meetings and town halls.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	26%	32%	24%	15%	15%
Strongly disagree	11%	14%	8%	6%	5%
Disagree	15%	18%	16%	9%	10%
Neither agree or disagree	18%	19%	18%	19%	14%
Agree	37%	34%	38%	42%	42%
Strongly agree	18%	14%	20%	23%	28%
Top-2 Box	55%	48%	58%	65%	70%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	1%	1%	-	1%	1%

Q6_A-Q6_D. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: All respondents, n=3413.

A summary index was developed to provide an overall average score across all statements related to open dialogue. “Don’t know / prefer not to say” responses were excluded from average scores, and respondents needed to have provided a valid rating of 1 to 5 for at least one statement to be included in the overall index calculation (with a rating of 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree).

The national average index score for “Open Dialogue” was 2.9 which represents a mid-range overall score.

Areas of focus

Staff working in institutions (42%) were more likely to have an unfavourable index score when it comes to open dialogue at CSC compared to those working at the community or district level (28%), RHQ (17%), and NHQ (14%).

Table 7 – Open dialogue index by areas of focus

Average score	Total (n=3407)	Institution (n=1,899)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=406)	National HQ (n=560)
% Unfavourable (score of less than 2.5)	32%	42%	28%	17%	14%
% Neutral (score of 2.5 to 3.49)	30%	31%	35%	27%	26%
% Favourable (score of 3.5 and higher)	38%	27%	38%	55%	61%
Mean	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.4	3.5

Q6_A-Q6_D. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: Excluding "Don't know/Prefer not to say" responses, n=3407.

Perceptions of employee engagement

A total of seven statements were presented to gauge staff perceptions of employee engagement at CSC. The area that warrants the most attention in this area relates to whether all staff are on the same page when it comes to working towards CSC's mission and priorities. Nearly half of employees strongly disagreed or disagreed that staff are on the same page when it comes to how they can all work towards achieving CSC's mission and priorities (47%). More than three times as many staff strongly disagreed (17%) with this sentiment than there were who strongly agreed (5%).

Equal proportions of staff (38%) agreed and disagreed that management clearly communicates its expectations to employees to reinforce the type of culture it is looking to achieve. That said, more strongly disagreed (15%) than strongly agreed (9%).

Half of employees (50%) feel supported in the work they do while 56% feel they are part of the team. While these findings are certainly positive for CSC, the findings that also reveal that one in three staff members do not feel supported in the work they do and that one in four do not feel like they are part of the team cannot be overlooked.

The most positive results related to employee engagement pertain to whether staff know how they can contribute to achieving CSC's mission and priorities and when it comes to understanding

and agreeing with CSC’s mission and priorities. More specifically, 74% of employees understand how they can contribute towards achieving CSC’s mission and priorities. Nearly seven times as many strongly agreed as there are you who strongly disagreed with this sentiment (27% vs. 4%). Those who strongly agree or agree increases to 81% when it comes to agreeing with CSC’s mission and priorities and climbs again to 89% when it comes to whether employees understand CSC’s mission and priorities.

Areas of focus

Employees who are not at NHQ were more likely to disagree in general with the following statements compared to those working at NHQ:

- Employees are on the same page working towards CSC’s mission and priorities (52% vs. 27%).
- Management clearly communicates expectations to employees (41% vs. 22%).
- I feel supported in the work that I do (36% vs. 17%).
- I feel like I am part of the team (28% vs. 10%).

Table 8 – Perceptions of employee engagement by areas of focus

Employees are on the same page when it comes to how we can all work towards achieving CSC’s mission and priorities.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	47%	58%	40%	37%	27%
Strongly disagree	17%	23%	12%	9%	8%
Disagree	30%	34%	28%	27%	20%
Neither agree or disagree	24%	23%	26%	29%	22%
Agree	21%	15%	26%	26%	34%
Strongly agree	5%	3%	6%	6%	13%
Top-2 Box	27%	18%	32%	32%	47%
Don’t know / Prefer not to say	2%	1%	2%	2%	4%

Table 8 – Perceptions of employee engagement by area of focus (continued)

Management clearly communicates its expectations to employees to reinforce the type of culture it is looking to achieve.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	38%	47%	34%	23%	22%
Strongly disagree	15%	21%	11%	7%	6%
Disagree	23%	26%	23%	15%	17%
Neither agree or disagree	22%	23%	23%	21%	22%
Agree	29%	23%	34%	42%	38%
Strongly agree	9%	6%	9%	12%	16%
Top-2 Box	38%	29%	43%	55%	54%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%
I feel supported in the work that I do.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	32%	41%	32%	16%	17%
Strongly disagree	15%	20%	15%	5%	5%
Disagree	17%	21%	16%	11%	12%
Neither agree or disagree	17%	19%	20%	15%	12%
Agree	33%	29%	34%	44%	39%
Strongly agree	16%	11%	14%	25%	31%
Top-2 Box	50%	40%	48%	69%	70%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	1%	<1%	1%	1%	1%

Table 8 – Perceptions of employee engagement by area of focus (continued)

I feel like I am part of the team.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	25%	33%	22%	13%	10%
Strongly disagree	10%	15%	8%	4%	4%
Disagree	15%	19%	15%	9%	6%
Neither agree or disagree	18%	21%	17%	14%	11%
Agree	37%	33%	42%	43%	42%
Strongly agree	19%	12%	19%	29%	36%
Top-2 Box	56%	45%	61%	72%	78%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	1%	1%	<1%	1%	1%
I understand how I can contribute towards achieving CSC's mission and priorities.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	10%	14%	6%	6%	5%
Strongly disagree	4%	6%	1%	1%	2%
Disagree	7%	8%	5%	5%	3%
Neither agree or disagree	15%	17%	11%	13%	12%
Agree	46%	44%	55%	49%	45%
Strongly agree	27%	23%	27%	32%	36%
Top-2 Box	74%	68%	83%	80%	81%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	1%	1%	<1%	1%	2%

Table 8 – Perceptions of employee engagement by area of focus (continued)

I agree with CSC’s mission and priorities.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	6%	8%	2%	2%	3%
Strongly disagree	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%
Disagree	4%	5%	1%	1%	2%
Neither agree or disagree	12%	15%	11%	9%	6%
Agree	42%	41%	43%	45%	40%
Strongly agree	39%	34%	43%	43%	49%
Top-2 Box	81%	75%	86%	88%	89%
Don’t know / Prefer not to say	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
I understand CSC’s mission and priorities.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	4%	5%	1%	2%	2%
Strongly disagree	1%	2%	<1%	1%	1%
Disagree	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%
Neither agree or disagree	7%	8%	4%	5%	3%
Agree	47%	48%	48%	48%	42%
Strongly agree	42%	38%	46%	44%	52%
Top-2 Box	89%	86%	94%	92%	94%
Don’t know / Prefer not to say	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

Q6_E-Q6_K. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: All respondents, n=3413.

A summary index was developed to provide an overall average score across all statements related to employee engagement. “Don’t know / prefer not to say” responses were excluded from average scores, and respondents needed to have provided a valid rating of 1 to 5 for at least one statement to be included in the overall index calculation (with a rating of 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree).

The national average index score for “Employee Engagement” was 3.5 which represents a somewhat favourable overall score.

Areas of focus

Employees working in institutions (17%) were more likely to have unfavourable index scores compared to those working in the community (6%), at RHQ (4%), and at NHQ (3%).

Table 9 – Employee engagement index by areas of focus

Average score	Total (n=3409)	Institution (n=1,899)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=407)	National HQ (n=561)
% Unfavourable (score of less than 2.5)	11%	17%	6%	4%	3%
% Neutral (score of 2.5 to 3.49)	35%	41%	36%	25%	24%
% Favourable (score of 3.5 and higher)	54%	42%	58%	71%	73%
Mean	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.9

Q6_E-Q6_K. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: Excluding "Don't know/Prefer not to say" responses, n=3409.

Perceptions of clear communication

A total of two statements were presented to gauge staff perceptions of clear communication at CSC. On this theme, results revealed that nearly half of staff strongly disagreed or disagreed that the communication approaches CSC employs are efficient and work well (47%). A lower although still notable proportion (40%) also strongly disagreed or disagreed that CSC's organizational culture is clearly defined and understood.

Areas of focus

Staff not located at NHQ were more likely to strongly disagree or disagree that the communication approaches CSC employs are efficient, and work well compared to those working at NHQ (51% vs. 28%).

Table 9 – Perceptions of clear communication by areas of focus

The communication approaches CSC employs are efficient and work well.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	47%	58%	45%	31%	28%
Strongly disagree	19%	25%	15%	7%	10%
Disagree	28%	32%	30%	25%	18%
Neither agree or disagree	23%	22%	25%	27%	23%
Agree	23%	17%	25%	33%	35%
Strongly agree	5%	3%	5%	7%	13%
Top-2 Box	29%	20%	30%	41%	48%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
CSC's organizational culture is clearly defined and understood.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	40%	46%	37%	28%	29%
Strongly disagree	13%	16%	12%	9%	10%
Disagree	26%	30%	25%	20%	19%
Neither agree or disagree	26%	26%	28%	25%	25%
Agree	26%	21%	27%	37%	31%
Strongly agree	7%	6%	8%	8%	12%
Top-2 Box	33%	27%	35%	45%	43%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%

Q6a_L-Q6a_M. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: All respondents, n=3413.

A summary index was developed to provide an overall average score across all statements related to clear communication. “Don’t know / prefer not to say” responses were excluded from average scores, and respondents needed to have provided a valid rating of 1 to 5 for at least one statement to be included in the overall index calculation (with a rating of 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree).

The national average index score for “Clear Communication” was 2.8 which represents a somewhat unfavourable overall score.

Areas of focus

Scores among RHQ and NHQ were similar. Results then become more negative for staff in the community. Employees working at institutions (42%) were the most likely to have an unfavourable index score compared to those working at the community or district level (31%), at NHQ (22%), and at RHQ (20%).

Table 10 – Clear communication index by areas of focus

Average score	Total (n=3404)	Institution (n=1,898)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=392)	Regional HQ (n=406)	National HQ (n=559)
% Unfavourable (score of less than 2.5)	34%	42%	31%	20%	22%
% Neutral (score of 2.5 to 3.49)	32%	34%	32%	33%	26%
% Favourable (score of 3.5 and higher)	34%	24%	37%	47%	52%
Mean	2.8	2.5	2.8	3.1	3.2

Q6a_L-Q6a_M. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: Excluding “Don’t know/Prefer not to say” responses, n=3404.

Perceptions of recognition and consequences

A total of four statements were presented to gauge staff perceptions of recognition and consequences at CSC. A slight majority of staff either strongly disagreed or disagreed that management is consistent when disciplining employees when it is required (53%) while half disagreed that CSC provides appropriate recognition for a job well done (50%). As well, over twice as many staff disagreed that disciplinary consequences that staff face for their actions were fair as there are who agreed that they are fair (42% vs. 20%).

If there is something on which staff generally agree is that they have a clear understanding of the types of performance and behaviours that will lead to being disciplined. On that matter, 70% agreed while 17% disagreed.

Areas of focus

Staff not at NHQ were more likely to strongly disagree or disagree with the following statements compared to those at NHQ:

- Believe management is consistent when disciplining employees (58% vs. 30%).
- CSC provides appropriate recognition for a job well done (55% vs. 27%).

- The disciplinary consequences that employees face for their actions are fair (46% vs. 23%).
- Have a clear understanding of the type of performance and behaviours leading to discipline (19% vs. 8%).

Table 11 – Perceptions of recognition and consequences by areas of focus

I believe that management is consistent in terms of how it disciplines employees when it is required.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	53%	63%	51%	39%	30%
Strongly disagree	29%	39%	24%	14%	11%
Disagree	24%	24%	28%	25%	18%
Neither agree or disagree	19%	17%	20%	21%	23%
Agree	13%	10%	13%	19%	17%
Strongly agree	4%	3%	2%	5%	8%
Top-2 Box	16%	12%	15%	24%	24%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	12%	7%	13%	16%	23%
CSC provides appropriate recognition for a job well done.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	50%	60%	52%	35%	27%
Strongly disagree	25%	34%	25%	12%	8%
Disagree	25%	26%	27%	23%	19%
Neither agree or disagree	21%	19%	20%	23%	27%
Agree	22%	16%	22%	34%	34%
Strongly agree	6%	4%	5%	7%	11%
Top-2 Box	28%	20%	26%	41%	45%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%

Table 12 – Perceptions of recognition and consequences by areas of focus (continued)

In my opinion, the disciplinary consequences that employees face for the actions they've done are fair.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	42%	51%	39%	30%	23%
Strongly disagree	19%	26%	16%	11%	8%
Disagree	22%	25%	24%	19%	15%
Neither agree or disagree	25%	24%	26%	28%	26%
Agree	15%	13%	16%	20%	19%
Strongly agree	4%	4%	3%	4%	8%
Top-2 Box	20%	16%	19%	25%	27%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	14%	9%	15%	18%	25%
I clearly understand the types of performance and behaviours that will lead to being disciplined.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	17%	22%	12%	10%	8%
Strongly disagree	6%	9%	4%	2%	3%
Disagree	10%	13%	8%	7%	6%
Neither agree or disagree	12%	13%	13%	10%	9%
Agree	40%	38%	42%	42%	42%
Strongly agree	30%	27%	31%	38%	38%
Top-2 Box	70%	64%	73%	80%	80%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%

Q6a_N-Q6a_Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: All respondents, n=3413.

A summary index was developed to provide an overall average score across all statements related to recognition and consequences. “Don't know / prefer not to say” responses were excluded from average scores, and respondents needed to have provided a valid rating of 1 to 5 for at least one statement to be included in the overall index calculation (with a rating of 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree).

The national average index score for “Recognition and Consequences” was 2.9 which represents a mid-range overall score.

Areas of focus

Employees working at institutions (43%) were more likely to have an unfavourable index score compared to those working at the community or district level (28%), at RHQ (18%), and at NHQ (12%).

Table 12 – Recognition and consequences index by areas of focus

Average score	Total (n=3405)	Institution (n=1,898)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=405)	National HQ (n=561)
% Unfavourable (score of less than 2.5)	32%	43%	28%	18%	12%
% Neutral (score of 2.5 to 3.49)	35%	34%	41%	35%	35%
% Favourable (score of 3.5 and higher)	32%	23%	31%	47%	53%
Mean	2.9	2.6	2.9	3.3	3.4

Q6a_N-Q6a_Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: Excluding “Don’t know/Prefer not to say” responses, n=3405.

Perceptions of engagement of middle management

A total of two statements were presented to gauge staff perceptions of engagement of middle management at CSC. While 30% of employees strongly agreed or agreed that middle management is empowered to do their job and support the culture, a greater proportion strongly disagreed or disagreed (44%). The trend is reversed when it comes to whether staff agree that managers and supervisors at CSC encourage employees to respect the vision and mission of the organization by modelling the appropriate behaviour. In this case, 44% generally agreed while 33% generally disagreed.

Areas of focus

Staff who are not at NHQ were more likely to generally disagree with both statements compared to those at NHQ:

- Middle management is empowered to do their job and support the culture (47% vs. 29%).
- Managers encourage employees by modeling appropriate behaviour (37% vs. 14%).

Table 13 – Perceptions of engagement of middle management by areas of focus

I feel that middle management is empowered to do their job and support the culture.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	44%	52%	45%	32%	29%
Strongly disagree	18%	24%	18%	9%	10%
Disagree	26%	28%	27%	23%	19%
Neither agree or disagree	21%	21%	20%	23%	20%
Agree	23%	19%	24%	31%	34%
Strongly agree	6%	4%	7%	8%	11%
Top-2 Box	30%	23%	31%	39%	45%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	5%	4%	4%	5%	6%
Managers and supervisors at CSC encourage employees to respect the vision and mission of the organization by modelling the appropriate behaviour.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	33%	42%	27%	18%	14%
Strongly disagree	15%	21%	11%	6%	4%
Disagree	18%	21%	17%	12%	10%
Neither agree or disagree	21%	21%	23%	21%	18%
Agree	34%	28%	37%	42%	44%
Strongly agree	11%	7%	12%	16%	20%
Top-2 Box	44%	35%	49%	58%	64%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%

Q6a_R-Q6a_S. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: All respondents, n=3413.

