

DEOCS 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.

SUMMARY OF EACH DIRECTORATE

DES

Participation analysis: There was a decrease in the number of DES staff that took the survey (56 vs 70 in FY 23), but DES had the second lowest response rate at 33% which is down from 41% in FY 23.

Protective factors: Of note, the Females and Minorities that responded to the survey had lower positive response rates on all the Protective Factors than the Males and Whites. The highest favorability ratings for the Protective Factors category were Supportive Leadership (89% vs 83% in FY 23), Cohesive Organization at 83%, and Work-Life Balance at 82%. Connectedness (81% - same as last year). However, the Females that responded feel far more connected at 78% versus 46% in FY 23. DES had the lowest ratings in the following Protective Factors: Transformational Leadership - Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL (35% down from 64% in FY23). Morale: High Morale is at

49% up from 35% in FY23 and Low Morale went down from 14% in FY 23 to 10% in FY 24. Safe Storage for Lethal Means at 67% (vs 69% in FY 23). Females that responded feel that firearms should not be stored safely at 22% which is down by 21% from FY 23. Minorities that responded with the lowest at 60% feeling that weapons should be stored safely. DES had the second lowest rating on Transformational Leadership - Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL with 35%.

Risk factors: DES did not have any Risk Factors flagged. The highest favorable rating for the Risk Factors includes Frequent Alcohol Memory Loss at 2%, which is an increase of 1% from FY 23. Toxic Leadership - Senior NCO/SEL at 3% and Passive Leadership for Senior NCO/SEL at 4% vs 12% in FY 23. Also at 4% is Presence of Sexist Behaviors. The highest ratings DES has in the Risk Factors are Moderate/High Stress at 31%, which is down 5% from FY 23. **Presence of Racially and Sexually Harassing Behaviors are both at 12%, which is an increase of 2% and 5%, respectively.** Passive Leadership and Frequent Workplace Hostility are both at 8%, which is down by 4% from FY 23. Minorities that responded had the largest percent of negative responses for all Risk Factors. The lowest ratings were Frequent Alcohol Memory Loss which is at 2% (increase of 1% from FY 23), Toxic Leadership for Immediate Supervisors at 4% (decrease of 3% from FY 23), and Presence of Sexist Behaviors at 4% (decrease of 3% from FY 23).

Service component questions: The service specific questions regarding sexual assault were also generally favorable. 91% of respondents indicated that if someone reported a sexual assault to their current commander, the commander would take the report seriously. The other 7% gave neutral responses and 2% who disagreed with that statement. The other questions related to sexual harassment were on were at least 79% positive responses. Commander having personal courage was low at 64% with a positive response and 34% neutral response rate, which there was a 1% difference from last year. The other low positive response rate was the unit's NCO demonstrates personnel courage at 68% and 30% neutral responses.

Comments: Responses to the locally developed questions were overall positive on leadership within that organization. DES lowest positive rating was having a mentor to encourage development. There were positive comments on first line supervisors. Comments were made that employees do not interact with the current GC and CSM to provide input on them. In reference to the locally developed short answer questions: Staffing is an issue for DES as they don't feel word is getting out when there are jobs available, and they don't feel HR is doing their best on recruiting. Employees feel communication is good and transparent (FD) and needs to be transparent (PD). They are happy with new fire chief and how he is running things. Expressed needing modern equipment. Some employees feel the morale is low and would like to see pay increased.

DPTMS

Participation analysis: The number of responses to the survey decreased this year over last year (91 vs 108, respectively). DPTMS responses had fewer neutral responses than some of the other directorates.

Protective factors: The organizations top three (3) Protective Factors are Work Life Balance (91%), Engaged and Committed (87%), and Supportive Leadership (85%). Supportive Leadership was not one of the top three (3) last year. In reference to Cohesion, Females that responded shared that 11% do not feel there is cohesion in DPTMS, which is a male dominant workplace. The Minority respondents feel the workplace is unfair at 17% negative weighted responses, feel less included at 11% negative response rate, and less supported by leadership with a 9% negative weighted response. The Minorities had the highest negative response rates with those factors and have the lowest morale in DPTMS. The bottom three (3) Protective Factors are Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader at 55%, Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL at 53%, and Firearms Safe Storage at 59%. Fairness was the next lowest at 67%. The rest are above 80%. Females and Senior Civilians feel that firearms would not be safely stored at 33% and 28%, respectively. However, the Minorities had the highest positive rating at 78%. Transformational Leadership had a lot of neutral responses. The largest negative response was once again Minorities at 11%. Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL did not have any negative responses but was high in neutral responses.

