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Background

1. In October 2015, the Leadership Group agreed that a working group be set up to review internal communications at the Scottish Parliament.

2. The purpose of the review was to ensure the following outcomes:
   - a better engaged work force;
   - a better understanding of our stakeholders;
   - effective management of change;
   - an agile, innovative and evolving approach to communications throughout the organisation.

3. It was agreed that the working group would include staff from across a range of offices and grades with equal representation of men and women.

4. Please see Annex F for membership of the working group.

Stakeholders

5. The following stakeholders were within the scope of the review:
   - SPS staff (including legal staff) and onsite contractors

6. The following stakeholders were outwith the scope of the review:
   - MSPs
   - MSPs’ staff
   - Visitors
   - Scottish Government staff

Scope

7. The following areas were within the scope of the review:
   - Organisation-wide information and messages
   - Information and messages from senior managers, Group Heads, Office Heads and line managers
   - Information about projects or programmes
   - Information between offices and teams
   - Information, ideas and messages upwards to Office Heads or Group Heads

8. The following areas were outwith the scope of the review:
   - communications within individual teams
   - crisis communications (managed as part of the BC Board’s remit)
Our Communications Objectives

9. On the Working Group, we agreed to take a positive approach to the review. We began by asking ourselves, “What can effective internal communications achieve?” as a way to establish the benefits of conducting the review. All the answers to this question could be categorised under one or more of the following four objectives.

- Improve understanding of what the Parliament is trying to achieve and how your role supports this
- Improve a sense of community/belonging
- Improve collaboration to deliver our work
- Reinforce and support our values

10. Each of the recommendations in this report support the first objective as well as one or more of the other 3 objectives.
Methodology

We used a methodology recommended by the Cabinet Office for developing an internal communications strategy which suggests working through 3 stages:

- Where are we now?
- Where do we want to be?
- How do we get there?

11. We identified 5 work streams:

- Review of Existing information
- Staff survey
- Culture and Future Trends
- Focus Groups
- Developing recommendations

12. This is how our work streams fitted in to the Cabinet Office methodology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet Office Stage</th>
<th>Internal Communications Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where are we now?</td>
<td>Work stream 1: Review of Existing Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work stream 2: Staff Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do we want to be?</td>
<td>Work stream 3: Culture and Future Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we get there?</td>
<td>Work stream 4: Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report to Leadership Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Individual reports were produced for each of the work streams and are included in annexes at the end of this paper.

14. Overall, feedback from our consultation with staff revealed that, generally, internal communications work well in the organisation. However, staff felt there was some room for improvement in relation to the following areas in particular:

- The effectiveness of organisation-wide (corporate) communications, particularly with regard to co-ordination, consistency and timeliness
- Methods and channels of communication
- The difficulties of finding information when it is dispersed throughout a number of different systems/sites
- Upward communication (both feedback and consultation)
RECOMMENDATION CATEGORIES:

15. Our recommendations are set out in the following 4 categories:

- Leading the Way
- Methods and Channels
- Feedback, Measuring and Improvement
- Centralised Internal Communications Function
LEADING THE WAY

Where are we now?

16. It is clear from our findings that staff do look to senior management for leadership and direction and that they value communications from the Clerk/Chief Executive and from Leadership Group. There is also an appetite for opportunities for staff to engage directly with Leadership Group colleagues.

17. There is a role for Leadership Group to lead by example and to demonstrate that communicating with staff in a timely, consistent and authentic manner is a genuine priority.  

18. Staff were generally positive about the availability of senior managers though there was feedback that not all Leadership Group members are visible or available.  

19. The staff survey asked for feedback on the statement, “Leadership Group communicates information effectively.” The response was that 40.7% felt that members of Leadership Group communicate information effectively most or all of the time; 42.1% felt that they communicate effectively some of the time; and 15.5% felt they seldom communicate effectively. This was further commented on by staff in the free text area under this section. This suggests that there is scope to improve communication from Leadership Group.

20. It is worth noting that Grade 7 and 8 staff were consistently more positive in their responses throughout the survey than other staff. This suggests a disconnect between Leadership Group members and other SPS staff which needs to be bridged.

21. There continue to be examples of information about the Parliament being communicated to Members and the media only, missing out internal communications with SPS staff and contractors altogether. 

---

1 Focus Group Summary - Methods and Channels  
2 Focus Group Summary - Information needed to do your job  
3 Focus Group Summary - Methods and Channels  
4 Staff Survey. Question 2. Effectiveness of Communication  
5 Staff Survey. Question 2. Effectiveness of Communication – comment boxes  
6 Focus Group Summary - Feedback and Consultation
Where do we want to be and how do we get there?

22. The Clerk/Chief Executive, the Assistant Chief Executives and Leadership Group are responsible for setting the strategic direction for the Scottish Parliament. As the strategic plan must be communicated to staff, Leadership Group should lead the way on internal communication and, in so doing, set an example for the way in which internal communications could function more widely. This includes a commitment to put internal communications at the forefront of our managers’ thinking. In each of the focus groups undertaken as part of this review, three topics were covered. In each topic staff were asked “Who should have responsibility for making change happen?” In each case, the answers included “Leadership Group”, “ACEs”, “senior management” or “Group Heads”.

23. The findings suggest that there is more that Leadership Group can do to prioritise internal communications and, as a follow-on our managers generally. For Leadership Group members’ part, this means becoming practiced at recognising internal communications needs and understanding that there are different stakeholder groups within the organisation with a variety of communications needs dependent upon the situation. Leadership Group should fully consider internal communications requirements for issues covered in LG papers, for strategic work streams, for communications with Members and any other major change planned.

24. Given the evidence that staff expect and want visible leadership, and because of our commitment to improve a sense of community we think it would be beneficial to hold an annual opportunity, hosted by the Clerk/Chief Executive, for all staff to come together.

25. A more open approach to all aspects of Leadership Group meetings would address a number of issues that have been raised such as:

- A desire for genuine consultation – for instance with staff within groups before a paper is discussed at LG
-LG visibility
- Demonstrating trust in staff by opening up papers to staff by default

26. We would add that, in January 2017 when Leadership Group agreed to the remit of the working group, it also agreed its own remit as part of this work. This included an
agreement to take responsibility for making sure that everything agreed is put in place and that any changes would continue to be supported.

27. The responsibility for Leadership Group to lead on internal communications ranges through the four communications objectives the working group has identified. Our recommendations in this section are therefore set out by their primary objective (but note that most of the recommendations do address more than one objective).

   **Recommendations**

**Objective 1: Improve understanding of what the Parliament is trying to achieve and how your role supports this.**

R1. Leadership Group to put plans in place for communicating the strategy, quarterly performance reports and decisions on the Parliament’s budget.

R2. Any communications concerning strategy decisions and projects (aside from Clerk/Chief Executive messages) to be consciously branded as on behalf of the Leadership Group.

R3. LG papers to have a communications section to ensure all communications issues are addressed fully at meetings.

R4. Leadership Group to agree a consistent, planned and co-ordinated approach to communicating significant organisational and/or policy change.

R5. The Clerk/Chief Executive to lead an all staff event on an annual basis (and at other times if appropriate). This would provide a broad scene setting view from the Leadership Group on key priorities and challenges for SPS, to be linked with follow-up specific snippets and/or drop ins hosted by LG members.

**Objective 2: Improve a sense of community/belonging**

R6. Re-instate the LG shadowing programme for staff to observe meetings.\(^1\)

**Objective 3: Improve collaboration to deliver our work**

R7. Group Heads to review the effectiveness of internal communications in their areas once a year.

R8. Leadership Group to agree further measures to ensure its meetings are as open and accessible as possible. The following measures are suggested:

   a. Leadership Group meeting updates to appear in the Corporate Bulletin to ensure they are easily accessible at the same time to all staff.

---

\(^{14}\) **LG Focus Group Summary**
b. Papers to be unrestricted on Sharepoint by default\textsuperscript{15}

c. Papers to be shared in advance via a link in the Corporate Bulletin. (See recommendation 11 which suggests changes to the Corporate Bulletin focussing it on SPS and on site contractors)

**Objective 4: Reinforce and support our values**

**R9.** Leadership Group to demonstrate commitment to receiving and acting upon feedback (see recommendations 21-27).

\textsuperscript{15}LG Focus Group Summary
28. It was clear from the analysis of the existing information that gathering views on the methods and channels would be valuable. We therefore included questions in the staff survey on the effectiveness of channels and preferences for different channels. In the focus groups we asked a series of questions under the heading “Method and channels of communication and their effectiveness”.

Where are we now?

29. There was some evidence that the number and range of existing channels was making it challenging for staff to know where to access information and which channels to use themselves.\textsuperscript{16} However, we should note that in the survey, staff were generally positive about our communications channels.\textsuperscript{17} Under the question on preferences, in the free text box there were some comments about channels\textsuperscript{18} which also came up in the focus groups covering:

- Importance of choosing the correct channel
- The number of channels and the difficulty in choosing the correct one
- The use of channels because they were new, rather than because they were most appropriate.

30. Currently there is inconsistency in the use of corporate channels and the timing and frequency of some messages.\textsuperscript{19} For instance, there is not sufficient resources to produce EH99 to its original proposed schedule of one per month.

31. Furthermore, there has been feedback that there is ‘too much’ information for staff to read and to understand and so it can be difficult to prioritise what to read. It was suggested that time constraints contribute to this problem.

32. At the Leadership Group Focus Group, there was discussion around channels and whether Leadership Group members should have the flexibility to choose a channel of delivery that was authentic for them while ensuring that the message was consistent regardless of how it was delivered.

33. Face to face communication came second to email in terms of staff preferences in most cases in our staff survey.\textsuperscript{20} However, there is widespread agreement among internal

\textsuperscript{16} Analysis of Existing Information \textsuperscript{17} Staff Survey – Executive Summary \textsuperscript{18} Staff Survey – Question 7 \textsuperscript{19} Focus Group Summary – Information needed to do your job \textsuperscript{20} Staff Survey – Question 7
communications experts of the value of face to face communication and the focus groups agreed that face to face communication was particularly important in situations where they wanted to ask questions or seek clarification. This is one of the reasons why ‘Snippets’ sessions have proved popular.

34. There was also discussion on how messages are received and the responsibility on Leadership Group and managers more broadly, to understand their audience and to test whether messages had been received and understood. There was an acknowledgment Leadership Group colleagues may benefit from training to gain confidence in a variety of communication styles. This is equally applicable to all managers.

**Where do we want to be and how do we get there?**

35. The staff survey analysis showed that staff were positive about the clarity and accessibility of products such as the Chief Executive’s message and EH99. There was evidence that staff made a point of reading a message which came directly from the Clerk/Chief Executive and so this should certainly be retained and used for key communications.

36. EH99 did divide opinion with as many disliking it as liking it. It does fulfil a role in communicating ‘people related’ and social stories from around the organisation while retaining a business link. Many find this of interest and there is a wealth of interesting and diverse events, projects, achievements, exhibitions and initiatives going on in the Parliament to populate a regular newsletter. It is important to ensure that no one would miss vital information by not reading EH99. If there are any articles on corporate initiatives, they will be from an angle that is complementary or supplementary to the ‘need to know’ facts which will be communicated by other methods.

37. The Corporate Bulletin is well used by staff and has the potential to be utilised for a wider range of communications in the period prior to the new intranet being introduced. Readership among MSPs and researchers is known not to be as high though these groups have not been canvassed for their views on the bulletin. Ideally all stakeholders should have communication channels that suit their distinct needs. For that reason it is proposed that both staff and Members would be better served with separate, more tailored channels. A separate piece of work would be required to scope how to take this forward with views taken from Members and their staff.

---

21 Culture and Future Trends Analysis
22 LG Focus Group
23 LG Focus Group
24 Staff Survey – Executive Summary
25 LG Focus Group
38. In response to feedback that staff are constrained by time\textsuperscript{26}, our recommendations in this section also aim to help make it as easy as possible for staff to access, read and understand corporate and cross-office information in a time-effective way.

