



Best Value User Satisfaction Surveys 2006-07

General Survey Initial Topline Report for Single and Upper-Tier
Local Authorities



Best Value User Satisfaction Surveys 2006-07

General Survey Initial Topline Report for Single and Upper-Tier
Local Authorities

On 5th May 2006 the responsibilities of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) transferred to the Department for Communities and Local Government

Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 020 7944 4400
Website: www.communities.gov.uk

© *Crown Copyright, 2007*

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp, or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ.
Fax: 01603 723000 or email: HMSOlicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Communities and Local Government Publications
PO Box 236
Wetherby
West Yorkshire
LS23 7NB
Tel: 08701 226 236
Fax: 08701 226 237
Textphone: 08701 207 405
Email: communities@twoten.com
or online via the Communities and Local Government website: www.communities.gov.uk

February 2007

Product Code: 06LGSRU04399

Contents

Introduction	5
Background	5
General Survey	5
Structure of this Report	5
Results	6
Summary of Best Value Performance Indicator Results	6
Corporate Health Indicators	6
Environment and Waste Indicators	7
Transport Indicators	7
Cultural and Recreational Service Indicators	7
Information Provision	8
Participation and Local Decision Making	8
Annex A	9
Introduction	9
List of Tables	9
Annex B – Technical Note	20

Introduction

Background

All English local authorities are statutorily required to undertake Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) surveys on a three-yearly basis to collect data for satisfaction performance indicators. The first round of surveys ran in 2000-01, the second in 2003-04 and this report publishes an initial set of results from the third round in 2006-07.

These survey-based measures form part of the wider suite of BVPIs, which councils are statutorily required to report. Local authorities collect these survey data following a methodology and a timetable prescribed by Communities and Local Government and the Audit Commission. Following data collection, authorities submit their data to the Audit Commission for collation and further analysis at national and regional aggregate levels.

There are five BVPI surveys: a general household survey; a survey of local authority benefit claimants, a survey of local authority tenants, a survey of planning applicants, and a survey of library users. This report publishes an initial set of results for single and upper tier authorities from the General Survey only.

The results presented here only relate to single tier and upper tier authorities because these authorities were asked to submit their data earlier than usual so that it could be used for Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) 2006. District councils are working to a slightly longer timetable with their results being due for submission at the end of March 2007.

General Survey

Fieldwork for the General Survey took place in authorities across England between September and November 2006. This survey focuses on four key areas: Corporate Health, Environment & Waste, Transport and Cultural & Recreational Services. The General Survey collects thirteen Best Value Performance Indicators. To reflect the responsibilities of different authority types, some indicators are not relevant to all authorities (**Table 1**).

Authorities collect data for the General Survey using a standardised questionnaire template. In addition to questions used to collect data for BVPIs, there are several non-BVPI questions. This includes question modules on Quality of Life in the local area and Anti-Social Behaviour. Data from these questions will be analysed and a report published in the summer of 2007.

Structure of this Report

This report publishes nationally aggregated BVPI results, as well as results by authority type, using data from 149 single and upper tier authorities.

The report includes an indicator by indicator commentary of 2006-07 results for the thirteen BVPIs collected by the General Survey. It also includes a time-series comparison with 2000-01 and 2003-04 results, as well as results by authority type and where possible, regional breakdowns (i.e. where data from district councils is not required). All relevant BVPI data is presented in tables in Annex A. A brief technical note of the methodology can be found at Annex B.

Results

Summary of Best Value Performance Indicator Results for single and upper tier authorities