A summary index was developed to provide an overall average score across all statements related to middle management engagement. “Don’t know / prefer not to say” responses were excluded from average scores, and respondents needed to have provided a valid rating of 1 to 5 for at least one statement to be included in the overall index calculation (with a rating of 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree).

The national average index score for “Middle Management Engagement” was 2.9 which represents a mid-range overall score.

Areas of focus

Employees working at institutions (39%) were more likely to have an unfavourable index score compared to those working at the community or district level (28%), at RHQ (17%), and at NHQ (14%).

Table 14 – Engagement of middle management index by areas of focus

Average score	Total (n=3381)	Institution (n=1,888)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=391)	Regional HQ (n=401)	National HQ (n=554)
% Unfavourable (score of less than 2.5)	30%	39%	28%	17%	14%
% Neutral (score of 2.5 to 3.49)	30%	31%	31%	28%	26%
% Favourable (score of 3.5 and higher)	40%	30%	42%	55%	60%
Mean	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.4

Q6a_R-Q6a_S. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: Excluding "Don't know/Prefer not to say" responses, n=3381.

Perceptions of tone from the top

A total of five statements were presented to gauge staff perceptions of the tone from the top at CSC. For nearly all statements considered, a greater proportion of staff disagreed than there were who agreed.

More specifically, nearly half of all employees (46%) strongly disagreed or disagreed that senior management consistently demonstrates the desired culture through their actions while 29% either strongly agreed or agreed. A similar result was obtained when staff were asked if they felt that senior management holds managers and supervisors accountable for their actions (43% strongly disagreed or disagreed while 26% strongly agreed or agreed). This trend continues when they were asked if they are kept informed of the actions that are being taken to obtain the culture senior management would like to see at CSC (43% strongly disagreed or disagreed while 31% strongly agreed or agreed). Results are similar when it comes to whether the tone from senior management is consistent with the type of workplace culture they value – in this case, 41% strongly disagreed or disagreed while 35% strongly agreed or agreed.

The balance tips slightly in favour of agreement when staff were asked whether senior management effectively communicates the type of culture it would like to see at CSC. For this metric, 41% strongly agreed or agreed while 37% strongly disagreed or disagreed.

Areas of focus

Those not working at NHQ were more likely to either strongly disagree or disagree with each statement compared to those working at NHQ:

- Senior management consistently demonstrates the desired culture through their actions (49% vs. 29%).
- Senior management holds managers and supervisors accountable for their actions (47% vs. 27%).
- They are kept informed of the actions taken to obtain the culture senior management would like to see at CSC (46% vs. 30%).
- Tone from senior management is consistent with the type of workplace culture they value (45% vs. 25%).
- Senior management effectively communicates the type of culture it would like to see at CSC (40% vs. 23%).

Table 15 – Perceptions of tone from the top by areas of focus

Senior management at CSC is consistently demonstrating the desired culture through their actions.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	46%	54%	44%	32%	29%
Strongly disagree	22%	28%	22%	13%	11%
Disagree	24%	27%	22%	19%	19%
Neither agree or disagree	22%	22%	26%	21%	22%
Agree	21%	16%	20%	30%	32%
Strongly agree	8%	6%	7%	13%	12%
Top-2 Box	29%	22%	27%	42%	45%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	3%	2%	4%	5%	4%

Table 16 – Perceptions of tone from the top by areas of focus (continued)

Senior management at CSC holds managers and supervisors accountable for their actions.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	43%	51%	38%	33%	27%
Strongly disagree	24%	31%	22%	13%	10%
Disagree	20%	21%	16%	20%	17%
Neither agree or disagree	22%	21%	22%	23%	24%
Agree	19%	15%	21%	24%	25%
Strongly agree	7%	5%	7%	10%	11%
Top-2 Box	26%	20%	29%	34%	36%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9%	8%	10%	11%	13%
I am kept informed of the actions that are being taken to obtain the culture senior management would like to see at CSC.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	43%	51%	39%	29%	30%
Strongly disagree	17%	23%	16%	7%	8%
Disagree	25%	28%	23%	22%	22%
Neither agree or disagree	24%	24%	23%	24%	22%
Agree	24%	19%	28%	34%	31%
Strongly agree	7%	4%	7%	12%	13%
Top-2 Box	31%	23%	35%	46%	44%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	3%	2%	3%	2%	5%

Table 16 – Perceptions of tone from the top by areas of focus (continued)

The tone from senior management is consistent with the type of workplace culture I value.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	41%	51%	39%	25%	25%
Strongly disagree	20%	27%	19%	10%	9%
Disagree	21%	24%	20%	15%	16%
Neither agree or disagree	22%	22%	20%	22%	21%
Agree	25%	18%	30%	35%	36%
Strongly agree	10%	7%	9%	15%	17%
Top-2 Box	35%	25%	39%	50%	53%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%
Senior management effectively communicates the type of culture it would like to see at CSC.	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Bottom-2 Box	37%	46%	32%	21%	23%
Strongly disagree	16%	21%	13%	8%	8%
Disagree	21%	25%	19%	13%	14%
Neither agree or disagree	21%	22%	22%	20%	20%
Agree	30%	24%	33%	40%	41%
Strongly agree	10%	7%	11%	18%	15%
Top-2 Box	41%	31%	44%	57%	56%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%

Q6b_T-Q6b_X. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: All respondents, n=3413.

A summary index was developed to provide an overall average score across all statements related to tone from the top. “Don’t know / prefer not to say” responses were excluded from average scores, and respondents needed to have provided a valid rating of 1 to 5 for at least one statement to be included in the overall index calculation (with a rating of 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree).

The national average index score for “Tone from the Top” was 2.8 which represents a somewhat unfavourable overall score.

Areas of focus

Employees working at institutions (51%) were more likely to have an unfavourable index score compared to those working at the community or district level (35%), RHQ (24%), and NHQ (23%).

Table 16 – Tone from the top index by areas of focus

Average score	Total (n=3397)	Institution (n=1,898)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=392)	Regional HQ (n=403)	National HQ (n=557)
% Unfavourable (score of less than 2.5)	41%	51%	35%	24%	23%
% Neutral (score of 2.5 to 3.49)	29%	28%	33%	30%	29%
% Favourable (score of 3.5 and higher)	30%	21%	31%	47%	48%
Mean	2.8	2.5	2.9	3.2	3.3

Q6b_T-Q6b_X. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: Excluding "Don't know/Prefer not to say" responses, n=3397.

Audit criteria index summary

To compare between the various key audit criteria, the average index scores can be used to determine which criteria are performing better overall across a variety of key subgroups.

The resulting index scores revealed that CSC is performing highest at employee engagement (3.5), with mildly unfavourable to neutral scores observed for all other criteria.

Favourable scores:

- Employee engagement (3.5)

Moderately unfavourable to neutral scores:

- Open dialogue (2.9)
- Engagement of middle management (2.9)
- Recognition and consequences (2.9)
- Tone from the top (2.8)
- Clear communication (2.8)

Areas of focus

Employees not at NHQ were more likely to have a lower index score for each of the audit criteria compared to those working at NHQ:

- Employee engagement (3.4 vs. 3.9)
- Open dialogue (2.8 vs. 3.5)
- Engagement of middle management (2.7 vs. 3.4)
- Recognition and consequences (2.8 vs. 3.4)
- Tone from the top (2.7 vs. 3.3)
- Clear communication (2.8 vs. 3.2)

Staff working in institutions were more likely to have a lower index score for each of the audit criteria compared to those not working in institutions:

- Employee engagement (3.3 vs. 3.8)
- Open dialogue (2.7 vs. 3.3)
- Engagement of middle management (2.7 vs. 3.3)
- Recognition and consequences (2.6 vs. 3.2)
- Tone from the top (2.5 vs. 3.1)
- Clear communication (2.5 vs. 3.1)

Table 17 – Index score summary by areas of focus

Response	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Employee Engagement	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.9
Open Dialogue	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.4	3.5
Engagement of Middle Management	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.4
Recognition and Consequences	2.9	2.6	2.9	3.3	3.4
Tone from the Top	2.8	2.5	2.9	3.2	3.3
Clear Communication	2.8	2.5	2.8	3.1	3.2

Q6a-Q6b_X. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Base: Excluding “Don’t know/Prefer not to say” responses, n=3411.

C. Extent of impact of COVID-19 pandemic

Employees were asked to consider whether any changes at CSC resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic have influenced the organizational culture at CSC, and if so, in which manner.

A quarter of staff (25%) believe that the changes made have for the most part worsened CSC’s organizational culture, while 13% believe that the changes made have for the most part improved culture. Most of the remaining employees (40%) described the changes as having mixed results on the organizational culture. Some employees (15%) did not notice any impact of the changes on culture at CSC, while 7% preferred not to provide an answer.

Areas of focus

Employees working in institutions (37%) were more likely to believe that the changes have worsened CSC’s culture compared to those working at the community or district level (12%), RHQ (11%), and NHQ (4%). Conversely, perceptions that the changes have improved CSC’s culture are highest among employees at NHQ (30%), a view that gradually weakens as we consider RHQ (22%) and community staff (21%), and then ending with institution staff (5%).

Table 18 – Extent of impact of COVID-19 pandemic by areas of focus

Response	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
The changes made have for the most part worsened CSC’s organizational culture	25%	37%	12%	11%	4%
The changes made have had mixed results on the organizational culture	40%	38%	48%	43%	36%
The changes made have for the most part improved CSC’s organizational culture	13%	5%	21%	22%	30%
I have not noticed any impact	15%	13%	14%	15%	23%
Prefer not to say	7%	6%	4%	8%	8%

Q7. Since March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic led to many changes at CSC. Has the impact of the changes made at CSC since the start of COVID-19 influenced the organizational culture at CSC? Which of the following statements best reflects how you feel: Base: All respondents, n=3413.

Impact of pandemic-related changes on culture – perceived improvements

Employees who noticed changes to the culture were then asked to describe specific examples of changes that have improved the culture at CSC. Survey participants entered their response using an open-ended text box. Responses were grouped thematically.

Results reveal that a slight majority of employees mentioned an aspect related to workload and hybrid work (52%). This was by far the most common theme on which employees touched. Two themes make up the next tier of responses: 22% of staff referred to an aspect related to employee engagement, while 18% focused on various improvements to operations. The next most common themes touched on communication within the organization, more specifically clear communication (6%) and open dialogue (4%).

Within each of the themes, employees more specifically referred to the following:

- Specific mentions related to workload and hybrid work mainly focused on the option to work from home (44%), as well as flexibility and accommodation in the schedule (21%).
- When referring to an aspect of employee engagement, employees more specifically touched on improvements to employee morale and teamwork (8%), engagement via virtual meetings (8%), as well as an improved sense of productivity and autonomy (7%).
- Improvements to operations mostly referred to an increase in the use of new initiatives and technology (9%), implementing best practices for COVID safety (4%), improved cleanliness (3%), as well as improvements to service and population control (3%).

Roughly one in six employees could not think of any positive impact on culture because of pandemic-related changes at CSC (17%), while 7% provided negative comments in response to this question.

Areas of focus

Employees in institutions were noticeably less likely to refer to improvements in the areas of workload and hybrid work (36%), employee engagement (15%), and recognition and consequences (1%). On the other hand, they were much more likely to only think of negative outcomes from the pandemic (11%) and to not be able to think of any positive outcomes at all (26%).

Table 19 – Improvements to organizational culture resulting from the pandemic by areas of focus (NET)

NET response	Total (n=2661)	Institution (n=1,523)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=321)	Regional HQ (n=311)	National HQ (n=389)
Workload and hybrid work	52%	36%	79%	74%	76%
Employee engagement	22%	15%	23%	32%	39%
Improvements to operations	18%	19%	14%	18%	23%
Clear communication	6%	6%	5%	6%	8%
Open dialogue	4%	3%	3%	4%	7%
Benefits and compensation	3%	2%	2%	4%	5%
Recognition and consequences	3%	1%	5%	6%	4%
Professional development	2%	1%	2%	3%	3%
Engagement of middle management	1%	1%	<1%	1%	2%
Working with offenders	1%	1%	-	-	1%
Tone from the top	<1%	<1%	-	1%	1%
Other	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Can only think of negative comments	7%	11%	3%	2%	2%
Nothing/can't think of any	17%	26%	7%	5%	4%
Not sure/unsure	4%	4%	1%	2%	1%

Q8. Please provide some examples of improvements to CSC's organizational culture that were introduced because of the pandemic? Base: Respondents who noticed impacts of COVID-19 on organizational culture, n=2661.

Impact of pandemic-related changes on culture – perceived deteriorations

Employees who noticed changes to the culture were then asked to describe specific examples of changes that have worsened the culture at CSC. Survey participants entered their response using

an open-ended text box. Responses were grouped thematically according to the culture audit criteria.

Staff raised a variety of ways in which culture changed for the worse with four particular themes representing the bulk of responses. First, 31% referred to negative changes related to workload and hybrid work. This was then followed by aspects of work related to tone from the top (25%), open dialogue (24%), and employee engagement (21%). Other areas in which culture was seen as changing for the worse included: recognition and consequences (13%), benefits and compensation (10%), engagement of middle management (9%), and clear communication (7%).

Within each of these themes, employees more specifically referred to the following:

- Specific comments related to workload and hybrid work included excessive workload (15%), frustration with the manner that work from home was rolled out and with the negative impact of this policy (13%), and the sense that CSC does not see the benefit of hybrid work options (5%).
- Issues related to tone from the top primarily focused on perceptions of inadequate response to the pandemic (19%), and a lack of focus on CSC's mission and mandates (5%).
- Issues related to open dialogue primarily revolved around a greater sense of division both within and between groups, and increased sciolism (22%).
- Comments related to employee engagement included the impact on team work and productivity caused by staff working at home (6%), a lack of in-person interactions (6%), a lack of dedication among staff (4%) and feelings of isolation both at home and at the office (4%) among others.
- Issues related to recognition and consequences focused almost entirely on increased pressure in the workplace and a lack of appreciation for essential workers (8%).
- Issues related to benefits and compensation included various abuses of leave (6%), inadequate efforts towards employee assistance (2%), and inadequate pay for work (2%).
- When staff touched on engagement of middle management, they mostly referred to a lack of accountability, support and leadership from managers and supervisors (9%).

Nearly one in ten employees could not think of any negative impacts on organizational culture caused by the pandemic (9%).

Areas of focus

Staff who do not work at NHQ were more likely to refer to issues in the following areas compared to those working at NHQ:

- Tone from the top (27% vs. 13%)
- Recognition and consequences (15% vs. 4%)
- Benefits and compensation (11% vs. 4%)

Employees working in institutions were more likely to raise issues in the following areas compared to those who work in other environments:

- Tone from the top (31% vs. 17%)
- Recognition and consequences (17% vs. 8%)
- Benefits and compensation (13% vs. 6%)

Table 20 – Negative impacts to organizational culture resulting from the pandemic by areas of focus (NET)

NET response	Total (n=2661)	Institution (n=1,523)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=321)	Regional HQ (n=311)	National HQ (n=389)
Workload and hybrid work	31%	33%	32%	29%	25%
Tone from the top	25%	31%	21%	17%	13%
Open dialogue	24%	23%	27%	31%	21%
Employee engagement	21%	21%	24%	28%	18%
Recognition and consequences	13%	17%	11%	9%	4%
Benefits and compensation	10%	13%	8%	7%	4%
Engagement of middle management	9%	10%	9%	7%	6%
Clear communication	7%	7%	9%	7%	6%
Improvements to operations	5%	5%	9%	3%	6%
Working with offenders	4%	6%	2%	1%	1%
Diverse policy concerns	4%	4%	2%	4%	2%
Professional advancement	2%	2%	5%	2%	2%
Other	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%

Dislikes many things or everything	1%	1%	-	<1%	-
Haven't been here long enough to comment	<1%	<1%	-	<1%	1%
Nothing negative/same/can't think of any	9%	6%	7%	11%	21%
Unsure/don't know	4%	2%	3%	4%	4%

Q9. Please provide some examples of ways CSC's organizational culture has changed for the worse because of the pandemic? Base: Respondents who noticed impacts of COVID-19 on organizational culture, n=2661.