**Recommendations**

**Objective 1: Improve understanding of what the Parliament is trying to achieve and how your role supports this.**

**R10.** Retain the Chief Executive’s message to staff\textsuperscript{27}

**R11.** Retain the Corporate Bulletin but investigate the possibility of tailoring it for staff and on-site contractors only.\textsuperscript{28}

**Objective 2: Improve a sense of community/belonging**

**R12.** Retain EH99\textsuperscript{29}, reviewing content strategy\textsuperscript{30}, frequency and whether it could be produced by staff outwith the internal communications function but with editorial responsibility remaining with it.

**R13.** Investigate the possibility of developing an alternative to the Corporate Bulletin for MSPs and their staff taking into account their views. We would link this into the work being undertaken to improve services to Members and in the medium to longer term the Digital Strategy.

**Objective 3: Improve collaboration to deliver our work**

**R14.** Continue to use SP snippets to communicate briefly and informally with staff on a particular subject – and to highlight any lessons learned.

**R15.** Reduce the number of email communications. Ultimately, develop a customisable 'one-stop shop' or hub\textsuperscript{31} for internal communications so that our staff can find information at a time that suits them. In the short term, the Corporate Bulletin should be expanded to take on this role. In the longer term, BIT and the Digital Strategy Board should feed this requirement into the work being undertaken on the Web and Online Programme and the Digital Workplace for SPS Programme.

**R16.** Investigate new means of communicating urgent, time bound communications instantaneously as part of the Digital Working Solutions for SPS project in the Digital Portfolio.

\textsuperscript{26} Staff Survey – Question 4
\textsuperscript{27} Staff Survey – Executive Summary
\textsuperscript{28} Analysis of Existing Information – What works well
\textsuperscript{29} Staff Survey – Executive Summary
\textsuperscript{30} Focus Group Summary - Information needed to do your job
\textsuperscript{31} Focus Group Summary – Methods and Channels
R17. Provide a learning resource that would be useful to all staff of what to consider before communicating with colleagues (e.g. method, individual preferences, impact of working patterns, timing) and tips for effective communication within the Parliament.

**Objective 4: Reinforce and support our values**

R18. Corporate communications to be clearly categorised so that there is clarity about what is required from staff (e.g. ‘for information’, ‘for action’).  

R19. Diversity and other networks to summarise what has been happening/advertise future meetings or events in the Corporate Bulletin and provide links to discussion forums in SPLearning for more information or interaction.

R20. Ensure that effective development opportunities on internal communications skills are delivered as part of HR’s ‘inclusive talent and learning approach’ by:

a. Allocating a knowledge development adviser whose focus would be to design a development programme and materials (with advice and consultancy from L&D).

b. Liaising with the Learning, Development and Change Manager to input into the review of the induction process.

This will:

a. support managers in communicating effectively with their teams; and

b. support staff in understanding the Parliament’s values in relation to communicating with each other and what is expected from them in terms of personal responsibility.

---

32 *Focus Group Summary - Information needed to do your job*
39. Research undertaken by the working group into the discipline of internal communications found widespread agreement among experts that measurement was a key aspect of a successful strategy.\(^\text{33}\)

40. Meaningful feedback can be used to undertake continuous improvement. Putting in place the ability to measure the success of the strategy will help us to refine and improve it over time.

**Where are we now?**

41. Currently there are few formal or recognised informal feedback mechanisms for staff.

- The Staff Forum has been dormant for more than a year though some of its members are keen to restart it in a form that would be the most beneficial for staff. There was support for the reinstatement of the Staff Forum from the focus group sessions\(^\text{34}\).
- Leadership Group Drop-In sessions had been trialled but had not proved to be busy. However, the analysis of the review of the sessions undertaken in 2014-15 showed that staff had found them useful, particularly the one themed around International Women’s Day.\(^\text{35}\)
- The survey undertaken as part of this review achieved a 57.8%\(^\text{36}\) response rate during a recess period which indicates an appetite for feedback.
- The focus groups identified a number of barriers to effective feedback including a lack of training for managers, ‘confidentiality mode’, lack of time and pressure of work.\(^\text{37}\)
- In terms of consultation, staff in the focus groups were divided between those who thought that staff were consulted on most important matters and were listened to, and those who felt that consultation was “rare, perfunctory and tokenistic”.\(^\text{38}\) If staff are consulted on something, they want to know that it is a genuine consultation and not just the imparting of information disguised as consultation. They also want to know the outcome of consultations.

\(^{33}\) [Culture and Future Focus]
\(^{34}\) [Focus Group Summary – Feedback and Consultation]
\(^{35}\) [Analysis of Existing Information]
\(^{36}\) [Staff Survey Summary]
\(^{37}\) [Focus Group Summary - Feedback and Consultation]
\(^{38}\) [Focus Group Summary – Feedback and Consultation]
Where do we want to be and how do we get there?

42. We have four aspirations for feedback, measurement and improvement of internal communications.

- Mechanisms put in place so that staff can feedback to Leadership Group on any topic. (LG genuinely want to hear from people and want to find ways that this can happen meaningfully and accessibly.)

- Developing a feedback culture. (We can all learn and develop from meaningful and well-meant feedback. This may require training or coaching for staff at all levels to become adept at giving and receiving feedback. This is connected to our values and we suggest that the working group looking at values may wish to consider this point.) This might also include re-instating a channel for anonymous feedback or comments.

- Consultation. (However, to be clear about when something is a consultation and when it is information sharing.)

- Measuring success. (We must measure the success of the internal communications strategy on an on-going basis and adapt in response to this feedback where necessary. This will lead to continuous improvement.)

Recommendations

Objective 1: Improve understanding of what the Parliament is trying to achieve and how your role supports this.

R21. Introduce a set of specific measurement indicators to measure success against strategy that can be monitored and reported on via the Quarterly Performance Report.

R22. An on-going and formal assessment of how staff feel about internal communications is required. This to be achieved in liaison with Human Resources who are currently scoping the next staff satisfaction survey.

Objective 2: Improve a sense of community/belonging

R23. Leadership Group Drop-Ins to be re-established, re-structured and themed. The purpose of the drop-ins would be to provide staff with the opportunity to meet with between 2 and 4 Leadership Group members in a room in an informal setting to discuss a particular topic. The purpose is to help the organisation’s leaders to communicate topical issues and change in a face to face setting. This is self-selecting, although we will aim to promote arrangements which make it an attractive opportunity for staff.
Objective 3: Improve collaboration to deliver our work

R24. Support a new staff body to replace the current staff forum.\textsuperscript{39} We propose that one of its objectives should be to support the delivery of the internal communications strategy by acting as a sounding board for proposals, providing a feedback loop and administering the quarterly feedback interviews (recommendation 25).

Objective 4: Reinforce and support our values

R25. One member of Leadership Group (on a rotational basis) to host a meeting of around 8-10 staff on a quarterly basis to sit down, listen and engage with staff on feedback and issues they wish to raise. We would develop an approach so that a wider cross section of staff gets the opportunity to participate. It would be a cross section of staff, not a Group Head’s functional area.

R26. Leadership Group and other managers to be clear about whether staff are being consulted or informed about a decision. If consultation is sought, ensure that there is sufficient lead time to undertake the consultation and review findings before a decision is taken or a plan developed. Also to ensure that staff hear the outcome of the consultation they have been involved in.

R27. The working group leading on developing the organisation’s values to consider how our values might support a feedback and consultation culture.

\textsuperscript{39} Focus Group Summary – Feedback and Consultation
43. Currently the Chief Executive’s Office is responsible for producing and issuing certain corporate communications and owns the existing internal communications strategy. The work involved is carried out part time alongside other responsibilities in the office. Other internal communications of course take place throughout the organisation, sometimes in liaison with the Chief Executive’s Office and sometimes not. There is therefore no dedicated internal communications function at the Scottish Parliament.

44. The notion of a dedicated function came up as a direct suggestion on a limited basis during our consultations - in the survey under a free text box on effectiveness of communication and in our issues log.\footnote{Analysis of Existing Information – Issues Log} (The issues log was compiled from suggestions, complaints, and observations which the working group collected throughout its work.)

45. However, given the nature of the preceding recommendations, should they be approved, it is our view that a dedicated resource is required to provide a holistic internal communications service. This would represent a significant step change. This new function would:

- oversee and co-ordinate corporate communications;
- form and develop relationships with stakeholders across the Parliament to improve our approach and share best practice;
- drive forward the work required to implement the recommendations above; put in place an internal communications delivery plan and measure the success of this on an ongoing basis; and
- work with Leadership Group to support it in meeting its communications responsibilities.

Where are we now?

46. As suggested above, there is currently no cohesive internal communications function. The consequences of this include a lack of consistency in our current communications and this has been a recurring theme throughout the review. This covers:

- timeliness vs the grapevine\footnote{Staff Survey - Executive Summary}
- style, quality and content\footnote{Staff Survey – Question 2}
- sharing information\footnote{Staff Survey, Question 4}
• methods and channels\textsuperscript{44}

47. Poor co-ordination of corporate and internal communications was also mentioned frequently during the review. 38.9\% of staff agreed that internal communications were well co-ordinated most or all of the time.\textsuperscript{45} The analysis of our existing information found that our previous communication strategies had an aspiration for all corporate and project communications to be co-ordinated.\textsuperscript{46}

48. Staff on long-term leave can be solely reliant on their line manager\textsuperscript{47} to receive information on corporate changes, job or development opportunities while they are away.

49. Staff have commented on being unable to find information when there are so many places it could be. The lack of a cohesive intranet and the introduction of relatively new platforms such as the communities on SP Learning and the various functions on Sharepoint may have contributed to this situation.

Where do we want to be and how do we get there?

50. A dedicated function could offer a practical way to deliver and support delivery of the other recommendations included in this report:

• supporting Leadership Group to fulfil its internal communications obligations as outlined in recommendations 1-10;
• advising of project communications and providing advice on communication plans;
• refining or streamlining channels including the ultimate goal of creating a customisable communications “hub”;
• liaising with colleagues on the digital programme to ensure the future direction of the intranet and other digital platforms is aligned to the needs of the internal communications strategy;
• helping to create a feedback culture; and
• monitoring the strategy and measuring how it is working.

\textsuperscript{44} Staff Survey, Question 7.
\textsuperscript{45} Staff Survey - Question 2
\textsuperscript{46} Analysis of Existing Information
\textsuperscript{47} Staff Survey – Question 3
Recommendations

Objective 1: Improve understanding of what the Parliament is trying to achieve and how your role supports this.

R28. Support Leadership Group, as necessary, with the implementation and ongoing support required to fulfil recommendations 1-9.

R29. The Head of Project and Programme Management to ensure that guidance on project communication is updated to take into account the requirements of the internal communications review. All projects should ensure communications plans are developed as part of project initiation and kept updated throughout the project.

R30. Introduce a forward planning grid for all significant ‘all staff’ internal communications at organisational, programme/project and business area level so that these can be planned, co-ordinated and promoted to our staff.

Objective 2: Improve a sense of community/belonging

R31. Develop processes to ensure that all stakeholders are included in communications. This would include those on long-term leave (maternity leave, sick leave, secondment, career break etc.) and those with part-time or flexible working patterns.

Objective 3: Improve collaboration to deliver our work

R32. Leadership Group to consider creating a dedicated internal communications function to sit within the Clerk/Chief Executive’s Office. The Office Head and the Clerk/Chief Executive would be responsible for considering how this would be resourced within the office. The function would collaborate with the new staff body (recommendation 24) and staff with a communications objective in other business areas in the Parliament.

Objective 4: Reinforce and support our values

R33. Measure the success of the internal communications strategy as per recommendations 21-27.
Annex A: Analysis of existing information

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to analyse existing information on internal communications in the Scottish Parliament.

For the purposes of this report, **internal communications** means the ways in which we communicate:

- Organisation-wide information and messages
- Information and messages from senior managers, Group Heads, Office Heads and line managers
- Information about projects or programmes
- Information between offices and teams
- Information, ideas and messages upwards to Group or Office Heads

The report sets out what is working well, priority issues and challenges and areas which require attention.