- **51%** satisfied with the **overall service** provided by the local authority – *a decline of 2 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **32%** of complainants satisfied with the **handling of their complaints** – *an improvement of 1 percentage point since 2003-04.*
- **64%** satisfied with the **cleanliness standard (keeping land clear of litter and waste)** in their area – *an improvement of 9 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **79%** satisfied with **household waste collection** – *a decline of 2 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **66%** satisfied with **waste recycling (local facilities)** – *an improvement of 5 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **79%** satisfied with **waste disposal (local tips)** – *an improvement of 4 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **54%** satisfaction with **local transport information** – *an improvement of 4 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **60%** satisfied with **local bus services** – *an improvement of 6 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **55%** satisfied with **sports and leisure facilities** – *an improvement of 3 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **71%** satisfied with **libraries** – *an improvement of 4 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **43%** satisfied with **museums and galleries** – *a decline of 1 percentage point since 2003-04.*
- **44%** satisfied with **theatres and concert halls** – *a decline of 3 percentage points since 2003-04.*
- **72%** satisfied with **parks and open spaces** – *an improvement of 2 percentage points since 2003-04.*

Corporate Health Indicators

The average overall satisfaction (BVPI3) with single and upper tier authorities has fallen from 53% in 2003-04 to 51% in 2006-07. Between 2000-01 and 2003-04 average overall satisfaction fell by 8 points (from 61% to 53%) (**Table 2**).

Overall satisfaction has decreased in Counties by 4 percentage points (from 54% to 50%), in Unitaries by 2 percentage points (from 52% to 50%) and in Metropolitan Boroughs by 2 percentage points (from 54% to 52%). London Boroughs have however seen an increase in satisfaction of 2 percentage points (from 52% to 54%). (**Table 2**).

The satisfaction with complaints handling (BVPI4) sees an increase of 1 percentage point since 2003-04. Previously this indicator had seen a drop of 5 percentage points between 2000-01 and 2003-04. (**Table 4**).

Environment and Waste Indicators

Three of the four environment and waste indicators have shown increased satisfaction (satisfaction with cleanliness of public land, waste recycling and waste disposal). Satisfaction levels for these three indicators now exceed the 2000-01 levels. The fourth indicator (satisfaction with household waste collection) shows a slight decline. (**Tables 5-8**).

Satisfaction with cleanliness of public land, waste recycling (local facilities) and waste disposal (local tips) has increased across all authority types. For all these indicators, London Boroughs have seen the most marked increase in satisfaction.

The slight decrease in satisfaction with household waste collection at the overall single and upper tier authorities level hides considerable variation across authority types: while Unitaries see a decrease of 6 percentage points since 2003-04 and Metropolitan Boroughs a decline of 3 percentage points since 2003-04, satisfaction in London Boroughs has risen by 4 percentage points since 2003-04.

Transport Indicators

For single and upper tier authorities as a whole, transport indicators have shown increased levels of satisfaction (satisfaction with transport information and local bus services). This is true across the different authority types. Again, the highest increases in satisfaction are for London Boroughs, with a 9 percentage point increase in satisfaction with public transport information and an 11 percentage point rise in satisfaction with local bus services. (**Tables 9 – 10**)

Levels of Satisfaction on transport indicators have increased across all regions. The most marked progress is observed for London, the East, South East and West Midlands.

Cultural and Recreational Service Indicators

Of the cultural and recreational service indicators, three indicators show an increase in satisfaction (sports and leisure facilities, libraries, and parks and open spaces). The other two show a slight decline. (**Tables 11 – 15**)

Levels of satisfaction with sport and leisure facilities, parks and open spaces and with libraries have increased for single and upper tier authorities overall since 2003-04 and now exceed the 2000-01 levels of satisfaction for these indicators.

Satisfaction with museums and galleries shows a slight decline. (**Table 13**).

Satisfaction with theatres and concert halls has declined by 3 percentage points since 2003-04. (**Table 14**).

Information Provision

The relationship between the degree to which respondents feel informed and levels of overall satisfaction appears to be similar in both 2003-04 and 2006-07 (**Table 16b**). Those who feel well informed are more satisfied than those who do not feel informed. The proportion of people saying they feel 'very well informed' or 'fairly well informed' has decreased between 2003-04 and 2006-07 (**Table 16a**).

Participation and Local Decision Making

For the first time questions concerning the opportunities for participation and local decision making have been included in the survey (**Tables 17 a b and c**). These early results suggest that there appears to be a relationship between overall satisfaction with the authority as a whole and opportunities for participation and the degree to which respondents agree they can influence local decisions.