D. Proposed changes to CSC's culture

To wrap up the survey, employees were asked to specify the one thing they would change about CSC's culture if they could change anything. Survey participants entered their response using an open-ended text box. Responses were grouped thematically according to the culture audit criteria.

The two most popular themes were employee engagement and open dialogue. More specifically, nearly a third of staff would make changes in the area of employee engagement (31%), and a similar proportion would improve areas related to open dialogue (29%). At least one in ten staff made recommendations for improvements in the following areas: job recognition and consequences (16%), tone from the top (13%), access to professional development opportunities (11%), and, clear communication (10%). Slightly fewer would make changes in the area of workload and hybrid work (9%).

Within each of these themes, employees referred to the following:

- When touching on employee engagement, employees are more specifically seeking changes to foster a more positive work environment (13%), changes that promote camaraderie (10%), as well as changes to improve equity and inclusiveness (7%) among other suggestions.
- Changes related to open dialogue primarily focused on a need for improved communication and interaction between managers and employees (18%). Additional suggestions included consulting with employees when making changes (5%), and engaging employees in decisions (4%).
- Suggestions related to recognition and consequences included addressing the lack of accountability or of a clear process to address incidents (10%), as well as a need for equal accountability in job performance (7%).
- Recommendations related to tone from the top were varied and included an improved focus on the mission (4%), addressing nepotism and favoritism (4%), a lack of meaningful work (2%), as well as addressing abuse of power and authority (2%).

- Suggestions related to professional development included a need to improve hiring and recruiting processes (5%), providing clearer steps to opportunities for advancement (4%), and improved training (3%).
- Changes related to clear communication included improved timeliness, consistency, and relevancy of communications (6%), as well as clear policies and operating procedures (4%).
- Specific mentions related to workload and hybrid work included effective management of workloads (5%), a better approach to hybrid work options (3%), and prioritizing work-life balance (3%).

One in ten employees provided no answer (10%), while a few did not feel any changes were needed (3%).

Areas of focus

Employees working at the community level were more likely to recommend changes in the following areas compared to those working in other areas of focus:

- Workload and hybrid work (20% vs. 8%).
- Improvements to operations (12% vs. 7%).

Table 21 – Proposed changes to CSC’s culture by areas of focus (NET)

NET response	Total (n=3413)	Institution (n=1,901)	Community/ District/ Parole Office (n=393)	Regional HQ (n=408)	National HQ (n=562)
Employee engagement	31%	34%	29%	30%	25%
Open dialogue	29%	31%	30%	27%	27%
Recognition and consequences	16%	18%	17%	17%	12%
Tone from the top	13%	15%	15%	10%	9%
Professional development	11%	12%	14%	9%	11%
Clear communication	10%	11%	9%	9%	11%
Workload and hybrid work	9%	6%	20%	13%	9%
Improvements to operations	7%	6%	12%	7%	8%
Benefits and compensation	4%	4%	6%	5%	3%
Working with offenders	3%	4%	1%	<1%	1%
Policy concerns	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%
Engagement of middle management	1%	1%	<1%	1%	<1%
Other	7%	7%	7%	5%	7%

Change everything/needs an overhaul/so many things	1%	2%	-	<1%	<1%
Haven't been here long enough	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Nothing to change/can't think of any/continue/none	3%	2%	4%	5%	8%
No answer/no comment	10%	7%	5%	11%	12%

Q10. On a final note, if you could change one thing about CSC's culture, what would it be? Base: All respondents, n=3413.

Qualitative research results

A. Overall perceptions of workplace culture

Each interview and focus group gave staff an opportunity to describe what they liked the best about the work they do at CSC and, if anything, what they are most proud of in their work at CSC.

What employees like the most about working at CSC

The two most common themes that surfaced when describing what they liked the best included the type of work they do and the people with whom they work.

Those who focused on the type of work they do tended to refer to the broader role they play in relation to CSC's mission and mandate rather than on the day-to-day tasks. This could include "keeping Canadians safe", "supporting offenders in their rehabilitation", and helping and supporting staff. Some also referred to appreciating that the work they do allows them to practice in a field in which they feel passionate about, which included work related to correctional services specifically (such as rehabilitation, security, etc.) or to certain functions within the service such as IT, communications, human resources, healthcare, etc.

When discussing what they enjoy about the work they do, some also liked that their work involves a lot of variety ("each day is different", "there is never a dull moment"), it offers many challenges and it gives them an opportunity to have an impact or make a difference, whether at the offender level, at a team level or at a strategic level.

Those who focused on the people with whom they work almost always referred to their immediate team. These participants would describe the nucleus of individuals with whom they work as professional, competent, dedicated, and supportive. Sometimes this would also include an immediate supervisor or manager while in other instances, participants stressed the importance of having a strong group of peers in the absence of a strong immediate manager or leader. At times, participants would explain that they enjoy working with individuals at CSC given their level of passion and dedication to the mandate. Finally, in some instances, participants would exclusively refer to enjoy working with their immediate manager who would be described as professional, competent, dedicated, and supportive.

It is also worth noting that for some, the strength of their team is often what helps them either overcome or tolerate to some extent the variety of challenges they face on a regular basis.

Beyond the work and the people, other aspects of working at CSC that were mentioned as highlights for some staff included job security, good compensation, and the benefits package.

Analysis by area of focus

Results by area of focus reveal a variety of consistencies and differences in what staff enjoy the most about the work they do at CSC. Many across the organization, irrespective of the area of focus, enjoy their immediate team members – in other words, the people with whom they spend the most time. While this was not a universal truth, it was a popular one.

Employees who work in institutions expressed a range of sentiments when asked what they liked the most about the work they do. It is arguably the work environment where the most extreme views were heard, ranging from individuals who enjoy many aspects of the work they do to individuals who do not like any aspect at all. Views varied from the frontline, to middle management to senior management. They also varied from institution to institution and across departments within an institution. Ultimately, this complex, multi-layered, and diverse range of opinions characterized the responses to all questions explored in this research, not just what employees like the most about their work at CSC. As well, this makes it impossible to capture how individuals across all institutions feel on any issue with broad strokes beyond summarizing them as complex, multi-layered, and diverse.

One theme that was more likely to surface through conversations with individuals working in institutions, especially frontline staff, was compensation, benefits and job protection.

Employees in the community most often explained that they particularly like their team, with an emphasis on their peers. They also often explained that they enjoy the role they play in protecting citizens and working with offenders as they transition to and adapt to community life. Staff in this area of focus also tended to feel that they were doing the type of work that best aligned with their passions and schooling.

When asked what they like the most about their work at CSC, staff at RHQ and NHQ shared similar views. The focus was most often on their team (which, contrary to those in institutions and in the community, tended to include the manager as part of the team) and the opportunity to make, or at least be involved in decisions that have impact on the organization.

What employees are most proud of in their work at CSC

When discussing what they are most proud of in their work at CSC, a variety of themes emerged. Some would refer to specific accomplishments such as having participated on special assignments or in special projects. Some would refer to having successfully progressed through the organization. Others would say they are most proud of the work they have done with their clients, whether those are offenders or staff.

Managers, especially senior managers, would often say they are proud of their team and what their team has been able to accomplish. Finally, many participants in management and middle management positions, especially those who had recent experience on the frontlines, also explained that they were proud of having persevered through challenging work situations and environments to get to “a better place in the organization.”

Some women in middle management and management positions also explained how proud they were to have succeeded in an environment that has, historically, been male-dominated.

Finally, it should be noted that some frontline staff (meaning those whose work mostly or entirely involves direct contact with offenders), were hard pressed to think of anything they were proud of in the work they do at CSC.

Analysis by area of focus

At the institution level, staff pride was often rooted in perseverance, which included things such as their ability to do their job, to remain true to their values, and to even advance despite what many describe as a very challenging work environment. Employees in institutions were also apt to explain how proud they are of the many successes in which they’ve been involved, which include having “made a difference” in the rehabilitation journey of an offender, security-related incidents, and even saving a life. That said, this was the work environment where staff were most likely to either hesitate or be unable to answer when asked for the aspect of their work of which they were the proudest.

At the community level, employees were most likely to be proud of the many reintegration successes in which they and their team have been involved.

At RHQ and at NHQ, many staff have long histories at CSC of which many are very proud. These histories often include overcoming a variety of challenges, working on special projects or assignments, working in different types of environments, and working with a variety of internal and external groups. Staff, especially managers and senior managers, at RHQ and NHQ are also more likely to talk about how proud they are of their team’s accomplishments. While team accomplishments were also a source of pride among institution and community staff, it seemed more pronounced among RHQ and NHQ staff.

The most challenging aspect of the work they do

While most participants were proud of the work they do and that they liked certain aspects of the work they do, they all face challenges. In some cases, one or two specific challenges overshadow all others and in other cases, the variety and number of challenges were too many to list.

Some of the more common challenges faced by staff can best be summarized as follows:

- Excessive workload / too few resources.
- Constantly changing priorities / the organization is reactive and not proactive / the organization is overly reactive to external forces (e.g., political, public opinion, media, labour partners, etc.).
- Rather than creating teachable moments, the organization focuses on “the blame game.”
- A “toxic” work environment: working with offenders is difficult / working with other staff is difficult / managers are not managing / there is too much favouritism.
- Accountability without authority / too much centralization / too much upwards delegation.
- Prioritizing process over purpose / losing sight of the mandate.
- Lack of emphasis on staff wellbeing / too little staff recognition.
- Inadequate attention paid to departments outside of “operations.”
- Staff do not feel as though their voice is being heard.
- Lack of good managers and/or genuine leadership at multiple levels.
- Lack of a cohesive and concerted effort to achieve the mandate / the organization is fractured in many ways / everyone works in silos / departments do not collaborate / there is a divide between staff and management and between NHQ and many other parts of the organization.

Many of these challenges overlap or have a causal relationship. For instance, it was often said that constantly shifting priorities leads to excessive workload which in turn leads to a lack of staff wellbeing. Similarly, constantly changing priorities contributes to excessive workload which in turn leads to prioritizing process over purpose.

Analysis by area of focus

Staff across all areas of focus were united in terms of the various key challenges they face in their work at CSC. Many staff across all four areas of focus face the challenges listed above in varying degrees and in different ways. That said, some challenges were more likely to be raised in each area of focus.

In institutions, references to a “toxic” work environment were more frequent. There were also many references to divides in the organization, most notably between institutions and NHQ, between staff and management, and between departments within the same institution. As well, staff often talked about too little staff recognition and about their voice not being heard.

At the community level, excessive workload and lack of resources were often raised, as were struggles with policies being developed at NHQ without their input, and the organization's focus on process rather than purpose. A lack of emphasis on staff wellbeing and staff recognition was also a common issue at this level.

At RHQ, staff struggled most often with accountability without authority and with time delays caused by too much upwards delegation. They also were more likely to talk about constantly changing priorities and how the organization is overly reactive.

At NHQ, there were frequent mentions of inadequate attention paid to departments outside of "operations", there are too many changing priorities, the organization is too reactive and not sufficiently forward-thinking and that there is too much upwards delegation.

How employees describe the current culture at CSC

Finally, to get a quick sense of overall culture at CSC, respondents were asked to select one or two words that they feel best describes the current culture. Many participants felt that trying to describe the overall culture at CSC was quite impossible – they tended to feel that CSC was an agglomeration of many sub-cultures that exist at multiple levels throughout the organization. Most often, participants felt that there is a culture at NHQ which is in many ways different than what is experienced in each of the regions, which could then in turn be quite different than the culture lived in each of the community sites and institutions. Many also agreed that at NHQ and within an institution there are multiple sub-cultures. This led many to suggest that the overall culture is multi-faceted, complex, incoherent, broken and divided.

By focusing on the culture they experience on a regular basis, participants tended to use a variety of terms which more often than not reflected or captured some of the main challenges they encounter in their workdays. Some of the more common ways in which culture was described was toxic, challenging, thankless, hierarchical, reactive, lacking accountability, risk-averse, unchanging, and process-driven.

Not all terms used by staff focused on the challenges that they or the organization face. Some do see the culture in a positive light in which case terms such as professional, team-focused, dedicated, and hard-working were used.

Analysis by area of focus

Interestingly, staff at all levels of the organization used similar terms to describe the current culture at CSC. As noted above regarding the challenges employees face, some terms were more commonly used in certain areas of focus compared to others. Notably, the terms toxic, challenging,

lacking accountability, and thankless were more likely to be used at the institution level. Staff at the community level also often used the terms challenging and thankless but they also referred to the culture as being process-driven. At RHQ and NHQ, the culture was much less likely to be considered “toxic” and more focused on strategic considerations such as risk-averse, unchanging, and reactive. At those levels, staff were also more likely to use positive language such as professional, team-focused, dedicated, and hard-working.

B. Exploring open dialogue and employee engagement

Participants were invited to share their thoughts on how well they feel management performs in terms of actively gathering and listening to feedback from employees at all levels and positions in the organization.

Participants were fairly unified in thinking that the organization is quite effective at gathering feedback from employees but performs quite poorly when it comes to actively listening to that feedback. Most participants feel they have many mechanisms at their disposal to share feedback including various surveys, manager open door policies, consultations on directives, and team meetings. There is also a sense that the organization is making a greater effort to provide more opportunities for staff to share their feedback.

That said, many also believe that the efforts aimed at open dialogue and employee engagement are in many ways artificial and nothing more than efforts to demonstrate that mechanisms are in place for employees to share feedback. Many employees, including managers, from middle managers up to and including senior managers, feel that while they are invited to share feedback, they do not believe this feedback is taken into consideration and some even believe it is not even heard. Two of the more common examples cited by participants pertained to participation in surveys, especially the Public Service Employee Survey (PSES), and when they are invited to provide feedback on Commissioner Directives (CD’s).

- Everyone was familiar with the PSES and while many continue to participate, many explained that they and many of their colleagues have stopped participating because they believe that no matter how often they participate or what the results show, no changes are seen. This leads them to believe that this form of employee engagement is hollow and meaningless.
- Similarly, employees, in particular, managers who are invited to provide feedback on CD’s are irritated by the routinely limited number of days to submit input to then receive a final CD at the end of said consultation that has not changed despite the feedback that was provided. This leads employees to believe that the interest in their input is not authentic

and that the consultation was nothing more than “a ticky-box exercise” to demonstrate that they were given a chance to provide feedback.

Other commonly cited challenges or barriers related to open dialogue and employee engagement included the following:

- Other than through surveys, some do not believe they have any mechanisms to share feedback.
- Not all middle-manager and manager doors are truly “open.”
- Some employees are reluctant to share feedback out of concern for repercussions from either their peers or their immediate supervisor or manager.
- Some open-door policies allow employees to share feedback, which they can do, but some have come to realize that this leads to nothing. Some are appreciative that they can share feedback with their immediate supervisor or manager even though they are informed that there is not much that their superior can do with that feedback.
- A rigid organizational hierarchy limits the extent to which staff can speak to their “manager’s manager.”
- The organization’s structure also impedes some individuals from seeing their manager very often which limits their ability to interact with them and share feedback. Common examples here included individuals who work shifts and individuals who report to someone located in a different part of the province or country.

For the most part, the discussion around open dialogue and employee engagement leaves most employees feeling like the manner in which decisions are taken at CSC is best described as top-down rather than collaborative.

Analysis by area of focus

Views on open dialogue and employee engagement vary across areas of focus. For the most part, individuals at NHQ and to some extent RHQ feel like there is some collaboration in the decision-making process, they have genuine opportunities to voice their opinions, they feel comfortable voicing their opinions and they are more likely to believe that their voice is heard. On the other hand, the feeling that CSC is top-down is strongest at the institutional and community levels where many staff do not believe their supervisor or manager is interested in their opinions and even if they are, those suggestions rarely gain momentum at higher levels of the organization.

While the culture appears more collaborative at NHQ and RHQ, this should not be misconstrued to mean that there is never collaboration in the community or in institutions. While most would argue that there is a lot of work to be done on this front, many also propose that there have been improvements or at least efforts are being taken to increase collaboration. Similarly, RHQ and NHQ staff explained that despite somewhat healthy degrees of collaboration in their work environments, many emphasized that there remains work to be done since, in the end, the decision-making process is more often than not top-down.