Documents reviewed

We took a deliberate decision to analyse more recent documents in order to get an up-to-date picture of internal communications in the Scottish Parliament. We reviewed the following documents:

- Internal communications strategy 2009
- Internal communications strategy 2014 and 2015
- Staff experience survey 2015
- Memorandum about notices sent out from the Chief Executive’s Office, May 2015
- Analysis of Leadership Group Drop-Ins 2014-2016
- Corporate Bulletin analytics (2015-2016)
- Wyllie report about Defining Leadership and Management in the Scottish Parliament, 2017
- Leadership and Management discussion paper (OD programme), 2017
- Issues log for Internal Communications Working Group, 2017

The documents present a limited picture of how internal communications is operating in the Scottish Parliament:
Three documents addressed specific aspects of internal communications (notices sent from Chief Executive’s Office, analysis of Leadership Group Drop-Ins and Corporate Bulletin analytics)

Two documents contained specific feedback about communications from SPS staff at Grade 5 and above as part of a wider survey on leadership and management in the Scottish Parliament.

The staff experience survey in 2015 had a good response rate and contained some feedback about communications as part of a wider survey about working in the Parliament.

Since the formation of the Internal Communications Working Group, individual SPS staff have been providing anecdotal feedback to Mary Ann Masson about their views on internal communications – Mary Ann has compiled this feedback into an issues log for use by the Working Group. These are the views of individuals and would need to be validated against existing information, by the internal communications survey or through the focus groups.

Although the documents present only a partial picture of internal communications in the Scottish Parliament, they do give us some understanding of what works well, priority issues and challenges and areas for attention.

**Internal communications strategies**

The aspirations in both internal communications strategies are still relevant:

- Internal communications should be a two-way process
- There should be an effective exchange of information and ideas across the organisation
- Communications should be equally accessible to all and in language which is clear to all
- A range of different communication methods should be used
- Communications should be tailored to the audience
- Communication to internal users should be delivered from internal sources
- Information should be shared across the organisation fully, in a timely manner and accessible format and staff should take personal responsibility for keeping ourselves updated
- There should be discussions with staff who work non-standard hours or are on long-term leave to discuss communication options and preferences
- All internal communications should be co-ordinated
- All major projects/initiatives should be supported by a communication plan which includes internal audiences
- Leadership Group is expected to share information and knowledge freely
- Different and innovative channels should be created to improve communication across the organisation
Annex A – Analysis of Existing Information

What works well

- Two-way communication between SPS staff and their line managers (90% of SPS staff feel that they receive candid and constructive feedback from their line manager to help improve performance; 94% of SPS staff feel that their line manager listens to their views and ideas (Staff survey))
- Sharing information within teams (90% of SPS staff feel that there is a free exchange of ideas and opinions in their team; people are not afraid to say what they think (Staff survey))
- Service bulletins from BIT, FM and HR – sent out as quickly as possible when urgent communication is required
- Chief Executive Office communications containing information which is novel, contentious or of a cross-cutting nature (eg independence camp)
- Corporate Bulletin reaches 1738 people and the majority of them open it immediately (Corporate Bulletin analytics)
- Leadership Group Drop-Ins – feedback from participants indicated that they valued the opportunity to talk to members of Leadership Group in an informal environment. Participants particularly valued the International Women’s Day Drop-In both because it had a theme (which helped them to think of questions) and because it was in a meeting room (which made them feel less exposed and more relaxed)

Priority issues and challenges

1. Review of methods/channels of communication

There are already many methods and channels of internal communication. Some of these channels and methods have been reviewed (communications from the Chief Executive’s Office, Corporate Bulletin, Leadership Group Drop-Ins), others have not.

In recent years, more traditional communication methods have been supplemented by blogs, online communities on SPShare and SPLearning, videos and the establishment of internal networks (Leadership Academy Network, Women’s Network, Coaching Network), with more networks being launched this year. Information about the Parliament is also made available on social media channels, such as Facebook and Twitter.

The number and range of communication methods and channels can make it difficult for staff to know where to find information and could lead to internal communications being missed. It could also mean that information is inconsistent in different places, leading to a lack of clarity among staff about what is correct.

A review of methods and channels of communication has also been a key theme in the issues log.

*We recommend that we seek feedback from SPS staff about methods and channels of communication:*

*Location*
• Should there be a central location or hub for internal communications irrespective of where or how the communication originally appeared?
• If so, where should it be hosted?
• Should social pages be located separately?

Tools and technology

• What tools and technology do we currently have which could be used to improve internal communications?

Methods of communication

• When should face to face communication be used?
• What alternative forms of communication could we use (videos, infographs, audio, social media)? When would we use them as an alternative to written communications? What is the appetite among staff for alternative forms of communication? What are the barriers to using these?
• What is the role of the new networks in internal communications?
• How can we ensure that particular groups receive the communications they need? (Those on different shift patterns or who work mostly off-site? Those who are on long-term absence? Contractors?)
• Can you give us examples of best practice in relation to internal communications in the Parliament at the moment? Can you give us examples of best practice from other places you have worked?

2. Organisation-wide communication

In the staff survey, only 80% of SPS staff considered that Leadership Group communicates its decisions openly and effectively.

There was some feeling from the Leadership Academy Network that leaders were not always ensuring that change was fully communicated, understood and embedded at each level of management. They also felt that sometimes it could seem that there were mixed messages from members of Leadership Group.

In addition, there were some specific points in the issues log about communications from Leadership Group, either individually or as a group

Leadership Group

• What role should Leadership Group play in internal communications?
• How can Leadership Group engage with staff effectively?
• Are there better ways to communicate to staff about Leadership Group meetings?
• How can we give the strategic plan and the organisation’s values greater prominence so that staff know where to find them?
Effective communication

- How do we ensure that internal communications are co-ordinated?
- How do we ensure the timeliness of communications so the right people hear at the right time?

3. Feedback/consultation

In the staff survey, only 81% of SPS staff felt that they were involved in decisions on changes that affected their work.

Staff from the Leadership Academy Network felt that when staff are consulted, the purpose of the consultation is not always clear. They want engagement with senior leaders/Leadership Group in formal meetings and informal meetings to promote the exchange and sharing of values, business requirements and operational delivery experiences, leading to better decision-making in the organisation.

Staff from the Leadership Academy Network felt that there was possibly too much emphasis on consensus working leading to indirect communication and a reluctance to embrace healthy conflict and constructively challenge colleagues.

In the issues log, there were several comments relating to feedback and consultation:

- information travels up to come back down and that this should be addressed so the staff can move things forward without referring up the way
- if good, early consultation happened in good time between teams, then communications on that topic would look after themselves

We recommend that we seek feedback from SPS staff about:

- what the Scottish Parliament can do to encourage a feedback culture
- whether they feel able to express a different view from that of their colleagues and constructively challenge colleagues on work matters
- how we can tap into the expertise of colleagues at all levels of the organisation in order to improve decision-making and collaboration between offices?

Areas for attention

1. Collaboration/collaborative working

In the staff survey, only 83% of SPS staff thought that staff were encouraged to work across teams and share knowledge between offices.

Staff from the Leadership Academy Network (Grade 5 and above) felt that collaboration across functions was important and that the Leadership Academy Network should focus on collaboration, internal networking and relationship building.
Channels of communication, for example EH99, communication information about the work and projects of offices after they have happened. In order to facilitate collaborative working, information needs to be shared when projects or work are being initiated.

We recommend that we seek feedback from SPS staff about collaborative working:

- Are staff at all levels encouraged to work collaboratively?
- What are the barriers to collaborative working?
- Could internal networks encourage and promote collaborative working?
- Could the staff forum (which has not met for a couple of years) have a role in relation to information sharing about the work of their offices?
- How can we share information between offices so staff can identify opportunities for collaborative working at an early stage?

2. Corporate Bulletin

Although the majority of staff open Corporate Bulletin immediately, there are far less click throughs to further information (Corporate Bulletin analytics). It is unclear why this is the case.

We recommend that we should seek feedback from SPS staff about click throughs:

- is the summary in the home page of the bulletin sufficient for them
- is the information in Corporate Bulletin not relevant to them
- are they choosing to click through to further information only in relation to items which are relevant or of interest to them?
- is the format of Corporate Bulletin so familiar to them that they forget that they can click through to more information?
- would another method of communication for organisation-wide information be more relevant?

3. Leadership Group Drop-Ins

SPS staff valued the opportunity to talk to members of Leadership Group in an informal environment but some of them struggled to think of questions. The Drop-In on International Women’s Day worked well because it had a theme and was in a meeting room rather than the Garden Lobby.

We recommend that Leadership Group Drop-Ins should recommence and that:

- they should be held in a meeting room
- they should have a theme
- Leadership Group could be invited to drop in on a meeting of one of the internal networks to discuss issues of importance to them

4. Personal development
Staff from the Leadership Academy Network (Grade 5 and above) felt that their conversations with line managers focussed on outputs and outcomes rather than feedback relating to how effectively they communicate, their interpersonal skills or whether they built good working relationships.

They felt that these skills should be role modelled by leaders in the organisation in casual conversations with staff.

In addition, the issues log suggested that development programmes could be used to encourage staff to develop their own personal networks. There was also a question about what behaviours the organisation rewards and values and how this affects communications.

*We recommend that we should seek feedback from SPS staff about whether they receive feedback from line managers in relation their communication and interpersonal skills. If they do not, what feedback would they like to receive and in what format?*

**Issues log: themes**

**Infrastructure**

- Is internal communications a service? If so, it needs an owner. Do we need a centralised communications function?
- What is the relationship between internal communications and engagement?
- Could we have internal communications reps in each office to share information with other teams, attend other team’s meetings, create a network with other reps?

**Method of communication**

- How can we improve email distribution lists in order to improve communication?
- Should all offices have named mailboxes from which to issue messages to the wider staff group?
- Is the Corporate Bulletin purely factual? What should and should not be included in it? (eg should it include real-life feedback about development courses in order to encourage other staff to attend?)
- How do staff know when LG papers have been released?

**Integrity of communication**

- What is the relationship between internal communications and trust?
- How can we ensure that communications have integrity? That we admit when something has gone wrong or why one course of action was taken over another?

**Personal responsibility**

- What role does personal responsibility play in internal communications?
• Could we use development programs to encourage staff to build their own personal networks? New courses often encourage staff to meet with other attendees to discuss learning
• Can staff be encouraged to develop their own networks – ‘go to people’ who can help with collaboration

House style

• We don’t have a house style for communications
• We need to use plain English – is this a training need?
• Should we be using the Corporate Identity more?
• Meeting agendas from Boards and Groups should be broadly consistent in format. This would create consistency in communications flowing from meetings

Work of the Internal Communications Working Group

• How can we deliver ‘need to know’ information effectively when staff report that they are increasingly busy?
• How do we ensure that communications are fit for purpose, given the high rate of change in the organisation?
• Do our communications make clear what we want people to do with the information that’s being communicated?
• How can we build diversity and inclusion into our strategy?
• What can be learned from well-used publications like TWISP and the Weekly Tracker?
• Bear in mind the dependencies with work being done on Leadership and Management
• What facilitation methods should we use in our focus groups?
• Measuring our success is critical – how can we do this? Can this become part of our communication strategy? It must be meaningful. How do we measure some of the intangible benefits associated with an effective and efficient workplace?

Shona Skakle
Lesley Pirie
James Brown
Mary Ann Masson

6 April 2017
Annex B: Analysis of survey results

Internal Communications Survey, April 2017: analysis of survey results

INTRODUCTION

In November 2016, a working group was established to review internal communications in the Scottish Parliament, with a view to making recommendations for discussion with Leadership Group on a revised internal communications strategy and plan.

The working group undertook an analysis of more recent documents to get an up-to-date picture of internal communications in the Scottish Parliament. Although these documents contained some evidence relating to internal communications, they did not focus solely on this subject.

The working group therefore decided to conduct a survey which would provide it with an up to date assessment of internal communications across the organisation.