Risk factors: DPTMS had one (1) Risk Factor flagged and that is Frequent Binge Drinking at 9% compared to the rest of the Army. Minorities, Females and Senior Civilians are 11% to 17%. The organizations three (3) Risk Factors with the lowest unfavorable ratings are Frequent Alcohol Memory Loss (1%), Toxic Leadership – Ratings for Immediate Supervisors at 7%, and Passive Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL (8%). All of these have higher ratings than in FY 23. Minorities had no memory loss. Toxic leadership was rated lowest by Minorities with 6% saying toxic leadership and 37% overall remained neutral. Passive leadership was rated lowest by females (8%) while overall 41% remained neutral. The three (3) Risk Factors with the highest unfavorable ratings for overall unit are Passive Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader (17%, which decreased by 1%), Moderate/High Stress (19%, which increased by 1%), and frequent Workplace Hostility (16%, which increased by 1%). Minorities rated passive leadership at 22% and the overall rating for the presence of passive leadership is 17%. Regarding High/Moderate Stress, 19% is the overall rating and again Minorities had the highest rating at 28%. Frequent Workplace Hostility is 16% overall with Minorities at 30%. There is a negative view of the workplace from the Minorities that took the survey in DPTMS.

Custom closed-ended questions: For the custom closed-ended questions, the three (3) with the highest positive responses were “I am proud of the work I do” at 93%,

88% for the command taking allegations of sexual assault seriously with no negative responses, and “I feel comfortable reporting allegations of sexual harassment to my organization” at 86%. Communication and having a mentor were the lowest one at 57% and 50%, respectively.

Comments: For the short answer questions, communication needs improvement. Changes to better support diversity and inclusion is to not have the leadership of the command involved in hiring actions. Most significant challenges are the LRC - Maintenance, lack of qualified individuals to do the work (staffing and turnover), lack of funding, and communication. What can be done to increase trust is better communication and an org day. Three things that are needed is funding, staffing, and better communication. The RDO came up in this as well. Overall comments were about the RDO and not all the DPTMS employees get to partake in it.

DPW

Participation analysis: Survey participation for this year decreased by seven (7) employees compared to last year (100 vs 107, respectively) for an overall response rate of 44%.

Protective factors: The two (2) highest favorability ratings for the Protective Factors are the same as last year and include Work-Life Balance at 95% (92% last year) and High Connectedness at 88%, which is also increased from last year (85%). Earning a higher rating than last year's third highest favorability rating, Engaged and Committed (88% last year), is Supportive Leadership – Ratings for All Immediate Supervisors is the third highest favorability rating at 87%, a 6% increase from last year. The three (3) lowest favorable ratings differ from last year. High Morale still is rated amongst the lowest with this year's rating being 66%, although it has improved 7% over last year (59%). The second lowest is Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leaders, which rated 48% compared to 66% last year. The third lowest is Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL at 34%, which is a 27% decrease from last year. The 7% increase in High Morale is due to significant improvements within the demographic data. **Focusing on historically oppressed groups first: 11% of Females said there is low morale in comparison to last year's 20% and only 3% of Minorities said there was low morale, which is an 8% decrease from last year's rating of 11%.** When comparing this year to last year's data, there was another notable shift in the High Morale ratings. **Amongst Non-Supervisors and Supervisors last year, 15% of Non-Supervisors and 2% of Supervisors said there was low morale. This year, Non-Supervisors dropped by 8%, which is an improvement; however, now 10% of Supervisors feel that there is low morale, an 8% increase for that demographic.** In comparing this year's demographic data against last year's for Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leaders, the largest differences come from Senior Civilian

(-41%), Supervisors (-37%), and Minorities (-34%). The data shows a similar shift for Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL with the Senior Civilian category reflecting a 58% decrease, but further disparities show within the Non-Hispanic White and Female demographic categories a 32% and 30% decrease, respectively.