A particular sore point, especially but not exclusively among employees at the institution and community levels, is that decisions that impact their day-to-day work are taken at NHQ by, in their view, individuals who have no frontline or institution experience. They believe that the organization's inability to incorporate input from all levels of the organization into those decisions is a clear demonstration to them that, despite all feedback mechanisms made available to them, CSC remains a "top-down" organization.

Root cause analysis

Staff were asked to share their views on why CSC performs poorly when it comes to open dialogue and employee engagement and why decisions are taken in a top-down fashion.

An important contributing factor according to many is that the organization is risk-averse and is reluctant to change. As such, any suggestions for change are either dismissed out of hand or are met with long review and approval cycles which often result in the status quo.

Some also propose that many of the policies are rooted in legislation and that irrespective of what staff might want to propose or change, things cannot change without changing the law.

Some also feel that the organization is too large to realistically always consider feedback from all employees.

Some also suggested that ideas for change are muted by managers who, out of concern for their own careers, are reluctant to "rock the boat." Similarly, there are beliefs that the organization is more likely to reward managers who agree to support and implement directives from above rather than managers who want to change the status quo. Some observed that many management positions are held by actors who, wanting to secure an indeterminate position or just generally impress, may be more reluctant to manage change from reports compared to a manager holding their position substantively.

Some feel that managers at all levels are too busy to effectively collect, process and communicate ideas for change upwards. On a related note, some feel that the organization is too busy

addressing priorities stemming from external pressures to manage any suggestions for change stemming from internal voices.

Finally, a good number of employees also believe that the organization remains rigidly hierarchical and paramilitary in nature and that it is in its DNA (and the DNA of some of its leaders) to follow an established chain of command that sees decisions taken at the top and followed obediently by subordinates. These staff believe that suggestions are systematically dismissed because they are grassroots.

C. Exploring clear communication

When asked to provide their feedback on the communication style at CSC, employees tended to focus on two aspects of communication. They would comment on overall corporate communication and they would comment on communication that happens, formally and informally, at a more micro or team-based level. In the end, communication at CSC represented somewhat of a paradox for staff – on the one hand it was considered plentiful if not excessive and on the other hand it was also seen as lacking and ineffective.

When assessing communication at CSC, especially corporate communication, employees would focus almost exclusively on the emails they receive. For most, this refers to what staff call “GEN-COM” emails. This form of communication was deemed by many as the main means of communication for CSC. Many feel that the culture at CSC is such that “if it was emailed, then it was communicated and nothing else needs to happen.” While the tone of these emails was considered professional and the content quite comprehensive, their volume was almost always considered overwhelming, and their relevance often deemed lacking. This has compelled many to be very selective in reading these emails with some staff admitting that they do not read any of them at all.

The challenge seems to be mainly with relevance – employees are annoyed with receiving emails that have little to no impact on their work or even their department. Even if they do receive something that could pertain to their work in general, the content of the email does not allow them to easily decipher or operationalize the information; in other words they do not always understand the information and if they do, it is not always clear to them what they need to do with the given information. The challenge is further compounded by the behaviour among many to delete many emails without even opening them.

It was also explained by many that the challenge is not just that they receive many emails. Their ability to manage their inbox is further hindered by what many see as an already unmanageable

workload. This sentiment was just as likely to be voiced by managers and supervisors as it was to be voiced by staff.

These various challenges related to email communication at CSC lead many to assign a high level of importance to verbal communication, especially at the team level. Those who feel that communication overall is working well at CSC also tend to be employees who believe that team-level communication is strong. These individuals have opportunities to meet as a group or individually with their supervisor, or even someone above their supervisor, so that key information is shared, interpreted, and operationalized. This allows the employee to not only be made aware and understand the information being shared but know how it directly applies to their day-to-day work. Conversely, those who feel that communication at CSC is ineffective also tend to be those who believe that, despite the many emails they receive, too little information is shared with them, they are not given opportunities to discuss the “why” behind certain decisions or procedures and ultimately feel they are on a “need to know” basis or that they are being blind-sided by new procedures or priorities.

Another area related to communications which is seen as a weakness at CSC is the organization’s inability to effectively communicate what it does with employee feedback or why certain employee feedback is not taken into consideration when decisions are made. While some fully understand that in some ways the organization is limited by legislation and consequently certain changes suggested by employees cannot happen, this is not always a relevant factor nor are all employees necessarily cognizant of what can and cannot be changed because of underlying legislation. As for feedback obtained through mechanisms such as town halls, team meetings, and surveys, many managers and senior managers explained that feedback is often considered and survey results are analyzed and digested. These steps sometimes lead to action plans and yet they feel that many of these efforts are not effectively conveyed to all levels of the organization. They see that as a missed opportunity to demonstrate that management is in fact actively listening and that certain decisions, priorities and changes are introduced as a direct result of employee engagement and feedback.

Certain changes that happened at CSC because of the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on communications. Employee views of those changes are mixed. The increase in videoconference meetings was seen by some as an opportunity for their team to meet more often and more efficiently, especially for teams whose members are not all in the same location. Certain senior managers and executives who have staff located in different locations met more often with them, resulting in improved two-way communication. On the other hand, the fact that some staff were working from home either permanently or occasionally reduced or limited the opportunities for some teams to meet as often as they used to or even to meet as needed. In an environment where

team-level communication is so valued, this was seen by many as a critical barrier to overall communication.

The weekly messages from the Commissioner were also the subject of feedback in the context of clear communication. These were often viewed and considered quite differently than “GEN-COM” emails. First, many staff appreciated that the Commissioner is communicating directly with them, something which, while not perfect, they viewed as an overall improvement in communications at CSC. Those who appreciated this communication felt it opened a window on what is happening in other parts of the organization, it conveyed and reinforced the organization’s values (e.g., diversity, inclusiveness, etc.), and featured interesting staff and team stories. Those who connected less well with this communication felt that it consistently overlooked challenges with which they contend regularly and instead, focuses on “priorities” and storylines that they consider quite secondary. As noted later in this report in the section dedicated to “tone from the top”, some staff are not inclined to pay attention to communications about values which they view as disconnected from their daily lived experience.

Analysis by area of focus

Employees across each of the areas of focus agreed that communications at CSC are a weakness.

The challenges related to corporate communications and the use of GEN-COM emails are especially acute at the institution and community levels where many employees explained that their email inbox is further “cluttered” by emails that are forwarded and re-forwarded to them. Some explained that they often get the same email from different individuals in the organization. Furthermore, many employees (such as correctional officers, nurses, etc.) do not have regular access to a computer or are not always sitting at a computer.

While there were critics, use of and appreciation for the Commissioner’s weekly messages were more pronounced at NHQ and RHQ.

Root cause analysis

Staff were asked to share their views on why they believe CSC performs poorly when it comes to communications.

Many feel that to better understand the relevance and implications of certain communications on their day-to-day duties, their supervisor or manager should take the time to customize the information. Some suspect managers and supervisors are too busy to personalize communications. Some also suspect that certain managers and supervisors are of a mindset that it is the employee’s responsibility to read communications sent to their attention and that it is not

up to them to personalize the information in that communication. As well, some also believe that certain managers are not good communicators.

Some believe that CSC relies heavily on email for communication for three main reasons: first, some are assuming that because it is a very large organization, email is the most efficient way to get a message out to all staff. Second, given the type of information being communicated, it is important for that information to be consistently shared with all staff. Third, some suspect that CSC needs to be able to demonstrate that certain information has been communicated to employees, and email is the best way to do this.

Finally, many staff suspect that certain managers and executives believe that if something has been emailed, it has been communicated and nothing else needs to happen.

D. Exploring employee recognition and consequences

Participants were then invited to discuss the approaches taken by CSC when it comes to employee recognition and employee discipline. A common sentiment among staff in various positions and levels of the organization is that CSC is seen as quick to discipline and slow to recognize employees.

Employee recognition was seen through two lenses – formal and informal recognition. While many believe that the means for formal recognition are adequate and sufficient at CSC, there remain many weaknesses. Firstly, not everyone seemed aware of or familiar with the various forms of formal employee recognition such as the extra mile awards, instant awards, long service awards, etc. Those who were aware of them had mixed feelings towards them. On the one hand they understand that, as a federal government department, there are financial limits to how the organization and its managers can formally recognize its employees. Despite those limitations, employees generally feel that the various forms of recognition are underutilized. There are also some who feel that even if they are nominated for an award, it takes far too long to receive it. One manager argued that “there is nothing instant about the instant award.” As well, some recall being handed their award in a rather unceremonious manner by their manager. Ultimately, the way formal recognition is managed at CSC leaves many with the feeling that employee recognition is an afterthought and a low priority at CSC.

Informal recognition at CSC received mixed reviews. Many, especially but not exclusively frontline employees, seem to believe that this is not part of CSC’s culture. Others, especially those with good working relationships with their immediate supervisor, believe that they receive informal recognition in a timely and authentic manner which leaves them feeling that recognition is well done at CSC. This recognition often takes the form of a verbal or email message thanking them for something they had done or recognizing they had gone over and above their regular call of duty.

It was also explained that “recognition” could and sometimes does take many forms. For instance, employees feel recognized when they are asked to be part of special assignments, when they are asked for their “expert” advice on something, or when they are promoted or assigned to an interim position. Employees also feel “recognized” when their immediate supervisor checks in on them from time to time, when their workload is considered or when their supervisor takes the time to listen to their feedback.

Ultimately, employees almost always conclude that how well employee recognition is done depends on the supervisor or manager. Some do it well and others not so much. Finally, some staff feel that the way someone might experience recognition is largely determined by who they know in the organization.

Analysis by area of focus

Employees across each of the areas of focus agreed that CSC can always do better when it comes to employee recognition.

The pattern that seems to emerge within each area of focus seems to be mostly related to hierarchy rather than at which of the four areas of focus the staff work. More specifically, within each of the four areas of focus, employee recognition appears to be at its weakest the closer one gets to the frontline or to administrative levels. As such, in institutions, recognition of frontline staff is especially weak (notably among correctional officers, parole officers, healthcare workers, etc.) and seems to improve as one’s role rises in the establishment. Similarly, at the community level, recognition is particularly weak among frontline staff (notably parole officers and administrative staff). Similar patterns emerge at NHQ and RHQ.

It also appears that staff who have more regular interactions with their manager are more likely to feel like recognition is working well. While proximity is no guarantee of success, it does seem to be a contributing factor. This represents important challenges for individuals who do shiftwork, as well as those whose managers or supervisors are not nearby such as certain institution staff in healthcare, programs, and education.

Root cause analysis

Staff were asked to share their views on why CSC performs poorly when it comes to employee recognition.

As noted earlier, not everyone seemed aware of or familiar with the various forms of formal employee recognition.

Employees also generally felt that the various forms of recognition are underutilized, something that both managers and employees acknowledged.

Many also believed that the administrative process surrounding awards is flawed because it takes far too long for an employee to receive their award.

As well, some recalled being handed their award in a rather unceremonious manner by their manager. This left them with the impression that not all managers believe in or value staff recognition.

Some explained that recognition is not part of CSC's history. Some suspect that if certain managers did not experience it progressing through the organization, then they are probably less likely to do it themselves.

In some cases, employee recognition is seen as ineffective because it is a by-product of favouritism.

In the end, many employees concluded that effective employee recognition requires time and effort on behalf of the manager or supervisor. This led to some staff suspecting that ineffective employee recognition happens at CSC for any or all of the following three reasons: despite their best intentions, some managers don't have the time to do it properly; some managers don't know how to do it properly; some managers are not interested in doing it, and some managers don't see or interact with their direct reports enough to know if or when recognition is warranted.

Employee discipline also received mixed reviews, although the general sense is that CSC's performance is lacking. Although there is consensus that the policies are clear in terms of what should lead to discipline and that discipline does follow a progression in line with policy, many argue that there remains too much latitude for managers and the overall process at CSC is flawed on many fronts.

Not everyone who participated in this research believes that employee discipline at CSC is flawed. Views among many suggested that the policies are in place and that discipline is handled with the attention and care that it deserves. Although there were exceptions, a general trend seemed to emerge that the higher in the hierarchy one worked, the more positive discipline in the organization was seen. Many senior managers and executives also highlighted that they have not needed to discipline their staff and as a result their experience with the disciplinary process is limited.

On the other hand, many employees have strong criticisms of the disciplinary process at CSC. Some of the more frustrating aspects as noted by employees included the following:

- Some feel that managers in general are held to a different standard and that they are not disciplined in the same way as other staff, if at all.
- Similar to recognition, some staff feel that the manner in which someone might experience discipline is largely determined by who they know in the organization. Favouritism was seen as responsible for sparing certain staff from discipline when it was warranted and it was seen as responsible for disciplining others unnecessarily.
- The disciplinary process is seen as taking far too long.
- The disciplinary process is considered cumbersome for managers.
- Some believe that staff who should be disciplined are often either moved to a different team or location or they are promoted. The underlying theory is that it is easier to move someone than it is to discipline them.
- Discipline is too quickly administered for what some might consider relatively minor “errors” or “oversights” while discipline is not adequately or consistently administered for more severe actions.

The perceived inequities in terms of discipline are viewed with greater concern and disapproval when they are combined with a management style that places too little effort and value in employee recognition.

Analysis by area of focus

The most vocal criticism came from staff working in institutions, followed by those who work in the community, although individuals RHQ and NHQ also had concerns. Employees in institutions and in the community were more likely to point out the various issues listed above. Those on the frontlines in institutions were also inclined to believe that employees are more likely to be disciplined than offenders and that in many ways, offenders are better treated than CSC staff.

It should be noted that not everyone could provide feedback on employee discipline since they had not experienced it themselves nor had they needed to administer any. This was more likely to be the case among RHQ and NHQ employees. If anything, employees at RHQ and NHQ were more likely to have to conduct performance management rather than discipline.

Root cause analysis

Staff were asked to share their views on why CSC performs poorly when it comes to employee discipline.

An issue related to discipline on which many employees seem to agree is that the disciplinary process is both cumbersome and takes a long time. These factors have been suggested by some as important contributing factors that might explain why some managers avoid disciplining staff.

Many also suspect that discipline does not happen as often as it should because it leads to nothing. The sense is that disciplinary measures are often if not always grieved and decisions are often (and according to some “always”) overturned. This then leads some staff to suggest that managers will not “waste their time” and go through a disciplinary process when they are already overworked and the disciplinary measure has a high likelihood of being grieved and overturned.

Some believe there are too many managers at CSC not appropriately trained regarding the disciplinary process and cases are often lost when they go to arbitration leaving many feeling like the process is either broken or useless. Some of the managers shared this view.

Some also believe that too many managers are in acting positions, which some feel discourages them from disciplining staff. Someone in an acting position may not be inclined to discipline one of their previous peers, especially if they will be on an equal footing in the near future. As well, managers in acting positions are often seen as “thrown into the position” and are not adequately trained for conflict resolution or on the disciplinary process.

Finally, some staff and managers feel like they are not supported by higher levels in the organization when it comes to staff discipline. Certain forms of discipline require review and approval from more senior managers, which not only takes significant time but also results too frequently in decisions to discipline being either ignored or overturned. This leaves managers feeling as though they are being held accountable with inadequate authority by both their immediate reports and the organization overall.

Some believe that certain labour partners are too vocal and influential which leads to certain staff not receiving the type of discipline that is warranted.

E. Exploring engagement of middle managers

There was widespread agreement that the culture that an employee experiences is largely determined by their manager or supervisor. As such, employees were first asked to explain what constitutes an “ideal” manager who, in their opinion, fosters an ideal workplace culture. The following were the most consistently proposed attributes or actions:

- they actively listen

- they are present
- they are accountable for their actions and hold their staff accountable for their actions
- they are competent
- they communicate efficiently and in a timely fashion
- they represent the interests of their team to senior managers
- they “check-in” from time to time
- they recognize their staff
- they are approachable
- they are professional
- they are respectful
- they prioritize the success of the team over their own success.

While many believe that it would be impossible for all CSC managers to fit the mold of what they consider an “ideal”, there is also a common belief that there is room for improvement.

A common weakness seen in CSC managers is that while they might be good “managers”, they are not necessarily well equipped to lead. A common example given is that many managers know CSC policy and directives however they do not have the right skillset to lead a team – they may lack skills such as conflict resolution, communication skills, performance management, etc.