The purpose of the survey was to get the views and opinions of all staff on how we communicate with each other in relation to:

- Organisation-wide information and messages
- Information and messages from senior managers, Group Heads, Office Heads and line managers
- Information about projects or programmes
- Information between offices and teams
- Information, ideas and messages upwards to Office Heads or Group Heads
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- A response rate of 57.8% was achieved for the Internal Communications Survey
- While there was variation in responses among staff and across the survey questions, on the whole, responses were positive
- Grades 7 and 8 were consistently positive in their responses throughout the survey; other than that, there were no consistent patterns relating to grade
- The closer the information is to the work staff are likely to be doing, the more likely they are to feel confident that they are well informed (for example, in relation to the work of their team and their office)
- In relation to organisation-wide information, staff feel well informed, keep up to date and are generally positive about communication channels
- Throughout the survey, there is evidence that staff feel least well informed about the work of other offices – however, some indicated that they did not necessarily feel this was important if it was not relevant to their role; and that as long as they knew where to go for additional information, that was sufficient
- There were more mixed feelings in relation to effectiveness of communication (particularly co-ordination of internal communication, whether members of Leadership Group communicate effectively, consistency and timeliness of information, and receiving information through the grapevine)
- There were also more mixed feelings in relation to sharing information, with some staff feeling that they were consulted too late to make any meaningful contribution and others feeling that they were not encouraged to express a view different to that of their colleagues
- Most staff knew where to go to update themselves but many felt that they did not have the time to do this on a day to day basis
- Staff prefer to receive information using a range of different methods but are concerned that the most appropriate method should be used; comments about style and clarity of communication also appeared in every section of the survey
- Staff were positive about the clarity and accessibility of products such as the Chief Executive’s message and EH99
- Fewer than 25% of staff who responded to the survey felt that blogs, online communities and videos were their preferred ways of receiving information; and a similar number felt that they were effective ways of receiving information
METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

The Internal Communications Survey was conducted using an online survey format between 31 March and 21 April 2017. It was sent to all staff and contractors in the Scottish Parliament.

The survey was divided into 6 sections:

- Breadth of communication
- Effectiveness of communication
- Sharing information
- Keeping up to date
- Preferences in relation to methods of communication
- Effectiveness of different methods of communication

Survey respondents were asked to rate items on a standard scale. At the end of each section, respondents could add comments in a free text box.

The survey also included a section asking staff to identify their grade in order to allow analysis of the effectiveness of communications across all levels of the organisation. Staff in the Solicitor’s Office were asked to identify the grade closest to their own. There was a separate category for on-site contractors.

A total of 296 responses were received from a staff body of 512, giving a response rate of 57.8%.

As is normal with this type of survey, not all respondents completed the whole survey with fall-off rates increasing marginally as respondents worked through the questionnaire. This is because a decision was made at the outset that respondents could not progress through the survey if they failed to respond to the questions in each section. Nevertheless, at least 264 respondents answered all questions in the survey, meaning that every question had an overall response rate of 51.6% or greater.

Initial analysis was carried out at an all staff level, followed by analysis by grade. The results of these findings are discussed under each section.

In relation to the sections on Preferences in relation to methods of communication and Effectiveness of different methods of communication, staff were asked to tick as many boxes as applied. Unfortunately there was a design flaw in the survey which meant that respondents completing the survey on Friday 31 March could not move on to the next question unless they had ticked one of the 3 boxes in each category. This design flaw was brought to the attention of survey designers by a member of staff and was corrected early on the morning of Monday 3 April. There were therefore a small number of respondents who were forced to tick a box which they would not otherwise have ticked – some of them commented on this in the free text boxes under these sections.
DEMOGRAPHICS

This section of the report provides demographic data of those that responded to the survey. Staff were asked to select Grades 2-8 or on-site contractor. Only one person did not respond to this question (this was the only question where respondents were allowed to progress through the survey without giving a response).

Please select your grade from the following list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choice</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Grade 2</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grade 3</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Grade 4</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Grade 5</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grade 6</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Grade 7</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Grade 8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other passholders (on-site contractors)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered  295
skipped  1

Please select your grade from the following list:

- Grade 2
- Grade 3
- Grade 4
- Grade 5
- Grade 6
- Grade 7
- Grade 8
BREADTH OF COMMUNICATION

This section of the report provides analysis of responses to statements about how well-informed staff felt about what was happening in the Parliament. All respondents answered the questions in this section. This table provides an analysis of responses from all staff to all questions in this section:

2. Please indicate how informed you feel about what is going on in the Parliament by responding to the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am well informed about the work of my team.</td>
<td>47.6% (141)</td>
<td>39.9% (118)</td>
<td>10.1% (30)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am well informed about the work of my office.</td>
<td>25.3% (75)</td>
<td>47.6% (141)</td>
<td>22.6% (67)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am well informed about the work of my Group.</td>
<td>10.5% (31)</td>
<td>31.4% (93)</td>
<td>41.6% (123)</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am well informed about the work of other offices and Groups.</td>
<td>0.7% (2)</td>
<td>15.9% (47)</td>
<td>46.3% (137)</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am well informed about projects and programmes.</td>
<td>3.7% (11)</td>
<td>25.7% (76)</td>
<td>49.3% (146)</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am well-informed about matters which affect the whole organisation</td>
<td>8.4% (25)</td>
<td>48.0% (142)</td>
<td>32.8% (97)</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents felt well informed about the work of their team and their office:

- 87.5% felt well informed about the work of their team all or most of the time
- 73% felt well informed about the work of their office all or most of the time

A majority of respondents also felt well informed about matters which affect the whole organisation:

- 56.4% felt well informed most or all of the time; 32.8% felt well informed some of the time; 10.8% felt that they were seldom or never well informed about matters which affect the whole organisation

Respondents felt less well informed about the work of their Group, projects and programmes and the work of other offices or teams:
• There was a fairly even split between those who felt they were well informed about the work of their Group all or most of the time (41.9%) and those who felt that there were well informed some of the time (41.6%); 16.5% felt that they were seldom or never informed about the work of their group.

• 46.3% felt well informed about the work of other offices and Groups some of the time; however, 37% of respondents felt that they were seldom or never informed about the work of other offices and Groups.

• 49% of respondents felt well informed about projects and programmes some of the time; slightly more respondents (29%) felt well informed most or all of the time than those (21.3%) who felt that they were seldom or never well informed about projects and programmes.

Analysis by grade:

• Grades 7-8 were positive in their responses to questions.

• The majority of respondents who felt they were seldom or never well informed about the work of their Group were in Grades 2-5.

• Grades 2 and 5 were as likely to feel that they are seldom or never informed about projects and programmes as they were to feel that they are well informed most or all of the time.

• The majority of respondents who felt they were seldom well informed about matters which affect the whole organisation were in Grades 2, 3 and 5.

• Grades 2-4 are as likely to feel that they were seldom or never informed about the work of other offices and Groups as they were to feel that they are well informed some of the time.
Comments:

There were 44 free text comments in this section and the main themes were:

- Staff don’t need to be well-informed about everything all the time
- Time is an issue both in keeping up to date and in relation to sharing
- Communications can be variable (told about some projects and not others, told about new systems at the start but not when major changes made afterwards)
- Need for better communication between offices
- Communications should be clear (explain acronyms and consider how information could be interpreted)
- Role or office has an impact on how well informed people feel
- Information shared on a 'need to know' basis with key staff but little consideration given to others who also need to know
- There can be a lack of clarity about what is happening and who does what
- Communications from managers can be variable – some don’t communicate vacancies or opportunities; some Group Heads don’t speak to staff
EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNICATION

This section of the report provides analysis of responses to statements about how effective staff felt internal communications were. 280 survey respondents responded to the questions in this section. This chart illustrates how all staff responded to all questions in this section:

Survey respondents felt very positive in some areas:

- 73.9% felt that they understood the content of internal communications most or all of the time; with a further 21.6% feeling that they understood some of the time
- 66% felt that managers within their office communicated information effectively most or all of the time; with a further 26.2% feeling that they communicated effectively some of the time
They were also fairly positive about the level of detail in internal communications:

- 54.2% felt that internal communications contained an appropriate level of detail most or all of the time; with a further 38.2% feeling that they contained an appropriate level of detail some of the time

They felt more neutral in other areas:

- 38.9% of respondents felt that internal communications were well co-ordinated between different levels of management most or all of the time; 44.3% felt that they were well co-ordinated some of the time; 15% felt they were seldom well co-ordinated
- similarly, 40.7% felt that members of Leadership Group communicate information effectively most or all of the time; 42.1% felt that they communicate effectively some of the time; 15.5% felt they seldom communicate effectively
- 30.7% of respondents felt that they seldom or never got their information through the grapevine; 50% felt that they got their information through the grapevine some of the time; 19.3% felt that they got information through the grapevine most or all of the time
- 41.8% of respondents felt that internal communications were consistent most or all of the time; 40% felt that they were consistent some of the time; 15.7% felt they were seldom consistent
- 43.6% of respondents felt that internal communications were timely most or all of the time; 46.1% felt they were timely some of the time; 10% felt they were seldom timely

Analysis by grade:

- Grades 7-8 were mostly positive in their responses to questions, with some selecting some of the time in this section
- The majority of respondents who felt that internal communications were seldom well co-ordinated between different levels of management were in Grades 2-5
- The majority of respondents who felt that members of Leadership Group did not communicate effectively were in Grades 2-5, with only a few more Grade 5s selecting most of the time compared with those selecting seldom
- The majority of respondents who got most or all of their information through the grapevine were in Grades 2-5; significantly 34% of Grade 2s responded in this way
- Respondents who felt that internal communications were seldom consistent were in Grades 2-6, with an even split at Grade 6 between those who selected most of the time and those who selected seldom
- The majority of respondents who felt that internal communications were seldom timely were in Grades 2-5
Comments:

There were 38 free text comments in this section and the main themes were:

- Communications should be clear and succinct (acronyms explained, use of Plain English, no jargon)
- Lack of consistency (wide disparity in methods, style, quality and content; difficult to know what is important and what is for information only; relevance unclear; communications an afterthought rather than part of the decision-making process)
- Timeliness an issue (sign off takes time or issues are fast moving, staff feel the last to know, part-time workers receive communication later)
- Leadership Group communications and contact (lack of visibility, send emails about detailed strategy rather than meeting staff to discuss issues)
- Poor communication on specific issues (OD programme, TRS, recruitment outcomes)
SHARING INFORMATION

This section of the report provides analysis of responses to statements about sharing information across the Parliament. 277 survey respondents responded to the questions in this section. This chart illustrates how all staff responded to all questions in this section:

A clear majority of respondents gave very positive responses in relation to this section:

- 79% agreed or strongly agreed that they knew how to feed back their ideas or views, with 13.4% agreeing nor disagreeing
- 69.3% agreed or strongly agreed that they were encouraged to share ideas or views with colleagues at all level, with 19.4% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 70.8% agreed or strongly agreed that they shared information with colleagues in other offices, with 17.3% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 72.6% agreed or strongly agreed that they were encouraged to communicate with colleagues in other offices to achieve common goals, with 22% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
Respondents were less positive on other aspects of sharing information:

- 51% agreed or strongly agreed that they were encouraged to express a different view to that of their colleagues, with 32.1% neither agreeing or disagreeing; but 14.8% disagreed
- 56.3% agreed or strongly agreed that they were consulted about matters which were directly relevant to them, with 25.3% neither agreeing or disagreeing; but 15.2% disagreed
- 47.3% agreed or strongly agreed that internal communications support collaborative working; 37.9% neither agreed nor disagreed that internal communications support collaborative working; 11.9% disagreed

**Analysis by grade:**

- Grades 7-8 were positive in their responses to questions on sharing information
- The majority of respondents who disagreed that they were encouraged to express a different view from that of their colleagues were in Grades 2, 4 and 5
- The majority of respondents who disagreed that they were consulted about matters which were directly relevant to them were in Grades 2, 5 and 4
- The majority of respondents who disagreed that internal communications supported collaborative working were in Grades 2-6, with the highest number at Grade 4; there was also an even distribution at Grade 4 between those that agreed and those that neither agreed nor disagreed

**Comments:**

There were 30 free text comments in this section and the main themes were:

- Can express views but not always listened to (healthy challenge not always welcomed particularly in relation to a matter which is already in progress, discouraged from sharing views on specific subjects, senior managers take decisions without consultation about practical implications, it is often too late to influence change)
- Need for better communication between offices (including being able to provide critical feedback, good communication can depend on managers)
- Inconsistency (some offices share too much and some not enough, some projects push collaborative opportunities and others don't, different understanding in different offices of the same message)
- Reliance on line managers (encouragement to share ideas, failure to pass on information when on maternity leave)
- Not good at sharing/collaboration (collaboration can be protracted and negative behaviours not challenged)
- Some offices are quite insular
KEEPING UP TO DATE

This section of the report provides analysis of responses to statements about the way staff keep themselves up to date with what is happening in the Parliament. 277 respondents answered the questions in this section.

