
**Argyll and Bute Community Planning
Partnership**

**Helensburgh & Lomond
Area Community Planning Group**

17th May 2016

Agenda Item [6]



**Area Community Planning Group – Members Satisfaction Survey
Results Feedback**

Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to members on the findings of the Area Community Planning Group – Members Satisfaction Survey

1. Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to members on the findings of the Area Community Planning Group – Members Satisfaction Survey 2016.

2. Recommendations

2.1 Members are requested to consider the findings of the survey and to provide comment to help inform the creation of an Area Community Planning Group Improvement Plan which will take forward improvements to working arrangements during the 2016/17 financial year

3. Background

3.1 The purpose of the Area Community Planning Group – Members Satisfaction Survey was to gauge the satisfaction of members with working arrangements for Area Community Planning Groups in order to identify potential areas of improvement. This was an Action Point in the Customer Service Development Plan (GL10) and was undertaken during Q4 2015/16.

3.2 A survey face questionnaire was launched on the 18th of February 2016 a period of 4 weeks. This timescale allowed Community Councils time to discuss the survey at a meeting. The survey was circulated round Area Community Planning Group Members distribution lists.

4. Detail

4.1 In total 25 individuals responded to the survey. There was a good geographical spread of respondents as shown in Table 1 below.

A breakdown of the results relating to individual questions is included in Appendix 1.

Bute and Cowal	43.48%
Helensburgh and Lomond	26.09%
Mid Argyll, Kintyre and Islay	47.83%
Oban, Lorn and the Isles	39.13%
<i>Table 1: Area Community Planning Group – Members Satisfaction Survey % age of respondents by geographical area NB Some respondents indicated they attended more than 1 Area CPG meeting</i>	

4.2 The main findings were as follows:

- The responses show that, while there are a variety of views, members are satisfied with the new working arrangements with only 8% (2 respondents) indicating that they were not satisfied.
- There was also general satisfaction with the agenda setting process. However, some dissatisfaction was expressed with the current format of meetings and the follow up of actions identified at meetings. Comments were also made about the amount of information that is provided and a suggestion was made that a 1 page summary suitable for further dissemination would be helpful.
- Satisfaction levels varied when the respondents considered communication links with other groups. There was general satisfaction with regards to communication with the Community Planning Partnership Management Committee with 64% of respondents being either very satisfied or quite satisfied with this area. However satisfaction levels dropped when considering communication links the wider community with 42% of respondents being either very satisfied or quite satisfied respectively and only 33% were either very satisfied or quite satisfied with the communication with other Area CPGs
- 83.34% of respondents were either 'very satisfied' or 'quite satisfied' with the time of day meetings were held while 66.67% were either 'very satisfied' or 'quite satisfied' with the current meeting locations. One respondent mentioned the cost of travel in relation to rotating meetings. Lack of VC

facilities and clashes with other meetings were also highlighted in the comments.

- There is a high level of satisfaction with the administrative support given to the meetings with 95.65% of respondents being either 'very satisfied' or 'quite satisfied' with the administrative service provided by the Area CPG teams. The only area where there was any dissatisfaction recorded was in connection with the Front Page Agenda being circulated 4 weeks in advance of the meeting date. 1 respondent indicated that they were 'quite dissatisfied' with this and there was a comment that it was 'too much notice'.

4.3 6 respondents indicated they attended Helensburgh & Lomond Area CPG meetings. It should be noted that some respondents also attended meetings in other areas which may skew the findings therefore caution must be taken when interpretation results at an individual CPG level.

In general, the responses were similar to the overall survey, however there were some local differences which may be of interest to members

- No respondent indicated that they were dissatisfied with the new working arrangements
- A higher number of respondents (5/6) indicated that were 'neither satisfied or dissatisfied' or 'quite dissatisfied' with communication with the wider community while 4/6 indicated that they were neither satisfied or dissatisfied' or 'quite dissatisfied' with the communication with other Area CPGs
- In general responses reflected the overall findings with regards to the current format of meetings, agenda setting processes and the follow up of actions identified at meetings, while only 1 respondent was 'quite dissatisfied' with the current meeting timings and locations

5. Conclusions and Next Steps

5.1 The survey found that there is a high level of satisfaction with the administrative support given to the meetings and the new working arrangements in general.