An important part of the discussion regarding managers focused on what the organization could do to develop managers that are more likely to meet staff expectations and who foster the ideal workplace culture. The results from this discussion are captured in the root cause analysis section featured below.

Analysis by area of focus

CSC managers seem to be “better” as one moves up in the organization, in other words, higher in the organizational chart. While there are certainly excellent managers and supervisors at all levels, feedback from staff would seem to suggest that managers with shortcomings are more likely to be present as one gets closer to the frontline and to lower occupational levels.

There is also a common theory that if someone “evolved” in an institutional setting, they are less likely to have developed the ideal skill set to be both a manager and a leader. Again, there are

exceptions to this; however, it was a common view. Some explained that, historically, working in an institution is demanding, compliance-based, and often harsh work that involves daily exposure to negativity. Those who advance in this environment seem to naturally carry this forward in their own management style, which in turn shapes the next generation of supervisors and managers, resulting in a vicious cycle. While these individuals might have a strong understanding of the policies and regulations that govern an institution, they do not have sufficient staff management and leadership skills. While nobody suggested that their ability to “lead” should come at the expense of their technical competence, many do feel that managers should be selected and trained to have a more well-rounded skill set.

Employees saying they have a strong manager or senior manager were more likely to work at RHQ and NHQ. This is not to say that all RHQ and NHQ managers are strong, feedback simply suggests that positive comments were more likely to come from staff located at RHQ and NHQ than from those located in institutions and in the community.

Root cause analysis

Staff were asked to share their views on why certain CSC managers do not live up to staff expectations.

Many seem to believe that there are too many acting managers, which in turn weakens management at CSC overall. While acting positions can certainly be used to motivate staff to consider different types of work and more senior responsibilities, a good number of employees believe that this approach to filling positions and developing staff can in many ways lead to weak leadership and disgruntled staff. Some have proposed that an acting manager who knows they will only be in a position for a limited amount of time may not go “the extra mile” to support their staff, discipline, develop team competencies, mentor, etc. As well, someone who knows they will only hold a position for a limited number of months may not have all the competencies to hold that position nor might they be interested in taking on extra training to develop them which results in teams at CSC with managers who are less knowledgeable than one would like. It was also proposed that those taking on acting positions may not have enough time for training which leads to too much “trial by fire.”

Various forms of favouritism were also seen as an important reason why some individuals without management skills are selected for key positions.

Some believe that competitions for management positions do not take a holistic view of the individual’s skill set.

There seems to be inadequate time for shadowing and mentorship which leads to many managers being assigned their position and asked to perform immediately.

There are still too many who adhere to and believe in an archaic, paramilitary form of management which is anchored in a “command and obey” approach rather than what many consider a more modern holistic approach to management.

Finally, both staff and managers explained that managers are overworked and under-resourced and do not have enough time to follow management training. As well, they are overworked with little consideration for their mental health and wellbeing and so they, in turn, use this management approach on to their own staff, either forcibly or by choice.

A role that many agree a manager should play is foster a culture of inclusiveness. Support for inclusiveness is high although not all employees see or define “inclusiveness” the same way. Some of the more common interpretations of a culture of inclusiveness were the following:

- All voices are welcome to the table irrespective of ethnicity, gender, religion, etc.
- All employee voices are welcome irrespective of their position in the organization.

As such, inclusiveness is not just about accepting and even leveraging differences across employees, but also seen as engaging employees at all levels and positions in the organization. Feedback would suggest that there has been progress on this front over the years, especially in terms of gender inclusiveness, but there remains quite a bit of work ahead.

Analysis by area of focus

Feedback seems to suggest that progress on inclusiveness has been achieved in all parts of the organization but that challenges on this front are most noticeable in institutions.

F. Exploring “tone from the top”

Employees also all agreed that the culture that an organization experiences is in many ways set by what is said and done by that organization’s leadership team. For the most part, the focus of this discussion was on the Commissioner since few staff knew or had heard of anyone else at the executive level. Even here, a good number of staff, especially those on the frontlines, were unfamiliar with what was being said and done at the leadership level and as such could not provide much input.

In terms of what employees believe the leadership team is doing to contribute to an ideal workplace culture, the emphasis tended to be on broad communication of values and priorities. They believe that the tone of this communication is the right one and they appreciate the effort to convey, at a high level, the organization's values such as respect, inclusiveness, mental health, etc. There is also some appreciation for communication being sent out directly by the Commissioner which highlights key achievements and struggles experienced at all levels of the organization.

Some also viewed the audit on organizational culture and the associated research with employees as a step in the right direction in terms of understanding the current culture and, hopefully, addressing the many concerns employees have. While there is a clear understanding that this is an ambitious task which will take time, many are optimistic that change can happen if the leadership team perseveres and acts.

What tends to be frustrating for staff is that many of these priorities and values, while nice to hear, important and honourable, come across as largely disconnected from what is happening on the frontlines. There is a widespread belief, especially as one gets closer to the frontline, that CSC is "not walking the talk."

In order to foster a better culture, employees provided a variety of recommendations:

- A common recommendation was for the leadership team to become more familiar with the reality of what employees at all levels of the organization were living.
- There were also many in favour of a less formal and email-based approach to communication.
- Many would like more genuine engagement which incorporates feedback from employees at all levels and positions in the decision-making process.
- Staff would like the leadership team to be less reactive to external opinions and forces and be more proactive in terms of addressing the organization's mandate and mission.
- Staff would like the leadership team to assign more resources so that workload is better balanced and that, consistent with one of its priorities, employee mental health is better addressed.
- Employees would like the organization to show how much they value their employees by putting their wellbeing ahead of that of offenders.
- Finally, staff would like the leadership team to empower managers to make decisions and follow-up by making them more accountable for their actions.

Research Methodology

Quantitative research methodology

The research methodology consisted of an online survey with CSC employees. Quorus was responsible for coordinating nearly all aspects of the research project, including designing the research instrument, coordinating specific aspects of data collection, and delivering the required research report.

All CSC employees were invited to participate through an email survey invitation sent to their CSC email address. A database of 19,661 eligible survey candidates was provided to Quorus by CSC. This database was used by Quorus to distribute the individual links to each employee, as well as three reminder emails to participate during the data collection period. CSC took additional measures to maximize response rates. Quorus and CSC communications efforts were as follows:

- April 25, 2022 – Pre-launch message in *This Week at CSC* (internal newsletter), and a series of pre-launch messages on the HUB (CSC Intranet site)
- June 30, 2022 – Message from the Commissioner informing employees of the survey invitation (Launch on July 1)
- July 5, 2022 – Email to Union heads with FAQ for Audit of Organizational Culture
- July 25, 2022 – 1st reminder email from Quorus
- July 29, 2022 – Message from the Commissioner informing employees of the 1st survey reminder
- August 2, 2022 – Computer pop-up advertisement (image that appears on the screen of all employees when they connect to the CSC network)
- August 8, 2022 – Promotion of the survey in *This Week at CSC*
- August 25, 2022 – 2nd reminder email from Quorus
- August 26, 2022 – Message from the Commissioner informing employees of the 2nd survey reminder
- September 6, 2022 – Promotion of the survey in *This Week at CSC*
- September 13, 2022 – Physical poster put up at CSC workspaces
- September 16, 2022 – Reminder in the Commissioner’s weekly message
- September 19, 2022 – 3rd and final reminder email from Quorus
- September 23, 2022 – Message from the Commissioner informing employees of the 3rd and final survey reminder

The goal was to conduct a census of the CSC staff. The data in this report is not weighted. The distribution of this survey will not necessarily reflect the distribution of the employees who work for CSC. Results are not projectable to the entire population given the high proportion of total non-response, especially among institution staff. These results represent the opinions of the sub-group of employees who were willing to provide their feedback, the profile of which is presented in the demographic data available in this report.

As an attempted census of employees, no estimates of sampling error can be calculated. All research work was conducted in accordance with the professional standards established by the Government of Canada Public Opinion Research Standards, as follows:

- The survey consisted of an online survey with CSC employees.
- Respondents were invited to participate through an email invitation. All employees with a valid email were included in a database for distribution of the survey link.
- Quorus collaborated with the client team at CSC to design the survey instrument in English and translated the survey into French.
- Respondents had the choice to complete the survey in English or French and were informed of their rights under the Privacy and Access to Information Acts.
- The survey took roughly 25 minutes on average to complete, consisting of both open and closed-ended questions.
- Data collection occurred between June 27 and October 4, 2022 and included a pretest of 16 surveys conducted in English and five in French. The pretest helped to assess the flow of the survey, comprehension of the questions, language, data integrity, and particularly the length of the survey.
- A total of 3,413 surveys were completed. The equivalent margin of error for a probability study of 3,413 cases would be +/-1.5%.
- The final participation rate for this study was 17%.

This report compares findings across the audit's areas of focus. Given the fact that the study involved an attempted census, all differences between areas of focus should be considered real differences however given an overall participation rate of 17%, the reader should focus on broad trends.

All research was conducted in accordance with the *Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research – Online Surveys*.

Respondent Profile

Equity-denied groups	Total (n=3,413)	Region	Total (n=3,413)
Disability	11%	Prairie	24%
Indigenous	9%	National Headquarters	17%
Visible Minority - Other	6%	Ontario	17%
Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression Minority	5%	Pacific	15%
Visible Minority – Black	2%	Quebec	14%
None	52%	Atlantic	10%
Prefer not to say	19%	Prefer not to say	2%

Occupational group / classification	%	Occupational group / classification	%
Audit committee member (AM)	<1%	Hospital Services (HS)	<1%
Architecture and Town Planning (AR)	<1%	Information Services (IS)	<1%
Administrative Services (AS)	19%	Information Technology (IT)	2%
Clerical and Regulatory (CR)	9%	Nutrition and Dietetics (ND)	<1%
Computer Systems (CS)	1%	Nursing (NU)	3%
Correctional Services (CX)	18%	Occupational and Physical Therapy (OP)	<1%
Economics and Social Science Services (EC)	1%	Physical Sciences (PC)	<1%
Education (ED)	2%	Personnel Administration (PE)	2%
Engineering and Scientific Support (EG)	1%	Purchasing and Supply (PG)	<1%
Electronics (EL)	<1%	Pharmacy (PH)	<1%
Engineering and Land Survey (EN)	<1%	Programme Administration (PM)	1%
Executive (EX)	2%	Printing Operations (PR)	<1%
Financial Management (FI)	2%	Psychology (PS)	1%
General Labour and Trades (GL)	2%	Secretarial Stenographic, Typing (ST)	<1%
General Services (GS)	3%	Social Work (SW)	1%
General Technical (GT)	<1%	Welfare Programs (WP)	19%
Heating, Power and Stationary Plant Operations (HP)	<1%	Prefer not to say	9%
Historical Research (HR)	<1%	-	-

Age	%	Employment status	%
18-24	2%	Indeterminate	86%
25-29	5%	Term	6%
30-34	7%	Acting	1%
35-39	11%	Casual	1%
40-44	15%	Contract	<1%
45-49	16%	Student	<1%
50-54	16%	Other	<1%
55-59	10%	Prefer not to say	5%
60+	5%	-	-
Prefer not to say	13%	-	-
Survey language	%	Years at CSC	%
English	82%	5 or less	26%
French	18%	6 to 10	11%
-	-	11 to 15	22%
-	-	16 to 20	13%
-	-	21+	21%
-	-	Prefer not to say	7%

Gender	%	Area of focus	Survey %	Population %
Woman	52%	Institution	56%	73%
Man	31%	National Headquarters	16%	8%
Non-Binary	<1%	Regional Headquarters	12%	7%
Other	<1%	Community / District Offices / Parole Offices	12%	13%
Prefer not to say	17%	Other	2%	-
-	-	Prefer not to say	2%	-

Qualitative research methodology

The qualitative phase of this project consisted of a mix of virtual and remote qualitative research methodologies, consisting of online focus groups and 1-on-1 telephone and web-based depth interviews. In total, the project planned for 46 online focus groups and 120 1-on-1 depth interviews. Both the focus groups and depth interviews were held with employees within Correctional Service Canada, targeting various occupational groups and work locations to be as reflective of the target audience as possible.

Quorus was responsible for coordinating all aspects of the research project including working with CSC in designing and translating the invitation scripts and the moderation guide, coordinating all aspects of participant recruitment, managing the data collection platforms and related logistics, moderating all sessions and interviews, and delivering required reports at the end of data collection.

Target Audience and Sample Frame

This phase of the project targeted four broad segments of employees within Correctional Service Canada representing approximately 20,000 employees:

- 1,550 employees – National Headquarters
- 1,450 employees – Regional Headquarters
- 15,000 employees – Institutions
- 2,600 employees – Community Corrections

Employees were grouped by job classification by CSC to ensure adequate representation among each of the primary area of focus. A total of 17 employee groups were created as follows:

1. National Headquarters Directors / Director Generals
2. National Headquarters Middle Managers (EX minus 1, EX minus 2) and Regional Headquarters Regional Administrators
3. National Headquarters Employee Level
4. National Headquarters Executive Committee (Assistant Deputy Minister Level / Sector Head)
5. Regional Headquarters Assistant Deputy Commissioners (EX-2, EX-3)
6. Regional Headquarters Employee Level, includes CX-03's from institutions

7. Community Parole Office Supervisors (WP-05) / AS-05, FI-02
8. Community Parole / Program Officers (WP-04) / Other community positions (WP-03, PG-02, FI-01, GS, GL, HS, NU, PS, SW)
9. Community admin staff
10. Wardens (EX-2)/ Warden, Healing Lodges, District Directors (EX-2 Level)
11. Assistant Wardens (AS-07) and Deputy Wardens (AS-08)/Deputy-Director Healing Lodges (AS-07), Area Directors / Associate District Director (WP-06)
12. Institution Correctional Managers (CX-4)
13. Institution Correctional Officers (CX-1, CX-2)
14. Institution Manager Programs / Manager Assessment and Interventions (WP-05) / Unit Chiefs (Finance, Health Services, Operations and Maintenance, etc.) / Managers / Regional Headquarters FI-03's and FI-02's
15. Institution Parole Officers /Program Officers (WP-04) / Teachers / Security Intelligence Officers (AS-05) / Other Officers (WP-03) / Chiefs of Sentence Management (AS-05)
16. Institution Health Care Staff (Nurses, MH, Psychology)
17. Institution Works and Maintenance (Electricians, Food Services, etc.), Institutional Admin Staff

CSC was responsible for preparing the database of employees and for grouping all employees into the above categories. CSC then provided Quorus a database consisting of 17 subsets which contained nothing more than the employee's first and last names and their CSC email address.

Research Instrument Design

With the support of CSC, Quorus designed and translated the invitation scripts and the moderation/interview guide. The questions and themes explored in the focus groups and interviews were identical across all employee categories.

Questions were aimed at addressing the current culture of CSC and gathering insight on the root causes of a lack of alignment with the desired culture of the organization. Specific areas of exploration included but were not limited to:

1. **Tone from the top:** Senior management has defined CSC's values and emphasizes their importance while holding management accountable to appropriately execute their duties.
2. **Engagement of Middle Managers:** Managers ensure that the vision and mission of the organization are being respected by all employees by modelling appropriate behaviour and creating a culture of inclusiveness.
3. **Open Dialogue:** Management actively gathers and listens to feedback from employees at all levels and positions across the organization.
4. **Clear Communication:** Management reinforces the values and CSC's culture through clear communication of expectations across the organization.
5. **Employee Engagement:** All employees are engaged in discussions on how to fulfill CSCs mission, and all staff are working towards the same goal.
6. **Recognition and Consequences:** Management ensures employee recognition of successful events and outcomes and applies appropriate discipline when required.

Quorus provided an electronic copy of the draft version of the research instruments, in English, at least 5 days prior to fieldwork to enable PORD to review.

The Quorus team ensured that the English invitation scripts and moderation/interview guide were translated into French. All final versions of the research instruments were provided to CSC in both official languages.

Description of Data Collection Procedures

Data collection consisted exclusively of online focus groups, each lasting 1.5 to 2 hours each, and depth online and telephone interviews, each lasting approximately 60 minutes.