Most respondents felt positive in relation to this section:

- 77.3% agreed or strongly agreed that they knew where to go to update themselves about information relating to their job, with 14.4% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 68.9% agreed or strongly agreed that they knew where to go to update themselves about information relating to the wider organisation, with 21.3% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 74% agreed or strongly agreed that they kept up to date with organisation-wide information and messages, with 19.5% neither agreeing nor disagreeing

In general, respondents felt more neutral about whether they made time to go and find information about what was happening in other areas of the Parliament – 41.1% agreed or strongly agreed; 34.7% neither agreed nor disagreed; 22.4% disagreed. This chart compares the responses to this question by grade:
Analysis by grade:

- Grades 7-8 were positive in their responses to these questions
- The majority of respondents who disagreed that they made time to seek information about other areas of the Parliament were in Grades 2-5; and at Grade 3, there was a fairly even division between those who agreed and those who disagreed:

Comments:

There were 32 free text comments in this section and the main themes were:

- No time/too busy (don’t look beyond information related to role, difficult to find information – one stop shop would help, shift work/part-time working/atypical work patterns don’t help, difficult to make time to keep up to date, send out short messages with links rather than long messages)
- Difficult to find information
- Relevance of information can be unclear
- Specific comments on current information sources
PREFERENCES IN RELATION TO METHODS OF COMMUNICATION

This section of the report provides analysis of responses to statements about staff preferences in relation to methods of communicating organisation-wide information, information about projects or programmes and information about the work of other offices. Staff were asked to tick as many boxes as applied. 268 respondents answered the questions in this section.

I prefer to receive communications by the following methods:
(Tick as many boxes as apply)

![Bar chart showing preferences for communication methods]

Organisation-wide information

Staff prefer to receive organisation-wide information through a range of methods and channels, with email being the most popular (88.4% of respondents), followed by Corporate Bulletin, then Chief Executive’s message, then face to face and EH99. A small number of respondents preferred to receive this information through blogs, online communities and videos.

Information about projects and programmes

Staff prefer to receive information about projects and programmes through email, then face to face or by Corporate Bulletin. Fewer than half the respondents wanted to receive this information through the Chief Executive’s Office message, EH99, blogs, online communities and videos.
Information about the work of other offices

Staff prefer to receive information about the work of other offices through email, then face to face, then in Corporate Bulletin, then in EH99. A small number of respondents preferred to receive this information through the Chief Executive’s Office message, blogs, online communities and videos.

Methods and channels of communication

For all types of information, the preference was to receive information through email. Fewer than 25% of respondents preferred blogs, online communities and videos for receipt of any information.

Analysis by grade

- There were no significant patterns by grade

Comments:

There were 65 free text comments in this section and the main themes were:

- Problems with the survey (8 respondents completed the survey before the design flaw was fixed and many of them had to tick blogs, online communities or videos when they didn’t want to do so)
- Challenges with newer technologies (videos difficult to watch because of service requirements and should have subtitles, blogs and videos an extra hoop to jump through or disliked)
- Too many channels (need to streamline the clutter, hard to know where to find information, don’t keep up with newer channels)
- Feedback on existing channels (individual comments on the channels mentioned in this section)
- Channels should be appropriate to message (consider strengths and weaknesses before using, new channels shouldn’t be used just because they look more modern, short email would suffice with links to other information, medium should depend on content)
- No time/too busy (push information in manageable chunks, no time for work if access all this information)
- Examples of good communication (Lobbying Register, Snippets)
- Clarity of communication (too long, email should be fall back, bite-size information)
- Need for one stop shop/central location for information
- Relevance (only need to read information relevant to role, put off reading material not relevant)
- Lack of consistency (staff in different offices or groups don’t get the same information, some communications too flash, others better)
EFFECTIVENESS OF DIFFERENT METHODS OF COMMUNICATION

This section of the report provides analysis of responses to statements about how effective staff felt methods of communication were in relation to organisation-wide information, information about projects or programmes and information about the work of other offices. Staff were asked to tick as many boxes as applied. 264 respondents answered the questions in this section.

Organisation-wide information

Staff felt that a range of methods and channels were effective in relation to the delivery of organisation-wide information, with email being the most popular (87.8% of respondents), then Corporate Bulletin, then Chief Executive’s message, then face to face. A small number of respondents preferred to receive this information through EH99, blogs, online communities and videos.

Information about projects and programmes

Staff felt that email was effective in relation to delivery of information about projects and programmes, followed by face to face and Corporate Bulletin. Fewer than half the respondents wanted to receive this information through the Chief Executive’s Office message, EH99, blogs, online communities and videos.
Information about the work of other offices

Staff felt that email was effective in relation to information about the work of other offices, followed by face to face, EH99 and Corporate Bulletin. Fewer than half the respondents wanted to receive this information through the Chief Executive’s Office message, blogs, online communities and videos.

Methods and channels of communication

For all types of information, the email was felt to be effective. Fewer than 25% of respondents felt that blogs, online communities and videos were effective.

Analysis by grade

- There were no significant patterns by grade

Comments:

There were 42 free text comments in this section and the main themes were:

- Problems with the survey (8 respondents completed the survey before the design flaw was fixed and many of them had to tick blogs, online communities or videos when they didn't want to do so)
- Feedback on existing channels (individual comments on the channels mentioned in this section)
- Clarity of communication (emails should be short, in Plain English and detail impact on the individual, too much emphasis on format over content)
- Channel should be appropriate to the method (face to face crucial for important message, videos difficult if not using headphones)
- Need for one stop shop/central location for information
- Benefits of newer technologies (news feeds/apps etc., blogs, online communities and videos OK if you have time and good for interaction)
- No time/too busy
- Too many channels

Shona Skakle
9 May 2017
ANNEX 1: ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM CONTRACTORS

Contractors have been included as part of the overall survey results but it was also felt that it would be useful to look at their responses separately in order to determine whether there were any distinct themes relating to contractors. The maximum number of responses received from contractors was 12.

BREADTH OF COMMUNICATION

Responses from contractors followed a similar pattern to those from other staff. 12 contractors answered survey questions in this section.

Respondents generally felt well informed about the work of their team, office, group and matters which affect the whole organisation:

- 58% felt well informed about the work of their team all or most of the time, with 33% feeling well informed some of the time
- 67% felt that about the work of their office all or most of the time, with 25% feeling well informed some of the time
- 58% felt well informed about the work of their group all or most of the time, with 33% feeling well informed some of the time
- 67% felt well informed about matters which affect the whole organisation all or most of the time – however, 25% felt that they were seldom or never informed about such matters

Respondents had more mixed feelings in relation to the work of other offices and groups and projects and programmes:

- 50% felt that they were well informed about the work of other offices some of the time, with 33% feeling they were seldom or never informed
- 42% felt that they were well informed about projects and programmes some of the time, with 33% feeling they were seldom or never informed and 25% feeling that they were well informed most of the time

EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNICATION

In most cases, the responses from contractors followed a similar pattern to those from other staff. 10 contractors responded to survey questions in this section.

Respondents were positive about the content of and level of detail in internal communications and about communication from managers within their office:

- 70% felt that they understood the content of internal communications all or most of the time, with 20% understanding it some of the time
- 60% felt the managers in their office communicated effectively all or most of the time, with 30% communicating effectively some of the time
60% felt that there was an appropriate level of detail in internal communications all or most of the time, with 20% feeling that there was an appropriate level of detail some of the time and 20% seldom

Respondents felt more neutral in relation to co-ordination, consistency and timeliness of communications and the effectiveness of Leadership Group communications:

- 40% felt that internal communications were well co-ordinated most of the time, with 50% feeling they were well co-ordinated some of the time
- 30% felt Leadership Group communicated effectively all or most of the time, whereas 60% felt that they communicated effectively some of the time
- 50% felt that information was consistent most of the time, with 40% feeling that it was consistent some of the time
- 40% felt that information was timely most of the time, with 50% feeling that it was timely some of the time

Unusually, respondents had a very positive reaction to the question about receiving information through the grapevine:

- 80% felt that they seldom or never receive information through the grapevine

**SHARING INFORMATION**

The responses to questions in this section were more positive across the board than those of all staff. 9 contractors responded to the survey questions in this section.

- 56% agreed or strongly agreed that they knew how to feed back their ideas or views, with 33% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 56% agreed or strongly agreed that they were encouraged to share ideas or views with colleagues at all levels, with 33% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 56% agreed or strongly agreed that they were encouraged to express a different view to that of their colleagues, with 44% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 56% agreed or strongly agreed that they were consulted about matters which were directly relevant to them, with 22% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 67% agreed or strongly agreed that internal communications support collaborative working, with 33% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 67% agreed or strongly agreed that they were encouraged to share information with other offices, with 22% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 78% agreed or strongly agreed that they were encouraged to communicate with colleagues in other offices to achieve common goals, with 11% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
KEEPING UP TO DATE

In this section, responses were similar to those of other staff. 9 contactors responded to survey questions in this section.

Respondents felt agreed that they knew where to go to update themselves:

- 78% agreed or strongly agreed that they knew where to go to update themselves about information relating to their job, with 11% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 67% agreed or strongly agreed that they knew where to go to update themselves about information relating to the wider organisation, with 33% neither agreeing nor disagreeing

However, feelings were more mixed in relation to keeping up to date with organisation-wide information and messages and the work of other offices:

- 33% agreed or strongly agreed that they kept up to date with organisation-wide information and messages, with 56% neither agreeing nor disagreeing
- 50% agreed or strongly agreed that they made time to go and find information about what was happening in other areas of the Parliament, with 40% neither agreeing nor disagreeing

PREFERENCES IN RELATION TO METHODS OF COMMUNICATION

Organisation-wide information

Respondents prefer to receive organisation-wide information through a range of methods and channels, with email being the most popular, followed by Corporate Bulletin, then Chief Executive’s message, then face to face and EH99. A very small number of respondents preferred to receive this information through blogs, online communities and videos.

Information about projects and programmes

Respondents prefer to receive information about projects and programmes through email, then face to face or by Corporate Bulletin, then by Chief Executive’s message. No respondents wanted to receive this information through the EH99, blogs, online communities and videos.

Information about the work of other offices

Respondents prefer to receive information about the work of other offices through email, then face to face, then in Chief Executive’s message and Corporate Bulletin, then in EH99. No respondents preferred to receive this information through blogs, online communities and videos.
Methods and channels of communication

For all types of information, the preference was to receive information through email. Only 14% of respondents preferred blogs, online communities and videos for receipt of any information.

EFFECTIVENESS IN RELATION TO METHODS OF COMMUNICATION

Organisation-wide information

Staff felt that a range of methods and channels were effective in relation to the delivery of organisation-wide information, with email being the most popular, then face to face, then Corporate Bulletin, then EH99, then Chief Executive’s message. No respondents preferred to receive this information through blogs, online communities and videos.

Information about projects and programmes

Staff felt that email was effective in relation to delivery of information about projects and programmes, followed by face to face, Corporate Bulletin, Chief Executive’s message and EH99. No respondents wanted to receive this information through the blogs, online communities and videos.

Information about the work of other offices

Staff felt that email was effective in relation to information about the work of other offices, followed by face to face, Chief Executive’s message, Corporate Bulletin and EH99. A very small number of respondents wanted to receive this information through the blogs, online communities and videos.

Methods and channels of communication

For all types of information, email was felt to be effective. Only 14% of respondents felt that blogs, online communities and videos were effective.
Annex C: Summary of Future Trends Findings

Video – 93% of Internal Comms professionals believe video has become essential.

Video blogs from executives have been rising in prominence among internal comms circles for some time. They offer an innovative way to communicate with employees, existing in a much more bite sized format and allowing communicators to put a friendly face and voice to the information that’s being shared.

Add to this the fact that 2016 saw the rise of live video broadcasting over social media, from Facebook to Instagram. This adds a completely new dimension to the possibilities of video communications. Just as the position of video in general is being solidified, a new landscape of possibilities is making itself known.

