

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF THE RANDOM SURVEY OF SARNIA HOUSEHOLDS

### COMMUNICATIONS

#### Question 7: Value of Sources of Information

This question asked respondents to rate on a scale of 1 (not important at all) to 5 (extremely important), the value of a number of sources of information about city business. **Table 1** provides a summary of the responses received.

<b>Table 1 – Value of Sources of Information</b>				
<b>Information Source</b>	<b>Total # and % of responses</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 4 &amp; 5</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 3</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 1 &amp; 2</b>
Attendance at City Council meetings	328 (84%)	134(41%)	94(29%)	100(30%)
Attendance at Town Hall meetings	317 (81%)	121(38%)	103(33%)	93(29%)
City publications	320 (82%)	175(55%)	97(30%)	48(15%)
City web site	314 (80%)	131(42%)	87(27%)	96(31%)
Department brochure / flyers	303 (77%)	106(35%)	97(32%)	100(33%)
Direct contact with City staff	317 (81%)	208(66%)	79(21%)	40(13%)
Direct contact with Mayor or Councilor	323 (83%)	195(60%)	77(24%)	51(16%)
Inserts in tax and water bills	327(84%)	177(54%)	97(30%)	53(16%)
Newspaper – daily	343 (88%)	208(61%)	71(20%)	64(19%)
Newspaper – weekly	362 (93%)	172(48%)	80(22%)	110(30%)
Posted notices	322 (82%)	130(40%)	87(27%)	105(33%)
Radio	345 (88%)	214(62%)	78(23%)	53(15%)
Television (Cable 6, Cogeco)	329 (84%)	171(52%)	80(24%)	78(24%)
Television (news)	314 (80%)	203(65%)	73(23%)	38(12%)

Of the responses received, the information sources that received the highest scores in terms value of importance (4 or 5) included direct contact with staff, direct contact with the Mayor or Council, the daily newspaper, radio and television news. Information sources viewed as less important by a significant number of respondents, in terms of value as a source of information (scores of 1 or2) included the weekly newspaper, posted notices, attendance at Council Meetings, Department brochures, City web site and attendance at Town Hall Meetings.

**Question 8: Are there other ways you would like to be informed?**

The most frequently mentioned responses were:

- Direct mailings (9);
- Information Bulletins/flyers/inserts (8);
- Expanded use of the City’s Web site (5); and
- E-mail.

**Question 9: Input Methods**

This question asked respondents to rate on a scale of 1 (not important at all) to 5 (extremely important), the methods to provide input and feedback to City staff. **Table 2** provides a summary of the responses received.

<b>Table 2 – Importance of Methods to Provide Input and Feedback to City Staff</b>				
<b>Public Input Method</b>	<b>Total # and % of responses</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 4 &amp; 5</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 3</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 1 &amp; 2</b>
Counter inquiries	315 (81%)	202(66%)	65(21%)	48(15%)
Delegation at Council meetings	306 (78%)	134(44%)	93(30%)	77(26%)
Direct mail	306 (78%)	184(61%)	81(26%)	41(13%)
E-mail	287 (73%)	119(42%)	72(25%)	96(33%)
One-on-one meetings with City staff	306 (78%)	156(51%)	74(24%)	76(25%)
One-on-one meetings with Mayor/Councillors	297 (76%)	145(48%)	70(24%)	82(28%)
Public open houses	313 (80%)	153(48%)	83(27%)	77(25%)
Special public meetings	322(82%)	180(56%)	83(26%)	59(18%)
Telephone	313 (80%)	204(65%)	63(20%)	46(15%)
Town Hall meetings	319 (82%)	130(41%)	100(31%)	79(28%)

The communication methods that were most frequently rated the highest in terms of importance (score of 4 or 5) included telephone, counter inquiries, direct mail and special public meetings. Methods viewed as less important by a number of respondents included e-mail, delegations at City Council meetings and Town Hall meetings.

**Question 10: Are there other ways you would like to offer input to Council and City staff?**

The most frequently mentioned alternative input options were:

- This survey is a good input method (6);
- E-mail (3);
- Written submissions (2); and
- The City’s Web site (2).

### **Question 11: Ease of Obtaining Information**

Respondents were asked to rate the ease of obtaining information about the City and City activities. **Table 3** provides a summary of the responses received.