Risk factors: The lowest unfavorable ratings for the Risk Factors include Toxic Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL (0.56%), Frequent Alcohol Memory Loss (2%), and two (2) factors tie at 4%: Frequent Binge Drinking and Presence of Sexist Behaviors. Although Toxic Leadership – NCO/SEL and Frequent Alcohol Memory Loss increased (0.03% and 1.02%, respectively), both Frequent Binge Drinking and Sexist Behaviors decreased by 3% and 6%, respectively. Of these three (3) factors, two (2) of these remain on the lowest three (3) unfavorable ratings from last year – Toxic Leadership – NCO/SEL and Frequent Alcohol Memory Loss. **The highest unfavorable ratings for the Risk Factors category show some changes from last year as only one (1) Risk Factor from last year is still amongst the top three (3) highest unfavorable ratings – Moderate/High Stress.** This year, Moderate/High Stress remains as the highest unfavorable rating at 23%, which is a **6% improvement** over last year's rating (29%). Demographics show that there was range of improvement from **1% - 9% across all demographics except Minorities** where Moderate/High Stress rating increased by 6% to 28% this year. The second highest is Passive Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL at 14%, which is a 10% increase from last year's 4%. Overall, the unfavorable and neutral ratings increased amongst all the demographic categories compared to last year except for Minorities having a 3% decrease in their neutral responses. The average increase in Passive Leadership for each demographic was 9.87%, and the average increase in neutral responses across all demographics except Minorities was almost 20%. The third highest unfavorable rating is Passive Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader at 13%, which is a 2% decrease from last year. Overall, the data shows that the ratings for Passive Leadership have decreased an average of 10% across the board except for Non-Supervisors exhibiting a 1% increase and no change in Non-Hispanic Whites while neutral responses have increased ranging from 4% - 38% across all demographic categories.

Custom closed-ended questions: Responses to the custom questions shows that the workforce believe that their chain of command would take a report of sexual assault allegation seriously with 94% agreeing and 6% being neutral. Additionally, 95% of the workforce are proud of the work they do with the remaining 5% being neutral or disagreeing (2% and 3%, respectively). Some items indicating opportunities for improvement include having a mentor at work encouraging development, communication flowing freely from senior leadership to all levels of the organization, and communication from their chain of command being clear. **Only 47% of the workforce agreed that they have a mentor encouraging development while 34% are neutral and 19% disagreed.** For communication flowing freely from senior leadership to all levels, 68% agreed that it does while 20% were neutral and 12% disagreed. Additionally, 74%

of the workforce agreed that communication from their chain of command is clear while 17% were neutral and 9% disagreed.

Service component questions: Responses to the service-specific questions show that the workforce agrees that if someone were to report sexual assault that their commander would take it seriously (93%). The workforce is neutral when it comes to their commander and unit's senior NCO/SEL demonstrating personal courage (39% and 40%, respectively). Areas of concern would include the questions revolving around reporters of sexual assault and/or harassment. Favorable responses to these four (4) statements range from 73% - 82% and unfavorable responses range from 2% - 11% with 11% of the workforce agreeing that reporters of sexual assault would be discouraged from moving forward with the report.

Comments: There were several positive comments from the workforce about being happy with their job, the people they work with, and their immediate supervisor. Other comment trends relate to communication deficiencies, questionable hiring/hiring practices, and the desire for developmental opportunities.

DHR

Participation analysis: The response rate for DHR was 87% (48 responses out of 55 registered participants). This is up from last year where there were 39 responses out of 52 registered participants. Respondent demographics indicate most participants were non-supervisory Junior Civilians.