However there is still a misunderstanding between corporate and social usage on how the interaction of content, celebrity, production values, length of viewing time, integrity and participation work together to produce the volume of engagement desired. Viewing figures given are still not trust worthy as they do not tell us if the total numbers are unique views nor the duration a viewer remained watching.

Enterprise Social Networks

Over the past decade, adoption of ESNs has grown from 10% of businesses to 65%, and a McKinsey Global survey predicts it will plateau at 70% by the end of 2017. No doubt Facebook will do whatever it takes to push up that figure further, or to eat Yammer, Jive and Slack’s lunch, or both, not to mention trying to nail the coffin on corporate email. Slack his currently being used as a communications tool between Broadcasting and Chamber Office. Particular strengths between Clerks in the Chamber and TV Gallery in addition to messaging between staff members not confined to a desk and therefore replacing email. Windows Teams, a Slack equivalent, is about to go under trial in Broadcasting and a comparison and evaluation made over the summer. View is to have wide spread roll out across the Parliament.

Outcomes – not outputs.

More emphasis on focused campaigns where outputs are systematically measured and carefully analysed. Move away from directionless, hope for the best campaigns. Software technology such as Campaign Outcome Survey now available to help easily gather data and combine outputs and outcome results.

Engagement

2015 global survey by Aon Hewitt found that 5% increase in employee engagement is linked to a 3% increase in revenue growth the following year. More interestingly for Parliament that unequivocally, the single most important key to driving employee engagement across the board is leadership. Aon concludes that engaging leaders who engage others are not just nice to have – they are the key ingredient to creating a culture of engagement that sustains business. “Leaders make engagement happen….and we find that creating a culture of engagement starts with leaders”.

50
Engagement is profoundly affected by employee experience. Thinking in terms of experience helps overcome one of the biggest engagement hurdles companies face which is the struggle to measurement engagement.

**Culture + Technology + Physical Space = Employee Experience.**

A recent global survey of IC showed almost unanimous agreement on the importance of measuring the impact of IC.

---

**2016 Rachel Miller founder of All Things IC consultancy –**

1. Face to face communication cannot be beaten. It can be replicated via technology, but in person remains the most effective form.
2. Peer to peer will continue to grow importance. We’re moving from hierarchical to horizontal communication. Peers are powerful and can transform organisational communication.
3. Trust is the currency of communication. With trust, great things can happen. You need to trust employees to do the right thing, rather than assume they’ll do the wrong thing.
4. Everything that is not shared is lost.
5. There’s no such thing as purely ‘internal’ communications. Everything has the potential to be shared.
6. Don’t view communications as something you do to employees, but for and with them.
7. The role of professional communicators has shifted from content creators to content curators.
8. Work is a thing you do, not a place you go.
9. Integrated communication does not mean setting aside skill sets and disciplines. Equip, enable and empower your employees and customers by having a joined up approach.
10. Employee engagement isn’t something extra. It’s what you say and how you do it.

“Corporate communications will increasingly be lost amongst the scores of notifications: in email, in app, and within collaborative intranet. Communicators and copywriters should work with developers within IT to craft the micro-copy to enhance the user-experience of apps, workflows, and social intranet.”

Paul Jones Strategy Team Leader – Sequel (content and channel creators)
INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH: FOCUS GROUP ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

In November 2016, a working group was established to review internal communications in the Scottish Parliament, with a view to making recommendations for discussion with Leadership Group on a revised internal communications strategy and plan.

Online survey

In March and April 2017 the working group conducted an online survey with SPS staff seeking views and opinions on how we communicate with each other. A report on the survey was submitted to the chair of the Working Group in May.

Follow-up focus groups

As a follow-up to the survey, in May and June 2017, three focus group interviews were conducted with volunteers from staff who had completed the survey. The purpose of the focus group interviews was to explore in greater depth some of the issues which came up in the survey.

Each focus group was moderated by two members of the working group and the discussion written up in a short paper.

This report summarises the findings from the three focus groups.
FOCUS GROUP ANALYSIS

Each focus group was asked to address a series of questions under three headings:

- Additional information you need communicated to be able to do your job
- Method and channels of communication and their effectiveness
- Feedback and consultation

Two of the focus groups followed this structure closely, while the other group provided more general responses rather than grouping responses under specific topics. This analysis attempts to draw out the main issues which arose across all three focus groups. It should be noted, however, that there was considerable repetition of responses, in particular across the first two discussion topics.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION YOU NEED COMMUNICATED TO BE ABLE TO DO YOUR JOB

This discussion topic covered all forms of communication that focus group members found effective, not just directly related to information relevant to the day to day work of participants, but which provide context and depth to the role and work of staff.

What works well and why?

Group 1 felt that face-to-face conversation, which is timely and provides the opportunity to ask questions and clarify issues, was a good way of conveying important information. The Group also recognised that different people had different preferences for communication styles and that, where possible, these preferences should be used.

Similarly, Group 3 commented that openness was important to addressing communication problems and that communications worked best when everyone was positive and open to ideas. Group 2 agreed that effective communication was a two-way process and was most effective when senior management are available and seen as approachable.

Examples of effective forms of communication included:

- The Public Information Tracker
- The Corporate Bulletin (for job information)
- Summaries provided by some (not all) office heads
- Short team meetings/briefings (long meetings can be counter-productive)
- The grapevine – though not always accurate
- Alert messaging system (efficient notification of incidents)
- Emails – everyone on the system but best when short and to the point
- EH99. Tone and style appropriate for informal information. (Admired by some, but not all)
In addition, participants in Group 1 felt that a clear understanding of who does what in the Parliament, including who is working on current projects, helps effective communications.

What works less well and why?

Group 3 highlighted holding on to information as a problem in some cases. Information is only useful when fully shared in a timely manner with those who need to know. Communications which come at the last moment or which are unduly selective put people under unnecessary pressure and limit operational effectiveness. Presumption should be to share, but we can be too risk averse. This concept of risk aversity arose in all groups across all three discussion topics.

Group 1 also highlighted poor timing of communications as a problem while Group 2 agreed that information is not always cascaded to the appropriate people. A lack of clarity of message can also be a feature of some communication, as can inconsistency of tone, depth of information and means of communication.

Group 1 felt, in particular, that information on projects should be “properly publicised and explained” and that this does not always happen, with much communication seen as inadequate or as an afterthought.

Some participants in Group 1 said that it was incumbent on staff to be proactive in finding out information but that it was not always clear where to look, or indeed, if you didn’t know about something, you would not know you needed that information. However, others said that finding information was not generally a problem. Group 2 agreed that finding information could be difficult as we don’t have an effective search engine. They also said that the “lack of a common IT platform” hindered good communications.

What should be kept or done more of?

All 3 Groups thought that the following forms of communication were effective at conveying information and should be retained:

- Corporate Bulletin
- Snippets

Groups 1 and 3 felt that the following should also be retained:

- TWISP – though this was not well publicised
- EH99 - though some felt there was some room for improvement
- The Tracker – clear and interesting information
- Face to face communications – need to ensure we don’t just communicate be email/papers etc.

In addition, Group 1 felt that regular all-staff events and updates are valuable in some circumstances and should continue. However, not everyone in the Group agreed on the value of such events.
Group 2 said that a real positive for the Parliament was that there was not much of a “them and us” culture and that this should be celebrated and valued.

Other forms of communication that Group 2 thought worthy of retaining or expanding were:

- Genuine consultation before policies are agreed
- Group open door events
- Photo on email – make it mandatory, really good to know who is who
- Corporate messages from all ACEs where appropriate.
- Facebook – this was popular and shared

What should be changed and how?

Group 1 said that if SP Learning is to remain, it should be changed to make it more purposeful. The Group highlighted a lack of staff buy-in based on no common understanding of its purpose. They suggested it could be reconfigured to make it more useful.

Group 1 also thought that an improved EH99, with a better balance between the social and business side, would be useful. The Group also felt that staff should be better informed about social media activity around the Parliament.

Group 2 argued for:

- better means for communicating with senior management.
- a digital process for asking questions of Leadership Group – email account?
- better feedback on the outcome of consultations
- a single form to notify HR & other areas such as FM & BIT of transfers/new starts/promotions (temp)
- better internal comms to Visitor Services & Public Information & Publications during crisis etc
- more concise Organisational Development updates
- a better search engine for the intranet

Group 3 would like to see:

- more encouragement for human connection between staff and teams (MBWA), such as work shadowing, secondments etc.
- greater encouragement and opportunities for staff to ask questions of senior management – eg what do ACEs do?
- Snippets placed online – so they can be viewed at a convenient time
- More information on who is responsible for decisions
What needs to be taken away and why?

Groups 1 and 2 were critical of SP Learning, arguing that it is now being used largely as a training/event booking system when there are other more suitable tools available.

Some in Group 2 did not like the format of EH99, though others in the Group and in other groups, liked this publication.

Group 3 expressed concerns over the current hierarchical and grading structure of the organisation.

What are we not doing but could do – something new?

All three groups suggested that a staff forum should be established (or re-established) as a place where staff could ask questions and raise issues safely and possibly anonymously without fear of ‘reprisals’. All three groups also suggested some form of ‘Communications hub’ or central communications point, though some in one group disagreed on the basis that there’s already too much centralisation.

Other suggestions included:

- Make sure all staff are aware of all communications channels, including Tracker, TWISP, EH99 etc.
- A better and meaningful intranet
- Provide office sharing space – physical & digital

What are the potential barriers to change?

Focus groups identified a number of potential barriers which might inhibit change and prevent the development of more effective internal communications.

These barriers can be classified as ones related to:

- **People and organisational culture** – some people do not like change and organisations can develop a culture and ways of doing things which are inimical to change. Such cultures can also be internal, resulting in the development of silos and intra-office rivalries.
- **Time and pressure of work** – good communications take time to produce and disseminate and also require time for staff to read, understand and respond. The pressure of business can inhibit both these aspects of communication.
- **Scale of information communicated** – as noted above, information takes time to produce and to consume. Communicating too much information can be as bad as communicating too little.
- **Relevance and timeliness of communications** – related to the previous point, more consideration needs to be given to who “needs to know”.
- **Clarity and consistency of communication** – it is not always clear what the ‘purpose’ of a communication is and too much jargon and unnecessary acronyms
are used. The format of communications can be inconsistent and it is not always clear who is responsible for decision-making, what any deadlines are and how to respond.

- **Communication skills** – the ability to communicate clearly and effectively varies across the Parliament, including at senior level. Some communications are seen as an afterthought.

- **Technology** – some technology can act as a barrier to good communication if it is not set up properly or if staff are not adequately trained in its use. It is not easy to find things on the intranet and website; SPShare is not easy to use for some; some see SP Learning as pointless; some links do not work on mobile devices eg Corporate Bulletin. Also, not everyone has access to the same technology – eg ipads and other mobile devices.

**How can these barriers be overcome?**

To a large extent, ways in which barriers to effective communication can be overcome are the ‘flipside’ of the criticisms made under the previous ‘barriers’ heading.

- **People and organisational culture** – promote more sharing of information between offices; for example, encourage work shadowing; attendance at other team meetings; events to encourage cross-office working and thinking and sharing of best practice. Encourage staff to use face to face interactions more to get people away from their desks and to develop relationships and intra-office links and understanding. Provide incentives for people to work together (and disincentives for secrecy).

- **Time and pressure of work** – ensure that staff have the time and support to keep up-to-date with what is happening in the Organisation – build this into office and personal planning.

- **Scale of information communicated** – encourage people to think more carefully about what needs to be communicated, in what form and to whom. Short, sharp messages can be more effective than long turgid emails, for example.

- **Relevance and timeliness of communications** – related to the previous point, more consideration needs to be given to who “needs to know”. A scattergun/just in case approach to communication should be avoided. Communications should make it clear who the communication is aimed at, whether and what, if any, action needs to be taken. Communications should be issued in plenty of time for any relevant action to be taken. There should be regular and ongoing updates on projects appropriate to level of involvement or interest and an option to feedback on relevant projects.

- **Clarity and consistency of communication** - the ‘purpose’ of any communication should always be clear; plain English should be used and jargon and unnecessary acronyms avoided whenever possible. An accessible parliamentary “glossary” might be useful. Communications should be issued in a consistent format and it
should be clear who is responsible for decision-making, what any deadlines are and how to respond. All major projects should have a clear communications plan.