<b>Table 3 - Ease of Obtaining Information</b>			
<b>Total # and % of responses</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 4 &amp; 5</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 3</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 1 &amp; 2</b>
320 (82%)	170 (53%)	100(33%)	43 (13%)

Of the 320 responses received, 170 (53%) respondents rated the ease of obtaining information as a 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 (being extremely difficult) to 5 (being extremely easy). A total of 43 (13%) respondents felt that it was not easy to obtain information about the City and City activities.

### **Question 12: Contact with a City employee and the level of satisfaction with the response received.**

Respondents were asked to identify whether they had contact with an employee of the City during the past year and to rate their level of satisfaction with the way staff responded to their question/problem/concern, with 1 being “not satisfied at all” and 5 being “extremely satisfied”. **Table 4** provides a summary of the responses to this question.

<b>Table 4 - Contact with City Employee and Level of Satisfaction with Response</b>				
<b>Contact with an employee of the City during the past year</b>	<b>Total # and % of responses</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 4 &amp; 5</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 3</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 1 &amp; 2</b>
Yes	198 (66%)	189(71%)	35(13%)	43(16%)
No	103 (34%)	N/A	N/A	N/A

There were 301 responses to this question representing a 77% response rate. Of those that responded, 198 (66%) of the respondents had contact with a City employee during the past year, while 103 (34%) had not. A strong majority of respondents having contact with a City employee 189 (71%) rated their level of satisfaction with the response they received as either a 4 or 5 with a 5 being “extremely satisfied”. There were 43 (16%) respondents indicating that they were not satisfied with the response they received from City staff.

### **Question 13: Level of Service Responsiveness**

This question asked respondents to rate on a scale of 1 (very poor) to 5 (very good) the level of service responsiveness typically demonstrated by City Staff with regards to courtesy, friendliness, knowledge and overall helpfulness and interest in answering questions or solving problems or concerns. **Table 5** provides a summary of the responses received.

<b>Table 5 - Level of Service Responsiveness</b>				
<b>Manner</b>	<b>Total # and % of responses</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 4 &amp; 5</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 3</b>	<b>Total # and % rating 1 &amp; 2</b>
Courtesy	314 (80%)	224(71%)	62(20%)	28(9%)
Friendliness	314 (80%)	216(69%)	71(23%)	27(9%)
Interest in solving your problem / situation	314 (80%)	176(56%)	82(26%)	56(18%)
Knowledge	304 (78%)	187(61%)	84(28%)	33(11%)
Overall helpfulness	303 (77%)	190(60%)	72(24%)	41(16%)

Table 5 shows that for each manner the majority of respondents rated the level of service responsiveness as either a 4 or 5. Those manners which received the highest ratings from the largest number of respondents were “courtesy” (71%) and “friendliness” (69%). Those manners which received the lowest ratings by several of the respondents were “interest in solving your problem/situation” (18%) and “overall helpfulness” (16%).

**Question 14: Overall, what do you consider to be staff’s greatest strength in their communications efforts to date?**

The most frequently mentioned strengths were:

- Staff are helpful and willing to assist (37);
- Knowledgeable staff (17);
- Courteous staff (15);
- Prompt responses (11);
- Friendly staff (9);
- Staff is caring and listens (8);
- Informative staff (7);
- Staff are open and receptive (6); and
- Accessibility and availability of staff (6).

**Question 15: Overall, what do you consider to be staff’s greatest weakness in their communications efforts to date?**

The most frequently mentioned weaknesses were:

- Lack of prompt follow up to complaints and information requests (14);
- Poor customer service (8);
- Lack of sympathy and interest shown by staff (8);
- Lack of knowledge of job (6);
- Not using common sense and will to make a decision (4);
- Poor manners (2); and
- Poor listening skills (2).

**Question 16: What would be the one thing you would recommend City staff could do to improve communications?**

The most frequently mentioned suggestions to improve communications were:

- Training in customer service and job responsibilities (16);
- Provide prompt follow-up to complaints and information requests (13);
- Provide information bulletins/flyers/inserts (7);
- Improve staff listening skills (3);
- Seek more public input and opinions (3);
- Show interest in citizen problems (3); and
- Reduce reliance on voice mail (3).

**Question 17: Please share any additional comments or suggestions you have about improving communication and customer service provided by City Staff.**

The most frequently mentioned additional comments included:

- Staff is doing a fine job (19);
- Staff should show a caring attitude and demonstrate good manners (6);
- Ensure prompt follow-up and uphold commitments (4);
- Solve problems more expediently (3).