

# Stakeholders Election Survey 2009

These are the results of the Stakeholders Election Survey 2009. Survey forms were sent to 36 Candidates, Party Workers and Election Agents, following the European Parliamentary Election and the Staffordshire County Council election on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2009, 14 were returned (39%). Please find the results of the survey below.

## **SECTION 1 – Staff**

1. Conduct – Of the 14 Surveys received 100% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0	0	14
0%	0%	100%

2. Efficiency – Of the 14 Surveys received, 100% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0	0	14
0%	0%	100%

3. Helpfulness – Of the 14 surveys received, 100% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0	0	14
0%	0%	100%

4. Availability – Of the 14 surveys received, 100% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0	0	14
0%	0%	100%

### Comments

- All helpful
- They provided a good service
- Efficient, polite, courteous
- All fine
- Excellent as ever

## **SECTION 2 – Information**

1. The nomination pack – Of the 14 Surveys received, 93% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0	0	13
0%	0%	100%

2. Other Council communication on elections – Of the 14 surveys received, 93% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0	0	13
0%	0%	100%

3. The quality of information provided – Of the 14 surveys received, 93% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	0 0%	13 100%

4. Electoral forms – Of the 14 surveys received, 93% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	0 0%	13 100%

5. Candidate/Agents Briefing (if attended)? – Of the 14 surveys received, 64% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	1 11%	8 89%

#### Comments

- Much improved from District elections 2 years ago
- Session was good but the meeting did not deal with the issue of posters. I did not feel a conclusion was reached.
- I did not hear about the briefing.

### **SECTION 3 – Website**

1. Ease of finding electoral information – Of the 14 surveys received, 43% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	2 20%	4 80%

2. How useful was the information – Of the 14 surveys, 43% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	0 0%	6 100%

#### Comments

- Much improved, again
- I have no need to use the internet for information
- Main page icon to election guides
- A little difficult to find

#### **SETION 4 – Council Accommodation**

1. Accessibility – Of the 14 surveys received, 86% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	2 16%	10 84%

2. Facilities provided – Of the 14 surveys received, 86% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	1 8%	11 92%

#### **SECTION 5 – Poll Cards**

1. Did you find the poll cards clear and easy to understand? – Of the 14 surveys received, 93% answered

Yes	No
13 100%	0 0%

2. Was it helpful that the absent vote deadline and despatch dates were included? – Of the 14 surveys received, 86% answered

Yes	No
12 100%	0 0%

3. Did you think it was helpful that a polling station map was included? – Of the 14 surveys we received, 100% answered

Yes	No
14 100%	0 0%

Comments

- Polling cards to have the name of candidates names included?

#### **SECTION 6 – Postal and Proxy Voting**

1. The postal-poll card information sent to postal voters – Of the 14 surveys received 43% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	2 33%	4 67%

2. The postal vote pack – Of the 14 surveys received 36% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	2 40%	3 60%

3. The postal vote application form – Of the 14 surveys received 43 answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	2 33%	4 67%

4. The proxy vote application form – Of the 14 surveys received 36% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	2 40%	3 60%

Comments

- Some postal voters did not receive cards
- May be a little difficult for older voters
- It said fold once but this was impossible because of size of paper (**Note – EU ballot paper was large and had to be folded several times to fit in the envelope folder – Will review for the next EU election – ARO/DRO**)

## SECTION 7 – Polling Stations

1. Friendliness/helpfulness of staff – Of the 14 surveys received 100% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%0	0 0%	14 100%

2. Accessibility – Of the 14 surveys received 93% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	1 8%	12 92%

3. Overall Suitability – Of the 14 surveys received 100% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	1 7%	13 93%

Comments

- Codsall Methodist church needs better signs to rear rooms
- Is it essential to close Birches First School? Perhaps more voters would vote if they were taking children to school
- No concerns

## SECTION 8 – The Count(s)

1. How will do you feel the Thursday night count was organised? – Of the 14 surveys received 86% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
1 8%	4 33%	7 59%

2. How well do you think the Sunday European count was organised? – Of the 14 surveys received 14% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
0 0%	0 0%	2 100%

3. Do you think you were kept informed about the process? – Of the 14 surveys received 79% answered

Poor 1-3	Average 4-7	Good-Excellent 8-10
1 9%	1 9%	9 82%

#### Comments

- Have the larger counts held at another venue or the next day
- The count on Thursday/Friday was let down by poor planning of the European verification (**Note – Verified European and counted all County Council Divisions on the evening. In hindsight the large multi-member Division would have been better completed on the Friday. DRO/ARO**)
- There was a problem caused by having two different types of election on the same day, especially European (**Note – Large European ballot paper was difficult to handle and we had two ballot boxes for 60% of the polling stations. Also a greater need for accuracy due is the European count method. ARO/DRO**)
- Count to take place Friday morning not Thursday night
- Count process was not totally open and available to candidates (**Note – The ARO/DRO explained the procedure at the start of the count. We propose to provide a written note on the procedure to be given out at the count entrance and also provide this with the count ticket letter. ARO/DRO**)
- Whole count process should be open
- It was incredibly dark when we left the Wombourne count at around 2am, there is a danger of tripping (**Note – High School lighting is on a fixed timer. We will investigate over-riding this for the next elections at this venue. ARO/DRO**)

### **SECTION 9 – Engagement with the public**

#### Comments

- Large coloured poster reminders to widen press coverage
- Registration is high
- Poor turnout due to behaviour of MP's and anti Europe position of the majority of the electorate
- Year round publicity not just at election time – Public posters in libraries etc to show what each council does/ responsibilities and budgets. Encourage attendance of meeting to see councillors in action – Perhaps by contacting appropriate local groups

**Analysed by the Deputy/Acting Returning Officer  
September 2009.**