

TO: Members of the CDD Policy Committees
FROM: Hickory R. Hurie
SUBJECT: Some observations on the surveys from Committee and staff members regarding the 2012 summer funding process for 2013-14
DATE: January 19, 2013

Attached are two sets of composite reports listing individual responses to a set of questions in a survey of Committee, and staff conducted in September 2012. I did not include the few surveys returned from applicant agencies because of their small number, but would be willing to share those comments at a later date.

The composite reports list each committee or staff members' response to a survey question asking either for a rating of importance or satisfaction for particular aspects of the summer process, or for a response to an open ended question. There were of a total of 13 responses from policy committee members and 13 responses from City staff who participated in the process.

Committee and staff from the E\early childhood committee and team are labeled within a handwritten **square**, members from CDBG are labeled within a handwritten **circle**, members from the Community Services Committee are labeled within a **triangle** and members from the Aging area are **unadorned**.

For example using the committee member composite, on the questions asking about importance or satisfaction, committee members were asked about the importance of the clarity of City goals and objectives, and how satisfied they were with the clarity of those goals.

The three members of the Community Services Committee rated the clarity of goals in this manner:

Member	Importance	Satisfaction
A	Highest 5	Lowest 1
B	Medium 3	Low 2
C	High 4	High 4

What does this mean? The three responding Community Services Committee members tended to perceive the clarity of goals/objectives/criteria as high in "importance", but the members tended to have a fairly range of satisfaction with the current goals/objectives/criteria (from 1 to 4).

How can one interpret the composite results?

One quick way to analyze the results is to look for clusters of individual response in the quadrants of each graph. The graphs where the responses are tightly clustered would suggest the greatest areas of agreement; the graphs where the responses are dispersed around the graph would suggest areas of greatest diversity of opinion.

For example, most committee members ranked the clarity of goals as an important factor in the summer process, and ten of the thirteen respondents were satisfied or highly satisfied with the goals. While twelve of the members ranked data about community needs as high in importance, fewer members (5) were as satisfied, compared to the clarity of goals.

Note too that different committees had various degrees of consensus. Community Services Committee members were as a group less satisfied than the members of the Committee on Aging.

Different committees had different perceptions of the summer process; in a sense there were four processes.

One can also analyze the results in terms of what types of actions the pattern of agreement or disagreement suggest: (a customer window analysis) If one were to divide each graph into four “windows” (high importance/high satisfaction, high importance/low satisfaction, low importance, high satisfaction, and low importance/low satisfaction), the clustering of responses should suggest the following actions:

- * Things of high value and of high satisfaction: make certain to reinforce current practices
- * Things of high value and of lower satisfaction: work to improve this quadrant, to move these items from low satisfaction to higher satisfaction

I look forward to your observations and discussions on these responses..