

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF THE NON-RANDOM SURVEY OF SARNIA HOUSEHOLDS

(Surveys submitted via e-mail and surveys picked up at the counter)

COMMUNICATIONS

Question No. 7: Value of Sources of Information

Question 7 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.

Table 1 – Value of Sources of Information				
Information Source	Total # of responses	Total # and % rating 4 & 5	Total # and % rating 3	Total # and % rating 1 & 2
Attendance at City Council meetings	21	11(52%)	5(24%)	5(24%)
Attendance at Town Hall meetings	21	10(48%)	5(24%)	6(28%)
City publications	22	13(50%)	5(23%)	4(18%)
City web site	21	13(62%)	6(28%)	2(10%)
Department brochure / flyers	22	9(41%)	6(27%)	7(32%)
Direct contact with City staff	22	20(91%)	1(4.5%)	1(4.5%)
Direct contact with Mayor or Councillor	22	19(86%)	2(9%)	1(5%)
Inserts in tax and water bills	22	15(68%)	5(23%)	2(9%)
Newspaper – daily	21	13(62%)	5(24%)	3(14%)
Newspaper – weekly	19	10(53%)	6(32%)	3(16%)
Posted notices	22	6(27%)	10(45%)	6(27%)
Radio	22	16(73%)	5(23%)	1(4%)
Television (Cable 6, Cogeco)	21	11(52%)	3(14%)	7(33%)
Television (news)	22	15(68%)	4(18%)	3(14%)

Based on the responses received, the information sources that received the highest scores in terms value of importance (4 or 5) included: “direct contact with City staff” (91%), “direct contact with the Mayor or Council” (86%), “radio” (73%) and “television news” (68%). Information sources viewed as less important in terms of value as a source of information (scores of 1 or 2) included “television (Cable 6)” (33%), “Department brochure / flyers” (32%), “attendance at Town Hall Meetings” (28%) and “posted notices” (27%).

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

There were no suggestions made by more than one respondent. The suggestions included:

- Letters from the desk of the Mayor;

- A simple, newsletter in the tax bills or sent out by unaddressed mail with highlights in it;
- Mayor should have periodic “State of the City Addresses” on Cable 6;
- Internet;
- Letters; and
- Direct phone calls.

Question No. 9: Input Methods

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

Table 2 – Methods to Provide Input and Feedback to City Staff				
Public Input Method	Total # of responses	Total # and % rating 4 & 5	Total # and % rating 3	Total # and % rating 1 & 2
Counter inquiries	21	15(67%)	4(19%)	3(14%)
Delegation at Council meetings	21	11(52%)	7(33%)	3(14%)
Direct mail	22	14(64%)	6(27%)	2(9%)
E-mail	22	15(68%)	4(18%)	3(14%)
One-on-one meetings with City staff	21	15(71%)	2(10%)	4(19%)
One-on-one meetings with Mayor/Councillors	22	15(68%)	4(18%)	3(14%)
Public open houses	22	11(50%)	6(27%)	5(23%)
Special public meetings	22	13(59%)	5(23%)	4(18%)
Telephone	22	17(77%)	3(14%)	2(9%)
Town hall meetings	21	12(57%)	5(24%)	4(19%)

All public input methods were rated as either a 4 or 5 by a majority of the respondents. Those methods that were rated most important (score of 4 or 5) included “telephone” (77%), “one-on-one meetings with City staff” (71%), “one-on-one meetings with Mayor/Councillors” (68%) and “e-mail” (68%). The public input method that were rated the less important by several respondents (score of 1 or 2) was “public open houses” (23%).

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

There were no common input options mentioned by more than one respondent. The input option suggested included:

- Surveys like this one;
- On-line submission forms; and
- E-mail.

Question No. 11: Ease of obtaining information

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

Table 3 - Ease of Obtaining Information			
Total # and % of responses	Total # and % rating 4 & 5	Total # and % rating 3	Total # and % rating 1 & 2
20 (91%)	6 (30%)	10(50%)	4 (20%)

Of the 20 responses received, the majority of the respondents (50%) rated the ease of obtaining information as a 3 on a scale of 1 (being extremely difficult) to 5 (being extremely easy). Thirty percent of the respondents rated the ease of obtaining information as easy, while 20% rated the ease of obtaining information as difficult.

Question No. 12: Contact with a City employee and the level of satisfaction with the response received.

This question asked if the respondents had contact with an employee of the City during the past year and of so, to rate their level of satisfaction with the way staff responded to their question/problem/concern. Table 4 provides a summary of the responses received.

Table 4 - Contact with City Employee and Level of Satisfaction				
Contact with an employee of the City during the past year	Total # and % of response	Total # and % rating 4 & 5	Total # and % rating 3	Total # and % rating 1 & 2
Yes	18 (82%)	8(44%)	5(28%)	5(28%)
No	4 (18%)	N/A	N/A	N/A

All 22 respondents answered this question. Table 4 shows that 18(82%) of the respondents had contact with a City employee during the past year, while only 4(18%) had not. Eight respondents (44%) were satisfied with the staff response while 5 respondents (28%) were not satisfied.

Question No. 13: Level of Service Responsiveness

Respondents were asked 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.

Table 5 - Level of Service Responsiveness				
Manner	Total # and % of responses	Total # and % rating 4 & 5	Total # and % rating 3	Total # and % rating 1 & 2
Courtesy	22 (100%)	11(50%)	5(23%)	6(27%)
Friendliness	22 (100%)	11(50%)	5(23%)	6(27%)
Interest in solving your problem / situation	22 (100%)	10(45%)	3(14%)	9(41%)
Knowledge	21 (95%)	8(38%)	4(19%)	9(43%)
Overall helpfulness	21 (95%)	9(43%)	3(14%)	9(43%)

The manners of service responsiveness that were rated the highest (score of 4 or 5) were “courtesy” (50%) and “friendliness” (50%). The manners that were given poorest levels of service responsiveness by several respondents (score of 1 or 2) were “knowledge” (43%), “overall helpfulness” (43%) and “interest in solving your problem/situation” (41%).

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:

- Willingness to share information (2); and
- Knowledgeable staff (2).

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:

- Not empowered to solve problems (2); and
- City Hall communications (2).

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

The most frequently mentioned improvements were:

- Customer service training (3); and
- Prompt follow-up on complaints and information requests (3).

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

The following additional suggestions were provided:

- Pleased to see the survey effort;
- Newsletters highlighting Department matters; and
- Keep the City's Web site up to date.