Protective factors: The highest rated favorable Protective Factors were Work-Life Balance – 92%, Engaged & Committed – 90%, and Supportive Leadership - All Immediate Supervisors – 84%. These are like last year's results. There were two (2) factors flagged as very low compared to all other units and organizations and Total DoD and Army Overall ratings from last year. These were Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL – 46% and Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader – 60%. These are both significantly lower than DHR ratings from last year which were 67% and 87%, respectively. Responses to questions for the Senior NCO/SEL level indicate a higher overall neutral response and responses indicating the presence of non-Transformational Leadership where last year there was none. The non-Transformational Leadership responses came from White, Male, Non-Supervisor and Junior Civilian demographics. Responses to questions for the Unit Leader level are like last year's responses with all demographics indicating presence of non-Transformational Leadership. Last year White, Male respondents did not indicate non-Transformational Leadership, but this year they did. A third lowered Protective Factor rating is High Morale – 57%. Last year, the favorable rating was 71%. The change this year comes from a higher indication of low morale across all demographics.

Respondents indicated their own morale was very low – 2% and low 7% and said the morale of people they work with is very low – 4% and low 8%.

Risk factors: Three (3) of the highest unfavorable ratings for Risk Factors were Moderate/High Stress – 41%, Passive Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader – 21%, and Frequent Workplace Hostility – 20%. The first two (2) are similar to last year, but Frequent Workplace Hostility is up significantly from 6% last year. Both this factor and the Passive Leadership factor have flags for being very high compared to all other units and organizations. There is a significant increase across all demographics indicating the presence of Passive Leadership. Responses to questions indicate that 21% believe unit leadership does not address problems brought to their attention and let negative behaviors become bigger problems. 46% of responses were neutral and only 33% believe that unit leadership addresses problems. Frequent Workplace Hostility was indicated by all demographics with higher indications coming Whites, Males, Senior Civilians, and Supervisors. Responses to questions related to Workplace Hostility show that there are more “rarely” and “sometimes” response than “often.”

Custom closed-ended questions: These did not reveal any areas of concern. The lowest rated item was about having a mentor who encourages development with 56% agreeing, 22% neutral, and 22% disagreeing. 98% of respondents indicated that they are proud of the work they do.

Service component questions: Most of these questions had favorable results, but 7% of respondents indicated that they are sometimes asked questions about their sexual life that makes them uncomfortable, angry or upset. There was a higher unfavorable rating where 15% of respondents indicated that reporters of sexual assault would be discouraged from moving forward with the report.

Comments: There were several positive comments about satisfaction with current supervisor. Several indicate that they have addressed issues with supervisors and things are showing improvement. There are also several that indicate supervisors are micro-managing, only pointing out mistakes, and piling more work on when employees are behind and trying to catch up. There were several comments about not having enough staff. Comments about the GC and CSM being too new to make an assessment. There were some negative comments about being asked for demographic information, indulging in “wokeness”, and fear of reprisal for using chain of command.

DFMWR

Participation analysis: Survey participation for this year increased over last year (32% vs 30%, respectively) with 142 surveys returned out of 445 registered participants. Comments from participants were negative towards leadership (poor decisions, lack of accountability & listening to employees, and training), preferential

treatment of Females over Males at lower levels, needing more opportunities for employee development, and that there are harassing behaviors that occur in the workplace that are not being addressed.

Protective factors: The highest favorable ratings for the Protective Factors are Firearms Safely Stored (87%), Work-Life Balance, Supportive Leadership and High Connectedness were tied at (75%), which is down 2%, 2%, and 1%, respectively, from FY 23. Engaged & Committed and Inclusive Organization were both third at 70%, which is down 12% for Engaged & Committed from last year and an increase for Inclusive Organization of 3%. This is consistent with last year's survey except Engaged and Committed was right under Firearms Safely Stored versus being third this year. The Males in DFMWR feel the least connected and they were about half of the respondents. Supervisors have the highest number of negative responses for Work-Life Balance at 67%. The lowest favorable ratings for the Protective Factors are High Morale (42%, down 3% from FY 23), Fair Treatment was flagged at 49%, down 1% from FY 23, Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader (47%, down 9% from FY 23), and Transformational Leadership – Ratings for NCO/SEL at 42%, which is down 27% from FY 23. These were also included in the lowest favorable ratings from last year. DFMWR had the lowest positive rating for The Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader. The demographic breakdown for High Morale show Minorities rating for High Morale is 50%, which is higher than the other demographics. Supervisory White males have the lowest morale at 32%, 38%, and 40% respectively. Supervisory white Males feel they are not supported by leadership in DFMWR. There are comments that indicate the perception that certain staff can get away with things that others do not. The Cohesive rating for DFMWR received a flag as being very low compared to all other Directorates.