Participants were contacted and invited to attend by email (since not all employees have a direct work telephone number). For each online focus group, Quorus aimed to recruit approximately 8

participants to achieve 6 to 8 participants per focus group. If interest in a specific session was high, up to 10 to 12 participants could attend.

Recruitment of participants was conducted by Quorus from the in-house list provided by CSC. Employees were made aware by CSC that they could be contacted by Quorus to schedule a focus group or interview session.

Quorus worked with the CSC client team to establish the following:

- The specific employee categories that should only be invited to an interview instead of a group discussion; and
- The specific distribution of focus groups and depth interviews across the four broad segments of employees within CSC.

Employees were then randomly selected by Quorus and contacted to be invited to a focus group (unless they have been specifically targeted for a depth interview). Based on their interest and ability to attend their designated focus group, participants could participate in a depth interview instead.

- A few employees contacted the CSC Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector directly to participate in an interview or focus group. These individuals were contacted by Quorus to set up their session.
- No employee was denied participation. If their focus group was full or one was no longer available in their preferred official language (either because it was full or the session had already taken place), an employee was always offered the opportunity to participate in an interview.
- Six employees participated in both a focus group and an interview. These were individuals who first participated in their designated focus group and were interested in sharing more feedback via an interview. These employees were not double counted when calculating overall employee participation.
- For some of the larger employee categories, one scheduled focus groups was exclusively for individuals who identify as a member of an equity-denied group: Indigenous people, people with disabilities, people who are part of 2SLGBTQI+ communities, religious minority groups and racialized people. The language of the session was established by obtaining participant preferences ahead of the session. If an employee preferred to participate in the other official language, an interview was conducted.
- All online focus groups and interviews were done via MSTeams since this platform is regularly used by CSC.

- Employees participating in an interview had the choice to participate by telephone or online via MSTeams.
- Research participants were not offered an incentive for their participation.

Given the large number of employees in certain categories, not all employees were invited to this phase of the research project. The goal for this phase was not to conduct a census of employees but rather hear from a random selection of employees on organizational culture. All employees were given the opportunity to share their opinions on the subject matter via the online survey.

As such, for large employee categories, invitations were sent in batches of 20 to 25 emails at a time until the scheduled sessions for each category were filled. Because there was no official language indicator in the employee database provided by CSC, Quorus could not target specific employees for English or French sessions. This resulted in French focus groups being smaller in size since the distribution of invitations to all employees for a given category stopped once English sessions were filled.

All steps in the research process complied with the *Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research – Qualitative Research*. With respect to recruitment specifically, Quorus also respected the following requirements:

- All invitation emails to participate in a focus group or interview were bilingual.
- Upon request, participants were informed on how they can access the research findings.
- Upon request, participants were provided Quorus' privacy policy.
- Inform participants of their rights under the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act and ensure that these rights are protected throughout the research process. These assurances include informing participants of the purpose of the research, identifying both sponsoring department and research supplier, and informing participants that their participation in the study was voluntary and that the information provided will be administered according to the requirements of the Privacy Act.

At the recruitment stage and at the beginning of each session, participants were informed that the research was for CSC. Participants were also informed upfront of the audio recording of their session. Participants were also informed that nobody from CSC, other than those participating in their focus group, was observing their session and that recordings would remain exclusively with Quorus.

CSC took additional measures to promote participation, which are listed as follows:

- August 8, 2022 – Promotion of focus groups and interviews in *This Week at CSC*

- September 6, 2022 – Promotion of the focus groups and interviews in *This Week at CSC*
- September 13, 2022 – Physical poster put up at CSC workspaces
- October 11, 2022 – Promotional message in *This Week at CSC* (internal newsletter)
- November 4, 2022 – Reminder in the Commissioner’s weekly message
- December 5, 2022 – Email to EXCOM members promoting interviews
- December 6, 2022 – Email to union President promoting interviews
- March 3, 2023 – Reminder in the Commissioner’s weekly message

A total of 46 online focus groups and 120 depth interviews were planned. In the end, 37 online focus groups and 122 telephone and online individual depth interviews were completed, in which 318 CSC employees participated between October 11, 2022 and October 18, 2023. The specific configuration and distribution of the focus groups and interviews were as follows:

FG1 NHQ Directors / DG					
Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	Bilingual	Wednesday December 7	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	8	7
Interview requests / completed				5	4
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				13	11
INVITATIONS SENT				33	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				0	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				33	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				39.4%	33.3%

FG2 NHQ Middle Managers (EX minus 1, EX minus 2) and RHQ RA's					
Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Wednesday December 7	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	9	8
B	French	Tuesday December 13	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	5	4
C	English	Tuesday December 13	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	10	9
Interview requests / completed				8	5
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				1	1
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				31	25
INVITATIONS SENT				213	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				1	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				212	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				14.6%	11.8%

**FG3
NHQ Employee Level**

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Thursday November 24	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	8	8
B	French	Tuesday November 29	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	5	5
C	English	Tuesday November 29	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	9	9
Interview requests / completed				2	2
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				24	24
INVITATIONS SENT				605	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				12	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				593	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				4.0%	4.0%

**FG4
NHQ EXCOM (ADM Level / Sector Head)**

				Signed-up	Attended
Interview requests / completed				16	16
INVITATIONS SENT				18	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				0	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				18	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				88.9%	88.9%

**FG5
RHQ ADC (EX-2, EX-3)**

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	Bilingual	Thursday December 8	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	4	3
Interview requests / completed				4	3
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				8	6
INVITATIONS SENT				41	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				4	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				37	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				21.6%	16.2%

FG6

RHQ Employee Level, includes CX-03's from institutions

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Wednesday November 30	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	6	5
B	French	Monday December 5	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	2	2
C	English	Monday December 5	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	9	9
D	French	Friday December 9	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	7	5
Interview requests / completed				10	8
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				34	29
INVITATIONS SENT				385	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				16	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				369	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				9.2%	7.9%

FG7

Community Parole Office Supervisors (WP-05) / AS-05, FI-02

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Thursday December 1	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	7	6
B	French	Friday December 2	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	1	1
Interview requests / completed				6	4
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				14	11
INVITATIONS SENT				100	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				5	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				95	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				14.7%	11.6%

FG8

Community Parole / Program Officers (WP-04) / Other community positions (WP-03, PG-02, FI-01, GS, GL, HS, NU, PS, SW)

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Wednesday October 12	10:00 am to 11:30 am EDT	9	9
B	French	Monday October 17	10:00 am to 11:30 am EDT	5	1
C*	English	Tuesday October 25	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EDT	6	3
D	French	Wednesday January 25	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	3	3
E	English	Wednesday January 25	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	6	4
Interview requests / completed				6	5
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				2	2
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				33	23
INVITATIONS SENT				460	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				21	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				439	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				7.5%	5.2%

FG9

Community admin staff

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Wednesday November 23	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	6	6
B	French	Friday November 25	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	0	0
C	French	Friday January 20	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	0	0
D	English	Friday January 20	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	5	5
Interview requests / completed				4	3
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				15	14
INVITATIONS SENT				457	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				37	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				420	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				3.6%	3.3%

FG10

Wardens (EX-2)/ Warden, Healing Lodges, District Directors (EX-2 Level)

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Thursday December 8	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	6	6
B	French	Friday December 9	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	0	0
Interview requests / completed				7	7
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				1	1
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				12	12
INVITATIONS SENT				47	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				0	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				47	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				25.5%	25.5%

FG11

Assistant Wardens (AS-07) and Deputy Wardens (AS-08)/Deputy-Director Healing Lodges (AS-07), Area Directors / Associate District Director (WP-06)

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Tuesday December 6	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	10	10
B	French	Monday December 12	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	3	3
Interview requests / completed				9	8
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				22	21
INVITATIONS SENT				120	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				5	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				115	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				19.1%	18.3%

FG12

Institution Correctional Managers (CX-4)

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Wednesday December 14	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	10	8
B	French	Friday December 16	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	2	1
Interview requests / completed				8	4
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				20	13
INVITATIONS SENT				440	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				33	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				407	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				4.9%	3.2%

FG13

Institution Correctional Officers (CX-1, CX-2)

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Wednesday October 12	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EDT	4	3
B	French	Monday October 17	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EDT	0	0
C*	English	Thursday October 20	10:00 am to 11:30 am EDT	1	1
D	French	Tuesday October 25	10:00 am to 11:30 am EDT	0	0
E	English	Friday October 28	10:00 am to 11:30 am EDT	3	1
Interview requests / completed				24	20
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				32	25
INVITATIONS SENT				2854	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				216	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				2638	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				1.2%	0.9%

FG14

Institution Manager Programs / Manager Assessment and Interventions (WP-05) / Unit Chiefs (Finance, Health Services, Operations and Maintenance, etc.) / Managers / RHQ FI-03's and RHQ FI-02's

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A*	TBD	Thursday December 1	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	3	3
B	English	Friday December 2	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	8	6
C	French	Friday December 2	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	1	0
D	French	Friday January 27	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	2	2
E	English	Friday January 27	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	11	6
Interview requests / completed				14	9
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				39	26
INVITATIONS SENT				290	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				10	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				280	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				13.9%	9.3%

FG15

Institution Parole Officers / Program Officers (WP-04) / Teachers / Security Intelligence Officers (AS-05) / Other Officers (WP-03) / Chiefs of Sentence Management (AS-05)

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A*	TBD	Friday December 9	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	7	4
B	French	Thursday December 15	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	2	2
C	English	Thursday December 15	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	7	6
D	French	Friday February 3	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	0	0
E	English	Friday February 3	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EST	9	7
Interview requests / completed				6	5
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				1	1
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				30	23
INVITATIONS SENT				370	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				19	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				351	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				8.5%	6.6%

FG16**Institution Health Care Staff (Nurses, MH, Psychology)**

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Wednesday December 14	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	5	4
B	French	Friday December 16	10:00 am to 11:30 am EST	1	0
Interview requests / completed				9	8
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				0	0
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				15	12
INVITATIONS SENT				602	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				50	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				552	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				2.7%	2.2%

FG17**Institution Works and Maintenance (Electricians, Food Services, etc.), Institutional Admin Staff**

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	Signed-up	Attended
A	English	Thursday October 13	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EDT	6	6
B	French	Thursday October 20	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EDT	7	6
C	English	Friday October 21	10:00 am to 11:30 am EDT	11	8
D*	English	Monday October 24	1:00 pm to 2:30 pm EDT	3	2
Interview requests / completed				7	6
Staff who participated in a focus group and an interview				1	1
TOTAL: SIGN-UP VS ATTENDANCE (NO DOUBLE-COUNTING)				33	27
INVITATIONS SENT				1315	
INVALID EMAILS / BOUNCED EMAILS				63	
TOTAL VALID INVITATIONS SENT				1252	
TOTAL: % SIGN-UP VS ATTENDED				2.6%	2.2%

All focus groups and interviews were moderated by Quorus senior researcher Rick Nadeau.

Piloting the Qualitative Approach

For this study, the research team scheduled three focus groups with the following employee groups:

- October 12, 2022: Community Parole / Program Officers (WP-04) / Other community positions (WP-03, PG-02, FI-01, GS, GL, HS, NU, PS, SW)
- October 12, 2022: Institution Correctional Officers (CX-1, CX-2)

- October 13: Institution Works and Maintenance (Electricians, Food Services, etc.), Institutional Admin Staff

For these sessions, the research team paid close attention to discussion flow and assessed whether adjustments to the moderation guide were needed. These “pre-test sessions” were conducted as real qualitative sessions in actual conditions, following the moderation guide, to identify any potential issues with the questions asked, the length of the session, and any issues encountered with the platform used by participants to express their opinions.

Following a debrief session with the client team, no modifications were deemed necessary to the moderation guide or the data collection process. All results from the pilot sessions were included in the analysis and results presented in this report.

Since the one-on-one interviews for this project were condensed versions of focus groups, it was not deemed necessary to conduct a pre-test with this format. That said, close attention was paid to how the first few one-on-one interviews unfolded.

Qualitative research disclaimer

Qualitative research seeks to develop insight and direction rather than quantitatively projectable measures. The purpose is not to generate “statistics” but to hear the full range of opinions on a topic, understand the language participants use, gauge degrees of passion and engagement, and leverage the power of the group to inspire ideas. Participants are encouraged to voice their opinions, whether or not those views are shared by others.

Due to the sample size, the special recruitment methods used, and the study objectives themselves, it is clearly understood that the work under discussion is exploratory in nature. The findings are not, nor were they intended to be, projectable to a larger population.

Specifically, it is inappropriate to suggest or infer that few (or many) real-world users would behave in a certain way simply because few (or many) participants behaved in this way during the sessions. That kind of projection is strictly the prerogative of quantitative research.

Appendices

Survey instrument

2022 Audit of organizational culture – employee survey

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this survey.

Just a quick reminder that we would appreciate if you submit your completed survey by midnight (EDT) on **September 30, 2022**.

If you cannot complete the entire survey in one session, you can exit the survey at any point in time and use the same link that was sent to you to continue the survey from the point where you left off.

We appreciate your involvement in this important initiative.

A. Overall perceptions of culture at CSC

- 1) We will begin by getting your feedback on the overall workplace culture at CSC. In a nutshell, an organization's culture refers to all the values, expected behaviours and beliefs that all staff share. These will influence the interactions between management, employees and other groups of individuals with whom the organization might interact, such as offenders, stakeholders, partners, contractors, etc. Ideally, an organization's culture supports its mission.

Generally, how would you describe the culture at CSC these days?

- Excellent
- Very good
- Fair
- Poor
- Very poor
- Prefer not to say

- 2) Overall, how has the culture at CSC been changing over the past three or four years? If you have worked at CSC for a shorter period of time, consider from the moment you started your employment at CSC.

- It has generally been headed in the right direction – there have been more positive steps than negative ones
- Not much has changed
- It has generally been headed in the wrong direction – there have been more negative steps than positive ones
- Prefer not to say

3) What, if any, would be the one or two aspects of the current organizational culture that you appreciate or feel most positively towards?

4) What do you like most about working at CSC and why?

5) What do you like the least about working at CSC and why?

B. Audit criteria drill-down

STATEMENT LEGEND - INTERNAL USE ONLY:

- a. Open Dialogue
- b. Employee Engagement
- c. Clear Communication
- d. Recognition and Consequences
- e. Engagement of Middle Management
- f. Tone from the top

6) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

PROGRAMMING NOTES:

- **GROUP STATEMENTS INTO THREE BLOCKS: A-K; L-S; T-X**
- **RANDOMIZE STATEMENTS WITHIN EACH BLOCK**
- **RANDOMIZE THE PRESENTATION OF THE THREE BLOCKS**
- **DO NOT INCLUDE THE LETTER AT THE END OF EACH STATEMENT SINCE THIS IS FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY**

- a) Management makes efforts to gather feedback from employees at all levels and across the organization. (a)
- b) I feel that management takes employee feedback into consideration when making decisions. (a)
- c) I am given enough opportunities to have my voice heard through activities like team meetings, town halls, etc. (a)
- d) I feel comfortable asking questions and speaking up in team meetings and town halls. (a)
- e) I understand CSC's mission and priorities. (b)
- f) I agree with CSC's mission and priorities. (b)
- g) I understand how I can contribute towards achieving CSC's mission and priorities. (b)

- h) Employees are on the same page when it comes to how we can all work towards achieving CSC's mission and priorities. (b)
- i) Management clearly communicates its expectations to employees to reinforce the type of culture it is looking to achieve. (b)
- j) I feel supported in the work that I do. (b)
- k) I feel like I am part of the team. (b)
- l) The communication approaches CSC employs are efficient and work well. (c)
- m) CSC's organizational culture is clearly defined and understood. (c)
- n) CSC provides appropriate recognition for a job well done. (d)
- o) I believe that management is consistent in terms of how it disciplines employees when it is required. (d)
- p) In my opinion, the disciplinary consequences that employees face for the actions they've done are fair. (d)
- q) I clearly understand the types of performance and behaviours that will lead to being disciplined. (d)
- r) Managers and supervisors at CSC encourage employees to respect the vision and mission of the organization by modelling the appropriate behaviour. (e)
- s) I feel that middle management is empowered to do their job and support the culture. (e) NOTE: Middle management includes all managers below the EX level.
- t) Senior management at CSC holds managers and supervisors accountable for their actions. (f)
- u) Senior management effectively communicates the type of culture it would like to see at CSC. (f)
- v) I am kept informed of the actions that are being taken to obtain the culture senior management would like to see at CSC. (f)
- w) The tone from senior management is consistent with the type of workplace culture I value. (f)
- x) Senior management at CSC is consistently demonstrating the desired culture through their actions. (f)

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don't know / Prefer not to say

7) Since March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic led to many changes at CSC. Has the impact of the changes made at CSC since the start of COVID-19 influenced the organizational culture at CSC? Which of the following statements best reflects how you feel:

- The changes made at CSC **as a result of the pandemic** have for the most part improved CSC's organizational culture
- The changes made at CSC have had mixed results on the organizational culture – some changes have improved it while others have made it worse
- The changes made at CSC have for the most part worsened CSC's organizational culture
- I have not noticed any impact of the changes made at CSC as a result of the pandemic on its organizational culture
- Prefer not to say

8) **[SKIP IF Q7="I have not noticed any impact" or "Prefer not to say"]** Please provide some examples of **improvements** to CSC's organizational culture that were introduced because of the pandemic?

