

Oxygen

Integrated Findings Brief

Pulse Group Surveys & 2025 Employee Engagement Survey

Lane Transit District

Data sources: Pulse Group Survey (three cycles, Baseline through February 2026) and 2025 Employee Engagement Survey

Prepared by Andrew Robinson & Suzi Lantz · March 2026

Two Independent Instruments. One Consistent Story.

This brief integrates findings from two independent data sources: the LTD Pulse Group Survey, administered across three measurement cycles, and the 2025 LTD Employee Engagement Survey, independently confirmed by Xenium. Neither instrument was designed with the other in mind. *Their convergence is analytically significant.* Where two independent measurement tools arrive at the same conclusion, confidence in that conclusion rises substantially.

Where Both Instruments Agree

Across seven distinct themes, the Pulse Group Survey and the Employee Engagement Survey arrive at identical conclusions. No finding from either instrument was contradicted by the other. The areas of convergence span both the organization's genuine strengths and its most persistent structural gaps.

Strengths both instruments confirm

- Employees remain deeply committed to the mission and public service — consistent across all three Pulse cycles and confirmed by the Employee Engagement Survey.
- Executive leadership is viewed as ethical and acting in good faith, a meaningful asset that creates space for structural correction.
- Peer-level collaboration is high and frequent, even if it is high-cost. Both instruments frame this as a foundation to build on.
- Employee willingness to speak up remains stable. No increase in fear or withdrawal was detected in either instrument.
- Relational tone has improved measurably across all three Pulse cycles. The net average change of +0.16 reflects genuine progress, not noise.

Persistent gaps both instruments confirm

- Leadership follow-through is the most persistent gap in both datasets. The Pulse communication-of-closure item has the flattest trajectory of any measure across three periods (net: -0.03). The Employee Engagement Survey names it a core pressure area.
- Prioritization discipline is structurally weak. The Pulse workload clarity item (2.60) is the lowest-scoring item in the entire dataset. Employees experience overload and shifting focus because tradeoffs, sequencing, and workload limits are not consistently communicated.
- Cross-department coordination is inefficient despite high interaction. Both instruments confirm that collaboration is occurring despite the system rather than because of it — creating high coordination cost and growing fatigue risk.
- Change attribution is limited. Employees cannot reliably connect their input to organizational decisions. Both instruments identify this gap as a credibility risk for feedback mechanisms over time.
- Narrative inconsistency is an active systemic risk. When employees receive contradictory explanations, they do not simply discount the specific error — they begin filtering all future leadership communications through skepticism. Both instruments surface this pattern independently.

Integrated Analysis

Read together, the two instruments do more than confirm shared findings — they reveal the structure of the problem. The organization is bifurcated along a consistent axis: *relational tone is improving; structural reliability is not.* Employees do not question leadership intent or ethics. They question

whether decisions become completed work with visible outcomes, clear ownership, and defined closure. The Employee Engagement Survey names this directly: this is not a morale issue, not a disengagement issue — it is an execution discipline issue. The Pulse data confirms the same condition from below, showing three consecutive periods of flat or oscillating structural indicators while relational scores improve.

Trust completed a three-period Pulse arc — 3.14 → 3.05 → 3.30 — that looks like recovery but is better understood as *performance-based trust*, not the identity-based trust that persists across setbacks. The Employee Engagement Survey confirms this: employees extend confidence based on recent observable behavior, and that confidence must be re-earned each cycle. Without structural embedding — mechanisms that make reliability a property of the system rather than of individual leaders — trust will remain transactional.

The Q7 cross-departmental collaboration score of 4.50 — the highest item in the dataset — appears at first as an unambiguous strength. Both instruments complicate that reading. Qualitative Pulse data describes this collaboration as forced, high stress, and occurring under impossible deadlines. The Employee Engagement Survey distinguishes between increased *interaction* and improved *coordination*. High collaboration under low infrastructure is not sustainable. It produces fatigue, not momentum.

The culture has moved beyond skepticism. It is now in the prove-it-structurally phase. The next phase is not more relational effort — it is building the operating architecture that makes those gains durable.

What the Data Tells Us About Direction

- The relational phase of culture development has produced real gains. The next phase requires architectural work — systems that outlive announcements, symmetrical accountability, visible tradeoff logic, and unified messaging in content, not just tone.
- Employees are extending conditional trust. That trust can consolidate or erode depending on what is observed in the next one to two quarters. The Pulse 4 trajectory on workload clarity and communication closure will be the clearest test.
- The highest-leverage action is not a new initiative. It is completing and communicating the work already underway. Employees are explicitly asking for fewer initiatives, executed better.
- Employees are not resistant to change. They are waiting for evidence that the system can sustain change once it begins. The distinction matters for how leadership frames its next steps.
- Chief visibility at the frontline remains a structural gap. Multiple Pulse respondents report not knowing who the Chiefs are. Increased physical presence across shifts is among the most direct, low-cost trust-building actions available.

Strategic Conclusion

Two independent instruments, measuring the same organization through different lenses, arrive at the same diagnosis. LTD has a committed, capable, and still-engaged workforce. It also has an execution infrastructure that does not yet match the relational gains employees and leadership have made together. The constraint is systemic, not motivational. The opportunity is specific and actionable: *build the operating architecture that makes reliability a property of the organization, not a property of individual effort.*