- **Communication skills** – prior planning for communications is important as is leadership and taking responsibility for communications. Could be useful to have an internal communications expert to advise on effective communications. Staff should be encouraged to go on communication skills courses.

- **Technology** – Give everyone access to mobile devices; provide more proactive help with managing email – a key communication tool; streamline systems with single logon to different systems and databases.

**Who should have responsibility for making change happen?**

Groups 1 and 2 said that tackling barriers to good communications was the responsibility of everyone. Group 1 added that senior management should lead by example. Group 3 highlighted the need for information holders to be willing to share information and to listen to and act on feedback, including negative feedback. Group 2 agreed that responding to feedback was important.

Group 2 suggested that Group and Office Heads have a responsibility to filter and share relevant information and to respond positively to all feedback from staff. There was also a key role for the newly appointed Head of Internal Communications and could be a role for an internal communications subject matter expert, should such a person be appointed.

Group 1 said that there should be, “…clarity around roles and responsibilities in each area and that people should be held to account for failures”.

**What will you do to make this happen?**

Two of the focus groups (Groups 1 and 3) discussed what actions they could take personally to implement changes to make internal communications more effective.

Both groups said that they would be willing to share information as widely as possible to as many colleagues as possible (and feel supported). Group 1 added that they would also:

- Get involved, provide positive feedback and participate more
- Challenge negativity
- Be constructive in making suggestions or criticism - not moaning
- Communicate in a way that they would like to receive information
When does this need to happen – priority order?

All three groups said that these changes needed to happen immediately.

Group 2 said that staff should “Be able to be making the loop rather than just brought into it – collaborative/empower staff”.

What would improved internal communications look and feel like?

All three focus groups addressed this question. Some responses provided a descriptive list of what they felt an organisation with an efficient and effective internal communications system would look and feel like. Other responses addressed what a good communications system itself would look like.

*Improved internal communications would produce an organisation which is:*

- Perceived as a single team - “Team Parliament”
- Efficient, with better tools eg well-structured intranet and search tools
- A better place to work; where staff are valued, trusted and well informed
- Less bureaucratic with less corporate red tape
- More honest, open, creative and productive
- Happier
- Seen as relevant
- More aware – staff would know why things are being done and be able to understand and influence decisions
- Good at crisis communications – little and often
- Good at consultation and clear on the difference between consulting and informing.

*Improved internal communications would be:*

- High Quality
- Clear and concise with a clarity of purpose (using plain English and rejecting unnecessary jargon)
- Consistent in look and style
- Timely
- Personalised – with more individual choice and targeted to needs and interests
- Able to employ a variety of communication methods to suit particular needs
- Accessible to all across different devices
METHOD AND CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION AND THEIR EFFECTIVENESS

This area of discussion relates to the ways in which information is communicated across the Organisation and how effective these channels or methods of communication are perceived to be. However, it was appreciated that no single channel or method was appropriate to all audiences or all purposes. The only channel which seems universally unpopular with the focus groups was SP Learning.

What works well and why?

This question appears to have been interpreted slightly differently across the three groups. Group 1 has addressed what might be called ‘technical’ channels of communication eg software and communication systems. Groups 2 and 3 mainly discussed less technical channels, such as meetings and publications.

Group 1 thought that the following communication channels work well:

- SPARK format (used in weekly tracker) - Good mix of text and pictures, right amount of information, good on desktop and mobile devices
- Group call (used recently) – captures wider number of people, not over-used and therefore has greater impact, succinct
- Slack (a team instant messaging service used by Broadcasting) – not reliant on desktop (everyone get messages on SP iPhones), instant, encourages participation and inclusion, not reliant on phone signal (works on wifi or 4G)

Group 2 felt that the following methods and channels of communication work well:

- The Tracker
- Corporate Bulletin – gathers a lot of information in one place
- Information provided by (some, not all) Office Heads
- The “grapevine”
- Emails – available to everyone on a DL list, but best when short and to the point
- Short team briefings/meetings/ideas
- Alert messaging system
- EH99 – Tone and style appropriate for informal information.

Group 3 agreed with Group 2 on the usefulness of the Corporate Bulletin, which they said was generally popular, with useful links. This Group was only partly supportive of EH99 with some regarding it as useful and others thinking it was less so. Group 3 also agreed with Group 1 on the benefits of SP Group call, which they suggested be renamed ‘Alert’.

Other methods and channels of communication which Group 3 thought currently worked well were:
• ACE messages – always read, should be restricted to really important matters – but who decides?
• PO’s message – nice but no action required (usually used to praise staff) – infrequency helps
• ACE attendance at staff meetings – some suggested this but others disagreed
• Staff blogs – some liked this idea, but others disagreed
• All-staff meetings – useful where they have a specific purpose
• TWISP/Tracker (not everyone knows what these are, but the Group thought them useful – promote them more)
• Group Head communications - but these can vary in format, clarity and content - depends on the particular Head.

What works less well and why?

Two common areas of discontent around communication channels emerged across the three focus groups. These were emails and SP Learning.

On emails, Group 1 said:

“Email reliance is old-fashioned, cluttered and slow; access is poor, especially for mobile workers; too slow to access via laptops/desktops, the format is no longer fit-for-purpose; there should be more face-to-face communications”.

Group 2 said that there was too much reliance on emails in the Parliament and Group 3 added that not everyone has the time to read hundreds of emails.

Criticism of SP Learning featured in the first two questions across all three focus groups. Most felt that the purpose of SP Learning was not widely understood and that the system was used by relatively few staff. As a channel of communication, Group 1 said:

“SP Learning hasn’t taken-off, communities are not working, there should be a single sign-on, and there is no notification”.

Group 2 described SP Learning as, “…a mess. Its only use is as a booking system – the rest is a ‘faff’”.

As noted in previous responses, Groups 2 and 3 felt that the intranet was not well structured or easy to search and was often out of date. These two groups also said that staff blogs were not very visible, so not easy to access. Group 3 suggested they should be linked to the Corporate Bulletin and there should be an icon on staff desktops to make them more visible and accessible.

On communications from senior management, Group 1 said:

“With regard to the flow of information from SPCB/LG to staff – too much information is restricted, too ‘gradist’ (trust/respect issues e.g. SRB site is all restricted), what
information emerges and when (often too late), top-down approach with no avenue for staff to feedback.”

Group 2 discussed attendance at team meeting by members of the Leadership Group but, on balance, felt that this could be, “…artificial, scary and make it difficult for staff to contribute”. Group 3 felt that, where ACEs attended a staff meeting, it should be for a specific purpose.

Other channels or methods of communication which focus group members felt did not always work as well as they could, included:

- Facebook/Twitter/Instagram – what has been promoted to the public is not promoted to staff
- Group Head communications – the quality and frequency of communication depends on the group head; there is no consistency
- Written information - Too much information is written or provided in links
- Website – this is too big and not well structured
- IT – There is a lack of common IT Platform i.e. lots of different browsers/applications result in workarounds and use of out-of-date systems.
- Management availability - not all management are considered ‘available’ or have a high profile, so can be difficult to reach
- Consultations – feeling that views, particularly negative views, are not really taken on board following consultation
- Channels for communications to/from/between lower grades are not clear
- Information flow – not always great when something changes e.g. Chamber suspended and information doesn’t always get fully cascaded

What should be kept and done more of?

Each group came up with similar types of communication they would want to see maintained or extended. These were:

- Genuine staff consultations on important policy before changes are made
- All staff event (Paul’s talk in the Chamber) useful but needs to have more new information, not just things that everyone knows
- Corporate wide initiatives – continue with snippets and staff briefings. However, HR currently needs 6 weeks to input snippets in SP Learning – this is not efficient and defeats the purpose of being flexible, agile and responsive.
- Corporate messages from all ACEs, where appropriate
- The Business Bulletin – good example of segmented information tailored by the consumer
- TWISP and Tracker – seen as generally useful and informative
- Facebook – interesting and has potential for greater use
- Group open door events
- Face-to-face communications – effective and should be encouraged
What should be changed and how?

At the organisational level, Groups 1 and 3 felt that there was a need to address excessive bureaucracy e.g. to enable messages to be cleared for issue quickly and to change the culture of the Organisation to encourage greater openness and sharing.

Groups 1 and 2 felt that EH99 would be more effective and useful if it could achieve a better balance between social and business purposes.

Group 1 thought that there should be a clear understanding of which channels are most effective for conveying different types of message and a clear structure for selecting that channel.

More pragmatically, Group 2 said:

- We need a form to notify HR & other areas of transferred/new starts/promotions (temp) linking to FM & BIT

What needs to be taken away and why?

There were few responses under this question, though there is a direct read across to responses given to the same question under the first discussion topic “Additional information you need communicated to be able to do your job”.

Two groups (Groups 1 and 2) said that SP Learning should be removed or its functions integrated into an existing system.

What are we not doing but could do – something new?

Again, responses to this question were similar to those given in relation to the first discussion topic.

Two groups (Groups 1 and 2) said that there should be a (new) staff forum to enable staff to discuss ideas and raise issues in a safe environment. Similarly, two groups (Groups 2 and 3) thought that single point of access or a common communications hub or platform would be useful for co-ordinating communications across the Parliament and for finding information.

Other things focus groups felt the Parliament would benefit from improving or doing more of were to:

- be more trusting of staff
- be less risk averse
- encourage more face-to-face communication
- focus on content not just format – digital is not just about format!
What are the potential barriers to change?

The focus groups identified what they saw as a number of possible barriers to achieving desirable changes to improve communication channels. Like the responses given to the same question under the first discussion topic, some of these responses were about people and behaviours while others were about technical matters and systems.

**People and behaviour**

- We are too risk averse as an organisation and lack trust in staff
- Parliament is too hierarchical and not willing to delegate responsibility
- Confidentiality could be at risk with the wide sharing of information
- Lack of staff resources and potential costs might be an issue
- Need for training on software communication systems, but generally a lack of time
- Chinese whispers – need for ‘rumour control’
- Hanging on to jargon and technical language which is divisive rather than inclusive.

**Technical and systems**

- SPSHare restrictions
- Availability of channels to staff away from the Parliament (part-time work patterns) and out of hours
- Over reliance on digital

How can these barriers be overcome?

Again, the solutions to the problems highlighted above reflect each group’s perceptions of the problems.

**People and behaviour**

- Be more open to feedback
- Apply common sense to situations
- Less use of jargon and esoteric language
- People should be able to choose to receive information at a time that works for them
- Explain purpose – more conversations
- Sharing information between offices – overcome silo/bubble thinking; mind set change re keeping others in the loop; attend other team meetings
- Central point of contact (person and digital resource)
- Adopt central approach to feedback and consultations
- More face-to-face interaction (gets people away from their desks)
- Share/promote best practice
**Technical and systems**

- Rationalisation of IT systems, including intranet and website
- Team instant messaging system
- Streamline systems and no logging onto different platforms (SP Learning etc.)
- Seek to achieve consistency of communications across organisation/managers:
  - Provide examples of what good internal communications look like. Set SP standards for communication - requires strong leadership. Should be an LG priority
  - Appoint internal communications subject matter expert
  - Help with managing e-mail – also culture shift to how we use email
  - Equality of access to information e.g. PC, mobile devices
  - Comprehensive/inclusive thoughts – FM/BIT to be part of New Post bidding process
  - Clear distribution networks so that information gets to relevant staff.

**Who should have responsibility for making change happen?**

As with responses to the question of who should have responsibility for making changes which would result in removing barriers to improving the general distribution of information, focus group members thought that everyone had a role in improving channels of communication. However, all three groups said that Leadership Group had primary responsibility for leading and ensuring these changes happen.

- Top down, but taking all staff on the journey – don’t just tell us!
- BIT for all technical and system aspects of change

**What will you do to make this happen?**

Similar responses were given to this question as to the responses given to to the previous discussion topic. Focus group participants said that they would:

- Contribute positively to sessions
- Innovate to look for positive change
- Respond positively to initiatives to improve communication channels

**When does this need to happen – priority order?**

All three groups said that changes needed to happen as soon as possible and one group (Group 3) cautioned that change is not a one-off – it is constant and ongoing and communication channels must be kept under review.