Annex A

Introduction

The questions on which the General Survey Best Value Performance Indicators are based all include a 5-point satisfaction response scale (very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, fairly dissatisfied and very dissatisfied). BVPIs are based on those who indicate that they are satisfied. Therefore, all figures included in the tables show those satisfied (i.e. % very satisfied plus % fairly satisfied) as a percentage of those responding to the question. Those who did not answer are excluded from the base number. Results at a national, authority type or regional level are based on average scores for authorities within those groups with a requirement to report the relevant indicators.

List of Tables

1. Best Value Performance Indicators collected by the General Survey.
2. Overall Satisfaction BVPI3 – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
3. Summary of change in overall satisfaction and satisfaction with individual services between 2003-04 and 2006-07 (results for single tier and county councils only).
4. Satisfaction with complaints handling BVPI4 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
5. Satisfaction with cleanliness of public land BVPI89 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
6. Satisfaction with household waste collection BVPI90a – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
7. Satisfaction with waste recycling (local facilities) BVPI90b – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
8. Satisfaction with waste disposal (local tips) BVPI90c – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
9. Satisfaction with public transport information BVPI103 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
10. Satisfaction with local bus services BVPI104 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
11. Satisfaction with sports and leisure facilities BVPI119a – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
12. Satisfaction with libraries BVPI119b – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

13. Satisfaction with museums and galleries BVPI119c – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
14. Satisfaction with theatres and concert halls BVPI119d – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
15. Satisfaction with parks and open spaces BVPI119e – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.
- 16.a and b
Information provision & overall satisfaction BVPI3 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 (for single tier and county councils only).
- 17.a, b, and c
Levels of satisfaction (BVPI3) by participation and local decision-making– 2006-07 (single and upper tier authorities only).

Table 1: Best Value Performance Indicators collected by the General Survey	
Best Value Performance Indicators	Authority Types
BVPI3 – Overall satisfaction with the authority as a whole	All
BVPI4 – Satisfaction with complaints handling (of those making complaints)	All
BVPI89 – Satisfaction with cleanliness of public land	Districts, Metropolitan Boroughs, London Boroughs, Unitaries, City of London.
BVPI90a – Satisfaction with household waste collection	Districts, Metropolitan Boroughs, London Boroughs, Unitaries, City of London.
BVPI90b – Satisfaction with waste recycling (local facilities)	Districts, Metropolitan Boroughs, London Boroughs, Unitaries, City of London.
BVPI90c – Satisfaction with waste disposal (local tips)	County Councils, Metropolitan Boroughs, London Boroughs, Unitaries, City of London.
BVPI103 – Satisfaction with transport information	County Councils, Metropolitan Boroughs ¹ , London Boroughs ² , Unitaries, City of London ² .
BVPI104 – Satisfaction with bus services	County Councils, Metropolitan Boroughs ¹ , London Boroughs ² , Unitaries, City of London ² .
BVPI119a – Satisfaction with sports and leisure facilities	All
BVPI119b – Satisfaction with libraries	All
BVPI119c – Satisfaction with museums/galleries	All
BVPI119d – Satisfaction with theatres/concert halls	All
BVPI119e – Satisfaction with parks and open spaces	All

Table 2: Overall Satisfaction BVPI3 – 2000-01, 2003-04, and 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.					
<i>Taking everything into account, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way the authority runs things?</i>					
% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	65	55	-10	*	*
Single tier and county council average	61	53	-8	51	-2
County Councils	62	54	-8	50	-4
Unitary Authorities	62	52	-10	50	-2
Metropolitan Boroughs	62	54	-8	52	-2
London Boroughs	55	52	-3	54	+2
District Councils	68	56	-12	*	*

¹ On behalf of PTA

² On behalf of Transport for London

* No result is available because data from District Authorities is not yet due

Table 3: Summary of change in overall satisfaction and satisfaction with individual services between 2003-04 and 2006-07 (results for single tier and county councils only)