Risk factors: There were no red flags for the Risk Factors. The lowest unfavorable ratings for the Risk Factors were Frequent Alcohol Memory Loss at 0.73%, which is down by 1.27% from last year. Frequent Binge Drinking at 1%, which is also down by 1% from last year. Toxic Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL is at 1%, the same as last year. Last year's ratings included these factors and Passive Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL. In both alcohol-related categories, the demographics with the highest percentage of risk are Non-Supervisors and Males. The highest unfavorable ratings for the Risk Factors were Moderate/High Stress at 47%, which is down 4% from last year. Passive Leadership – Ratings for Unit Leader at 18% which is up by 3% from last year. Most of the responses were neutral at 56%. Frequent Workplace Hostility came in third at 17%, which is down 2% from last year. The Stress Risk Factor had the highest unfavorable rating compared to other Directorates. Time management and staffing are recurring themes in the comments that may be related to the Stress rating factor. Responses to the Presence of Racially Harassing Behaviors rating indicate that behaviors are mostly in the "rarely" and "sometimes" category. It

appears the largest area of concern is about racial/ethnic jokes and stereotypes being present.

Comments: For the short answer questions, communication needs improvement. Some suggestions are active listening, leaders needing to communicate within all levels of their chain of command, and communication binders for classrooms. Changes leadership should make to better support diversity and inclusion are more training (ability to attend it), don't play favorites, and even distribution in workload to give everyone the opportunity to excel. Significant challenges for DFMWR are challenging behaviors (children) and no curriculum to meet their needs, staffing and funding shortages, and communication (includes disagreements on how to handle situations). Increase trust with better communication, honesty, follow up/through, active listening, and better leadership. Three changes provided are improved communication, constructive feedback, listen to the staff, professional development, better staffing, and equality/accountability around all the centers.

Medium Directorates (OSJA & RMO)

Participation analysis: The response rate for Medium Directorates was 69% (22 responses out of 32 registered participants). This is slightly down from last year where there were 26 out of 36 registered participants.

Protective factors: The highest favorable Protective Factors were the same ones as last year's: Supportive Leadership (All Immediate Supervisors) – 92%, Cohesive Organization – 91% and High Connectedness - 90%. There were two (2) factors flagged as very low compared to all other units and organizations. These were Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL – 61% and Firearms Would Be Safely Stored – 76%. The factor with the lowest favorability rating was High Morale – 55%, but it is higher than the rating for Army Overall. Comparing the lowest favorable Protective Factors to last year's ratings reveals that **there is a decline in favorable responses about Morale from Females compared to last year** with an increase in neutral and unfavorable responses. Responses by Males to the questions about firearm storage indicate that 18% said firearms would not be safely stored. Although the favorability rating for Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL was lower than last year, there were no responses indicating non-Transformational Leadership – just an increase in neutral responses.

Risk factors: Five (5) of the Risk Factors had 0% unfavorable ratings. The other four (4) that had unfavorable ratings were Passive Leadership - Ratings for Unit Leader – 9%, Presence of Sexist Behaviors – 9%, Passive Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL – 11%, and Moderate/High Stress – 45%. Although Moderate/High Stress appears to be the highest Risk Factor for Medium Directorates, it is only slightly higher

than Army Overall from last year (43%) and average for overall Garrison. The Presence of Sexist Behaviors was indicated by 33% of Senior Civilian responses, but the responses to the question indicate that they rarely occur. The rating for the Moderate/High Stress is related to 52% of respondents indicating that they have sometimes felt nervous or stressed in the past three months.

Custom closed-ended questions: These did not reveal any areas of concern. The lowest rated item was about having a mentor who encourages development with 43% agreeing, 43% neutral, and 14% disagreeing.