9) **[SKIP IF Q7="I have not noticed any impact" or "Prefer not to say"]** Please provide some examples of ways CSC's organizational culture has **changed for the worse** because of the pandemic?

10) On a final note, if you could change one thing about CSC's culture, what would it be?

C. Demographics

These final few questions will be used to help the research team understand if responses from certain groups of individuals are any different from other groups. We would like to remind you that your responses will be protected in accordance with the [Privacy Act](#). Your identity will be further safeguarded by grouping your responses with those of other respondents when reporting results.

1) Please select the area where you are physically located:

- Institution
- Community / District Office / Parole Office
- Regional Headquarters
- National Headquarters
- Other, please specify: _____

2) Please select the CSC region that you report to:

- Pacific
- Prairie
- Ontario
- Quebec
- Atlantic
- National Headquarters

3) Please select your occupational group/classification and level: *(Format as two drop down lists)*

Occupational group / classification				Level
AM	EL	IT	PS	01
AR	EN	MD	SW	02
AS	EX	ND	ST	03
CR	FI	NU	WP	04
CS	GL	OP	Prefer not to say	05
CX	GS	PC		06
DD	GT	PE		07
DM	HP	PG		08
EC	HR	PH		09
ED	HS	PM		10
EG	IS	PR		11
				12
				13
				Prefer not to say

4) Please select your current employment status:

- Indeterminate
- Term
- Casual
- Contract
- Student
- Other, please specify: _____
- Prefer not to say

5) How many years have you worked for the Correctional Service of Canada?
(Drop down starting with <1 up to 30+)

- Prefer not to say

6) Please select your age range:

- 18-24
- 25-29
- 30-34
- 35-39
- 40-44
- 45-49
- 50-54
- 55-59
- 60+
- Prefer not to say

7) With which gender do you identify?

- Man
- Woman
- Or please specify here: _____
- Prefer not to say

8) Intersectionality is important. Please select any of the following equity-denied groups that you identify with: *(Check all that apply)*

- Indigenous
(Includes First Nation, Inuit, or Métis)
- Racialized minority – Black
(Includes anyone who identifies as Black)
- Racialized minority – Other
(Includes anyone - other than an Indigenous or Black person - who is non-white in colour or race. Examples include but are not limited to Asian, East Indian, or Latin American.)
- Disability
(Includes anyone with a physical, mental, intellectual, cognitive, sensory, learning or communication impairment, or a functional limitation, whether apparent or not, and permanent, temporary or episodic in nature, that hinders a person's full and equal participation in society when they face a barrier)
- Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression Minority
(Examples include but are not limited to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, two-spirit, non-binary, or gender non-conforming)
- None of the Above
- Prefer not to say

Thank you for participating in the *Internal Audit of Organizational Culture Employee Survey* and choosing to influence the organization's culture and future.

This survey was initiated by the Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector. If you would like to provide additional feedback regarding the organizational culture at CSC or if you have any questions regarding *the Internal Audit of Organizational Culture*, you can reach out to the Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector through this email address: AUDITCulture.GEN-NAT@CSC-SCC.GC.CA.

In terms of next steps, Quorus Consulting Group Inc. will also be collecting staff feedback through focus groups and interviews. The Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector will be using this data as one form of evidence in the overall audit. A report summarizing the findings from the online survey, the focus groups and the interviews will be prepared and, within 6 months of completing all data collection, will be posted on the website of Library and Archives Canada.

The Internal Audit Team will also be conducting additional data analysis through various other means, including examining results from the Public Service Employee Surveys, the 2021 National Employment Equity Survey of Women Employees at CSC, employee complaints and grievances, employee discipline, employee harassment complaints, and work stoppages. The Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector will be using the available data and information to finalize an audit report. This report will be presented to Senior Management and the Departmental Audit Committee in the Winter 2023, and upon its approval will be made publicly available.

ON BEHALF OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA, THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Focus group invitation script template

SUBJECT LINE: Audit of Organizational Culture – Employee Focus Groups / Groupes de discussions avec les employé(e)s aux fins de l’audit de la culture organisationnelle

[TEXT TO BE INCLUDED IN EMAIL]

(Le français suit.)

Correctional Service Canada (CSC) is currently conducting an audit of organizational culture, with the objective of determining whether its actual organizational culture is in line with its desired one. [To understand more about the internal audit that is taking place, please refer to: <http://thehub/En/about-csc/sectors/internal-audit/organizational-culture/Pages/default.aspx>.]

This audit would be incomplete if it did not hear from CSC employees. CSC is working with Quorus Consulting Group to conduct focus groups with CSC staff to obtain their views and feedback on the organization’s culture. Input from these sessions will complement the results obtained from the ongoing organization-wide *Internal Audit of Organizational Culture Employee Survey* which was launched in early July.

With over 20,000 employees, it would be impossible to hold focus groups with all staff. As such, you are among a randomly selected slice of CSC employees who have been invited to attend a focus group with some of your peers. We want to reassure you that your invitation to a focus group is random – it has not been influenced by your tenure at CSC, your history at CSC or by your manager or supervisor.

Here are some additional important details regarding these focus groups:

- The discussion will be led by a senior researcher from Quorus Consulting [the same research team responsible for the *Internal Audit of Organizational Culture Employee Survey*].
- No more than eight individuals will be participating in each focus group.
- We have organized these groups so that all participants in a given group do a similar type of work or that they are all from the same organizational level. As well, staff would never be in the same group as their supervisor or manager.
- Your responses will in no way affect your relationship with CSC, your manager or your supervisor.
- The Quorus researcher will do an audio recording of the session for notetaking purposes. Any notes taken by the Quorus research team would not identify any participant by name.
- Nobody from CSC will be observing the sessions nor will they have access to any recordings.
- Your identity will be further safeguarded by grouping your responses with those of other focus group participants when reporting results.

- Individuals are not required to participate if they are invited to a focus group. If they attend a focus group, participants are not required to provide an answer to each question posed by the researcher.

In terms of logistics, all focus groups will be videoconference meetings held online using MS Teams and are scheduled to last 90 minutes. If you agree to participate, please coordinate with your manager to ensure you are provided with access to a computer or laptop in a private room or office if you do not already have access to these amenities. You will not be in the same room as another individual participating in your focus group.

If you are interested, please RSVP as soon as possible (seating is limited) by replying to this email and selecting the group in which you would like to participate:

Session	Focus Group Language	Date	Time	RSVP deadline
A	English	XX	XX	XX
B	French	XX	XX	XX
C*	TBD	XX	XX	XX

NOTE: *Session C is exclusively a safe space focus group for individuals who identify as a **member of an equity-denied group**: Indigenous people, people with disabilities, people who are part of 2SLGBTQI+ communities, religious minority groups and racialized people.

Although we encourage group participation, one-on-one interviews (telephone or videoconference) can be scheduled for staff who prefer sharing their feedback this way rather than in a focus group.

If you have any questions about these focus groups or the *Audit of Organizational Culture* in general, you can reach out to the Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector through this email address: AUDITCulture.GEN-NAT@CSC-SCC.GC.CA.

Important: Please do not forward this invitation to other staff. Participation in the focus groups is by invitation only.

We hope you'll be able to participate!

Quorus Consulting Group Inc.
 Telephone 833.739.1983
 E-mail discussions@quorusconsulting.com
www.quorusconsulting.com



QUORUS is an ESOMAR Corporate Member and an accredited member of the Canadian Research Insights Council (CRIC), demonstrating our commitment to following the best practices and the highest standards and ethics in the research industry.

Le Service correctionnel du Canada (SCC) mène présentement un audit de la culture organisationnelle, dont l'objectif est de déterminer si la culture organisationnelle actuelle correspond à celle désirée. [Pour mieux comprendre le déroulement de cet audit interne, veuillez vous rendre à <http://thehub/Fr/a-propos-du-scc/secteurs/verification-interne/culture-organisationnelle/Pages/default.aspx>].

Il nous serait impossible de compléter cet audit sans obtenir la perspective des employés et employées du SCC. Le SCC collabore avec le groupe-conseil Quorus pour organiser des groupes de discussion avec le personnel du SCC afin d'obtenir leurs points de vue et leurs commentaires sur la culture de l'organisation. L'information recueillie lors de ces discussions viendra étoffer les résultats du *Sondage auprès du personnel du SCC aux fins de l'audit interne sur la culture organisationnelle* à l'intention de tout le personnel du SCC lancé au début du mois de juillet.

L'effectif du SCC s'élève à plus de 20 000 personnes, d'où l'impossibilité de tenir des groupes de discussion avec tous les membres du personnel. C'est pourquoi vous faites partie d'un groupe d'employées et d'employés du SCC choisis au hasard pour participer à un groupe de discussion avec des collègues. Nous tenons à vous rassurer que votre invitation à participer au groupe de discussion est tout à fait aléatoire – ni votre ancienneté ou vos antécédents au SCC, ni votre gestionnaire ou superviseur n'ont eu d'influence sur votre invitation.

Voici quelques renseignements supplémentaires importants concernant ces groupes de discussion :

- Un chercheur principal du groupe-conseil Quorus animera les discussions. [Il s'agit de la même équipe de recherche qui a mené le *Sondage auprès du personnel du SCC aux fins de l'audit interne sur la culture organisationnelle*.]
- Il y aura au plus huit personnes qui participeront à chaque groupe de discussion.
- Nous avons organisé les groupes de manière à ce que tous les participants d'un groupe donné occupent des postes similaires ou fassent partie du même niveau organisationnel. De plus, une personne ne fera jamais partie du même groupe que son superviseur ou son gestionnaire.
- Vos commentaires n'auront aucune incidence sur votre relation avec le SCC, votre gestionnaire ou votre superviseur.
- Le chercheur de Quorus effectuera à un enregistrement audio de la discussion à des fins de prise de notes. Toute note compilée par l'équipe de recherche Quorus n'identifiera jamais le nom d'un participant.
- Aucune personne du SCC n'observera les groupes de discussion ni n'aura accès aux enregistrements.

- Nous protégeons également l'identité des personnes en regroupant vos commentaires avec ceux des participants des autres groupes de discussion dans la préparation du rapport.
- Les membres du personnel n'ont pas l'obligation de participer s'ils reçoivent une invitation à un groupe de discussion. Les personnes qui participent n'ont pas non plus l'obligation de répondre à chaque question que le chercheur posera.

Du côté de la logistique, tous les groupes de discussion se feront par vidéoconférence avec MSTeams. Chaque groupe de discussion aura une durée de 90 minutes. Si vous acceptez de participer, veuillez prendre des arrangements avec votre gestionnaire pour vous assurer d'avoir accès à un ordinateur ou un portable, de même qu'à une salle ou un bureau privé si vous n'y avez pas déjà accès. Vous ne partagerez pas la même pièce avec une autre personne qui participe à votre groupe de discussion.

Si vous souhaitez participer, veuillez nous faire parvenir un RSVP dès que possible par le biais d'un retour de courriel (le nombre de places est limité). Veuillez également indiquer le groupe dans lequel vous souhaitez participer.

Séance	Langue du groupe de discussion	Date	Heure	Réponse requise d'ici le
A	Anglais	XX	XX	XX
B	Français	XX	XX	XX
C*	À déterminer	XX	XX	XX

REMARQUE : * La **séance C** est un espace sécuritaire pour le groupe de discussion réservé exclusivement pour les personnes qui s'identifient comme faisant partie d'un **groupe privé d'équité**. Ces groupes comprennent les Autochtones, les personnes en situation de handicap, les personnes faisant partie des communautés 2ELGBTQI+, les groupes religieux minoritaires et les personnes racisées.

Bien que nous encourageons la participation dans les groupes de discussion, nous pouvons organiser des entrevues individuelles (par téléphone ou par vidéoconférence) pour les membres du personnel qui préfèrent donner leur point de vue de cette manière plutôt que dans un groupe de discussion.

Si vous avez des questions au sujet de ces groupes de discussion ou sur *l'Audit sur la culture organisationnelle* en général, vous pouvez communiquer avec le Secteur de la vérification interne et de l'évaluation à l'adresse suivante : AUDITCulture.GEN-NAT@CSC-SCC.GC.CA.

Important : Nous vous prions de ne pas acheminer cette invitation à d'autres membres du personnel. C'est seulement sur invitation personnalisée qu'une personne peut participer à un groupe de discussion.

Nous espérons que vous serez en mesure de participer!

Le groupe-conseil Quorus Inc.
Téléphone 833.739.1983
Courriel discussions@quorusconsulting.com
www.quorusconsulting.com



Membre de l'ESOMAR et membre accrédité du Conseil de recherche et d'intelligence marketing canadien (CRIC), Quorus démontre son engagement à respecter les pratiques exemplaires, les normes et les pratiques éthiques les plus élevées de l'industrie de la recherche.

Le contenu du présent courriel est confidentiel et s'adresse uniquement au destinataire mentionné dans le message. Il est strictement interdit de partager ce message, en tout ou en partie, avec une tierce partie sans le consentement écrit de l'expéditeur. Si vous recevez ce message par erreur, veuillez y répondre, puis le supprimer. Nous verrons à éviter qu'une telle erreur se reproduise.

Individual interview invitation script template

SUBJECT LINE: Audit of Organizational Culture – Interview / Entrevue aux fins de l’audit de la culture organisationnelle

[TEXT TO BE INCLUDED IN EMAIL]

(Le français suit.)

Correctional Service Canada (CSC) is currently conducting an audit of organizational culture, with the objective of determining whether its actual organizational culture is in line with its desired one. [To understand more about the internal audit that is taking place, please refer to: <http://thehub/En/about-csc/sectors/internal-audit/organizational-culture/Pages/default.aspx>.]

This audit would be incomplete if it did not hear from CSC employees. The CSC Internal Audit team is working with Quorus Consulting Group to conduct one-on-one interviews to obtain insight and feedback on the organization’s culture. Input from these interviews will complement the results obtained from focus groups and the organization-wide *Internal Audit of Organizational Culture Employee Survey* which was completed in September.

Here are some additional important details regarding these interviews:

- The discussion will be led by a senior researcher from Quorus Consulting [the same research team responsible for the *Internal Audit of Organizational Culture Employee Survey*].
- Your responses will in no way affect your relationship with CSC.
- The Quorus researcher will do an audio recording of the session for notetaking purposes. Any notes taken by the Quorus research team would not identify any participant by name.
- Only you and the senior researcher from Quorus will be in attendance. Nobody from CSC will be observing the sessions nor will they have access to any recordings.
- Your identity will be further safeguarded by grouping your responses with those of other interview and focus group participants when reporting results.
- You are not required to participate if you are invited to an interview. As well, during your interview, you will not be required to provide an answer to each question posed by the researcher.

In terms of logistics, interviews can be held online using MS Teams or by telephone and are scheduled to last 60 minutes.

If you are interested, please RSVP by replying to this email and providing possible dates and times that suit your schedule between now and March 31, 2023.

If you have any questions about your interview or the *Audit of Organizational Culture* in general, you can reach out to the Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector through this email address: AUDITCulture.GEN-NAT@CSC-SCC.GC.CA.

We hope you'll be able to participate!

