1 DRDC recommendation

Trust rebuilding through team unity

Luc Pigeon
DRDC – Valcartier Research Centre

Defence Research and Development Canada

IMPORTANT INFORMATIVE STATEMENTS

Disclaimer: Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of National Defence ("Canada"), makes no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, of any kind whatsoever, and assumes no liability for the accuracy, reliability, completeness, currency or usefulness of any information, product, process or material included in this document. Nothing in this document should be interpreted as an endorsement for the specific use of any tool, technique or process examined in it. Any reliance on, or use of, any information, product, process or material included in this document is at the sole risk of the person so using it or relying on it. Canada does not assume any liability in respect of any damages or losses arising out of or in connection with the use of, or reliance on, any information, product, process or material included in this document.

This document was reviewed for Controlled Goods by Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) using the Schedule to the *Defence Production Act*.

Endorsement statement: This publication has been published by the Editorial Office of Defence Research and Development Canada, an agency of the Department of National Defence of Canada. Inquiries can be sent to: Publications.DRDC-RDDC@drdc-rddc.gc.ca.

Introduction

This document summarizes the recommendations made by the 1 DRDC Committee Co-Chairs to the Research and Development Executive Committee (RDEC) January 19th 2017 at the request of the ADM S&T (Dr. Marc Fortin). It is intended to provide a summary of the key points shared by 1 DRDC as their recommendations to work toward improvements for both the future Public Service Employee Survey (PSES) and more fundamentally, for our own organization's efficiency and a better workplace.

Background

1 DRDC, an advisory committee created by ADM S&T in May 2015, is to get more direct feedback about employees' perceptions and expectations in the context of the results of PSES 2014 and as part of the Ministerial Plan PSES 2014.

Hitherto, this committee was composed of representatives from each one of the nine sites/locations under the responsibility of ADM S&T: DRDC CORA, Corporate office, CSS, DGMPRA, DRDC – Atlantic Research Centre, DRDC – Ottawa Research Centre, DRDC – Suffield Research Centre, DRDC – Toronto Research Centre, and DRDC – Valcartier Research Centre. While not all categories of employment were represented, all employees were invited to participate with the aim to get as much diversity in opinion as possible. At one point, as many as 50 employees were active members of this committee (either at the oversight level, achieving specific initiatives, or at the physical locations—referred to as the 1 DRDC local committees).

The recommendations below are the result of the gathering and analysis of all the comments received and shared over the period between May 2015 and December 2016. Informal interviews were conducted with union representatives as well as all-level of the management staff, with the aim to produce a situation assessment as complete as possible about our own organization.

Recommendations

Endorsed by the 1 DRDC oversight committee, composed of members from all nine sites of ADM S&T, the following recommendations were presented to RDEC January 19th 2017 as requested by ADM S&T.

- 1 DRDC recommends the main short-term focus to be on rebuilding organizational **"trust."**
- The current main fuel to the lack of trust is a **perception of incoherence about the 1 Agency / 1 Team concept**. What is perceived is instead a sum of sub teams that too often interfere one with another.
- The **main indicators fuelling** negative perceptions are:
    1. Lack of clarity about **where we fit** within the Government of Canada (GoC), and in relation to other government departments/agencies, as well as within the broader network of partners (i.e. academia, industry, and allies);
    2. Lack of faith of our organization's ability to consistently and continuously perform **updated/relevant** capability reviews based on the time horizons, trends, and foresight

(short, mid, and long terms), and on a strong knowledge of defence and security requirements;

3. Doubts about sound management of our capabilities and our resources e.g. the recurring complaints about travel approvals highlight the organizations inability to share a message where knowledge development is perceived as a priority for both program delivery (e.g. getting solutions) and capability development (e.g. employees' expertise development).

4. **Information flows inconsistently** (conflicting messages) between all levels and work-classifications, both vertically and horizontally across the organization, especially between DGSTPs, DGSTCO and COS as parts of a single system;

5. Perceived inability to prioritize, coordinate, and integrate organizational, scientific and client requirements to enable support of innovative opportunities while empowering employees (i.e. ADSA,[1] Joint targeting, CUE);

6. Strong doubts of the employees (including part of the management staff) on the ability to manage significant investments (as well as significant cuts) and consequently improve employee understanding of organizational needs to enable consistent decision-making throughout the organization in day-to-day activities;

7. Many reported contradictions between the executive messages and the defence scientists' evaluation processes, particularly of inconsistencies with the elements of vision, mission, and values;

8. General perception that management avoids investing the time and efforts required to de-conflict employees' perceptions or on the contrary, avoid to strengthen known inconsistencies;

9. Critical mass of employees perceive irony in the message "people are our main strength," while they feel not much efforts are conducted to develop or even sustain this strength; and

10. Employees do not feel well equipped—or equipped enough—to easily adapt to internal and external changes.

It is the 1 DRDC perception that trust rebuilding implies to consider the previous 10 elements from an integrated point of view i.e. for a similar intended effort, to consider all elements at once, instead of assessing any efforts from their individual perspectives.

Prepared by: Dr. Luc Pigeon, 1 DRDC Co-Chair (DRDC – Valcartier Research Centre).

---

[1] If there is one message retained by the staff following the 2012 Work Force Adjustment: it is our organization constantly needs to reach and sustain **strategic significance**. Thus, it seems confusing to keep the "most strategic" mandates of our recent history out of our main programs. Many employees concluded that this is a disavowal or worse, a dry run to evaluate how much the Government can achieve without them.

Selected reference documents produced by 1 DRDC between May 2015 and December 2016

Annex 1: A summary of the first steps taken by the 1 DRDC committee.

F. Lapointe and L. Pigeon, 1 DRDC: Progress Update, Briefing Note to ADM S&T, 9 pages, June 29th 2015.

Annex 2: The progress report presented to ADM S&T in September 2015. It included a summary of the feedback received from all sites of ADM S&T, and a list of recommendations covering the four areas of: harassment, communication, knowledge, and wellbeing.

F. Lapointe and L. Pigeon, 1 DRDC: Final Employee-led Response to PSES 2014, Briefing Note to ADM S&T, 10 pages, September 3rd 2015.

Annex 3: This briefing note summarized that in spite of positive achievements, communications remained deficient to a point of disruptiveness. Recommendation was to aim for more consistency between 1 DRDC and RDEC.

B. Atkinson, L. Pigeon. 1 DRDC and RDEC: Consistency, timeliness and completeness, Briefing Note to ADM S&T, 1 page, November 21st 2016.

Complementary material can be found at the 1 DRDC Nexus page, including the main results of its June 2016 Workshop in Ottawa: https://sites.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/cmt/1DRDC/DRDC%20Site%20Pages/1DRDCPublic.aspx.

Annex 1   The initial orientation taken by 1 DRDC

2015-06-29

Produced for: ADM S&T

1 DRDC: Progress Update

Since 22 May 2015, when the new committee was officially confirmed, significant work has been undertaken to respond to the pressing need for employee feedback and contribute to develop a concrete action plan to address employee concerns.

This document presents an overview of the Committee's ongoing efforts:

1. Final committee membership;
2. Endorsed framework;
3. Proposed Terms of Reference;
4. Ongoing activities;
5. Next steps.

1.   Final Committee Membership

Table 1 presents the final committee membership as of 29 June 2015.

Table 1: Committee members by location (29 June 2015).

Location	Committee representatives & classifications, and local members/alternate participants
Co-Chairs	France Lapointe (EC), Luc Pigeon (DS)
Atlantic	Denton Froese (DS), Tara Leblanc (DS)
Corporate Office	Albert Chan (ENG), Claude Roy (CO)
CSS	Brian Greene (DS), Kate Kaminska (DS)
CORA	Rocques Poirier (AS), Adrienne Turnbull (xx)
DGMPRA	Jennifer Peach (DS), Justin Wright (DS)
Ottawa	Amy Hamilton (AS), Scott McLelland (xx)
Suffield	Nicole Barabé (BI), Michele Mayer (CH)
Toronto	Andrea Hawton (EG), Ritu Gill (DS)
Valcartier	Hakima Abou-Rachid (DS), Richard Carbone (CS), Marie-Sol Grondin (ENG)[2]

Now that the Committee has established a final membership, each center has agreed to select a maximum of two representatives. However, engagement with local sub-committees and unrepresented employees (i.e. management) is highly recommended and encouraged to strengthen the impact of feedback received and inputted into our recommendations.

---

[2] Valcartier representatives will confirm at short term who are the two representatives among the three indicated names.

Successful recruiting efforts have led to the Committee gaining representation from the AS, ENG, and CO streams, as well as all the previously missing local representation from CORA, Ottawa, and Atlantic.

The Committee's composition now represents the diversity required in terms of location and job categories.

2. Endorsed Framework

As proposed in our document dated 22 May 2015, the use of a *positive* Lencioni Pyramid [1], in the context of workplace wellbeing and functional teams, has been endorsed by the Committee and will be used to frame employee feedback, the Committee's analyses, and the resulting recommendations.

Figure 1: Framework – A positive Lencioni Pyramid [2] positioned in a well-being environment.

As clearly indicated in the bottom block, building trust is the most critical element and will be the focus of our initial analyses. Since the lack of trust, or broken trust, has been identified as a major issue through the Public service employee survey (PSES) 2014 results, a focus on rebuilding trust will enable us to move forward with progress. It is understood that without trust, recommendations will not be implemented with impact.

3. Proposed Terms of Reference

Attached in Annex A are the proposed terms of reference developed by the Committee Co-chairs with significant input from Committee members. They are intended to reflect both what was identified as priorities in ADM(S&T)'s email (Agency-focused Action Plan), as well as Committee discussions surrounding what is realistically achievable and deliverable.

They key elements of the Terms of Reference provide a clear mandate, roles and responsibilities, governance model, and the scope of the work we plan to undertake, recognizing that while all employee feedback will be heard and considered, some concerns are beyond our control. For example, complaints related to travel budgets and restraints are beyond the organization's control, and will therefore not be addressed. We also recognize that while we will consult with subject matter experts, such as human resources (HR) and Employee assistance program (EAP) representatives, we will not undertake any work that falls within a different level of expertise and authority.

4. Ongoing Activities

For the most part, every center has begun gathering employee feedback. Taking into account the different culture of each center, methodology will be decided by each representative, based on what they think will produce the most accurate results. The types of methodologies used currently include:

- Introduction emails identifying the members, how they can be reached, and the kind of feedback they expect;
- Engagement sessions conducted onsite, or via teleconference if necessary, facilitating open dialogue;
- Suggestion boxes;
- Online forum;[3] and,
- Use of section meetings to reach a larger number of employees.

The Committee has been meeting every two weeks to discuss 1 DRDC matters. Information is shared using email and Sharepoint, and meetings have enabled open dialogue and in depth discussions. A general *modus operandi* has been established, focused on ensuring a trusting, respectful and productive environment to conduct the Committee's work. Topics discussed have included:

- ADM(S&T) center visits;

- Internal communications about the agency, and the Committee;

- Terms of Reference, and the establishment of our mandate;

- Feedback received from employees, and potential solutions; and,

- Employee wellbeing.

5. Next Steps

We are on schedule with our proposed short-term roadmap. A quick review demonstrates the work that has already been completed by the committee. We are currently in the midst of

---

[3] Suffield has successfully created an online forum in which employees can provide feedback anonymously.

conducting a variety of employee engagement sessions, maximizing our reach and ensuring optimal employee perspectives in our final recommendations.

Table 2: Short-term roadmap.

Month (2015)	Focus	Expected outcomes	Keywords
May – early June	Establishing the Committee;	Confirmed membership, new name, terms of reference;	Kick-off
June	Determine current and desired end states of employee well-being and organizational health (both positive and negative elements);	A bottom-up perspective of the current perceived situation and a sketch of the expected desired end-state;	Situation assessment
July	Employee engagement sessions to validate analysis and identify potential short term actions to improve situation (quick wins);	Updated bottom-up perspective and a draft of potential actions toward improvement;	Suggested actions
August	First iteration of the list of potential actions respecting the SMART test, and classified according to short, mid and long term goals;	Preliminary document expressing committee recommendations for SMART short term action items;	Suggested SMART actions
September	Finalization of the proposed action plan (first iteration);	Recommendations for ADM S&T consideration;	Selected SMART actions refinement
Post-September	Iteration on Kotter stage-3 (vision refinement) and offered contribution to Kotter stages 4-8 achievements.	Support to ADM S&T *Agency-focused Action Plan* sustained realization.	Kick-off iteration 2

As we continue to engage employees to best represent them in our recommendations, we will undertake the following concurrently:

- Approval and finalization of the Committee's Terms of Reference;
- Transition of our Sharepoint site to Nexus;
- Sharing information between members to raise awareness of common issues;
- Defining the problems identified, as well as determining employee expectations; and,
- Analysis of root causes, and initial discussions on potential solutions.

Conclusion

This document is intended to both inform on the Committee's current work and the intent with regards to the execution of the strategy. Feedback is expected to ensure alignment to the ADM's vision and expectations.

To ensure that the Committee is aligned with ADM(S&T), guidance and approval is requested for the following items:

- Terms of Reference;
- Approach;
- Ongoing work suggested;
- Timelines proposed; and,
- Feedback to be incorporated in future work.

Prepared by: Mrs France Lapointe and Dr. Luc Pigeon, 1 DRDC Co-chairs.

References

[1] P. Lencioni, *The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002.

[2] P. Lencioni, "The Five Behaviors of a Team," *Strive.com*. [Online]. Available: http://www.strive.com/models/five-behaviours.

Annex A 1 DRDC/RDDC Term of Reference

Table A.1: 1 DRDC/RDDC Term of Reference.

1 DRDC/RDDC
TERMS OF REFERENCE

PURPOSE

The 1DRDC team is comprised of people working together in order to recommend, promote, and implement SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timely) and sustainable changes to improve workplace wellbeing and promote a functional and collaborative environment for all levels at DRDC.

MISSION

Through the establishment of positive partnerships with key partners and stakeholders, 1 DRDC is committed to building and supporting a healthy workplace culture.

MANDATE

As expressed in the Assistant Deputy Minister (Science & Technology)'s message of 20 May 2015, the Committee will develop and implement an action plan focused on concrete ways to improve relationships between colleagues, management, and the organization, by:

• Acting as a conduit enabling personnel to express their questions and concerns;
• Provide significant input into the PSES Action Plan
• Provide a voice to DRDC staff on the issues that matter to them; and,
• Through the above, contribute to building a sense of community across DRDC centers.

SCOPE

The 1 DRDC team recognizes that in the context of the federal public service and within the broader Government of Canada, impact and influence will be limited to areas that are clearly within ADM(S&T) authority.

Policies and guidelines established by the Treasury Board, Administrative orders established by the Department of National Defence, and any protocols dictated by the Government of Canada, will be excluded from discussions, and will not be addressed by the Committee.

In addition, the Committee will not venture into areas that require specific and existing expertise. While 1 DRDC will consult expert representatives as appropriate, it is expected that raising awareness of available resources, such as EAP representatives, will enable employees to resolve the types of issues that the Committee may not be able to address. Recommendations will be based on actions that can have demonstrated impact, as endorsed and approved by the ADM(S&T).

GOVERNANCE

The Committee will report to the ADM(S&T), and be supported directly by the DGST Corporate Services (DGSTCS). Support will include the provision of guidance, tools, and a liaison to the broader management community as required. When consensus cannot be reached by the Committee, the Co-Chairs will finalize all decision-making, in accordance to, and in consideration of, committee discussions.

MEMBERSHIP

The Committee membership consists of employees from all classifications, levels, and locations, to a maximum of 20 members. Representatives will have their manager's approval to participate, and will be recognized for their contributions via inputs into their learning plans and performance agreements.

ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

Co-Chairs

• Lead Committee meetings by organizing, preparing and providing supporting documents, formulating an agenda, sharing a record of decisions after each meeting;
• Manage resource email inbox, Sharepoint site (soon to be Nexus), and updated membership list;
• Provide input, recommendations, and progress reports to the ADM(S&T) and (Mylene) as necessary;
• Develop first drafts of Committee documents, including (but not limited to) Terms of Reference, Records of Decision, progress reports, (etc.);
• Share/Distribute information with the Committee as per its relevancy to the Committee's work;
• Seek members' input
• Finalize decision-making: when consensus is not reached, Co-Chairs will finalize any decisions based on Committee meeting discussions, and taking into consideration the majority opinion.

Members

- Attend and participate in Committee meetings by contributing to discussions, using Sharepoint outside of meetings, responding to emails as required, providing input into agendas, records of decisions, and other committee documents;
- Establish local sub-committees, as necessary, to address issues of interest to their center;
- Represent the interests of staff at their local center by ensuring availability and accessibility to listen to employee concerns, and bringing those concerns to Committee for discussions;
- Participate in collaborative work with the ADM and (Mylene) as required; and
- Contribute to the achievement of the Committee's mission within the one agency paradigm, where DRDC is a single entity working towards common goals.

MEETING FREQUENCY AND QUORUM
The 1DRDC Committee will convene at least once per month. Additional meetings may be called subject to operational requirements.

GOALS
The Committee aims to:
1. Engage employees to obtain their input: methodology will be determined according to specific center needs. Methodology will include, but is not limited to – emails, open door policy, organized lunch discussions, and any other suitable methods.
2. Establish positive partnerships with key stakeholders such as: employees, management, executive management, unions, government department, and any other relevant partners.
3. Provide significant input into the PSES Action Plan by using employee feedback to develop concrete and sustainable recommendations in the short and long-term, to improve workplace wellbeing and organizational health and culture.
4. Provide and maintain an avenue through which DRDC employees may voice their concerns or suggestions regarding workplace wellbeing in the agency.
5. Continue to support existing initiatives such as: the mental health initiative, and the Administrative Community of Practice (AA CoP).

DELIVERABLES
To maximize the impact of the Committee's work, and in the interest of transparency and accountability, 1 DRDC will:
- Provide progress updates to ADM(S&T) and DGSTCS, as well as to the employees they represent, including the next steps and way forward.
- Increase awareness and establish relationships with management by engaging them through presentations of the Committee's work at meetings such as the S&T Operations Committee.
- Share information relevant to workplace wellbeing, such as, but not limited to: timelines, meeting records of decision, employee feedback, proposed action plan and recommendations, articles and resources relevant to workplace wellbeing, (etc.).
- Produce and provide a report to the ADM(S&T) on concerns from employees, analyses of feedback, and proposed recommendations for improvement.
- Other actions or documents that may be found relevant toward the 1 DRDC mission achievement.

Annex 2: The progress report presented to ADM S&T in September 2015

1 DRDC: Final Employee-led Response to PSES 2014

Introduction

Since its creation in May 2015, the 1 DRDC Committee has worked diligently to contribute to the development of a concrete action plan intended to address concerns as expressed in the Public Service Employee Service (PSES) Survey 2014 [1]. To do so, we have:

- Established representative Committee membership characterized by various classifications and all locations throughout the agency;
- Consulted employees to obtain valuable feedback on perceived issues within the organization, as well as proposed solutions;
- Analyzed the feedback received to ensure that the perceived issues are well-understood, and that the solutions provided are suitable to address the right problems;
- Evaluated solutions proposed by employees by assessing specific criteria such as: alignment with workplace wellbeing; SMART test; applicability across the agency; feasibility; and alignment with Government of Canada and Department of National Defence policies and directives. The criteria are listed in Apendix I.
- Developed existing and new solutions that meet the SMART criteria to be included in the below action plan.

The Committee's contribution is attributed to the extensive time and effort invested by all Committee members:

Co-Chairs	France Lapointe	Luc Pigeon
Atlantic	Denton Froese	Tara Leblanc
CSS	Brian Greene	Kate Kaminska
CORA	Rocques Poirier	Adrienne Turnbull
Corporate Office	Albert Chan	Claude Roy
DGMPRA	Jennifer Peach	Justin Wright
Ottawa	Amy Hamilton	Scott McLelland
Suffield	Nicole Barabé	Michele Mayer
Toronto	Ritu Gill	Andrea Hawton
Valcartier	Hakima Abou-Rachid	Marie-Sol Grondin
		Richard Carbone

The Committee was also fully supported by a Human Resources representative, Christina Noble, and a Communications representative, Mélanie Bergeron, who provided valuable advice in a quick, accessible, and efficient manner enabling the Committee to meet its mandate.

Mandate and Framework

Following the approval of the 1 DRDC Terms of Reference [2], the Committee aimed to develop the action plan based on a pre-defined mandate, scope, and governance:

- Mandate—to develop and implement a concrete action plan focused on the improvement of relationships between colleagues, management and the organization as a whole.
- Scope—to work within the context of the federal public service, limited to areas that are clearly within ADM(S&T) authority; respecting the policies, guidelines and directives established by the Treasury Board; the Department of National Defence; and the broader Government of Canada; and in consultation with the expert representatives as appropriate.
- Governance—reporting directly to the ADM(S&T) and supported directly by DGSTCS.

As proposed and approved, the development of the action plan was done using a positive Lencioni Pyramid [3] in the context of workplace wellbeing as a framework, and Kotter's eight stages to transforming an organization [4] as an operational model, in order to position concerns in relevance to the main issues identified in the PSES 2014 – a decline in organizational trust, and perceived lack of communication. Not surprisingly, these two major concerns were highlighted across the agency, in every location, and therefore became the focus of many of the included recommendations.

Methodology

In consideration of the local culture associated with individual centers, each member was responsible to determine the most appropriate manner in which to obtain local staff feedback, including:

- Email/phone/face-to-face availability to discuss employee concerns;
- Voluntary employee engagement sessions, including management-specific sessions;
- Participation and presentations in team meetings; and
- Online forums, including an anonymous forum in Suffield.

In addition, to maximize the impact of the action plan the Co-Chairs have attempted to raise awareness about, and visibility into, the Committee's work, and to clarify expectations by reaching out to senior managers, and specifically to DGSTCO. The Co-Chairs are presenting at RDEC on 9 September, followed by a presentation to STOC on 10 September, to discuss the action plan and hear concerns on the implementation of our recommendations. The Co-Chairs are also organizing a series of meetings with center directors, in an effort to reduce duplication and maximize success through stronger collaboration between management and employees.

The Proposed Action Plan

Based on the feedback received throughout the agency, the Action Plan was developed according to the following:

- By the three major themes: Communications, Knowledge Access, and Wellbeing, where the improvement of any or all three results in increased trust, shared understanding, and a healthy workplace culture;
- Noting perceived issues identified through employee feedback; and
- Recommendations of concrete actions that can be taken;

Considerations for each recommendation have been discussed, but they have not been included. The Committee will provide considerations, as well as a detailed action and implementation plan on those items selected by ADM(S&T) to go forward.

The full iteration of the Action Plan can be found in Appendix 2.

Consolidated employee feedback can be found in Appendix 3.

Themes

The PSES 2014 results for ADM(S&T) [5] have been validated through the extensive employee engagement sessions conducted by Committee members. We have selected three themes based on the issues reported and their alignment to the areas identified for focus by ADM(S&T) in May [6], as well as by the DM in the context of BluePrint 2020 [7]. Our terminology may differ, but the issues are clearly linked to Leadership and Organizational Goals, and our recommendations are aimed towards the beginning of a long process to rebuild organizational trust.

Communication

Many issues identified fell within the realm of communications. From inconsistent messaging, to unavailability of information, to poorly defined roles and responsibilities and organizational vision, improving communication mechanisms would result in increased trust, shared understanding, and an open workplace culture that fosters relationships both horizontally and within a vertical hierarchical context.

Knowledge Access

Employee feedback has demonstrated that a lack of common knowledge is responsible for a significant portion of discontent. Often, access to information is dispersed and inconsistent, resulting in a disconnection between regions and headquarters. Understanding of what each location is responsible for, as well as corporate roles and responsibilities, is not widespread, often causing misinterpretation of organizational objectives.

<u>Wellbeing</u>

While "wellbeing" appears to be a broad topic, in the context of our analyses, it refers to issues relevant to individual satisfaction, career development, sense of belonging, and perception of unfair treatment. Wellbeing and workplace health has a great impact on productivity and employee retention. The PSES results indicated that DRDC employees have great pride in their work and are dedicated to solving S&T problems they feel have a positive impact on the CAF. To maximize the impact of this commitment on the organization, wellbeing is viewed as the most critical success factor.

<u>Harassment</u>

Because harassment is a sensitive issue, and because any level of harassment is unacceptable independent of how many cases have been reported at DRDC, this topic is being treated separately. While a zero tolerance policy is a solid step in the right direction, it is not sufficient. It must be supported by a number of mechanisms.

Issues

The Action Plan focuses on the issues that have been reported most often, across most locations and classifications, and that are determined as having the greatest impact on organizational health. A complete and unfiltered list of feedback is included in Annex F.

Proposed Solutions

Our recommendations include a list of potential solutions to address the issues identified across DRDC. If the action could not be assessed on SMART criteria, it was excluded from the plan. It should be noted that some actions will require additional resources—people or financial. They were included because they were assessed as having an impact that would be worth the investment.

We have determined that all of these actions can be undertaken, or at least started, within a fiscal year or less, but only if identified as priorities with the appropriate dedicated resources. Instead of providing a horizon timeline, we have instead focused on two main factors: quick win – for those that can be fully implemented and achieved quickly, without the need for major resources; and max impact – for those that may require additional resources, a change in culture, or other efforts, but have been determined as having a maximum impact on organizational health.

The Committee is prepared to develop detailed implementation plans for those actions that have been selected to be progressed forward.

Next steps

Once the proposed action plan has been reviewed by the ADM(S&T) and DGSTCS, it is expected that an updated and revised version will be approved more broadly, at which point an implementation plan will be developed by the Committee, in consultation with employees and management.

14

Conclusion

This document proposes an action plan that addresses the underlying issues as expressed in the PSES 2014, and as validated by employees across the agency.

As per our Terms of Reference, the action plan is part of our list of deliverables. In addition, the following deliverables have also been undertaken:

- A progress update was shared with ADM(S&T) and DGSTCS on paper on 29 June 2015, and discussed in person on 8 July 2015 [8];
- Establishment of relationships with management by:
  - A meeting with DGSTCO on 19 August 2015 to discuss the involvement of center directors to align efforts to improve workplace wellbeing;
  - Presentation to the R&D Executive Committee (RDEC) on 9 September to discuss the proposed action plan;
  - Presentation to the S&T Operations Committee on 10 September 2015 to discuss the implications of the Committee's work;
  - Opening lines of communication on an ongoing basis with managers across the agency.

The Committee will continue to fulfill its long-term mandate by providing a voice to employees on issues that matter to them through ongoing local representation, sharing of action plan, feedback and other documents using Nexus, and by consistently bringing up employee concerns requiring actions to the ADM(S&T) as required.

Prepared by: Mrs. France Lapointe and Dr. Luc Pigeon, 1 DRDC Co-chairs.

References

[1] Government of Canada. (2015, January 13). 2014 Public Service Employee Survey. Retrieved February 2015, from Treasury Board Secretariat of Canada Secretariat: http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pses-saff/2014/results-resultats/bq-pq/03/560/org-eng.aspx

[2] 1 DRDC. (2015, June). Terms of Reference. Ottawa, Ontario: DRDC.

[3] Lencioni, P. (n.d.). The Five Behaviours of a Team. Retrieved May 2015, from Strive.com: http://www.strive.com/models/five-behaviours.

[4] Kotter, J. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. Harvard Business Review, 59-67.

[5] Department of National Defence. (2015, March 25). Public Service Employee Survey 2014—Results for the Department of National Defence. Presentation to BP2020 Steering Committee. Ottawa, Ontario: Government of Canada.

[6] Fortin, M. (2015, May 20). Agency-focused Action Plan. Ottawa, Ontario: Government of Canada.

[7] Government of Canada. (2015, January 13). 2014 Public Service Employee Survey. Retrieved February 2015, from Treasury Board Secretariat of Canada Secretariat: http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pses-saff/2014/results-resultats/bq-pq/03/560/org-eng.aspx

[8] 1DRDC. (2015, June 29). 1 DRDC: Progress Update. Ottawa, Ontario: DRDC.

Appendix 1

Table 2.1.1: Criteria.

Criteria
Does the issue being addressed align directly with a workplace wellbeing issue?
Does the solution proposed meet the SMART principle: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, timely.
Does the issue affect more than one center?
Does the proposed solution benefit the agency as a whole?
Does the proposed solution work towards the re-establishment of organizational trust?
Does the proposed solution respect existing policies as set by the Government of Canada? (Treasury Board, DND, etc.)
Does the proposed solution have any financial impacts? If so, what are they, and how can they be mitigated?

Appendix 2

Table 2.2.1: Proposed action-plan.

Outcome:	The PSES 2014 results for ADM(S&T) have been validated through employee feedback. This feedback also validates the areas of concern and of priority to the Level 0 organization, as presented to the BP2020 Steering Committee.
Alignment:	The areas identified for focus by ADM(S&T) in May 2015 – the need for a better understanding of organizational goals, improved communication, and development of leadership skills, are aligned with those of the department, as indicated by the DM - Leadership (Senior Management) and Workplace (Organizational Goals).
Categorization:	Based on our analyses, we selected three major themes (Communication, Knowledge Access, Wellbeing) based on the fact that modifying either of them would have a direct and positive impact on organizational trust. Due to the specific concerns and seriousness associated with harassment, we have addressed this issue separately.
	Communication issues span various horizontal and vertical levels. In some cases, the problem is a lack of communication, in others, it is misunderstood or misinterpreted communication. In both cases, it results in broken relationships between management/employees, employees/employees, and managers/managers.
	Knowledge Access – Many of the perceived problems are a direct result of the lack of common knowledge across locations and classifications. The disconnection between, for example, the corporate office and the labs, or between locations, is so great, that rules and approaches are often applied differently for the same problems. Additionally, as the administrative processes or their purpose aren't well understood, roles and responsibilities become blurred.
	Wellbeing – This may seem like a broad topic, but in the context of our analyses, it refers to issues associated with individual satisfaction, career development, sense of belonging, and perception of unfair treatment.
	Harassment – We have treated this separately because any harassment in the workplace is a major concern requiring immediate attention, and because a zero tolerance policy must be supported by other mechanisms.
Assumption:	Our analyses conclude that the issues attributed to the three major themes selected, if resolved, can directly and positively influence organizational trust – the basic element supporting the entire organization. Improving communication, maximizing common knowledge, and optimizing wellbeing, will lead to increased trust, as well as better relationships between employees, managers, and the organization, and consequentially, provide employees with a better sense of belonging.
Note:	While we associated particular solutions with particular issues, they are not exclusively linked. Some solutions could have a positive impact on many issues. Similarly, the implementation of any potential solution is only a first step, and not the only step to be undertaken.
Assessment:	may require resources and time, but will have significant impact on employees and organizational culture.

THEME	ISSUES IDENTIFIED	POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS (to be refined in a detailed action plan)	QUICK WIN	MAX IMPACT
Communication + Leadership + Organizational Goals + Common understanding	Information is not disseminated consistently	Live Chat: similar to social media live chat to exchange information.		
		Live Q&A sessions online – real time, where ADM can communicate with employees virtually.		
	Messages are too high level and do not appear to speak to employee concerns.	Pilot message testing: a pool of available "testers" to evaluate messages from the ADM's office before dissemination.		
		Clearly define the expected timelines of transformation – managing expectations, change is a long-term endeavour.		
	Communication often seems to be going in only one direction, feedback loop not always present.	360 degree evaluations (individual and centers) to give leaders feedback on how they communicate		
	Tight deadlines and decisions are rarely explained, making them seem arbitrary.	"Helpdesks": Facilitators at every level, acting as a connection between staff and processes.		
	Responses to employee questions and concerns are not done within reasonable timeframes.	Progress bars: visual method by which people can see the progress of actions. E.g. Town hall items with associated point of contact.		
	Feeling of being disconnected from other locations, no understanding of what other labs are doing.	Collaborative tools: virtual lab tours, associated hyper links, org charts.		
		Institute annual DRDC S&T symposium using webinars or other online tools.		
Knowledge Access + Common understanding + Organizational Goals	Publication process - Misinterpretation of importance of quality vs quantity; slow process reflecting on researchers' evaluations.	Available and clearly defined expectations wrt publications. E.g. Limit the selection of publications of DS PERs, consider limitations of the system during PERs, hire more publication officers to reside onsite to reduce stress associated with publications.		
	Poor understanding of roles and responsibilities, resulting in a feeling of being disconnected from other locations, other classifications, and management.	Simple descriptions that illustrate roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities, in the day-to-day reality of all staff.		
		Updated and accessible org charts		
	Poor understanding of the broadly defined organizational mission and objectives.	As suggested by COS, undertake a DRDC Vision Exercise that would promote collaboration between employees and managers, and would improve organizational understanding through engagement.		
	"Red tape" and constantly new processes affects efficiency, increases workload, and results in increased levels of stress	Accessibility to colour-coordinated visual maps of business processes by section, including context wrt originator, purpose, etc.		
	Perception that change is applied inconsistently when met with resistance.	Establish a change management strategy applicable to both (non) change actors toward a coherent implementation of transformation initiatives (e.g. Kotter's stage 5 – remove or alter systems or structures undermining the vision). Track what portions of the change are working well and what can be improved.		

	Poor understanding and awareness of the link between ADM(S&T) and DRDC – Program formulation vs program delivery (and everything in between) – e.g. The removal of DGs from the labs is perceived as increasing the gap between the program formulation and delivery elements. Feeling of Science vs "The Others" – poor understanding of the need for both to meet the common objectives.	Use of expertise directory to raise awareness of who's who in the organization and enable broader reach to colleagues across the organization.	▨	
	Poor understanding of DND and GoC context (i.e. travel rules)	Enforce use of existing policies from the department and government. E.g.: teleworking arrangements and approval of overtime to improve the perception of fair treatment.	▨	
	Poor use of TBS policies	Fully implement and enforce the new TBS Key Leadership Competencies.	▨	▨
Wellbeing + Leadership + Organizational Goals	Perceived barriers between locations and classifications – no more "OTHERS" within the organization.	"Friday PM 1 pager" (other possible formats: Journal Clubs, Seminar Series, Guest speakers, Brainstorming sessions) – encourage employees to interact and explore topics outside of their mandated activities (inspired by Gor Tex, Google, 3M…. – time for creative ideas)	▨	▨
		Agile team building – use of existing psychological testing (e.g. Myer-Briggs) to improve team cohesion and respect. Mandatory leadership training. 360 feedback.		▨
		Heraldic crests – consider use of the general defence science crest for anniversaries, promotional material.		▨
		Improve social aspect to increase sense of belonging – e.g. use charitable events to create healthy competition between teams.	▨	
	Difficult integration of new employees and poor support system	Welcome package – to better integrate new employees into the organization. **(Already in progress)**	▨	▨
	Under-developed leadership competencies lead to ineffective leadership styles, resulting in dissatisfied employees with declining motivation.	Establish a leadership model where management select positive reinforcement.		▨
		Establish a mandatory training program for new incoming managers, and follow-up training sessions for existing management.		▨
	Inconsistent career development opportunities across locations and classifications.	Pilot – "Exchange program", once per year (TBD), enabling employees to be posted to another center with the purpose of improving common understanding and sense of belonging.		▨
	Inconsistent application of the PMA/PLP process results in unfair development opportunities	Establish and implement clear and explicit guidelines for prioritization of training and career development.		▨
		Develop a list of potential alternative methods to promote development. E.g. Job shadowing, attendance to high level meetings.	▨	▨
	Lack of staff (vacant positions) greatly impacts workload, increasing stress levels.	In parallel with efforts to fill vacancies, manage objectives and expectations for staff affected.	▨	▨
		Use temporary acting assignments when possible - would impact career development, increase skill sets and job diversification.	▨	▨
	Capacity issues with technological resources – results in perceived inabilities to do one's job.	Pilot – "Lounge Space" – e.g. bring your own device. Providing space that is conducive to better exchanges, improved focus, and increased productivity.		▨
		Invest in strengthening existing tools. E.g. VTC systems that work, CMA access at individual desks, resolving bandwidth issues.		▨

	Poor use of alternative methods to recognize employees for their work – formal and informal.	Establish mechanisms that will recognize, acknowledge and reward good work without the formal awards process (e.g. publicize the instant awards process).		
	Unfair treatment is perceived from non-management classifications/positions.	Establish and apply guidelines wrt working in the location of the position you occupy (e.g. Guidelines for flexibility to live and work in different locations) to foster a sense of fair treatment across classifications.		
Harassment	Unethical behaviour is not acknowledged, often protected. Inability for whistleblowing.	Ombudsman – provide a direct line to discuss and resolve cases of a more serious nature, without bias.		
	Poor definition of what "zero tolerance" means within the context of harassment and what the consequences are.	Develop and publicize a clearly defined "zero tolerance" policy, including identifying consequences.		
	Poor identification of resources – many locations do not have onsite reps, or have inadequate reps (i.e. member of the management community)	Implement a program that ensures that each location has 1 male and 1 female representative to discuss avenues for resolution of harassment cases.		
		Make available a list of all representatives across the agency, so that concerns associated with a particular location can be discussed "externally".		

Appendix 3

Table 2.3.1 (U): Employees feedback (U).

THEME	RELATED ISSUES	DEMONSTRATED BEHAVIOUR	PROPOSED SOLUTIONS	EXPECTED OUTCOMES	TIMELINE
Communication	Dissemination of Information	Communication of new employees or recently appointed staff not broadly know.	Create email, through Comms (perhaps) they announce new staff members/acting staff so all Centres are aware of new people and their roles.	Helps break down silos amongst agencies. Everyone is aware of new staff and their role, which may be of use amongst agencies. Demonstrate unity amongst Centres and demonstrates one agency goal.	Implementation should happen immediately.
		Information from meetings, RDEC not always disseminated to sections	Managers or DG's at RDEC should make their managers aware of upcoming 'issues', requests or changes in process. This way they can disseminate the information to the working level staff as a 'heads up'.	Increased flow of information between 'levels'. Staff/management increase trust level; productivity. The 'why' may be better answered or recognized.	6 months, better flow/dissemination of information from RDEC to working level staff
		Centres are allocating budgets differently. Travel caps not being adhered to within each organization. Info from DG seems incomplete and arbitrary. ADM may not provide complete vision for proper dissemination to Section Heads/Project Managers	Describe the 'why' and provide adequate; complete details prior to tasking staff. Often time's tasks are worked on with partial knowledge. ADM needs to clearly define what he is looking for prior to tasking...travel cap should be made prior to budget forecasts. Managers/staff should have concrete expectations or expected outcomes to work off.	Less confusion, more cohesive outcomes and process amongst all Centres. All spreadsheets should have a common look and feel when feeding up to the big spreadsheet in DGSTCO. Eliminating formatting which is time consuming. Less frustration among all levels requesting the information.	Ongoing initiative
	Communicating with staff at lower levels – ADM/townhalls	One-way communication – decreases morale, disconnected, lack of trust. Leaves staff feeling uninformed, disconnected, uncertain Employees are asked to share concerns but nothing tangible seems to get done to address those concerns. Emails and verbal responses are too high level and tend to be so wrapped in politically correct corporate-speak the	Ask staff for their opinion, implement ideas, and respond to their queries in a timely fashion. Townhalls provide two way communication/connection with ADM. However, when he states that questions will be answered, he needs to follow through in a timely manner. Not 6-12 months later. More meaningful communication. Not so political, real communication, vision.	Increased level of trust between senior leadership and staff. Staff feels heard and respected. Increase productivity, morale and enthusiasm, as the 'why' is answered. Establish clear guidelines on time limits management can take to respond back to requests, which enables periodic follow-up to	

		meaning is diluted or lost. Communication from ADM: ADM sufficient, but the message content is too high level and often does not speak to the concerns felt by staff		measure progress.	
	Communicating with staff at lower levels – Management cell	Staff at working level not sought for advice/opinion • Decisions are made, often feel arbitrary in nature. Working level workload increase. Feeding into a process that changes and has no clear mandate or expected results for the agency.	Clearly define requirements prior to tasking. Ask questions of staff, seek opinions. Same solution as above	Staff that understands the requirements should be able to contact anyone at a different lab and receive the same messaging. People are willing to put in the effort if they know why or feel appreciated.	
		Upper Management not in touch with work load of staff, demand quick turnaround, creating unnecessary stress. Work/Life Balance suffers.	Example: PMA was not clearly defined. It was after the fact. Countless hours were put into this process. Many AA's worked overtime to assist their Managers achieve the deadline.	People are willing to put in the effort if they know why or feel appreciated.	
		There is a sense that some initiatives (like the 1 DRDC committee) are box-ticking exercises so that someone can be seen to be addressing an issue, without any real concern for whether the core issue gets resolved.	Listen, engage and implement. Say what you mean and mean what you say. Less political checking and verbiage and more sincere, tangible communication and implementation.		
		Managerial stagnation.	ADM/upper management should communicate with managers before announcing majors changes that impact employees. This would give time for managers to understand and prepare themselves to explain the impact of such decisions on employees. The most personnel involved in the decisions at the lowest level possible, the most chances are of them buying in the decision. At a minimum, centre directors should be made aware, and most preferably, section heads. Put metrics into place to assess major transformations.		

	Management Workshop	To get to know and trust others, to promote a feeling of duty of care	Allow employees to have Face to Face meetings yearly – bi yearly to engage with colleagues.	
Management style & structure ▪	No Champion for Corporate Services	We have no DG\n\nCorpS staff needs to still feel engaged, part of community...not lost in shuffle.	Staff Director position of Corporate Services with a former Corporate Services Manager. Need to maintain knowledge	Creates trust during another re-org for Corporate Services staff
	Integration of new employees. Poor support system for new employees	Employees feel they are unable to take leave because the organization is short-staffed	Create Orientation Package that informs new employees of the structure, 1 page on each agency, common processes. Key people for them to contact.	
			Rotate managers back into their communities.	
	'Red tape'	Too many levels of process, management. Identified as major irritants leading to low efficiency, feelings of hopelessness, high stress, increased workload and low performance\n\nDelays in obtaining simple answers/approvals from management is often excessively long.	Trust employees,\n\n\nAllow for wider discretion of CDs.	
	Trust/SMART	Few case types are available for reference concerning the SMART objectives.	Better coordinate between government departments to share SMART objectives.	
	Program Formulation	New program formulation Objective: Help Science get in touch with clients	Clearly define objective of Program Formulation and	

		and support them. However, many projects have fallen through or just stopped because no client support or involvement; how is this a better structure than before?	expected outcomes.		
		Defence scientists are scientists first. Many of us who are trained in a specific area of expertise have to wait to be approached by someone with a relevant question in our area. As a result, we quickly lose our area of expertise and creativity.			
		Program formulation has been entirely taken out of the hands of scientists and given to a centralized cabal of higher-ups.			
		Management unable to produce guidance needed by scientists to determine research topics and specific research questions.			
	Lack of Management understanding or execution	Unable to produce a compelling vision of where the opportunities are for scientific enquiry in the future. This, again, may be a result of slavishly concentrating on serving the client when the client is not knowledgeable of or even interested in science.	Set clearly defined roles, priorities and targets for research to be effective, collaborative and in line with client requirements (even if they do not know they require it yet)		

		Lack of Management Skills & too many layers of management	Too many Managers are promoted without having any managerial experience. They do not understand the human component. Group leaders, Section Heads and upper management (Lencioni element: All)	Should be sent on training for management style, communication course (disseminating information, talking to staff) Conflict resolution, leadership skills course.	Creates a better functioning organization; Increase morale amongst staff, decrease stress due to management lack of knowledge or use of 'power', increase productivity amongst staff, as well as loyalty and trust	
				Undertake a comprehensive review of the structure and management practices across DRDC		
				Re-evaluate the need for the number of management positions at the agency (CSS has some sections consisting of less than 3 staff);		
				Implement a "flatter" (de-layered), more networked organizational structure		
				Set a maximum time limit per position to allow rotation and bring in fresh ideas.		
		Lack of non-Scientific Upper Management Representation	There are too many scientists at the upper echelons of DRDC power. Scientists are great, given the context of DRDC and its mandate, but they do not know everything and should be surrounded by non-scientific experts.	It is well documented that a performing organization counts on complementary multidisciplinary people in top management positions. Ensure upper scientific management have people at their levels who challenge the current "wisdom of things" to ensure best practices. This would provide great opportunity for DRDC which excellent talent at all levels. At least several non-scientific positions should be at level 2.		
				Institute a policy of longer site visits from the ADM and DGs – a minimum of three days. It's easy to cover up the cracks and make a centre seem pleasant for a day, but an extended visit will give them a chance to see how things really operate.		
				We suggest that DG postings become remote postings, so that someone in Halifax (for example) would be able to apply for the position without having to move.		

		Removal of DG's from Labs	With the DGs moving out of the labs, we feel less connected to that level, less engagement from that level, and have less understanding of the program formulation process, and les confidence that the DGs "get" our work and are able to represent it to the client.	Visibility of DG's. Create knowledge base for all employees to know what DG's are doing. We only hear of two DG's – DGSTCO and COS. There are more, unaware of what DGPrograms do, who they are and where they reside.	Foster trust, communication, guidance, knowledge of the 'why'. Why projects are changing, evolving, etc.	
			Feeling that DGs are not looking out for our best interest	DG's need to be part of the DRDC Community, not a separate branch.	Bring the DG back to the centre. Have an office for them within the research centres, to be staffed for 4 months at a time. Video conferencing and Nexus can keep them in communication with their office while they learn about, and interact with, employees.	
			The employees have no social capital with the Director Generals. DGs used to be able to fight on the centre's side, provide the needed authority to enable decisions, understand a centre's needs and capabilities, and represent the centre when forming relationships within government, military, and private industry. Furthermore, trust cannot be built in absentia, so efforts to re-create these capabilities have been unsuccessful.			
		Work Descriptions, Roles & Responsibilities, and Collective Bargaining (part 1)	There is confusion between PM and section heads roles.	Roles of PMs/section heads must be respected.		
			Possibility of growth is very limited for a non DS.	Only consider qualification based employee promotion.		
			Our jobs grow as we become better at them and more is asked of us from local management.	Respect classification standards and pay employees according to the work they do. Promote internal employee competency and interest.		
			Workload and number of tasks are increasing and therefore jobs are often under evaluated.	A re-evaluation of the work descriptions must be done every 5 years, as defined by TBS. Those doing far more than their work description as per the instructions of local management should be paid according to the work they do.		
				Managers are typically ignorant of Collective Agreements - they need serious training. They are also ignorant of work descriptions,		

		Managers lack understanding about the limits of what can be placed on a job description. Processes are too long and not adapted to our customer. FTE system is utopic since centers are not accounting time per employee precisely on a daily basis. Who should be giving guidance on priorities of employees' role/position?	how they are written, what can be added/removed, classification levels and standards, and rely too heavily on HR which favors the employer's side of things. Training and more union representation would be good. Doing work outside one's classification level or that is dangerous must be refused - the union must become involved. There needs to be a dedicated person/group to analyse processes and adjust them in relation to business needs. Assess the relevance of implementing a time accounting system.		
	Work Descriptions, Roles & Responsibilities, and Collective Bargaining (part 2)	Civilian employees are not necessarily familiar with the CF. Similarly, military members are not necessarily familiar with DRDC roles and responsibilities. Lack of personnel in almost every section, managers are lacking solutions to try to get tasks done as per signed charters. Not easy to know who`s doing what in the organization, the organizational chart is hard to find. There are less opportunities to know personnel from the center better. Lack of knowledge about the roles of liaison officers within DRDC.	Training could be offered pertaining to the MND as a whole, at a minimum it should encompass the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF), and ADM S&T. Civilian DRDC personnel should have access to online training to better understand the CAF, perhaps subsets of courses such as those offered in the Canadian Armed Forces Junior Officer Development (CAFJOD). Implement voluntary temporary position of civilian employees within military organisations, to facilitate interactions. Hire more qualified personnel where required. Would be beneficial to post ADM S&T organizational chart on the ADM S&T webpage and on PDM/NEXUS for easy access. May be beneficial to have a "café du centre" once a month, a few sections at a time, including upper management. Create more opportunities for liaison officers to get more involved within the projects, sections, PMs, so that people know who they are, in order to improve the impact with respect to CF.		

		Appears to be heavy requirement for management and corporate services to support a small and shrinking S&T staff. It feels science is not valued.			
Harassment and Workplace Conditions for Public Service	Accountability Commitment & trust	Harassment is not resolved on time and efficiently. Tolerance zero means nothing without actions; verbal and written denigration is tolerated within the agency. There is lack of respect at all levels through the agency. Employees are not at ease to denounce. Lack of information on follow through with regards to grievances and harassment.	Harassment declaration, resolution process and time involved have to be improved. Provide mandatory yearly training on harassment prevention, and clearly explains difference between harassment and conflict. Clearly define what is tolerance zero, clearly communicating consequences. Name two harassment advisors within each center, male and female, whose tasks would be to advise employees, and not management. Non-identifiable statistics so we can all be aware of how the issues are being handled and which will give an improved sense of accountability and transparency.		
	Whistleblowing Trust and mastering conflict	There exists political pressure between management and employees. Many do not know their rights and obligations under current legislation.	Raise the situation with local management and, if necessary, one step above, otherwise through the union. Provide reminders for employee to know their rights and responsibilities. http://www.pipsc.ca/portal/page/portal/website/slc/pdfs/whistleblowing.en.pdf http://www.forces.gc.ca/assets/FORCES_Internet/docs/en/contact/2014-guidelines-whistleblowing.pdf http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rp/icgtb-eng.asp		

Organizational Structure/ re-org(s)/ geographical awareness		Change the organizational culture to brake barriers between employee types and specific position (DS, EC, CO, ENG, AS, CH, PM, …)	personnel directory Bring back the heraldic crests / center-specific identities	Develop WD that will support DRDC internal professional growth based on the capacity to do the job and not on the base that for an AS-06, we need to have a priori an AS-4-5.	
				Internal Postings: Base the choice on what an employee has accomplished in DRDC, in GoC, in the private sector and not necessarily in the last 2 years which we know discriminate heavily and opens door for favoritism or to a bias in the hiring.	
	Each lab/agency is on its own. Silo effect	People are working on similar projects and have no idea between labs, even sections within the same lab.	Build an internal 'Facebook' to facilitate exchange across DRDC, between employee about their interests, knowledge, DRDC project to be started;	Increase employee awareness across all Centres.	
		Collaboration amongst Centres missing. Unsure of what other Centres are working on. May have similar tasks.	Personnel Directory		
	Teamwork/Collaboration		Hold a technical symposium every year to encourage collaboration between centres.	Allows for collaboration/enthusiasm amongst employees. Platform to discuss/demonstrate achievements.	
		Excessive centralization of power			
			Annually, some non-management employees from each center should be given the opportunity to travel to other centres to foster a knowledge base of those centres; alternatively have Agency-wide symposiums by VTCs as suggested by CORA	Teamwork fundamental component to a healthy working environment.	
			Should be recognized in all evaluations, including Managements Performance Review.		
			Not everyone is evaluated equally. Create standardized evaluation. Break down silos/tribes.		

		Geographical Awareness /Issues (disconnect)	We feel disconnected from the Agency and the other centres. We do not know what research goes on at the other centres and most of us never have an opportunity to visit them. We are often not eligible to apply for job opportunities at other centres	Open up competitions to all agency employees, no matter where they are located geographically		
		(lack of) Visibility of Senior Management, ADM in remote locations; Suffield	There is lack of authority at our Centre now to stand up for SRC's interests when dealing with CFB Suffield. The CD does not have the same authority to deal with the on-site Base Commander as the DG did previously. This affects all issues relating to infrastructure and ultimately has a negative effect on our capability.	Bring back DGs to the centres

Post Senior Military Officers to the centre with the same authority as the Base Commander | | |
| | | | The travel budget does not take into account that it takes a full day to travel from Suffield to most major cities, another day to travel back and that there are costs associated with this (airfare, hotel, per diem and mode of travel). This affects our interactions with the client, interactions with senior managers/program directors and attendance at conferences and meetings. | Give the outlying centres extra funding for travel to compensate for their geographic location. | | |
| | | | S&T staff unclear direction on tasks, how to prioritize them when there are conflicts over the use of people's time or availability of facilities. | ADM and senior managers need to allocate sufficient time to | | |

	Organizational uncertainty regarding work and priorities	Want clear definition of their role (S&T Staff) going forward – are we doing science, or managing science. It's unclear where SHs can obtain new work for their employees. They need to know who to talk to for help with this process.	spend at Suffield More guidance for employees on what tasks are a priority and why organizational tasks have a set, often tight, timelines ; for instance, employees rushed to get something done (e.g., capability review) at end of fiscal when other things are due. Once organizational tasks have been completed, timely, constructive feedback is needed. Provide employees with a written document/more clarity on what our priorities are, what should we be focusing on now and what our future focus looks like; who do we talk to if we run into research roadblocks? SH, CD, CH, DG, PM? Documented – ToR for example		

	Organizational Structure (cont'd)	The organizational structure is not clearly communicated (new positions, acting positions). A new org chart and description of the roles/responsibilities for positions outside the center would be helpful.	Clearly define the new structure. Have this documented in an area that is accessible to all employees.	
	Chain of Command (Civilian)	Civilian employees' chain of command is unclear. They don't know who to talk to if there is problem and fear "getting in trouble" if they talk to someone higher up in management. Before, employees were able to talk freely to the DGs – there's too much bureaucracy in the new process.		
	One Agency	In order to feel and work as one agency we need more than VTC, Nexus, and SharePoint. Tools are necessary but not sufficient to facilitate effective collaboration.	Face to face meetings, especially as the team gets to know each other, would foster better communication, collaboration, and trust which in turn would increase feelings of being one team/one agency.	
		If VTC is the most viable option, then the technology/equipment needs to work seamlessly.	Provide VTC equipment that is reliable, and provides clear image and sound quality.	
		The culturally distinct nature of each lab should be acknowledged within the "1 DRDC" mindset. Each lab is unique in its focus, location, and culture, and that is part of our strength. We can all work together as a team, but we will be more effective if we embrace the realities of our differences as we strive to meet our challenges.	Provide more opportunities and support for face to face contact between centers.	

		Even though we are supposed to be one agency, competition between centers is being fostered over funding, FTEs, and even projects – it feels as though every lab is out for their own survival.			
	Re-org(s) : Low morale at DRDC resulting from several reorganizations, new capabilities and change fatigue	In Toronto, beginning in 2001, there has been frequent reorganizing, new capabilities, and change fatigue that has greatly affected employees' morale. -Respect for science – with a reorganization that is focused on short-term solutions, research with a longer time-line does not appear to be part of the program, making it difficult for scientists to be innovative and feel empowered . Corporate Services has gone through 3 org- restructures in 3 years. Staff is frustrated. Last re-org seemed to be working well, why change it.	Communicate (non-political manner) why there is a requirement for change. Respect and acknowledge the incredible work that has been done over the past several years adopting new processes, changes to organizations. The disbandment of Corporate Services. Keep same procedures for longer than 6 months. Stick to priorities/capabilities for more than 3-5 years. Stop changing things in arbitrary ways. Understand the complexity of having corporate service functions silo'd into other organizations. Example; ADM(IE), ADM(HR-Civ). Maintain connection and service level prior to segregation		
Respect of Official Languages	Correspondence (paper & electronic) and meetings not in bilingual format	Correspondence (paper & electronic) and meetings are almost always in English when done outside of Valcartier.	ADM to ensure law is enforced. GoC policy and law dictate that Public Service is BILINGUAL and this must be respected. This must be respected as per law. The ADM must enforce this.		
Technological Resources	Different sections use different audiovisual (AV)	Different amongst agencies. Some agencies are more sophisticated.	One look and feel. All agencies should be upgraded for VTC and audio calls.	Provides confidence when using equipment. Should work most if not all the time. Greater	

	teleconferencing equipment, each of which is already difficult to use.	Better capabilities.		client/stake holder interaction.
	DRDC's VPN procurement was poorly orchestrated and insufficient VPN keys exist. When used, it does not work properly.			Save funds on travel if systems are properly working.
	Depending under which management structure you are, you have or not the possibility of teleworking. It is perceived negatively, as some have preferential treatments.			
Policies & Admin Practices	Processes and forms keep changing on a regular basis. Processes are too long and there`s too much bureaucracy.	Training form changed but not implemented by all, even amongst Centre.	Implement TBS compliant policies, not DRDC policies which change intermittently according to managerial whims. Have L0 and L1 propose options to influence TBS and government to adopt simplified policies that will enable workers to do their jobs.	
	Policy, standard and tools for government wide support are deployed years after other departments. Consequently we redo administrative practices.	Agency procedures are producing more churn at the bench level, making it difficult to produce tangible results.		
	Knowledge of Travel Policy (Managers)	Managers have the ability to refuse an employee staying at a TBS approved hotel because of vendettas or personal bias.	Managers must be reminded to respect TBS travel policy. They must be given training if necessary.	
		Managers treat all travelling employees the same, regardless of the rights signed our respective Collective Agreements which are sometimes different concerning travel	Managers must be reminded to respect to TBS Collective Agreements. They must be given training if necessary.	

	Travel	Travel is curtailed so limited opportunity to meet and collaborate with peers; when rarely appear at the table you are forgotten.			
Service Delivery	Accountability and achieving commitment	Current process simplification initiatives (Purchasing, security, hiring, travel requests, etc.) are seen as complete failures. Last minute requests should not become the norm.	Seek out best practices and existing technologies which may be able to provide the required functionality rather than program it in-house. Establish a roadmap including all activities, perform a business plan. Harmonize requests coming from upper HQs. Establish a cycle of periodic reports required by upper management.		
The Program/Project Structure	Inability to conduct science	Hamper ability to be innovative, agile and to deliver S&T. It affects the mandate and deliverables to our client because we are doing less science. The new Project Structure has a fixed	Process SME's (ADMIN, TECH, HR, IT, etc.) need to be given a more active role completing the processes rather than just advising; hire travel SME; ensure proper training, SOPs and simplify the processes so they are time efficient; change the metrics to reflect whether each process speeds up science output or not - then fix the process accordingly Re-instate agility funding; increase visibility at Corporate level of the importance of participating in partner activities		

	funding arrangement so that we are not easily able to respond to S&T gaps that are identified at meetings with our allies or OGDs - a skill that Canada used to be envied for. As one senior researcher put it, "We are no longer able to punch above our weight class".				
Procurement Process – Valcartier	There is a lack of stability within the procurement department due to the continuous change in leadership since 2011. As a consequence, purchasing at DRDC Valcartier is excessively laborious.Unhelpful managerial comments only further serve to divide employees who work hard to deliver programs to management who takes a hands-off approach to our daily realities.		Purchasing should provide daily, weekly, monthly and yearly metrics for the different types of purchases.		
			Prioritizing files by not penalizing those who submit on time.		
			Local management needs to be re-educated about how acquisition are managed. It is recommended that personnel managing acquisition cards should have up to date procurement course (Expenditure management: Sections 32, 33, 34 of the FAA) and be familiar with the Financial Administration Manual (Chap 1016-7-1).		
			Improved training for Purchasing officers. Every officer should know how to do all the other purchasing duties as well.		
			Purchasing processes need to be redefined at DRDC. Purchasing management needs to do a better job communicating why they have excessive delays.		
			Hire more temporary/permanent employees. Ensure priority is put on staffing a permanent position for section head to promote stability.		
			DRDC Valcartier needs to respect and comply with TBS purchasing policies and Procurement Administrative Manual (PAM).		

			Have DND DM approve powers to DCs to make purchases up to <100K or <1M to help improve the efficiency of large purchases.		
Annual Review/PMA/PLP	EG Progression Plan	"EG" classification for many of our technicians. Four years ago, the previous method by which EGs could expect to get a promotion (to an EG-4 from an EG-3, for example) was shut down, with the aims to introduce a new system which would be fairer and more meritorious than the previous, more subjective version. Process not in place			
	Allowable time for career progression activities Management	Give up to 20% of assignable time for an asking employee to work in a project which is related to his expertise/interest, even though it is not related to his substantive position.			
	Lack of support for training & professional development, particularly for conference attendance	For Defence Scientists, conference attendance should be viewed as a training activity required for DS professional development, networking, and to stay relevant in their area of expertise; and attendance should be managed differently than other travel. The current mandate on travel and events often does not allow more than 1 scientist to attend a conference, resulting in 1 person presenting the work of their peers, often without full knowledge of the area. Papers for conferences may be due before attendance has been approved, which can mean time is spend writing papers that do not get presented because attendance is denied. Some DSs choose to attend a conference that is less relevant and lower visibility	Need more transparency and clearer guidelines on what type of training/event/travel will be approved as well as who has the approval authority. When any of the above are not approved, an explanation as to why is necessary. There needs to be a clear definition of what professional development is in the organization.		

		because there won't be others competing to attend, so they are more likely to be approved than for the conference that really matters for them.			
		The lack of support and understanding of the necessity of conference attendance from the new structure is unsettling.			
		The organization needs to distinguish between training and travel. People think the goal is to send as many people as possible for training as it improves their professional development and makes them better at their job but that is not the message employees are receiving			
		What is the fallout for employees if not allowed to train? Who decides which person goes if multiple employees apply for a conference? Not an ideal situation to create competition and resentment among employees			
	PMA – Management Accountability and trust	Few case types are available for reference concerning the SMART objectives.	Consistent messaging and training to management/evaluators/project managers, etc		
		Employees with bad performance are hidden and protected by management.			
	Management support – PMA/PLP	Some performance evaluations are contaminated by conflicting managers and employees.	Revise the leadership competencies in accordance with the new (2015) Treasury Board Key Leadership Competency Profile (align with EX qualification standard);		
		The quality of some individuals' work is	Ensure, rate against measurable such as values/ethics; practical application.		

		unacceptable.	Ensure that Managers are properly evaluated by their subordinates. Implement 360 PMA		
		Local managers do not have the information they need to help us with career development; they have no time to champion us because they are busy with other agency imposed deadlines.			
		Managers and SH have little to offer in terms of career development; many positions are acting which is not helpful for DSs who need career advice/development.			
	Promotion System Better	Funds are not dispersed by employee. It is up to the manager who gets what training. Often Managers only allow training for current positions, not developmental. French Language – why can't an employee choose to use the allotted training towards French language when it's a requirement for their position.	Allow employees to use funding for both current requirements and developmental. This will increase morale and productivity as employees are being heard and their contribution towards the agency is being recognized		
	Workload & Evaluation	We are given tight timelines to work on things like capability review. Takes time away from client work that we are actually evaluated on; we get no credit towards career progression for supporting agency led initiatives such as capability review and are penalized on our annual review for not completing deliverables.	Review all tasks during evaluation period. Ensure that tasks not considered deliverables is given value. Acknowledge and understand the time commitment associated with 'above and beyond' requests.		

				Increased morale. Employees are heard. Managers are following through on signed off learning plan 'desires'.
	Training funds available for each FTE – not widely spread • Insufficient funds for maintaining employee skillset, especially for technical positions (EG, CS, DS, ENG, etc.). Standards indicate 2% employee salary to be set aside for training but DRDC reality is a fraction of this. • CorpS staff usually mandatory training not developmental	Corporate Services – lots of mandatory training however, training is often denied when it's developmental. Seems favoritism at play. French, when requesting within the $1300.00 limit should be granted as training if levels have expired, developmental, etc.	Employees should be allowed to choose what training they take outside of mandatory. Leadership course, French, University Course, use their allotment to further their career or knowledge in their current position. Stop paying for contractor/consultant training from research budgets. Instead, pay for employees involved in the projects to receive necessary training. Set aside more corporate funds on training, apart from yearly mandatory training (ex. harassment, work safety courses, etc.).	Increase trust and initiative amongst staff.
Publications Process ADMINISTRATIVE	High level of centralization	Centralization in Publications gives impression that DRDC does not trust its staff, especially when the reason cited for needing tight control is the quality of publications in the past.	Allow centers to have a publication officer who works at the center to increase "face-time" between the publication system and scientists who use the system. Allow these publication officers to have more control over decision making on publications. Publication officers should develop familiarity in a particular domain.	
		Mixed messages about whether or not we are treated as professionals. Major backlog & inaction	Hire more qualified temporary personnel to clear the backlog. Metrics need to be provided for its current status and estimates as	

			to its completion.		
	Trust				
	Commitment from Staff				
	Accountability with Clients	Problems with the system have created			
	Best results not achieved		DRDC should be a leader in information management (IM)

Implement TBS best practices for maintaining knowledge and expertise in-house, and implement industry -grade software to help manage the large volumes of data and reports generated, at multiple levels of classification. | | |
| THEME | RELATED ISSUES | DEMONSTRATED BEHAVIOUR | PROPOSED SOLUTIONS | EXPECTED OUTCOMES | TIMELINE |

Annex 3   A note on the key deficiency of communications

1 DRDC and RDEC: consistency, timeliness and completeness

Situation

Since May 2015, the focal attention of 1 DRDC is to empower all DRDC employees to collectively improve the underlying elements of the PSES 2014 identified deficiencies, while protecting and improving our organization's identified strengths. Hitherto, all initiatives proposed by 1 DRDC and supported by ADM S&T got a general positive welcome across the wide spectrum of actors composing the DRDC Team.

Complication

Communications remain however deficient to a point of disruptiveness. While ADM S&T messages and 1 DRDC Team personal contacts with peers seems generally very efficient to mobilize, 1 DRDC manoeuvre seems still too limited. This may be explained both by DRDC deficient culture regarding open communications, and by the available mediums to catalyst the previous cultural change. Those mediums range from the organization's figures of authority and/or leadership, to the enabling technologies (*e.g.* shared intranet and email systems). A consequence is an apparent inconsistency between the efforts deployed by 1 DRDC and the perceived day-to-day behaviour of DRDC as a whole.

Solution

1 DRDC poses the hypothesis that coordinated and consistent tangible actions between 1 DRDC and RDEC is the most promising course of action toward influencing the PSES aforementioned focal items. The hitherto proposed initiatives led 1 DRDC to feel a sense of completeness with limited efforts clusters *i.e.* the current 1 DRDC (8) initiatives are covering all the focal PSES items. However, key actors empowerment to align their efforts and associated messages implies these initiatives appropriation, and most likely iteration.
To this effect, 1 DRDC proposes to brief RDEC about its limitation to influence on its own the PSES focal items, the perceived importance of an active participation of the RDEC members at this moment, and a proposed list of tangible elements a joint 1 DRDC RDEC "coalition" can tackle at short term. The first measure of achievement is nothing less than the PSES 2017 upcoming survey. The other measures to be *e.g.* improved moral, wellness, and productivity.

Decisions

- Based on the previous, ADM S&T and 1 DRDC vision and messages alignment;

- With the goal of consistency, ADM S&T support to catalyst RDEC empowerment and sustained commitment toward the expressed goal;
- With the goal to overcome communications deficiencies, thus favouring joint efforts timeliness and completeness, ADM S&T support to include for a determined term a 1 DRDC liaison within RDEC; and,
- Accept to develop a coordinated approach between ADM S&T and 1 DRDC to enable the *sine qua non* trust required to make these decisions lead to the expressed desired end states.

Prepared by: Mrs Becca Atkinson and Dr. Luc Pigeon, 1 DRDC Co-Chairs.

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA					
(Security markings for the title, abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the document is Classified or Designated)					

1.	ORIGINATOR (The name and address of the organization preparing the document. Organizations for whom the document was prepared, e.g., Centre sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, are entered in Section 8.) DRDC – Valcartier Research Centre Defence Research and Development Canada 2459 route de la Bravoure Quebec (Quebec) G3J 1X5 Canada	2a.	SECURITY MARKING (Overall security marking of the document including special supplemental markings if applicable.) CAN UNCLASSIFIED
		2b.	CONTROLLED GOODS NON-CONTROLLED GOODS DMC A

3.	TITLE (The complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification should be indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S, C or U) in parentheses after the title.) 1 DRDC recommendation: Trust rebuilding through team unity

4.	AUTHORS (last name, followed by initials – ranks, titles, etc., not to be used) Pigeon, L.

5.	DATE OF PUBLICATION (Month and year of publication of document.) February 2018	6a. NO. OF PAGES (Total containing information, including Annexes, Appendices, etc.) 43	6b. NO. OF REFS (Total cited in document.) 4

7.	DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (The category of the document, e.g., technical report, technical note or memorandum. If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.) Reference Document

8.	SPONSORING ACTIVITY (The name of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development – include address.) DRDC – Valcartier Research Centre Defence Research and Development Canada 2459 route de la Bravoure Quebec (Quebec) G3J 1X5 Canada

9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.)	9b. CONTRACT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.)

10a. ORIGINATOR'S DOCUMENT NUMBER (The official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document.) DRDC-RDDC-2018-D0023	10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NO(s). (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.)

11a. FUTURE DISTRIBUTION (Any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.) Unlimited

11b. FUTURE DISTRIBUTION OUTSIDE CANADA (Any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.) NONE

12. ABSTRACT (A brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), (R), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both official languages unless the text is bilingual.)

This document summarizes the recommendations made by the 1 DRDC Committee Co-Chairs to the Research and Development Executive Committee (RDEC) January 19th 2017 at the request of the Assistant Deputy Minister Science and Technologies (ADM S&T), Dr. Marc Fortin. It is intended to provide a summary of the key points shared by 1 DRDC as their recommendations to work toward improvements for both the future Public Service Employee Survey (PSES) and more fundamentally, for our own organization's efficiency and a better workplace. Its annexes present a selection of documents intended to provide an overview of the 1 DRDC Committee's main milestones aimed toward rebuilding organizational trust, team communications, commitment to decisions, and unity to results.

_____

Ce document résume les recommandations qui ont été présentées par les co-présidents du comité 1 RDDC au Comité Exécutif Recherche et Développement (CERD) le 19 janvier 2017 à la demande du Sous-Ministre Adjoint Science et Technologies (SMA S&T), le Dr. Marc Fortin. Ces recommandations ont été produites avec pour cibles d'améliorer à la fois la perception des employés lors de prochains Sondage auprès des fonctionnaires fédéraux (SAFF), mais plus fondamentalement, l'efficacité et le climat de travail de l'organisation SMA S&T/RDDC. Ses annexes sont constituées d'une sélection de documents présentant les principales étapes par lesquelles le comité a cheminé, orienté vers un rétablissement de la confiance envers l'organisation, de meilleures communications entre ses équipes, d'un engagement du personnel envers les décisions, et finalement d'un sentiment d'appartenance à ses résultats.

13. KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS (Technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus, e.g., Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

Efficacité organisationnelle; Organizational Agility; Workplace Well-being; Public Service Employee Survey; Trust (Human/Teams)