Indicator	2003-04 average satisfied (%)	2006-07 average satisfied (%)	Direction of change
BVPI3 – Overall satisfaction with the authority as a whole	53	51	-
BVPI4 – Satisfaction with complaints handling (of those making complaints)	31	32	+
BVPI89 – Satisfaction with cleanliness of public land	55	64	+
BVPI90a – Satisfaction with household waste collection	81	79	-
BVPI90b – Satisfaction with waste recycling (local facilities)	61	66	+
BVPI90c – Satisfaction with waste disposal (local tips)	75	79	+
BVPI103 – Satisfaction with transport information	50	54	+
BVPI104 – Satisfaction with bus services	54	60	+
BVPI119a – Satisfaction with sports and leisure facilities	52	55	+
BVPI119b – Satisfaction with libraries	67	71	+
BVPI119c – Satisfaction with museums/galleries	44	43	-
BVPI119d – Satisfaction with theatres/concert halls	47	44	-
BVPI119e – Satisfaction with parks and open spaces	70	72	+

Table 4: Satisfaction with complaints handling BVPI4 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

*How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way in which your complaint(s) was (were) handled?**

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	40	33	-7	*	*
Single tier and county council average	36	31	-5	32	+1
County Councils	38	32	-6	34	+2
Unitary Authorities	40	32	-8	32	No change
Metropolitan Boroughs	39	32	-7	32	No change
London Boroughs	40	29	-11	31	+2
District Councils	40	33	-7	*	*

* No result is available because data from District Authorities is not yet due

Table 5: Satisfaction with cleanliness of public land BVPI89 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

<<Authority>> has a duty to keep clear of litter and refuse all open public land which it controls. How satisfied are you that the authority has kept this land clear of litter and refuse?

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	63	60	-3	*	*
Single tier and county council average	56	55	-1	64	+9
County Councils	County Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator				
Unitary Authorities	58	57	-1	64	+7
Metropolitan Boroughs	54	54	No change	61	+7
London Boroughs	53	52	-1	65	+13
District Councils	67	63	-4	*	*

Table 6: Satisfaction with household waste collection BVPI90a – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate whether you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each of the following elements of the service, which we provide...the waste collection service overall.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	86	84	-2	*	*
Single tier and county council average	81	81	No change	79	-2
County Councils	County Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator				
Unitary Authorities	84	85	+1	79	-6
Metropolitan Boroughs	85	85	No change	82	-3
London Boroughs	74	71	-3	75	+4
District Councils	88	86	-2	*	*

* No result is available because data from District Authorities is not yet due

Table 7: Satisfaction with waste recycling (local facilities) BVPI90b – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate whether you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each of the following elements of the service which we provide...the provision of local recycling facilities overall.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	66	68	+2	*	*
Single tier and county council average	60	61	+1	66	+5
County Councils	County Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator				
Unitary Authorities	64	66	+2	69	+3
Metropolitan Boroughs	59	62	+3	67	+5
London Boroughs	56	52	-4	61	+9
District Councils	69	71	+2	*	*

Table 8: Satisfaction with waste disposal (local tips) BVPI90c – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate whether you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each of the following elements of the service which we provide...the local tip overall.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	71	75	+4	79	+4
County Councils	76	82	+6	83	+1
Unitary Authorities	71	77	+6	80	+3
Metropolitan Boroughs	75	78	+3	82	+4
London Boroughs	60	61	+1	71	+10
District Councils	District Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator				
East	71	80	+9	81	+1
East Midlands	72	75	+3	80	+5
North East	71	80	+9	83	+3
North West	76	81	+5	83	+2
South East	72	76	+4	79	+3
South West	74	81	+7	81	No change
West Midlands	77	79	+2	83	+4
Yorkshire & Humber	72	78	+6	82	+4
London	60	61	+1	71	+10

