

Experiment Description

CONTACT INFORMATION

Agency: Liquor Control Board

Contact Name: Claris Nnanabu

Phone Number: 664-1642

Email: ccn@liq.wa.gov

PROBLEM STATEMENT – What specific problem (gap) did you address?

Employee Recognition Deficiencies.

There are gaps between LCB's recognition efforts and employees' perceptions of how they are valued. Only 64% of employees feel they receive recognition for a job well done. Consequently, 36% of LCB employees may not be performing at their best.

EXPERIMENT – Describe the details of the experiment

Objective:

Soon after the 2013 survey results were released, WSLCB management team met and decided that the division directors needed to have facilitated discussions with all employees at the division level in order to obtain accurate information that will help inform, analyze and address survey gaps. The plan to get to the root cause (within 4 weeks) was to be consistent in our experiment approach by:

1) Having the facilitators validate the obvious:

- “Why” does addressing this problem matter?

(Living out LCB’s culture; employee engagement and impact on employee moral; effort toward supporting Results WA).

- Recognize that LCB has made improvements in the employee survey; Director’s participation in a robust culture - building new employee orientation the first day of employment. Additionally, the Agency Director meets one-on-one with every single new employees to express gratitude that they have chosen to work for LCB, to discuss the agency's culture document, and to explain the employee's role in maintaining the culture. The facilitator discussed recognition methods that currently exists.
- Acknowledgement that the agency could be doing more.

2) Asking the same three questions of all LCB employees:

- What does “I receive recognition for a job well done” means to you?
- What has the LCB done well related to employee recognition? (specific examples of recognition you have liked).
- What should the agency be doing to meaningfully recognize employees?

3) Use a focus group to test the common themes that emerged from those meetings.

4) Implementation of viably tested recommendations.

5) Ask participants for lessons learned regarding experimental process and opportunities for improvement.

Hypothesis: If we gather specific information about recognition from all employees, and use focus groups to generate improvement ideas based on themes, then we will increase the degree to which employees feel they receive recognition for a job well done.

Measures:

Positive survey results.

Increase staff involvement and participation in recognition ceremonies.

Foster an environment that brings out the best in employees as measured by increased LEAN activities.

Plan to address the root cause and achieve the objective: (you may paste a Word table or Excel action plan below)

Most of the recommendations are relatively easy to implement. LCB has already started implementing some changes based on the recommendations:

- Inverting the recognition pyramid.
- Transparent process-Communicate process
- Simplify process
- Cross division recognition
- Add humor-fun recognition
- More frequent than annually
- Kudos email on electronic Board
- Putting out internal recognition communication to staff
- Recognition Bulletin Boards
- Highlight funny events
- Celebrate mistakes

A recognition committee will develop timelines and options to implement the outstanding highlighted recommendations.

Results/Progress and Learning:

The degree of employee engagement and satisfaction varied from division to division and in some instances from unit to unit. Increased emphasis on recognition needs to be more visible at the unit/division level.

Challenges experienced and how they were addressed:

LCB's employees are located statewide which makes it challenging to gather information. Additionally, some employees who felt employee recognition was adequate did not see the added-value in this investment of time.

Gathering information at the unit/divisional level provided the opportunity to address and gather appropriate input reflective of all employees' experiences.

Considerations for others adapting this experiment:

It is imperative that information is gathered at the unit level in order to drill down to get to the root cause. As well as, ensuring broader participation that could result in accurate analysis. To expedite the gathering of information, work groups may have to utilize already scheduled/standing meetings. This will help maintain momentum and reduce stagnation.

SCOPE & CONTEXT

Employee Group – describe the group of employees on which this experiment focused

Size of group: 290

Nature of their work: Enforcement, regulation, and administration

Primary customers served: Washington Communities and Agency Staff

Other important characteristics: Depending on the topic/problem, get as much stakeholder participation as possible. Balancing between timeliness and size of sample.

Resources – describe the resources involved to conduct this experiment

Role of point person: Agency Facilitator

Roles of other team members: HR Staff; Division Directors; All 67 supervisors and managers. Recognition committee, and all agency employees.

Why these roles were chosen: This was an agency wide problem that required all staff participation.

External resources or assistance (if any):

Resource ‘ intensity’ / FTE equivalent:

Timeline – describe how long the experiment took to complete, by phase if possible

Start to Finish: 7 months

Plan:

Do:

Check:

Act: