

Executive Summary

The 2024 United States Army Garrison (USAG) Fort Riley Command Climate Survey was conducted to comply with Army Regulation 600-20, RAR 20-SEPT 2012 and IMCOM OPORD 21-025 DEOCS. The intent of conducting the survey is to provide Commanders insight into the respondents' perspectives of their work environment and to serve as a gauge by which to measure the effectiveness of work climate improvement initiatives.

SURVEY DESIGN

The 2024 Defense Organizational Climate Survey (DEOCS) contained nineteen (19) overall Protective and Risk factors. The survey measured ten (10) Protective Factors: Cohesion, Connectedness, Engagement and Commitment, Fairness, Inclusion, Morale, Safe Storage for Lethal Means, Work-Life Balance, Leadership Support, and Transformational Leadership; and nine (9) Risk Factors: Alcohol Impairing Memory, Binge Drinking, Stress, Passive Leadership, Toxic Leadership, Racially Harassing Behaviors, Sexually Harassing Behaviors, Sexist Behaviors, and Workplace Hostility.

DEOCS utilizes these factors because they are related to six (6) identified DEOCS Strategic Target Outcomes (STOs). The STOs include Racial/Ethnic Harassment/Discrimination, Readiness, Retention, Sexual Assault, Sexual Harassment, and Suicide.

The factors were assessed by having survey participants respond to questions using a five-point scale. The scale ranged from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Those responses were then categorized and color-coded by the DEOCS platform as unfavorable (red), neutral (yellow), or favorable (green). Results were also broken out in demographic categories that include gender, race/ethnicity, officer status, supervisor status, and military/civilian status. The demographic information is based on information provided by survey participants and for results to be displayed each question must have had at least five responses from the same demographic group. Survey participants also had the opportunity to write in responses and comments to selected questions. These comments were not rated.

There were ten (10) locally developed questions or LDQs, ten (10) Service-Specific items linked to the service component on this survey. The responses to these items were broken out showing the percentage of Strongly Agree/Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, and Strongly Disagree/Disagree for each question. There were also 5 short response questions.

EXECUTION OF SURVEY

The survey was registered in DEOCS, and each employee received a system-generated email with instructions on accessing the survey. Directors were informed to enable and encourage their employees to take the survey. The survey was originally open from 12 August 2024 to 13 September 2024. An additional week was added to the survey due to low participation rates from one (1) Directorate, DFMWR, moving the

survey close date to 20 September 2024. Weekly reminders and updates were sent to Directors via e-mail. The overall response rate of 44% was lower than last year's by 1%. There were two (2) Directorates that showed an increase of more than 10% in participation compared to last year, DHR and Small Directorates. There were four (4) Directorates that had decreased participation by 10% or less with no decrease in participation of more than 10%. There were 14 fewer employees on board this year as compared to this time last year (1154 FY23 vs 1140 FY24). Each directorate experienced some loss except for two (2): DHR and DFMWR. However, fewer surveys were returned this year compared to last year by 19 surveys.

RESPONSES BASED ON CURRENT STAFFING LEVELS						
		# On BOARD	# Of RESPONSES	PERCENT RESPONSES	FY 23	DIFFERENCE
	SMALL Directorates	48	39/48	81%	40/62%	19%
Garrison Operation		4				
PAIO		5				
PAO		4				
EEO		3				
RSO		5				
GSO		6				
HHC		21				
	MEDIUM Directorates	32	22/32	69%	26/72%	-3%
RMO		15				
OSJA		17				
DES		168	56/168	33%	70/41%	-8%
DHR		55	48/55	87%	39/75%	12%
DFMWR (both APF & NAF included)		445	142/445	32%	127/30%	2%
DPTMS		165	91/165	55%	108/64%	-9%
DPW		227	100/227	44%	107/46%	-2%
TOTAL		1140	498/1140	44%	517/45%	-1%

Starting in 2024, all reportable DEOCS results are weighted using an industry standard process. Weighted survey results produce survey estimates and statistics that are more representative of the DEOCS registration than results without weighting. Like other voluntary surveys, not all members within a unit/organization may respond to a survey resulting in a nonresponse. To account for nonresponse, OPA weights unit/organization members responses to improve survey estimates by accounting for those individuals within a registration who did not respond and by adjusting to known roster totals.

Previous unweighted DEOCS results were recommended to be interpreted based only on those that responded to the DEOCS, however, weighted factor estimates can be interpreted based on the unit/organization as a whole. For example, if 58% of your

DEOCS participants agree with the statement “My immediate supervisor treats me fairly,” an appropriate unweighted interpretation would be “58% of the people in my unit who responded to the DEOCS in 2023 agree that their immediate supervisor treats them fairly.” With the implementation of weighting, however, it would be appropriate to say: “58% of the people in my unit agree that their immediate supervisor treats them fairly.”

SURVEY OUTCOMES

Establishing a basis for analysis.

The DEOCS platform did provide a comparison from the DEOCS survey from 2023 to 2024. The DEOCS also provided alerts for ratings that were deemed “very low” rated Protective Factors or “very high” rated Risk Factors when compared to Fort Riley’s service component (US Army). The alerts will be addressed by Directorate. There are unique cut-off scores for each factor within each service component, so alerted factors could have very different ratings. The short answer and locally developed questions will be addressed by Directorate in this report as well as organizational statistics. All percentages are based on the total number of responses to a question or set of questions. Overall Unit/Organization ratings factor in all survey responses while each Directorate rating is based only on the number of responses from that Directorate.

Overall Areas of Interest

Fort Riley Garrison’s overall trends show that six (6) out of the ten (10) Protective Factors favorable ratings compared to 2023 had a higher positive rate. Cohesive Organization (76% vs 80%), Fair treatment (60% vs 63%), Inclusion in Organization (76% vs 78%), Morale (56% vs 57%), and Work-Life Balance (83% vs 86%). Four (4) out of the ten (10) Protective Factors favorable ratings compared to 2023 had a decreased positive rate. High-Connectedness (83% vs 82%), Engaged and Committed (86% vs 82%), and Transformational Leadership (Unit Leader: 67% vs 55%; Senior NCO/SEL: 69% vs 48%).

Most responses to the LDQs from the overall view were favorable. However, many would like to see more options or opportunities to telework or have a flexible work schedule and more opportunities for training for career growth and development. Communication is still the number one issue in most of the directorates.

As far as Protective Factors, two (2) were flagged as very low compared to all other units and organizations: Transformational Leadership (Unit Leader and Senior NCO/SEL). The 2023 Favorable Rating Comparison for Army overall is 69% and 66%, respectively. These two (2) factors held the highest neutral ratings: 39% and 51% respectively. Outside of these two (2) flagged factors, Morale also had a high neutral rating of 31%.

For Risk Factors, there are high neutral ratings correlating with leadership. Passive Leadership (Unit Leader and Senior NCO/SEL) had the highest neutral rating of 48%

and 56%, respectively. Toxic Leadership (Unit Leader and Senior NCO/SEL) rated 14% and 44%, respectively. However, data shows that there was either no change or slight improvements to nine (9) out of the eleven (11) Risk Factors. The two (2) that exhibited a higher negative response were Passive Leadership: Senior NCO/SEL and Presence of Sexually Harassing Behaviors with a 2% and 1% increase, respectively.

Another note to keep in mind as the breakdown of each directorate is presented is that there are high numbers of neutral ratings and less definitive ratings across the directorates in correlation to data collected about leadership. This is not something to take personal as it reflects the workforce not yet knowing the new command team, which is also reiterated in comments left by the workforce. The efforts and conduct of the new command team are just unknowns right now.

Overall Areas of Excellence

Spotlighting our Service Members first, there were high favorable ratings for Fairness from Enlisted (87%), Military (91%), and Officers (93%). No one from the Military demographic, including Enlisted and Officers, said there was Toxic Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL whereas last year they had the highest unfavorable rating of 9%. Passive Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader was flagged last year for Overall and five (5) Directorates whereas this year it is flagged for only one (1) Directorate, DHR. Passive Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL was flagged last year for one (1) Directorate but is not flagged this year for any. This year, no Directorate has been flagged for Moderate/High Stress compared to last year having one (1) Directorate flagged. Sexually Harassing Behaviors are relatively even across the board for most Directorates, except Medium and Small, ranging from 12% - 14% unfavorable. Biggest improvement is seen for DPW with a 9% decrease in unfavorable ratings. Fewer Females and Non-Supervisors both at 13% this year said they are receiving unfair treatment than last year (21% and 20%, respectively). Fewer Females and Minorities, both at 7% this year, said there is a presence of Sexist Behaviors than last year (13% and 11%, respectively). All across the Civilian demographics (Race, Gender, and Supervisory Status), more are saying there is no Workplace Hostility with increase in favorable ratings anywhere from 3% - 6%.

Overall Opportunities for Improvement

There is always room for improvement as there is no perfect well-oiled machine. Starting with our Service Members, Connectedness rated low for Military (14%), Officers (14%), and Enlisted (16%). Not being Engaged and Committed was rated by Military (10%) and Enlisted (21%). 19% of Enlisted rated Not Inclusive whereas Officers rated 100% inclusive. Similarly, 13% of Enlisted rated Leadership Not Supportive whereas Officers rated 100% supportive. DFMWR maintains the highest unfavorable rating for Work-Life Balance at 13%, which is the same as last year. DFMWR was also flagged on Fairness at 49% (50% in FY 23) and Leadership Support at 75% (77% in FY 23).

DFMWR had most of the lowest scores overall in almost all of the factors, except the Safe Storage of Lethal Weapons. Demographic data from this year shares a similar story where Females and Supervisors had the highest ratings for Low Morale, same as last year, at 10% and 7%, respectively. Although exhibiting a 3% increase in favorable ratings for Workplace Hostility, data shows that DHR exhibited a significant increase in their unfavorable ratings of +14% compared to their 6% unfavorable rating from last year's data and was subsequently flagged. The demographic category that had the highest unfavorable rating were Supervisors at 15%.

Flags: DFMWR rated significantly low by the workforce compared to other Directorates as well as Army Overall in Fairness (49% vs 54%) and Leadership Support – Ratings for All Immediate Supervisors (75% vs 82%). DES, DPTMS, and the Medium Directorates were all flagged for Safe Storage for Lethal Means (67%, 59%, and 76%, respectively) with Army Overall being at 82% favorable for 2023. DHR rated significantly unfavorably high by the workforce compared to other Directorates as well as Total DoD and Army Overall for Passive Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader (21% vs 17%). Additionally, DHR was also flagged for Workplace Hostility at a 20% unfavorable rating compared to Total DoD (15%) and Army Overall (17%).

Recommendations for Way Forward

Each individual Director should review their results and create an action plan to address their specific issues to the Commander. The survey data is a snapshot and may not provide enough information for Directors to act upon. Directors should consider additional means to assess the issues such as organizing informal discussions, sensing sessions, conducting observations, or reviewing records.