* No result is available because data from District Authorities is not yet due

Table 9: Satisfaction with public transport information BVPI103 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate whether you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each of the following elements of the information on transport we provide...the provision of public transport information overall.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	47	50	+3	54	+4
County Councils	43	45	+2	48	+3
Unitary Authorities	45	49	+4	51	+2
Metropolitan Boroughs	54	53	-1	57	+4
London Boroughs	47	51	+4	60	+9
District Councils	District Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator				
East	38	39	+1	46	+7
East Midlands	49	52	+3	55	+3
North East	53	51	-2	52	+1
North West	53	55	+2	57	+2
South East	41	44	+3	48	+4
South West	42	48	+6	49	+1
West Midlands	49	46	-3	52	+6
Yorkshire & Humber	51	54	+3	56	+2
London	47	51	+4	60	+9

Table 10: Satisfaction with local bus services BVPI104 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate whether you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each of the following elements of the local bus service...the local bus service overall.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	50	54	+4	60	+6
County Councils	45	49	+4	55	+6
Unitary Authorities	48	53	+5	58	+5
Metropolitan Boroughs	58	57	-1	61	+4
London Boroughs	49	58	+9	69	+11
District Councils	District Councils do not have responsibility for this indicator				
East	42	45	+3	51	+6
East Midlands	52	58	+6	63	+5
North East	60	58	-2	58	No change
North West	56	58	+2	61	+3
South East	40	47	+7	55	+8
South West	45	50	+5	54	+4
West Midlands	56	53	-3	59	+6
Yorkshire & Humber	54	57	+3	61	+4
London	49	58	+9	69	+11

Table 11: Satisfaction with sports and leisure facilities BVPI119a – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or supported <<Authority>>...sports/leisure facilities and events.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	53	54	+1	*	*
Single tier and county council average	54	52	-2	55	+3
County Councils	54	53	-1	57	+4
Unitary Authorities	58	56	-2	57	+1
Metropolitan Boroughs	56	54	-2	55	+1
London Boroughs	45	44	-1	48	+4
District Councils	52	55	+3	*	*

* No result is available because data from District Authorities is not yet due

Table 12: Satisfaction with libraries BVPI119b – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or supported <<Authority>>...libraries.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	70	67	-3	*	*
Single tier and county council average	70	67	-3	71	+4
County Councils	72	69	-3	74	+5
Unitary Authorities	70	68	-2	72	+4
Metropolitan Boroughs	72	68	-4	72	+4
London Boroughs	64	61	-3	67	+6
District Councils	73	69	-4	*	*

Table 13: Satisfaction with museums and galleries BVPI119c – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or supported <<Authority>>...museums and galleries.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	49	42	-7	*	*
Single tier and county council average	49	44	-5	43	-1
County Councils	49	42	-7	40	-2
Unitary Authorities	53	47	-6	46	-1
Metropolitan Boroughs	54	49	-5	49	No change
London Boroughs	41	35	-6	34	-1
District Councils	48	41	-7	*	*

* No result is available because data from District Authorities is not yet due

Table 14: Satisfaction with theatres and concert halls BVPI119d – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or supported <<Authority>>...theatres and concert halls.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	52	47	-5	*	*
Single tier and county council average	53	47	-6	44	-3
County Councils	53	45	-8	42	-3
Unitary Authorities	57	53	-4	50	-3
Metropolitan Boroughs	54	49	-5	46	-3
London Boroughs	44	38	-6	37	-1
District Councils	51	47	-4	*	*

Table 15: Satisfaction with parks and open spaces BVPI119e – 2000-01 to 2006-07 results (for single tier and county councils only) and by authority type.

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with each of the following services provided or supported <<Authority>>...parks and open spaces.

% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
National average	63	71	+8	*	*
Single tier and county council average	66	70	+4	72	+2
County Councils	67	70	+3	73	+3
Unitary Authorities	69	74	+5	74	No change
Metropolitan Boroughs	61	67	+6	68	+1
London Boroughs	65	69	+4	73	+4
District Councils	62	72	+10	*	*

Table 16a: Information provision & overall satisfaction BVPI3 – 2000-01 to 2006-07 (for single tier and county councils only).

Overall, how well informed do you think your Council keeps residents about the services and benefits it provides?

