

# **2015 Environmental Body Satisfaction Survey**

## **Overview**

## 1. Introduction

In line with best practice, we undertake an annual satisfaction survey in May each year, which provides Environmental Bodies (EBs) with an opportunity to submit their feedback, thoughts and opinions on the quality and performance of our services. The responses and the findings that we receive enable us to form a better understanding of our effectiveness in regulating the Landfill Communities Fund (LCF).

Since 2013, we have refined the questionnaire, building on the results and feedback from previous surveys and responding to different areas of business need, whilst retaining key benchmarking measures to ensure we can compare our performance year on year.

We have carefully analysed the results of the survey and have developed an action plan to address those areas and issues, which stakeholders consider we should improve. A copy of the results of our analysis and our action plan are published on our website

## 2. Overview

The survey is an important tool that allows us to form an understanding, and gauge the level, of satisfaction with the quality of our services and EBs' perception of our work. Following an analysis of the results, we are then able to target our resources more effectively.

The principle aims of the satisfaction survey are to:

- gather information to help us to assess the level of satisfaction EBs have with our services over the last twelve months;
- analyse the results to enable us to identify any trends or areas of concern;
- develop an action plan to facilitate an improvement in the quality of our services and our performance as a Regulator; and
- be open and transparent about the outcomes of the survey by publishing them together with details about the identified actions on our website.

Having restructured the survey in 2013, we made some further refinements to the survey based on responses to the 2014 survey. For the first time we included a question about how frequently EBs have contacted or accessed our services across this year. This has allowed us to segment respondents and analyse results according to whether they are frequent or infrequent users of our services.

In 2015, we included new sections of the survey, relating to the payment of the levy and EB contact with our Finance Team, activity in Scotland and we also separated questions relating to Desktop Reviews and Compliance Inspections Visits to enable us to make more targeted analysis of our Compliance activity. Additionally, we refreshed the questions relating to our training programme to encompass a wider definition of training to include our new training videos and our 'how to' guides in addition to training events.

We also removed all questions relating to paper forms, as our Corporate Plan and Key Performance Indicators (KPI) make it clear that organisationally we aim to encourage the use of e-delivery, for example online form completion through Entrust Online (EOL). Furthermore, rather than including one section on EOL, we moved questions about EOL into each of the appropriate operational areas.

After the 2014 survey, we resolved to improve response rates by only asking questions of respondents where they indicate these are relevant to their experience of us and the LCF. This was incorporated into the 2015 survey.

All EB main contacts for whom we hold an email address were contacted by email on 28 May 2015 and invited to complete the survey by 30 June 2015. The survey was also prominently featured on our website, through our Twitter feed and in our June 2015 newsletter.

### 3. Summary of the findings

In 2015 we received 221 surveys, an increase of 48 (28 per cent) on the previous year, when 173 surveys were returned. The overall level of satisfaction reported for 2015 is 83% (2014: 81%). This rating is calculated across the overall survey results as a percentage of questions requiring a response from 1-5 which were responded to positively, with a rating of 4 (agree) or 5 (strongly agree). While we are pleased to see an improvement in satisfaction across the survey as a whole, we also note that there has been a slight decline in the three core questions that we ask, although results remain high for all three measures.

In 2015:

- 85 per cent agree that 'ENTRUST staff are very professional when dealing with me and my EB' (2014: 96 per cent);
- 85 per cent agree that they 'understand the role that ENTRUST undertakes as Regulator of the LCF' (2014: 96 per cent); and
- 78 per cent agree that 'overall ENTRUST provides high quality services' (2014: 87 per cent).

With these results in mind we have used the findings from the survey to focus on a number of areas for improvement which have formed the basis for our action plan for 2015.

### 4. Feedback

In the second part of the survey, we asked EBs to provide feedback about our performance or suggestions as to how our regulatory services might be improved. 46 per cent of respondents left additional, open ended feedback. Of these, more than half requested a response to their feedback and provided their contact details. All responses were completed within one month of the survey ending.

From our analysis much of this additional feedback was positive, both in terms of the LCF scheme in general and ENTRUST's services. In particular there was highly positive feedback for ENTRUST staff who were described as professional, helpful and friendly.

However, we received some mixed comments relating to the ability to find information on ENTRUST's website, with some finding it easy to navigate and others difficult. We are therefore considering how we can improve this as part of our website review. Additionally, there were those who had difficulty using EOL and who made constructive comments about how this may be improved. Our action plan includes a detailed look at how we can support EBs to use EOL and we have already updated all of our 'How To' guides for using EOL as part of our action plan.

We also identified a common theme in the feedback about the need to complete a Form 4, Statutory Annual Return – particularly in the case of those who only need to submit nil returns. We will review this as part of our Form 4 strategy to see how we can support EBs with this task.

We updated the questions regarding training and training resources, however a low response rate has not allowed us to fully understand what EBs think about our training programme. We have therefore included a point in the action plan to develop and undertake a training survey to better understand this area.

**The action plan including timescales for completion and the full charts report are available on our website.**