**What would improved internal communications look and feel like?**

Once again, responses to this question were similar to responses given previously. Improved internal communications would:

- make the Parliament look more open and accessible
- be shorter and more concise and therefore more efficient, saving time
• help to ensure that everyone who needs to know, knows
• make information easier to find and use
• be more tailored and personal (where appropriate)
• integrate space for feedback, comment and consultation
• result in happier staff who feel more valued

FEEDBACK AND CONSULTATION

This question sought views from focus group members on how consultation and feedback mechanisms worked in the Parliament.

Given the nature of focus group discussions and the cross-cutting nature of the questions addressed, many of the issues around feedback and consultation were raised in the previous sections of this analysis.

For this reason, the next section is presented more summarily than the previous two sections.

What works well and why?

Responses varied between those who thought that staff were consulted on most important matters and were listened to, and those who felt that consultation was “rare, perfunctory and tokenistic”.

Specific things that focus group members thought worked well, or could potentially work well, in relation to feedback and consultations were:

• Face-to-face events - good verbal communications, both informal and formal
• Office Head written information on team-specific information
• Regular catch-ups with manager (but depends on the manager)
• Where staff are specifically encouraged to feed up their views. However, this does not always happen, is inconsistent and personality driven

What works less well and why?

Focus group participants identified a number of areas in which our communications do not always work well and reasons for this:

• Consultation is sometimes seen as a “box-ticking” exercise. Lack of consultation has led to poor decision/processes especially in operational areas. Implications of this have been serious for the provision of business services.
• There is a perception that decisions are often already made and won’t be influenced by feedback
• We don’t consistently do the “feedback loop”
• We could make more use of the RACI model (tool used for identifying roles and responsibilities)
• There is a lack of transparency about when to give feedback and what feedback to give
• Our “empire-building” culture
• 360 degree feedback doesn’t work for everyone
• Relevance of an issue/policy is not always clear, so tends to be parked
• Feeding down/up from meetings does not always happen
• There is little understanding of the needs and work of other departments
• We often share information with outsiders first – with relevant internal staff not being included in the message.

What should be kept and done more of?

• We need to do more cross-office communication and collaboration with a view to achieving purposeful outcomes
• We need to do more and better with lessons learned – capture, share and put them into practice
• Anything that brings people together, like these workshops
• Business Bulletin – segmenting of information tailored by consumer

What should be changed and how?

• We need to effect a fundamental change in attitude – staff views and input should be genuinely welcomed
• Staff need to take personal responsibility for ensuring their voices are heard
• Get rid of the current “federated” approach to communications which can be used as a “power trip” only communicated by people of a certain grade (when this is not a necessity e.g. no particular sensitivities)
• Corporate bulletin – people only look at jobs
• When practices change staff need to be informed why (things disappear with no explanation)
• Achieve better timing for significant communications to take into account pressure of business – Tue/Wed/Thurs everyone is here but everyone is busier
• We all need a better understanding of what other teams do BUT we also need time to do that
• More effort should be made to reduce jargon and encourage plain speech
• There should be more options for receiving information when not in the Parliament or during recess periods
• Leadership Group needs to communicate better, both with themselves and with staff more widely.
What needs to be taken away and why?

Dissatisfaction with SP Learning and with the current intranet were again evident in responses to this question. However, the only issue mentioned which might relate to consultation and feedback was a plea to reconsider the use of confidentiality to restrict communication. This was seen by some as often unnecessary and as potentially preventing staff from making a contribution or influencing a decision:

“We need a concerted effort to improve the openness of our communications.” (Group 1)

What are we not doing but could do – something new?

A few suggestions were made for initiatives aimed at improving consultation and feedback mechanisms across the Parliament:

- Carry out more external appraisal – if, indeed we do any.
- Carry out genuine surveys of staff and use responses - G7/8 survey results show that this group thinks that everything is good
- Do more segmenting/ and tailoring of information to encourage responses from people with an interest
- Promote SP learning as a FB type platform eg to ask others questions etc.

What are the potential barriers to change?

Barriers to improving feedback and consultation mechanisms were:

- Tendency to slip into “confidentiality” mode
- Time and pressure of work – feedback and consultation are not prioritised when everyone is busy
- Fear of conflict when “crucial conversations” are necessary
- Lack of discernible/ measurable outputs (some people felt this was not the case with projects)
- Difficulty in changing attitudes and behaviours
- Personalities – not all managers can coach
- Some managers difficult to feed back to – especially if feedback is perceived negatively
- No mechanisms for providing feedback – eg election communications
- Being dismissed and not taken seriously when raising issues
How can these barriers be overcome?

The responses to how barriers to improving feedback and consultation in the Parliament can be lifted, were similar to responses given to previous discussion topics. Some involved changing attitudes and behaviour at all levels to make feedback easier and, indeed, normal, and to encourage staff to provide it on a risk-free basis, perhaps anonymously.

Other suggestions were:

- More consistency of approach
- Managers should be trained to be open to constructive criticism
- More and better coaching
- More staff or do less
- Provide a feedback button
- Develop a Staff forum
- Take advantage of people having time over summer recess for consultation (though not all staff are less busy over this period)

Who should have responsibility for making change happen?

Like previous responses, focus group members felt that everyone had a personal responsibility in respect of feeding back their views, including responding to consultations. However, all three groups felt that ACEs and Leadership Group have primary responsibility and should “lead by example”.

In addition:

- Line managers have responsibility and it should be considered to be part of their role (Group 1)
- There is a personal responsibility on staff at all levels to take up training opportunities (Group 3)

What will you do to make this happen?

Responses to this question were brief and to the point:

- Continue to press for change
- Set an example for others
- Feedback to colleagues
- Promote openness in my office

When does this need to happen – priority order?

Similarly, responses were brief and to the point:

- Yesterday
- Immediately; all the time, and reviewed and improved
What would improved internal communications look and feel like?

Focus group members believed that, with improved feedback and consultation mechanisms and practices, the parliament’s internal communications would:

- Inspire greater confidence in staff that we know what is going on and why, including confidence that your own voice can be heard and by the “right” people
- Make information more accessible, concise, timely and reliable
- Make information more digestible, useful and relevant
- Make information better tailored to different office needs
- Make staff feel more valued
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Annex E: LG Focus Group Notes

What should LG be communicating?

Group 1

- [What’s for Paul only to communicate?]
- Decisions
- [Communications plan in LG paper template]
- Strategic plan
- Strategic priorities – progress
- PO Commission
- External events (eg EU Referendum, General election)
- We can assume too much (eg staff understanding of ramification of external events)
- Forward thinking – when down the line can we communicate?
- Placeholder comms – ‘we are working on this, more information to come’
- Quarterly performance reports – positive and negative – transparent
- Budget – explaining – contextualise with strategic plan
- LG forward plan – staff interest?

Group 2

- LG decisions that directly impact staff
- Strategic plan related things – and spin off projects
- SPCB Budget info
- Forward agendas and decisions taken
- Crisis comms (but maybe not ICT/IMT level)
- Big projects: Digital, OD, chamber lighting
- “A view from the bridge”
- Does it matter if LG/Paul’s names appear on Comms? “LG branding”
- Feedback from SPCB meetings – MSPs note from SPCB

Group 3

- LG vs. Group Heads?
- Strategic, overarching decisions that have impact
  - D&I, PO Commission, Digital, OD
  - Do LG communicate these or the related boards?
- Individual decisions taken by LG e.g. H&S
- LG comms after meetings – sufficient? Should they be followed up differently?
- Availability of LG papers – circulating to office heads/team leaders for comments before meeting
• Different target audiences
• Contradiction: people want to know about other areas but they say they don’t want to be overloaded with information that isn’t relevant to them

How should LG communicate?

Group 1

Consistency
• Achieving a consistent message – too simplistic – understand key message but Group Heads know their people, context etc. – tailor, consider nuances
• Diversity and Inclusion example – LG briefed by D & I team – is this level of direction needed?
• A discussion at LG to distil key messages

Channels
• Authenticity important
• Use method that’s appropriate to audience – even if not in comfort zone of LG member delivering the message – training should be provided for LG members if necessary
• Think about message to consider what method of communications is necessary
• Face to face takes longer – size of group?
• Do people want to spare time for face to face?
• Don’t speak enough about comms at LG – do as part of each paper – add to template
• Co-ordination – across the year?

Inform/Consult
• Is this comms?
• Rather developing policy?

Group 2

• Difference between consult & inform
• Badge purpose: for info, for action etc.
• Communicate collectively
• Diversity and Inclusion plan
  o Early comms plan – what & how is going to be communicated & when?
  o Give time to get buy in from office heads. Turnaround between LG decision and implementation
  o Feedback loop built into comms plan
• Office structures very different so different things work
• Is there a place for anonymous feedback? Explore practicalities of how people will give feedback
• Drop ins on the back of specific comms e.g. Paul’s message
• Engage on specific topics – snippets
• More honesty face to face
• Benefit of single site organisation – make the most of it
• Whole staff events – speakers – coming together – again brings transparency
• Briefing after LG meetings – best method? Should format be considered if it’s being circulated by email?
• Briefing on key topics – consistent message, Q&A, feeling well informed
• People want concise actions
• Measuring success of comms e.g. survey
• LG shadowing

Group 3

• Are there decisions that don’t impact staff? E.g. MSP staff, external contractors etc
• Consistency: we need to be consistent in message, not in channels
• Team meetings: scheduling can be difficult
• LG paper publication scheme – comms plan?
• Feedback: difficult if not face to face. Email too passive
• Ways of engaging with reticent staff – talk at coffee bar
• Security staff – shift working challenging
  o 4 weeks to get round all staff in Security
  o Duplication when speaking to lots of different teams
  o “2nd class citizens”
• Staff regularly feeding back – takes time to engender confidence in staff to ask questions
• Paul/ACEs arriving in offices and chatting – sets a perception
• LG drop ins not busy, “meet the ACEs” not busy – staff having to take time out of their day

How practically should LG set a culture conducive to effective internal communications?

Group 1

What works well
• Inclusive culture – ‘relaxed’/informal
• Staff proud to work here and engaged with what’s happening (although not engaged on every topic)
• Camaraderie
• LG – comfortable with each other BUT are LG always working as a collective? Are LG ‘LG’ or a collection of individual senior managers representing their own business areas – this impacts collective communications and the messages LG deliver
• LAN

Inhibitors
• Projects – people forming a new team in relation to project
• Them and us attitude – on projects, between departments
• Letting perfection get in the way of progress (eg indycamp) – BUT legal/press implications
• Risk averse – very real in relation to comms about some topics but not others (openness versus restriction – papers etc.)
• Some people see knowledge as power – don’t want to share (this may be why cascading is not working)
• Political environment – can be preparing/managing comms for politicians/SPCB
• FOI

What can LG change?
• Lead by example (eg say LG papers open by default, not restricted)
• Going a wee bit further in relation to comms – not just sticking to lines
• Group Heads to encourage staff to open up their documents by default
• Making comms more interesting – gossip, story from behind the scenes, authenticity (face to face) – Snippets good for this
• Lead by example – being more open, it’s OK to get things wrong
• Proactive rather than reactive comms – we control the message (eg Expenses etc.)

Group 2

• Can you ‘set’ a culture? It can be influenced and encouraged
• What is the culture we’re aiming for? LG needs to reflect further. Very different offices with different comms styles etc. “Multi culture organisation”
• Values as an organisation – should be consistent across all offices
• Continually raising expectations – can’t meet them! Parliament is strong at internal comms
• Relevance of comms – do staff need to know? Gap between LG discussions and relevance to staff
• Corporate bulletin – approx. 45% open rate
• EH99 – “marmite”
• Staff usually want to talk to LG re operational matters
• Comms need more attention – should the LG paper template be changed to include a section on comms?
• LAN – make sure everyone buys into it – not just those who already have the skills to be leaders

Group 3

• Quarterly staff feedback based on Members’ feedback
• Perception – luxury of time
• Visibility – interruptible in Garden Lobby
• Staff Forum – “moan”. Feedback forum
• Comms coordination
• Feedback valued
• Openness (integrity?)
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