Quorus Consulting Group Inc.
Telephone 833.739.1983
E-mail discussions@quorusconsulting.com
www.quorusconsulting.com



QUORUS is an ESOMAR Corporate Member and an accredited member of the Canadian Research Insights Council (CRIC), demonstrating our commitment to following the best practices and the highest standards and ethics in the research industry.

The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.

Le Service correctionnel du Canada (SCC) mène présentement un audit de la culture organisationnelle, dont l'objectif est de déterminer si la culture organisationnelle actuelle correspond à celle désirée. [Pour mieux comprendre le déroulement de cet audit interne, veuillez vous rendre à <http://thehub/Fr/a-propos-du-scc/secteurs/verification-interne/culture-organisationnelle/Pages/default.aspx>].

Il nous serait impossible de compléter cet audit sans obtenir la perspective des employés du SCC. L'équipe de la vérification interne du SCC collabore avec le groupe-conseil Quorus pour organiser des entrevues individuelles avec les membres du personnel du SCC afin d'obtenir leurs points de vue et leurs commentaires sur la culture de l'organisation. L'information recueillie lors de ces entrevues viendra étoffer les résultats du *Sondage auprès du personnel du SCC aux fins de l'audit interne sur la culture organisationnelle* à l'intention de tout le personnel du SCC qui a pris fin en septembre et des groupes de discussion.

Voici quelques renseignements supplémentaires importants concernant ces entrevues :

- Un chercheur principal du groupe-conseil Quorus animera les entrevues [il s'agit de la même équipe de recherche qui a mené le *Sondage auprès du personnel du SCC aux fins de l'audit interne sur la culture organisationnelle*].
- Vos commentaires n'auront aucune incidence sur votre relation avec le SCC.
- Le chercheur de Quorus effectuera un enregistrement audio de la discussion à des fins de prise de notes. Dans les notes compilées par l'équipe de recherche Quorus, aucun participant ne sera identifié.

- Vous et le chercheur principal de Quorus serez les seules personnes présentes. Aucun représentant du SCC n’observera l’entrevue ni n’aura accès aux enregistrements.
- Nous protégerons également votre identité en regroupant vos commentaires avec ceux des participants aux autres entrevues et groupes de discussion dans la préparation du rapport.
- Vous n’êtes pas dans l’obligation de participer même si vous recevez une invitation à l’entrevue. Si vous participez, vous ne serez pas tenu(e) de répondre à chaque question que le chercheur posera.

Du côté de la logistique, les entrevues se feront par vidéoconférence avec MS Teams ou au téléphone. Chaque séance aura une durée de 60 minutes.

Si vous souhaitez participer, veuillez répondre au présent courriel en prenant soin d’indiquer les heures et les dates que vous préférez jusqu’au 31 mars 2023.

Si vous avez des questions au sujet de votre entrevue ou sur *l’Audit sur la culture organisationnelle* en général, vous pouvez communiquer avec le Secteur de la vérification interne et de l’évaluation à l’adresse suivante : AUDITCulture.GEN-NAT@CSC-SCC.GC.CA.

Nous espérons que vous serez en mesure de participer!

Le groupe-conseil Quorus Inc.
Téléphone 833.739.1983
Courriel discussions@quorusconsulting.com
www.quorusconsulting.com



Membre de l’ESOMAR et membre accrédité du Conseil de recherche et d’intelligence marketing canadien (CRIC), Quorus démontre son engagement à respecter les pratiques exemplaires, les normes et les pratiques éthiques les plus élevées de l’industrie de la recherche.

Le contenu du présent courriel est confidentiel et s’adresse uniquement au destinataire mentionné dans le message. Il est strictement interdit de partager ce message, en tout ou en partie, avec une tierce partie sans le consentement écrit de l’expéditeur. Si vous recevez ce message par erreur, veuillez y répondre, puis le supprimer. Nous verrons à éviter qu’une telle erreur se reproduise.

Focus group and interview moderation guide

[NOTE: This script has been designed for focus groups. It will be adapted by the moderator for one-on-one interviews as needed.]

A. Introduction to Procedures (10 minutes)

Thank you all for joining this online focus group!

- Introduce moderator/firm and welcome participants to the focus group: My name is [INSERT MODERATOR NAME] and I work with Quorus Consulting, and we are conducting research on behalf of Correctional Service Canada.

As you know, the reason we have invited you to participate in this session is to obtain your views and feedback on the organization's culture.

I'll describe what we mean by an organization's culture in a moment. In terms of background, the Commissioner of CSC has made it a priority to examine the culture at CSC. At the heart of this effort, the Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector is conducting an audit of organizational culture. This audit will involve gathering and analyzing data and input from a variety of different sources including focus groups, interviews and surveys, but also document review and analysis. When combined, all this information will help the audit team make recommendations for next steps.

Now I'd like to help you understand how this focus group will work:

- A discussion group is a "round table" discussion. We may also be asking you to answer a few survey questions from time to time to help guide the discussion.
- My job is to facilitate the discussion, keeping us on topic and on time. Your job is to offer your opinions on the various questions I'll be asking you.
- Your honest opinion is valued. There are no right or wrong answers. This is not a knowledge test.

Please note that anything you say during these groups will be held in the strictest confidence. We do not attribute comments to specific participants. Our report summarizes the findings from the groups but does not mention anyone by name.

IMPORTANT: Please do not provide any identifiable information about yourself or others and avoid bringing specific cases up in the discussion.

Your responses will in no way affect your relationship with CSC, your manager or your supervisor. We have organized these groups so that all participants in a given group do a similar type of work or that you are all from the same organizational level. While you probably do not know the others in this group, you can rest assured that we did not mix supervisors and managers with the staff who report to them.

If I ask a question that makes you uncomfortable for whatever reason, you are not required to answer it. As well, we may not be able to hear from everyone on every question and that is normal for this type of discussion.

We never know what direction these types of group discussions can take so I'd like to remind everyone that the Employee Assistance Program is available to you should you feel this could be helpful.

- Everyone’s opinion is important and should be respected.
- We want you to speak up even if you feel your opinion might be different from others. Your opinion may reflect that of many other employees at CSC.
- To participate in this session, please make sure your webcam and your microphone are on and that you can hear me clearly. If you are not speaking, I would encourage you to mute your line to keep background noise to a minimum...just remember to raise your actual or virtual hand and remove yourself from mute when you want to speak!
- We will be making regular use of the chat function. [MODERATOR EXPLAINS HOW TO ACCESS THE MSTEAMS CHAT FEATURE DEPENDING ON THE DEVICE THE PARTICIPANT IS USING]. Let’s do a quick test right now - please open the chat window and send the group a short message (e.g., Hello everyone). If you have an answer to a question and I don’t get to ask you specifically, please type your response in there. We will be reviewing all chat comments at the completion of this project.
- The discussion will last approximately 90 minutes.
- If you have a cell phone or other electronic device, please turn it off.
- Explanations.
 - The final report that Quorus will be writing can be accessed through the Library of Parliament or Library and Archives Canada website.
 - The session is being audio-video recorded for report writing purposes / verify feedback. This recording will stay with Quorus and is not shared with anyone else. In accordance with research industry standards, we safeguard the recordings for a period of 6 months and then they are destroyed. It is strictly forbidden for any of the participants to do their own recording of this meeting.
 - In the spirit of transparency, you should know that nobody else is observing this session.
 - Please note that I am not a CSC employee – my area of expertise is conducting research using approaches like focus groups, interviews and surveys. That said, I am quite familiar with CSC since our team was involved in last year’s National Employment Equity Survey of Women Employees at CSC and I’ve also been involved in studies where I’ve interviewed individuals having recently served a sentence at a federal institution.

Do you have any questions or concerns before we continue?

INTRODUCTIONS: Let’s go around – please tell us your name and a little bit about yourself, such as your position within CSC, how long you have been working at CSC and in what part of the country you are located.

B. Introduction to Workplace “Culture” and Overall Perceptions (10 minutes)

Let’s start things off by talking a little bit about the work that you do. **[QUICK WARMUP]**

- What do you like best about the work you do / about working at CSC?
- What are you most proud of in your work at CSC?
- What do you find most challenging about the work you do?

Just so we are all on the same page, we have invited you here to discuss your workplace culture. In a nutshell, an organization’s culture refers to all the values, expected behaviours and beliefs that all staff share. These will influence the interactions between management, employees and other groups of individuals with whom the organization might interact, such as offenders, stakeholders, partners, contractors, etc. Ideally, an organization’s culture supports its mission.

- What adjectives or descriptive words would you use to describe the overall workplace culture at CSC? Use the chat feature to share one or two words you would use and then we’ll have a short discussion.

Help me understand some of the words you have used.

You have all touched on a variety of topics and issues – we may not be able to do a deep dive on all of them but we will touch on some throughout today’s session.

C. Exploring “Open Dialogue” and “Employee Engagement” (15 minutes)

AUDIT CRITERIA:

Open Dialogue: Management actively gathers and listens to feedback from employees at all levels and positions across the organization.

Employee Engagement: All employees are engaged in discussions on how to fulfill CSCs mission, and all staff are working towards the same goal.

Let’s begin by talking about what we are doing right now in this focus group which is about giving employees an opportunity to have their voices heard – generally, how effective is management at actively gathering and listening to feedback from employees at all levels and positions?

- Do you get a feeling that people are comfortable asking questions and speaking up in team meetings and at town halls?
 - **PROBE AS NEEDED:** Help me understand why some employees may not be comfortable doing this? Why is this happening? What do you suspect is the cause of this?

- When CSC does conduct internal surveys or when the Public Service Employee Survey (PSES) survey is conducted, why don't more employees participate? Any theories on that?
- What changes would you like to see made on this front?
- Do you feel that when you participate in surveys and speak up at team meetings and town halls that something comes of that – that it makes a difference?
 - How do you know whether it is making a difference?
 - What would you need to see for you to feel like your feedback is being considered?
- How would you describe the approach to how decisions are made at CSC?
 - Would you describe the approach as top-down or do you feel it is a collaborative approach?
 - How does that make you feel?
- In the end, do you feel all staff are working towards the same goal?
 - **IF YES:** How is this achieved at CSC? How do you work towards the same goal and mission with your supervisors and colleagues?
 - **IF NO:** Why is this happening? What do you suspect is the cause of this?
 - Do you have any suggestions for how CSC can or should improve how they engage employees so that you all feel like you are working towards the same goal?

ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IF RAISED SPONTANEOUSLY BY PARTICIPANTS:

- **IF TRUST/LACK OF TRUST IN SENIOR MANAGEMENT IS RAISED:** A lack of trust has come up in the conversation – what has led to this lack of trust in senior management?
- **IF ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE IS RAISED:** A few of you have mentioned that the way the organization is structured is having an impact on how decisions are made and/or how much employees are involved in those decisions. Help me understand this a bit more.
 - Do you have any suggestions for how CSC can improve on this front? What needs to change in your opinion?

D. Exploring “Clear Communication” (10 minutes)

AUDIT CRITERIA:

Clear Communication: Management reinforces values and CSC’s culture through clear communication of expectations across the organization.

Let’s turn our attention to communication within the organization.

- How would you describe the communication style at CSC?
 - How does that style make you feel?
- How well do you feel management reinforces values and CSC’s culture through clear communication of expectations?
- What improvements can management make in how it communicates with staff?

E. Exploring “Recognition and Consequences” (15 minutes)

AUDIT CRITERIA:

Recognition and Consequences: Management ensures employee recognition of successful events and outcomes and applies appropriate discipline when required.

Let’s turn our attention to employee recognition and consequences.

- Let’s go back to the chat feature in MS-Teams. How would you describe the organization’s approach to employee recognition? ...what are some quick words that come to mind that best describe how that is done at CSC?
 - Help me understand some of the words you’ve selected.
 - What are some aspects of employee recognition that you feel CSC does well?
 - **AS NEEDED:** Some of the words you’ve selected suggest there is room for improvement. Why is this happening? What do you suspect is the cause of this?

EXPLORE THE FOLLOWING AS NEEDED:

- Does CSC do enough to recognize a job well done? What is the issue here? What needs to change?
- Is CSC consistent in how it recognizes a job well done? What is the issue here? What needs to change?

- Let's do a similar exercise for employee discipline. Please go back to the chat feature in MS-Teams and describe the organization's approach to employee discipline? ...what are some quick words that come to mind that best describe how that is done at CSC?
 - Help me understand some of the words you've selected.
 - What are some aspects of employee discipline that you feel CSC does well?
 - **AS NEEDED:** Some of the words you've selected suggest there is room for improvement. Why is this happening? What do you suspect is the cause of this?

EXPLORE THE FOLLOWING AS NEEDED:

- In your opinion, are consequences appropriate? What is the issue here? What needs to change?
- In your opinion, are consequences consistently applied? What is the issue here? What needs to change?
- In your opinion, does discipline follow a progression in line with policy? What is the issue here? What needs to change?

F. Exploring "Engagement of Middle Managers" (15 minutes)

AUDIT CRITERIA:

Engagement of Middle Managers: Managers ensure that the vision and mission of the organization are being respected by all employees by modelling appropriate behaviour and creating a culture of inclusiveness.

Let's focus a bit more on the role managers and supervisors play in an organization's culture.

- When it comes to achieving the ideal workplace culture, what role should managers and supervisors play?
- In what ways are individuals in those positions succeeding in delivering on those expectations?
 - What does your direct supervisor and what do other managers do to support you in your work at CSC?
- In what ways are individuals in those positions falling short of those expectations?
 - Why is this happening? What do you suspect is the cause of this?
- How many of you feel that one of the roles individuals in those positions should be playing is modelling appropriate behaviour that reflects the organization's mission and vision?
 - What would be a clear demonstration that they are doing this? ...give me a few examples of what this would look like.

- Is this what you see at CSC? If not, why not?
- What does it mean to you to have a culture of inclusiveness?
 - How effective are middle managers at creating a culture of inclusiveness? ...how well are middle managers creating a culture that makes you feel like you belong?
 - **IF NOT EFFECTIVE:** Why is this happening? What do you suspect is the cause of this?

G. Exploring “Tone from the top” (15 minutes)

AUDIT CRITERIA:

Tone from the top: Senior management has defined CSC’s values and emphasizes their importance while holding management accountable to appropriately execute their duties.

Another aspect of an organization’s culture is the tone that is set by the leadership team.

- Before discussing how you would describe the current tone, I’d like you to explain to me what you would see as the right kind of tone.
 - What are things you would need to see or hear for you to feel that the leadership team is having a positive impact on the organizational culture?
- Now let’s turn our attention to what is actually happening at CSC. How well is senior management actually delivering on what you consider the ideal tone?
 - First of all, help me understand in what ways, if any, it is succeeding in delivering the ideal tone. Which senior management practices have you noticed that are positive for the organizational culture?
 - Now help me understand how, if at all, the current tone from senior management is different from the ideal. Which senior management practices have you noticed that are negatively impacting the organizational culture?
 - Why is this happening? What do you suspect is the cause of this?
- How is the current tone from senior management making you feel as an employee at CSC?

H. Wrap-up (5 minutes)

We've covered a lot of territory related to the organization's culture.

If you could change one thing about CSC's culture, what would it be? Please provide your suggestion in the chat and then we'll have a short discussion.

Is there any other aspect of workplace culture at CSC that we should have discussed today?

Does anyone have any additional thoughts on what we have discussed today?

[MODERATOR TO SHOW INFORMATION ON SCREEN WHERE POSSIBLE]

If there is something else you would like to discuss with me directly regarding the culture at CSC, feel free to send me an email at rick@quorusconsulting.com to either share your feedback via email or to setup a telephone conversation.

You can also reach out to the Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector through this email address:

AUDITCulture.GEN-NAT@CSC-SCC.GC.CA.

In terms of next steps, we will be collecting staff feedback through focus groups, interviews and the online survey [which closed September 30]. The Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector will be using this data as one form of evidence in the overall audit. The Internal Audit Team will also be conducting additional data analysis through various other means, including examining results from the PSES surveys, the 2021 National Employment Equity Survey of Women Employees at CSC, complaints and grievances, discipline, harassment, and work stoppages. The Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector will be using all the available data and information to finalize an audit report. This report will be presented to Senior Management and the Departmental Audit Committee in the Winter 2023, and upon its approval will be made publicly available.

ON BEHALF OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA, THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION