

SATISFACTION METHODOLOGY

1.1. Purpose

The Uttlesford Citizens panel, Uttlesford Voices, was set up to provide a focused, cross district and representative group of residents who could be consulted on a wide range of issues relating to the council's policies and practices including regular surveying of user satisfaction with a portfolio of council services.

Panellists were recruited on behalf of the council by the private market research company BMG Research during April and May 2010 to a baseline of 500 citizens broadly representative of the demographic of the Uttlesford administrative area. By surveying the panel, it is possible to obtain views and opinions broadly representative of local residents which can be used to inform the process used by members and officers in developing future policy.

1.2. Background

1.2.1 The survey

The third Uttlesford Voices survey was sent out to panellists in late March 2011 just as the council was going into an election period. Customer satisfaction questions are included in every citizens panel questionnaire as part of the council's commitment to ongoing monitoring of how its services are performing. The data returned by panellists is then collated and analysed before being reported as a summarised submission into Covalent to inform the performance indicator KPI 02 Customer satisfaction with services (Max).

1.2.2 Rationale

A citizens' panel is regarded as being a cost-effective method for obtaining data on the opinions of a broad cross-section of the population. Such consultation generally achieves relatively good returns making the panel method one of the most effective tools in establishing a broad base of public opinion on a wide range of activities undertaken or planned by the council.

The agreed objectives of the citizens' panel are:

- To ensure that the opinions of the residents and other users are considered in the development and delivery of local public services in Uttlesford
- To offer an economic, diverse and efficient public consultation mechanism to gain a broadly representative sample of public and user views about services, policies and priorities
- To co-ordinate consultation within the district so as to provide a focused arena for feedback from Uttlesford residents
- To provide and collate consultation on behalf of partners such as the Local Strategic Partnership and to interact with other agencies at regional and national level
- To provide sound, accessible data that can be used and interrogated by the council and its partners
- Providing benchmarking data
- To inform policy and practice on how resources may be allocated and services best developed to serve future needs
- To build and develop relationships with the community

1.2.3 Profiling - The Legal Context

The Equality Act 2010 came into effect on 1 October 2010 and brings together, harmonises and extends current equality law. The existing anti-discrimination laws have been consolidated into a single Act, which has been introduced to strengthen the laws preventing discrimination and the inequalities that still exist in society today.

The Equality Act has also created changes to earlier legislation and includes discrimination previously unrecognised in legislation. In essence, it creates a new 'Single Equality Duty' on public bodies to tackle discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and encourage good community relations.

The term *protected characteristics* has replaced *equality strands* for describing the protected traits held by groups or individuals under anti-discrimination and equality legislation. The earlier separate duties for disability, gender and race have been replaced with a single, more effective framework and the new 'Single Equality Duty' covers:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender Reassignment
- Marriage and Civil Partnership

- Pregnancy and Maternity
- Race
- Religion or Belief
- Sex
- Sexual Orientation

Customer profiling is undertaken against protected characteristics to ensure that panel members represent a cross section of the population as a whole and is used to develop 'customer insight'. The IDeA and LGA describe insight as:

- 'the use of data and information about customers to better understand their needs, wants, expectations, behaviours and experiences; and
- the active application of this understanding in the design and delivery of services that better meet customers' needs.'¹

Although the panel has been carefully profiled for age, ethnicity, gender and long-term limiting illness so as to be fully representative of the demographic of the district as a whole (see Table 1.1 below), it should be noted that it is made up of people who have volunteered to take part, and so comprises an atypical sector of the population. The views expressed are accordingly representative only and cannot be regarded as a completely accurate reflection of the opinions of the Uttlesford district community as a whole.

Panel members tend to be better informed about the council's policies and aims whilst also being generally more concerned with issues affecting the district. Data analysis tools such as 'weighting' promote greater confidence in the overall representatives of the data by accommodating gaps in demographic coefficients such as gender and age, but cannot account for attitudinal and behavioural variables. Data derived from panel surveys should, then, be treated as a reasonably accurate representation of public opinion but should not be considered to be as fully complete a response as that given by a larger, representative but completely un-self-selected, sample of the population. A break down of the Uttlesford Citizens Panel, as it stood at the time of the UV3 consultation, is given below:

¹ *Insight: understanding your citizens, customers and communities* © IDeA and LGA - November 2008)

Uttlesford panel recruitment composition				
Age	PANEL		POPULATION*	
	Number	%	Number	%
16-19	9	1.8	3840	6.4
20-24	16	3.2	3200	5.3
25-34	54	10.8	7000	11.7
35-44	80	16.0	11600	19.3
45-54	109	21.8	11800	19.7
55-64	104	20.8	10100	16.8
65+	121	24.2	12500	20.8
Not provided	7	1.4	-	-
Total	500	100.0	60040	100
White	482	96.4	67685	98.2
Mixed	5	1.0	458	0.7
Asian/Asian British	4	0.8	376	0.5
Black/Black British	0	0.0	111	0.2
Chinese/ other	1	0.2	316	0.5
Not provided	8	1.6	-	-
Total	500	100	68946	100
Male	250	50.0	34342	49.8
Female	250	50.0	34601	50.2
Total	500	100.0	68943	100

Table 1.1 Panel recruitment composition

*Source Office for National Statistics (ONS), **Age (UV04) population dataset 16-65+ dataset; Ethnic Group (UV09) population dataset all persons dataset; Sex (UV03) population dataset all persons dataset** Last Updated: 2009
Base 500

It will be noted from the above table that there is now a disparity, particularly evident amongst the 'hard to reach groups'², between the panel composition and the overall demographic of the district. This has come about due to natural wastage amongst panel members which, proportionally is higher for these groups, especially where the younger age groups are concerned as members tend to move away to college or for employment.

² For further information on 'hard to reach groups' see Appendix 3

As part of the continuing commitment to good practice in consultation the panel composition is regularly reviewed³. The professional research company BMG have again been engaged to undertake a compressive panel refresh to ensure that the panel represents in microcosm, as far as is possible, the main protected characteristics of the macrocosm of the district. This is currently being undertaken (January-February 2012) and will reviewed again as and when the Census 2011 datasets are published so as to ensure the panel is accurately representative as possible. Appendix 2 provides data on under provision in the panel which should be accommodated by the refresh.

By surveying the panel, it is possible to obtain views and opinions broadly representative of local residents, but it will not be possible to accurately calculate the level of confidence in the results - confidence interval formulae are employed to make calculations from the baseline of an unbiased and statistically representative sample of the local demographic. Statistical variations in responses may just represent differences in the core sample of the panel rather than the public at large and should be represented as such in the output data. For a sample the size of the Uttlesford citizen's panel, to a baseline of 500 members, the confidence level is 95%. This means that we can be 95 per cent confident that the true value of the responses, set against the variable baselines for different questions – the differing numbers of panel members who answered each question – will be within 4.37 percentage points of the view we might have observed in the overall sample.

2.3. Satisfaction with services

Customer satisfaction questions are included in every citizens panel questionnaire as part of the council's commitment to ongoing monitoring of how its services are performing. As in previous surveys panel members were asked how satisfied they are with a portfolio of services and whether they considered that these services reflect value for money. It will be noticed that septic tank emptying is no longer provided by the council but is included in the satisfaction ratings because it was offered during the period since the previous survey (UV2 Winter 2010) and as satisfaction is rated retrospectively is here included for completeness. They will not be measured in future surveys. It also should be noted that whilst satisfaction with leisure centres in the district is monitored, the provision of services and facilities at Great

³ Equalities impact assessments have been undertaken for both the citizens panel and for holistic consultation processes. These are updated regularly and are available on request

Dunmow Leisure Centre, Lord Butler Fitness and Leisure Centre and the Mountfitchet Romeera Leisure Centre is under a private finance initiative with Leisure Connection.

The results are used to inform the council's corporate performance indicator KPI02 (formerly CI 42) which measures 'overall customer satisfaction with council services'⁴. This indicator is reported to the council's new Performance and Audit Committee as part of the performance management statistics on a half yearly basis.

Reporting of satisfaction data is usually divided into two parts with the first part examining the responses made by panellists to universal services - those accessible by all residents - and the second part examining the results of non-universal services (e.g. concessionary travel) among the specific users of those services. Satisfaction levels have been calculated using a weighted system to give an overall cross-user rating achieved by allocating scores for the number of respondents to each question in order to take account of whether customers were very satisfied (+2), satisfied (+1), dissatisfied (-1) or very dissatisfied (-2). Overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction are then shown as a percentage (%) score. For further details of how the calculations were arrived at, see Appendix 1.

All panellists who did not express an opinion and who are assumed to be non-users of that service are scored at 0 weighting. This provides a more accurate assessment of user attitude than the method employed to derive an overall level of satisfaction from then responses to UV1 and UV2. Given the change in analytical systems no direct comparison is possible with previous surveys but by correlating these figures against the returns made by panellists as part of the UV2 survey (Winter 2010), it is possible to ascertain general trends in service provision which can be used to inform the development of future policy. The raw data returns – number and percentage of respondents rating each service area – are shown in the table below.

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following services provided by Uttlesford District Council? - Results by absolute number of respondents and percentage

⁴ KPI 02 - Overall customer satisfaction with council services (Max) Measured as an overall value for customer satisfaction with council services as a percentage of panellists who responded to questions on a representative portfolio of council services and who expressed an opinion via the Uttlesford Voices citizens panel surveys.

	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No opinion	Respondents no.
Abandoned vehicles	44 (16.5%)	92 (34.5%)	11 (4.1%)	7 (2.6%)	113 (42.3%)	267
Animal warden	28 (10.7%)	81 (30.9%)	9 (3.4%)	14 (5.3%)	130 (49.6%)	262
Benefits fraud	10 (3.8%)	62 (23.4%)	29 (10.9%)	17 (6.4%)	147 (55.5%)	265
Building control	20 (7.7%)	92 (35.2%)	42 (16.1%)	28 (10.7%)	79 (30.3%)	261
Business rates	8 (3.1%)	49 (19.2%)	16 (6.3%)	6 (2.4%)	176 (69.0%)	255
Car parks and on-street parking enforcement	19 (7.6%)	116 (46.2%)	36 (14.3%)	39 (15.5%)	41 (16.3%)	251
Committee information - Public meetings and elected councillors	13 (5.1%)	115 (44.9%)	29 (11.3%)	8 (3.1%)	91 (35.5%)	256
Community Safety	23 (9.3%)	134 (54.5%)	13 (5.3%)	4 (1.6%)	72 (29.3%)	246
Concessionary travel	74 (28.1%)	77 (29.3%)	10 (3.8%)	2 (0.8%)	100 (38.0%)	263
Council Housing - Adaptations	17 (6.6%)	38 (14.8%)	5 (1.9%)	2 (0.8%)	195 (75.9%)	257
Council Housing - Day centres	18 (7.0%)	48 (18.8%)	4 (1.6%)	3 (1.2%)	183 (71.5%)	256
Council Housing - Homelessness	10 (3.9%)	35 (13.7%)	10 (3.9%)	4 (1.6%)	196 (76.9%)	255
Council Housing - Housing benefits	21 (8.1%)	30 (11.6%)	8 (3.1%)	8 (3.1%)	191 (74.0%)	258
Council Housing - Rents	19 (7.3%)	31 (12.0%)	7 (2.7%)	2 (0.8%)	200 (77.2%)	259
Council Housing - Repairs	18 (6.9%)	30 (11.5%)	7 (2.7%)	5 (1.9%)	200 (76.9%)	260
Council Housing - Right to buy	18 (7.0%)	41 (16.0%)	5 (1.9%)	4 (1.6%)	189 (73.5%)	257
Council Housing - Sheltered housing	16 (6.2%)	41 (16.0%)	4 (1.6%)	1 (0.4%)	195 (75.9%)	257
Council Housing - Tenant Liaison	13 (5.1%)	28 (10.9%)	6 (2.3%)	1 (0.4%)	209 (81.3%)	257
Council tax - Benefits and enquiries	23 (8.9%)	70 (27.2%)	10 (3.9%)	11 (4.3%)	143 (55.6%)	257
Elections and electoral register	93 (34.7%)	136 (50.7%)	5 (1.9%)	3 (1.1%)	31 (11.6%)	268
Environmental Health - air/water/noise complaints	36 (13.7%)	117 (44.7%)	19 (7.3%)	16 (6.1%)	74 (28.2%)	262
Flytipping	26 (10.0%)	109 (42.1%)	48 (18.5%)	23 (8.9%)	53 (20.5%)	259
Land charges	7 (2.8%)	54 (21.4%)	7 (2.8%)	3 (1.2%)	181 (71.8%)	252
Leisure centres	28 (10.7%)	116 (44.4%)	15 (5.7%)	17 (6.5%)	85 (32.6%)	261
Licensing (e.g. taxis, premises)	16 (6.2%)	90 (34.7%)	10 (3.9%)	5 (1.9%)	138 (53.3%)	259

Litter Control	14 (5.6%)	117 (46.8%)	65 (26.0%)	20 (8.0%)	34 (13.6%)	250
Museum	55 (20.8%)	115 (43.4%)	3 (1.1%)	3 (1.1%)	89 (33.6%)	265
Pest control	40 (15.4%)	97 (37.3%)	11 (4.2%)	7 (2.7%)	105 (40.4%)	260
Planning advice	24 (9.2%)	95 (36.5%)	18 (6.9%)	12 (4.6%)	111 (42.7%)	260
Planning applications	24 (9.1%)	85 (32.2%)	24 (9.1%)	20 (7.6%)	111 (42.0%)	264
Planning enforcement	15 (5.8%)	60 (23.2%)	34 (13.1%)	28 (10.8%)	122 (47.1%)	259
Septic tank emptying	16 (6.3%)	36 (14.1%)	4 (1.6%)	8 (3.1%)	191 (74.9%)	255
Waste and recycling	94 (34.8%)	113 (41.9%)	16 (5.9%)	7 (2.6%)	40 (14.8%)	270
Website	17 (6.8%)	123 (49.0%)	10 (4.0%)	2 (0.8%)	99 (39.4%)	251

Table 1.2 raw data returns by absolute and percentage

The demographic information was derived from questionnaires returned for this survey and is merged with information from the excel database which holds panel members' details. These are then collated against district statistics based on the most current data available from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) to provide a profiled return for the survey which permits the reporting of, for example, responses by locale, gender, age or disability. Trends amongst particular groups are then trackable.

Satisfaction is calculated using the weighted system described in the paragraph above. This is represented in the table below:

The chart below is drawn from the above results and shows total satisfaction and dissatisfaction levels for each of the services. A weighted system is used to give an overall cross-user rating achieved by allocating scores to the number of respondents to each question to take account of whether customers were very satisfied (+2), satisfied (+1), of no opinion (0), dissatisfied (-1) or very dissatisfied (-2). Overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction are then shown as a percentage (%) score. Where no opinion was offered, no calculation is included. For further details of how the calculations were arrived at, see Appendix 1.

Customer Satisfaction – results using rated scores






	Very satisfied +2	Fairly satisfied +1	Total satisfaction %	Fairly dissatisfied -1	Very dissatisfied -2	Total dissatisfaction	Net Score
Abandoned vehicles	88	92	87.80%	-11	-14	12.20%	155
Animal warden	56	81	78.74%	-9	-28	21.26%	100
Benefits fraud	20	62	56.55%	-29	-34	43.45%	19
Building control	40	92	57.39%	-42	-56	42.61%	34
Business rates	16	49	69.89%	-16	-12	30.11%	37
Car parks and on-street parking enforcement	38	116	57.46%	-36	-78	42.54%	40
Committee information - Public meetings and elected councillors	26	115	75.80%	-29	-16	24.20%	96
Community Safety	46	134	89.55%	-13	-8	10.45%	159
Concessionary travel	148	77	94.14%	-10	-4	11.12%	211
Council Housing - Adaptations	34	38	88.88%	-5	-4	11.12%	63
Council Housing - Day centres	36	48	89.36%	-4	-6	10.64%	74
Council Housing - Homelessness	20	35	75.34%	-10	-8	24.66%	37
Council Housing - Housing benefits	42	30	75.00%	-8	-16	25.00%	48
Council Housing - Rents	38	31	86.25%	-7	-4	13.75%	58
Council Housing - Repairs	36	30	79.51%	-7	-10	20.49%	49
Council Housing - Right to buy	36	41	85.55%	-5	-8	14.45%	64
Council Housing - Sheltered housing	32	41	92.40%	-4	-2	7.60%	67
Council Housing - Tenant Liaison	26	28	87.09%	-6	-2	12.91%	46
Council Tax - Benefits and enquiries	46	70	78.38%	-10	-22	21.62%	84
Elections and electoral register	186	136	96.69%	-5	-6	3.31%	311
Environmental Health - air/water/noise complaints	72	117	78.75%	-19	-32	21.25%	138
Flytipping	52	109	63.14%	-48	-46	36.86%	67
Land charges	14	54	83.95%	-7	-6	16.05%	55
Leisure centres	56	116	77.83%	-15	-34	22.17%	123

	Very satisfied +2	Fairly satisfied +1	Total satisfaction %	Fairly dis-satisfied -1	Very dis-satisfied -2	Total dis-satisfaction	Net Score
Licensing (e.g. taxis, premises)	32	90	85.92%	-10	-10	14.08%	102
Litter Control	28	117	58.00%	-65	-40	42.00%	40
Museum	110	115	96.15%	-3	-6	3.85%	216
Pest control	80	97	87.62%	-11	-14	12.38%	152
Planning advice	48	95	77.29%	-18	-24	22.71%	101
Planning applications	48	85	67.51%	-24	-40	32.49%	69
Planning enforcement	30	60	50.00%	-34	-56	50.00%	0
Septic tank emptying	32	36	77.27%	-4	-16	22.73%	48
Waste and recycling	188	113	90.93%	-16	-14	9.07%	271
Website	34	123	84.86%	-10	-4	15.14%	143
Aggregated score⁵			78.85%			21.61%	



Table 1.3 Panel return rated scores

The return data for H1 2011/12 then was entered as 79% (rounded up from 78.85%) in respect of KPI 02.

It should be noted that comparisons between satisfaction ratings registered by UV1, UV2 and UV3 do not necessarily constitute a trend as members views can be subject to external factors such as seasonal variations and nationally aligned conditions. Consultation on service satisfaction will be continued on a regular basis and movements in satisfaction levels reported as appropriate.

	Total satisfaction UV3 against UV1 and UV2 responses			
	UV3 April 2011	UV2 Nov 2010	UV1 June 2010	Overall progression UV2 to UV3 ⁶
Abandoned vehicles	87.80%	88.44%	88.50%	
Animal warden	78.74%	88.16%	85.01%	
Benefits fraud	56.55%	51.06%	49.66%	
Building control	57.39%	70.53%	72.25%	
Business rates	69.89%	58.56%	69.05%	

⁵ Variance (due to rounding up or down to two decimal places)

⁶ Progress key:  Up
 Down































Car parks and on-street parking enforcement	57.46%	64.22%	65.30%	
Committee information - Public meetings and elected councillors	75.80%	55.67%	70.07%	
Community Safety	89.55%	79.29%	86.17%	
Concessionary travel	94.14%	89.66%	88.10%	
Council Housing - Adaptations	88.88%	74.42%	80.06%	
Council Housing - Day centres	89.36%	80.34%	84.37%	
Council Housing - Homelessness	75.34%	70.53%	77.93%	
Council Housing - Housing benefits	75.00%	63.46%	69.29%	
Council Housing - Rent	86.25%	70.10%	79.06%	
Council Housing - Repairs	79.51%	74.73%	74.72%	
Council Housing - Right to buy	85.55%	70.00%	72.59%	
Council Housing - Sheltered housing	92.40%	84.00%	84.30%	
Council Housing - Tenant Liaison	87.09%	78.75%	75.84%	
Council Tax - Benefits and enquiries	78.38%	71.53%	73.83%	
Elections and electoral register	96.69%	86.67%	91.00%	
Environmental Health - air/water/noise complaints	78.75%	75.38%	80.43%	
Fly tipping	63.14%	58.71%	59.46%	
Land charges	83.95%	68.93%	81.92%	
Leisure centres	77.83%	72.28%	75.55%	
Licensing (e.g. taxis, premises)	85.92%	81.38%	87.35%	
Littering	58.00%	62.30%	60.38%	
Museum	96.15%	91.26%	91.59%	
Pest control	87.62%	88.76%	92.72%	
Planning advice	77.29%	66.23%	75.24%	
Planning applications	67.51%	64.63%	68.56%	
Planning enforcement	50.00%	61.11%	61.20%	
Septic tank emptying	77.27%	82.76%	87.95%	
Waste and recycling	90.93%	84.39%	87.42%	
Website	84.86%	75.31%	88.66%	
Aggregated score	78.85%	73.63%	77.52%	

Table 1.1 Panel return trending analysis

Detailed trending analysis is included for information only and is not reported as part of the performance indicator pre se. Some extrapolation of the data to provide a conspectual analysis is provided as part of the reports issued by the Consultation Unit to accompany the results of each citizens panel survey.

Satisfaction – How the scores are calculated - Rated Scores

Overview

Rating is a system recommended by Snap, the company who provide the consultation system used to collate and make the analysis of the Uttlesford Citizens Panel results. This is considered to present a more accurate representation of user's views than the 'overall satisfaction' employed to rate satisfaction in the Uttlesford Voices 1 and 2 reports.

For the satisfaction survey the responses given by panellists are given extra weight if the respondent was either 'very satisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with a service as distinct to being just 'fairly satisfied' or 'fairly dissatisfied'. This is called 'rating' and is achieved by attributing a weighted score (+2 for 'very satisfied' or -2 'very dissatisfied'; +1 for 'satisfied' or -1 'dissatisfied' and 0 for no opinion) to the number of responses received.

The score for overall satisfaction for each service has been calculated to exclude all panellists who did not express an opinion.

For example:

Abandoned vehicles (see 'absolute results ...' pdf):

44 respondents were 'very satisfied' = $+2 \times 44 = \text{score } 88$

92 were satisfied = $+1 \times 92 = \text{score } 92$

113 no opinion = $0 \times 113 = 0$

11 were fairly dissatisfied = $-1 \times 11 = \text{score } -11$

7 respondents were 'very dissatisfied' = $-2 \times 7 = \text{score } -14$

See table 'Customer Satisfaction – results using rated scores'

So for overall satisfaction (as distinct from dissatisfaction)

Total panellists who did express an opinion weighted scores = $88+92+11+14$
= 205

If 205 = 100% then the weighted satisfaction scores ($88+92= 180$) will
represent $180/205 = 87.80\%$

The weighted dissatisfaction scores ($11+14= 25$) will represent $25/205 =$
 12.2%

Overall customer satisfaction with council services for Abandoned Vehicles
can accordingly be represented by subtracting total dissatisfaction from total
satisfaction i.e. $87.80\%-12.20\% = 75.60\%$.

This can be expressed also as the Total score - see table 'Customer
Satisfaction – results using rated scores' of 155, which as a % of all 205 who
replied is $155/205 = 75.60\%$

APPENDIX 2

Uttlesford District Council Citizens' Panel- Profiling details for panel refresh

Overview

Ward Breakdown	Ideal Panellists Required
22UQGJ Ashdon	1
22UQ GK Barnston and High Easter	5
22UQGL Birchanger	0
22UQGM Broad Oak and the Hallingburys	8
22UQGN Clavering	2
22UQGP Elsenham and Henham	10
22UQGQ Felsted	7
22UQGR Great Dunmow North	1
22UQGS Great Dunmow South	8
22UQGT Hatfield Heath	4
22UQGU Littlebury	4
22UQGW Newport	0
22UQGX Saffron Walden Audley	0
22UQGY Saffron Walden Castle	0
22UQGZ Saffron Walden Shire	2
22UQHA Stansted North	3
22UQHB Stansted South	8
22UQHC Stebbing	0
22UQHD Stort Valley	4
22UQHE Takeley and the Canfields	0
22UQHF Thaxted	2
22UQHG The Chesterfords	3
22UQHH The Eastons	3
22UQHJ The Rodings	0
22UQHK The Sampfords	0
22UQHL Wenden Lofts	0
22UQHM Wimbish and Debden	8
Total	83

Comment: Concentrate on Broad Oak and the Hallingburys, Elsenham and Henham, Great Dunmow South, Stansted South, Wimbish and Debden. (Avoid recruiting from Saffron Walden Audley).

Ethnicity and age breakdown:

Ideal Panellists Required	18-24yrs	25-44yrs	45-64yrs	Total	
White	20	44	2	66	
Mixed Ethnicity	1	0	1	2	
Asian or Asian British	1	4	2	7	
Black or Black British	0	4	2	6	
Chinese or Other	1	1	0	2	
Total	23	53	7	83	

Gender:

(Of the retained 417 panellists, 197 are males and 220 females. District population profile is in a ratio of 49.8% to 50.2%.)

Recruitment of 83 new panellists needs to be approximately **53 new male** panellists and **30 new female** panellists.

Comment:

Male panellists between the ages of 25 and 54 are particularly desirable.

Uttlesford District Council Citizens' Panel- Hard to reach groups profiling

The Home Office's *Developing Practice Report 15* conducted research into this area and provides a useful backdrop to how 'hard-to-reach' communities can be defined.

This has been adapted to suit the nature of Uttlesford. Service providers are finding three distinct groups that are hard-to-reach:

i) Minority Groups:

These can be marginalised, disadvantaged or socially excluded. The following examples are those that are commonly identified by government as 'hard to reach' groups. Although there is no suggestion that these all apply to the Uttlesford District, this list is simply an indication of where certain groups or communities may be classified as 'hard-to-reach' in certain circumstances.

This group usually encapsulates service users who are often linked to population characteristics, such as minority ethnic groups, the traveller community or asylum seekers. Examples might include:

- Ethnic minority groups, particularly those who do not speak English

ii) Slipping through the net:

These groups tend to be overlooked and can even be 'invisible'. Often these groups may find it hard to articulate needs. This includes those caring for others, those with mental health problems and people who fall between service providers or require services from numerous organisations to fulfil their needs. Other examples may include:

- People aged over 50 especially those who are housebound in rural areas
- Migrant workers
- Other ethnically distinct groups resident in the area

iii) The Service Resistant:

Those who are becoming, or already are, unwilling to engage with service providers because they are suspicious, over targeted or even disaffected.

These might include:

- Some people aged 11-19.

It should be recognised that those groups articulated above are not always hard to reach for all service providers. In some cases, one or two particular groups will be hard-to-reach, and for other services they will not. Regardless, engagement with hard-to-reach groups, whomever they may be, is a fundamental part of service delivery.