Service component questions: Most of these questions had favorable results, but 5% of respondents indicated that they are sometimes asked questions about their sexual life that makes them uncomfortable, angry or upset. There was a higher unfavorable rating where 14% of respondents indicated that reporters of sexual assault would be discouraged from moving forward with the report.

Comments: Some indicate that there is a growing disconnect between Military and Civilian personnel within the organization. Internal communication is good but externally with IMCOM HQs is challenging. There were several positive comments about first line supervisors. There were several comments about not knowing the GC and CSM well enough yet to evaluate. There were several comments made indicating that telework or a hybrid environment would boost morale, support diversity and inclusion, and improve organizational climate. There were comments indicating lack of staff, delays in hiring staff, and lack of funding.

Small Directorates (USAG Office, PAIO, PAO, RSO, EEO, & GSO, HHC)

Participation analysis: The response rate for Small Directorates was 81% (39 responses out of 48 registered participants. Although the percentage changes year to year based on number of registered participants, the number of responses is about the same compared to previous years (40 in 2023 and 41 in 2022).

Protective factors: Favorable ratings for the Protective Factors were all above 75%, and there are no factor alerts when compared to USAG overall and Army overall. The highest favorable Protective Factors were Supportive Leadership (All Immediate Supervisors) – 95%, Engaged and Committed – 93%, and both Cohesive Organization and Inclusive Organization tied for third highest at 91%. The lowest favorable Protective Factors were High Morale- 76%, Transformational Leadership – Ratings for Senior NCO/SEL – 78%, and Fairness – 79%. Comparing the lowest favorable Protective Factors to last year's ratings does not reveal any significant issues. It appears there are a higher number of neutral responses than last year and slightly

higher non-favorable responses from Females. Like last year is that respondents who indicated they are Enlisted had more non-favorable responses than other demographic categories.

Risk factors: All of the Risk Factors had unfavorable ratings of 5% or less except for three. These were Passive Leadership - Ratings for Unit Leader – 9%, Presence of Racially Harassing Behaviors – 13%, and Moderate/High Stress – 37%. Although Moderate/High Stress appears to be the highest Risk Factor in Small Directorates, it is still lower than Army Overall from last year (43%) and average for overall Garrison. A comparison to last year shows a higher percentage of neutral responses to Passive Leadership across all demographics, and a higher percentage of unfavorable responses to Racially Harassing Behaviors across all demographics. Last year, there were no Civilian responses indicating the Presence of Racially Harassing Behaviors, but this year 8% of the Civilian responses indicated the presence of the behaviors. An analysis of the questions related to this factor show that racial/ethnic jokes, stereotypes, offensive terms, and lack of respect due to race/ethnicity happen at least “sometimes.” It was indicated by 3% of respondents that lack of respect due to race/ethnicity happens “often.” It was not one of the higher unfavorable Risk Factors, but since there is a zero tolerance for harassing behaviors, it is worth noting that 5% of respondents indicated the Presence of Sexually Harassing Behaviors. It is also worth noting that none of the unfavorable responses were given by Civilian employees, Females, or Minorities. The presence of Sexually Harassing Behaviors were indicated by White, Male, Military respondents to this set of questions.

Custom closed-ended questions: These did not reveal any areas of concern. The lowest rated item was about having a mentor who encourages development with 67% agreeing, 26% neutral, and 8% disagreeing.

Service component questions: Most of these questions had favorable results, but 3% of respondents indicated that they are sometimes asked questions about their sexual life that makes them uncomfortable, angry or upset. There are two (2) questions about leadership demonstrating personal courage by addressing problematic behaviors and neither of them received a negative response, but they both had 32% neutral responses.

Comments: Some of the positive comments indicate satisfaction with the work environment. There are a few that highlight communication as an issue – particularly from top level down. Quite a few comments say that they are neutral toward current Garrison leadership because there hasn’t been enough time to assess the GC and CSM. There are a few comments about lack of funding and manpower. A few others about White Males and employees with “traditional values” being singled out and made to feel wrong. It was suggested that leadership get out and visit with employees.