

Report No:	RFN11-09-07
File No:	A503-4
Date:	21 September 2011
Information Only – no decision required	

REPORT SUMMARY

Report to: Communications Subcommittee
Meeting Date: 27 September 2011
Report Author: Chris Choat Communications Adviser
Subject: **Communications Provider Service Survey**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In July this year as part of the quality control within the service contract between the Council and Dry Crust a survey of staff using Dry Crust's services was undertaken. The Council staff who have had to use the services of Dry Crust over the last year were offered the opportunity to complete a quality assessment survey of the service they received.

Of the 30 staff within the organisation who received the survey there was a return rate of 50%. The questions covered factors such as timeliness, cost, standard, and recognition of the environment the Council operates within. The survey gave respondents five levels of satisfaction to choose from ranging from poor through to excellent.

Below is a summary of the questions and the results recorded.

1. Timeliness of work completed - 80% thought it was above average or better.
2. Financial management within the estimate or budget allowed - 60% thought it was above average or better with 33% thought it was average.
3. Work completed to a standard that does not compromise the Council's reputation or ability to deliver its services - 86% thought it was above average or better.
4. Work carried out in a professional manner - 80% thought it was above average or better.
5. The value of the communications advice provided to the Tasman District Council - 73% thought it was above average or better with 27% thinking it was average.
6. How the contractor has managed its interaction with the community - 80% thought it was above average or better.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the Communications Subcommittee receives this report and adopts the draft resolution in the report.

DRAFT RESOLUTION

THAT the Communications Subcommittee receives the Communications Provider Service Survey Report RFN11-09-07.

Report No:	RFN11-09-07
File No:	A503-4
Report Date:	21 September 2011
<i>Information Only – no decision required</i>	

Report to: Communications Subcommittee
Meeting Date: 27 September 2011
Report Author: Chris Choat – Communications Adviser
Subject: **Communications Provider Service Survey**

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise the Communications Subcommittee of the results of the survey to measure the level of service provided by the contracted Communications Services provider Dry Crust and to provide the opportunity for the Subcommittee to discuss the findings.

2. Background

- 2.1 In July this year as part of the quality control within the service contract between the Council and Dry Crust a survey of staff using Dry Crust's services was undertaken. The Council staff who have had to use the services of Dry Crust over the last year were offered the opportunity to complete a quality assessment survey of the service they received.
- 2.2 Of the 30 staff within the organisation who received the survey there was a return rate of 50%. The questions covered factors such as timeliness, cost, standard, and recognition of the environment the Council operates within.
- 2.3 The survey gave respondents five levels of satisfaction to choose from ranging from poor through to excellent.

3. Discussion/Results

- 3.1 The Survey was conducted as part of the contractual arrangements within the Communications Services contract entered into by the Council and Dry Crust.
- 3.2 The results, based on five questions presented, were predominantly ranked from Above Average to Good to Excellent. Of the answers received that had

rankings of Average or Below Average (these can be found in the full results provided in Appendix 1) the Communications Adviser and Dry Crust investigated to identify the issues behind the answers provided.

- 3.3 Many of the reasons for the lower ratings were due to project changes or audience expectations during the individual projects, often out of the control of the staff managing the projects and Dry Crust.
- 3.4 Another reason was the associated cost with a small number of respondents marking this as average or lower. Once investigation of the concerns was carried out contributing issues were identified such as timeframes, sign off process and subjective design decisions.
- 3.5 To address the issues identified respondents have been reminded of the job order form, which in completing from both sides, client and provider, clearly identifies the costs and timeframes involved in specific jobs. This is being enforced and has been used successfully for the majority of job. The form has often enabled the forming of options and a closer understanding of the options available to ensure the correct communications vehicle is used to protect the outcomes of the project whilst maintaining a consistent view of Council presence.
- 3.6 The survey will be used as a benchmark and will be reissued to the same group in early January to measure improvements or otherwise in the working relationships governed by this contract.

4. Significance

- 4.1 The matters covered in this media monitoring report are not significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance.

5. RECOMMENDATION/S

- 5.1 That the Communications Subcommittee receives this report and adopts the draft resolution in the report.

6. DRAFT RESOLUTION

THAT the Communications Subcommittee receives the Communications Provider Service Survey Report RFN11-09-07.

Appendix 1

Survey and results

The survey was managed online and sent to the 30 people throughout the organisation who have had the opportunity to call upon the contractor's (Dry Crust Communications) services.

1. TIMELINESS OF WORK COMPLETED

Was the work you commissioned, to be delivered by Dry Crust, managed in a timely fashion (were the deadlines agreed to at the start of the process adhered to)?

Excellent

1 (7%)

Good

9 (60%)

Above Average

2 (13%)

Below Average

3 (20%)

Poor

0 (0%)

Total: 15

2. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT WITHIN ESTIMATE OR BUDGET ALLOWED

Was the work commissioned by you completed by Dry Crust within the agreed budget?

Excellent

0 (0%)

Good

8 (53%)

Above Average

2 (13%)

Average

5 (33%)

Below Average

0 (0%)

Poor
0 (0%)

Total: 15

3. WORK COMPLETED TO A STANDARD THAT DOES NOT COMPROMISE THE COUNCIL'S REPUTATION OR ABILITY TO DELIVER ITS SERVICES

Were you satisfied that the work you commissioned was to the agreed standard and fell within the requirements of Council's brand manual?

Excellent
2 (13%)

Good
8 (53%)

Above Average
3 (20%)

Average
2 (13%)

Below Average
0 (0%)

Poor
0 (0%)

Total: 15

4. WORK CARRIED OUT IN A PROFESSIONAL MANNER

Were you satisfied with the level of professional advice you received from Dry Crust and the quality of the end product?

Excellent
4 (27%)

Good
5 (33%)

Above Average
3 (20%)

Average
3 (20%)

Below Average
0 (0%)

Poor
0 (0%)

Total: 15

5. THE VALUE OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ADVICE PROVIDED TO THE TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Has the advice you received and followed, assisted you in the delivery of your projects and programmes?

Excellent

1 (7%)

Good

8 (53%)

Above Average

2 (13%)

Average

4 (27%)

Below Average

0 (0%)

Poor

0 (0%)

Total: 15

6. HOW THE CONTRACTOR HAS MANAGED ITS INTERACTION WITH THE COMMUNITY

Were you satisfied with the relationship, when required, that Dry Crust has established with the identified audience (eg when undertaking interviews, representing Council and workshops or A&P shows etc)?

Excellent

0 (0%)

Good

6 (40%)

Above Average

6 (40%)

Average

3 (20%)

Below Average

0 (0%)

Poor

0 (0%)

Total: 15

Chris Choat

Communications Adviser

g:\tara\agendas\communications subcommittee\2011\rfn11-09-07 communications provicer service survey.docx