% satisfied	2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
Very well informed	9	6	-3
Fairly well informed	42	36	-6
Not very well informed	32	37	+5
Not informed at all	17	20	+3

* No result is available because data from District Authorities is not yet due

Table 16b: A comparison of overall satisfaction (BV3) with information provision – 2003-04 and 2006-07 (for single tier and county councils only).

	2003-04			2006-07		
	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied
Very well informed	87	9	4	89	8	3
Fairly well informed	69	23	7	71	24	5
Not very well informed	38	40	22	43	42	15
Not informed at all	24	36	40	23	37	41

Table 17a: Levels of satisfaction (BVPI3) by Satisfaction with opportunities for participation in local decision-making – 2006-07 (single and upper tier authorities only)

<i>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the opportunities for participation in local decision-making provided by your Council?</i>	Proportion Satisfied (%)
Very satisfied	87
Fairly satisfied	77
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	48
Fairly dissatisfied	34
Very dissatisfied	21

Table 17b: Levels of satisfaction (BVPI3) by extent to which respondents agree they can influence local decision making – 2006-07 (single and upper tier authorities only)

<i>Do you agree or disagree that you can influence decisions affecting your local area?</i>	Proportion Satisfied (%)
Definitely agree	68
Tend to agree	71
Tend to disagree	48
Definitely disagree	26

Table 17c: Levels of satisfaction (BVPI3) by interest in getting more involved in local decision making– 2006-07 (single and upper tier authorities only)

<i>Generally speaking, would you like to be more involved in the decisions your Council makes that affect your local area?</i>	Proportion Satisfied (%)
Yes	47
No	61
Depends on the issue	51

Annex B

Technical Note

Authorities are required to carry out the Best Value User Satisfaction surveys to a standardised methodology. The methodological guidance specifies a postal research mode, a random or stratified random sample using from the Small Users Postal Address File (PAF) as the sampling frame, and the requirements for questionnaire wording and maximising response rates. Each authority conducts a local survey and submits full data to the Audit Commission. Local surveys are audited by the Audit Commission, and for 2006-07 all single tier and county councils' General Surveys have been judged to be methodologically robust.

All data is weighted by age and gender by 2006 mid-year estimates and ethnicity by the 2001 census. An additional 'household size' weight is applied to account for the use of the PAF as the sampling frame. Data is weighted centrally by a contractor on behalf of the Audit Commission and the Department.

Following the 2003-04 topline report³, the results presented in this report are weighted by age, gender and ethnicity to ensure that the achieved sample is representative of the target population. The data presented in this report is not weighted by household size, as the 2000-01 round allowed for different sampling frames to be used and so it is not possible to apply this weight across all three rounds of the survey.

Similarly, results presented here are an aggregate mean of the scores for the authorities reporting that indicator. This means that each authority is equally represented in the topline scores and the population size of each authority is not taken into account when calculating these scores.

The submission of data for 2006-07 is broken into two waves, with single tier and county councils submitting in December 2006 and district councils submitting in March 2007. This report presents results for the first wave – the 149 single tier and county councils – for comparability the previous years results given in this report are also for single tier and county councils. As districts are not included in this wave, results are not broken down by region for those indicators that districts are required to report.

Each authority is required to achieve a sample size of 1,100 resulting in a confidence interval of +/-3% at the 95% confidence level. The sample sizes in these aggregate scores are therefore very large (with a total of over 210,000 responses) meaning that the total trends and trends by authority type in this report are likely to be statistically significant.

Further analytical work is being conducted by the Department to understand the underlying factors that are responsible for the trends shown in this report.

In addition, analysis of the non-BVPI questions asked in the General Survey will be conducted covering topics such as quality of life in a local area, anti-social behaviour and respect, community cohesion, participation and involvement in local decision making and issues around customer care and perceived standard of service.

³ Best Value User Satisfaction Surveys 2003-04 General Survey Topline Report, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004.

BVPI user satisfaction results for individual authorities will be made available on the BVPI website (www.bvpi.gov.uk) shortly, and on the Audit Commission website in due course. Please note that authority level scores are weighted by age, gender, ethnicity and household size and may therefore differ slightly from the time-series results presented in this report, which do not apply the household size weight.