5.2 However five areas for potential improvement have been

identified, namely:

- Communication links with the wider community and other Area CPGs could be improved
- Consideration should be given to the format of reports and the volume of information provided to the meetings
- Consideration should be given to the current format of meetings and the follow up of actions identified at meetings
- The use of venues with reliable VC facilities should be encouraged
- Potential clashes with other scheduled meetings held by partnership organisations should be considered when setting the annual meeting cycle

5.3 Members are requested to consider the areas for improvement and to provide comment to help inform the creation of an Area Community Planning Group Improvement Plan which will take forward improvements to working arrangements during the 2016/17 financial year

6.0 SOA Outcomes

N/A Relates to Area CPG working practices

Name of Lead Officer

Shirley MacLeod, Area Governance Manager

01369 707 134

For further information please contact:

Lorna Elliott, Community Governance Manager

01631 567995

Appendix 1 – Breakdown of Survey Results

The survey was designed to explore member's satisfaction with three main aspects of Area CPG activity:

- The new working arrangements
- Meeting times and locations
- General administration

The findings relating to each area are presented below. The results are given as percentages with the actual number of respondents included in brackets for information.

1. Working arrangements

This section of the survey asked members to reflect on the revised ways of working which included changes to chairing arrangements, agenda setting and more structured format had been in operation for a period of one year.

Table 2 below summarises the responses to the questions asked.

How satisfied are you with the new working arrangements?	Very satisfied	Quite satisfied	Neither satisfied / dissatisfied	Quite dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
	28% (5)	36% (9)	28% (7)	4% (1)	4% (1)
Answered Question: 25 Skipped Question: 0					
How satisfied are you with the communication with the	Very satisfied	Quite satisfied	Neither satisfied / dissatisfied	Quite dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
CPP Management Committee	20% (5)	44% (11)	20% (5)	12% (3)	4% (1)
The wider community	12.5% (3)	29.17% (7)	29.17% (7)	16.67% (4)	12.5% (3)
Other Area CPGs	12.5% (3)	20.83% (5)	41.67% (10)	12.5% (3)	12.5% (3)
Answered Question: 25 Skipped Question: 0					
How satisfied are you with the following arrangements:	Very satisfied	Quite satisfied	Neither satisfied / dissatisfied	Quite dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
The current format of meetings	24% (6)	40% (10)	24% (6)	8% (2)	4% (1)
The agenda setting process	33.33% (8)	33.33% (8)	33.33% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)
The follow up of actions identified at meetings	20.83% (5)	33.33% (8)	33.33% (8)	12.5% (3)	0% (0)
Answered Question: 25 Skipped Question: 0					

Table 2: Summary of Responses to Area Community Planning Group – Members Satisfaction Survey Question 1 – 3

2. Meeting times and location

Each Area CPG sets the time of day and location of meetings to suit local circumstances. This section asked respondents to reflect on their local meeting arrangements. In addition to the question below respondents also had the opportunity to provide additional comment

How satisfied are you with the following:	Very satisfied	Quite satisfied	Neither satisfied / dissatisfied	Quite dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
The time of day meetings are held	41.67% (10)	41.67% (10)	8.33% (2)	8.33% (2)	0% (0)
The current meeting locations	25% (6)	41.67% (10)	16.67% (4)	12.5% (3)	4.17% (1)
Answered Question: 24 Skipped Question: 1					

Table 3: Summary of Responses to Area Community Planning Group – Members Satisfaction Survey Question 4

General Administration

Respondents were asked to indicate the length of time they had been receiving the services provided by the Area CPG teams.

The majority of respondents (53.1%) had been receiving the service for more than three years while 39.13% indicated they had been using the service for 1 – 3 years with the remainder having received the service for less than a year.

The survey then asked more detailed questions on particular aspects of the administrative service provided. The results are shown in Table 5 below

How satisfied are you with the administrative service provided by the Area CPG teams with regards to the following	Very satisfied	Quite satisfied	Neither satisfied / dissatisfied	Quite dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
General meeting administration	65.22% (15)	30.43% (7)	4.35% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
The way you receive meeting information	56.52% (13)	34.78% (8)	8.7% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
The accuracy of the minutes of the meeting	65.22% (15)	21.74% (5)	13.04% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Answered Question: 23
Skipped Question: 2

How satisfied are you with the timescales relating to the following:	Very satisfied	Quite satisfied	Neither satisfied / dissatisfied	Quite dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
The Call Out for Agenda items being issued 6 weeks in advance of the meeting date	52.17% (12)	47.83% (11)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
The Front Page Agenda being circulated 4 weeks in advance of the meeting date	56.52% (13)	34.78% (8)	4.35% (1)	4.35% (1)	0% (0)
The meeting papers being circulated seven days in advance of the meeting	63.64% (14)	31.82% (7)	4.55% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Answered Question: 23
Skipped Question: 2

Table 4: Summary of Responses to Area Community Planning Group – Members Satisfaction Survey Question 6 – 7

Respondents were also asked if they found it easy to identify the appropriate contact within the Governance service should they wish to do so.

91.3% of respondents found it easy to contact the correct person. Of the two respondents that answered No to this question, 1 noted that they had not had any need to do so and were unable to comment while the other mentioned it could be clearer but gave no other detail.