NYC Feedback

Citywide Customer Survey

Report of Survey Results
December 2008

Appendix A:
Survey and Reporting Methodology

Michael R. Bloomberg
Mayor, New York City

Betsy Gotbaum
Public Advocate, New York City

Edward Skyler
Deputy Mayor for Operations

Jeffrey A. Kay
Director, Mayor's Office of Operations

For more information about this report contact
the New York City Mayor's Office of Operations:

Jeffrey A. Kay, Director, Mayor's Office of Operations
Carole Post, Director, Agency Services
Emily Rubenstein, Senior Policy Advisor
Jeff Roth, Policy Advisor
Amy Forgacs, Senior Policy Analyst

The Mayor's Office of Operations
253 Broadway, 10th Floor
New York, New York 10007

For an electronic version of this report, please visit:
www.nyc.gov/operations

♻ Printed on paper containing 30% post-consumer material.

Contents

Tables

Overview

The NYC Feedback Citywide Survey was conducted from June 13, 2008 to August 15, 2008. The survey contained a total of 34 questions (some with multiple parts) and took approximately 15 minutes to complete. Surveys were distributed across all 59 community boards (CBs) so results would represent neighborhoods from all over the City.

A total of 24,339 surveys were completed by mail or online. An average of 4,439 residents from each borough completed the survey with highest percentage coming from Brooklyn (7,214 surveys) and the lowest percentage coming from Staten Island (1,138 surveys). Responses from CBs ranged from as many as 645 (for Queens Community Board #1) to as few as 253 (for Queens Community Board #12), and the average number of responses from each community boards was 376.

The NYC Feedback Citywide Survey and report of results was conducted by the Mayor's Office of Operations, the Office of the Public Advocate, The Fund for the City of New York and the team from National Research Center (NRC). NRC is a well-known and highly regarded citizen survey research firm that operates world wide, and has conducted hundreds of resident surveys in more than 40 states and abroad.

The NRC team included staff from NRC, as well as NRC senior fellow, Gregg VanRyzin of Rutgers University, Harry Hatry of the Urban Institute and Chris O'Brien and Neil Harrison of Diamond Consulting.

Developing the Questionnaire

The NYC Feedback Citywide Customer Survey was created as part of Mayor Bloomberg's performance management system. It was created to permit regular monitoring of residents' perspectives about the quality of life in New York City (NYC) and the quality of services provided. Stakeholders from the Mayor's Office of Operations, The Fund for The City of New York and the Public Advocate's office worked in partnership with survey consultants over a several week period to assure that critical services and characteristics of community quality were included in the survey. Emphasis was placed on including questions for a broad range of services so that many City agencies would gain reliable resident perspectives to help determine if the high quality of service delivery sought was being achieved.

Developing Survey Items

To determine which services should be covered in the survey, the survey team examined existing performance measures in the Mayor's Management Report and the Citywide Performance Reporting tool. In addition, the heads of City agencies and Ester Fuchs of Columbia University were consulted. The 2000 and 2001 New York City surveys of residents were also reviewed. Due to the large number of City agencies, not all could be included on the survey; therefore, certain services were excluded because they were either not direct services to New York City residents or would be unfamiliar to most residents.

The survey included three types of survey items, in addition to demographic questions:

1. Overall "citywide" perception of quality of life and City services
2. Satisfaction rating of particular City services and the living conditions affected by these services
3. Frequency of using a particular service, or if the respondent used the service at all

Response scales for evaluative items were created to have four points, avoiding a neutral medium. Nearly all evaluative items were on a scale of "excellent," "good," "fair" and "poor;" with a few items on a scale of "very safe," "somewhat safe," "somewhat unsafe" and "very unsafe." The survey contained a total of 121 items across 34 questions. The survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete

Pilot Testing

Special care was taken to ensure the layout of the survey was easy to read and that the order of the questions flowed in a way that would make sense to recipients. Once a final survey draft was developed it was translated into Spanish, Russian and Chinese. Pilot testing in the form of one-on-one interviews was done with 24 residents across all five boroughs: 10 English speaking residents, four Spanish speaking residents, four Russian speaking residents, three Mandarin speaking residents and three Cantonese speaking residents.

Half of the interviews were conducted by allowing the participant to complete the survey on their own. The interviewer then asked the participant a series of questions about specific items on the survey. The other half of interviews were conducted through a "think aloud" process where participants provided feedback to the interviewer and answered interviewer questions as

they took the survey. All participants were asked if they felt anything was missing from the survey, if anything was asked that should not have been asked and what they thought of the overall look and flow of the survey.

Spanish, Russian and Chinese pilot tests were completed May 20 and 21, and English interviews were conducted on May 16, 2008. Feedback from the survey indicated a few minor changes to the survey including specifying time of day riding the subway, removing public health-related acronyms and clarifying that all five boroughs were included when asking about "New York City." The Chinese interviews also uncovered the need to provide the survey in both traditional and simplified Chinese.

Selecting Survey Recipients

"Sampling" refers to the method by which survey recipients are chosen. A "sample" is a subgroup of all potential respondents in the population, selected randomly so that their average results are characteristic of the whole. In this way, a random sample helps ensure that the results can be generalized to all adult citizens in the population. There are three important criteria for doing this:

1. That each adult in the population has a chance of being included in the sample.
2. That the number of selected respondents is large enough, as shown by a statistical analysis of the reliability of results.
3. That the respondents be statistically representative of the whole City, in terms of such characteristics as their demographics and their locations, distributed throughout each community board (CB).

A key objective of this survey was to state results reliably within every CB. Therefore a goal of 18,000 respondents citywide was set to help achieve a minimum of 250 responses in each CB.

Selecting Households

All households located in New York City were eligible for the survey. Because local governments generally do not have inclusive lists of all the residences in the jurisdiction (tax assessor and utility billing databases often omit rental units), lists from the United States Postal Service (USPS), updated every three months, usually provide the best representation of all households in a specific geographic location. The survey consultants used the USPS data to select the sample of households.

A larger list than needed was sampled (a total of 258,536 addresses), so that a process referred to as "geocoding" could be used to eliminate addresses from the list that were outside the study boundaries and to assign each address to one of the 59 CBs. Geocoding is a computerized process in which addresses are compared to electronically mapped boundaries and coded as inside or outside these boundaries. The survey mapping team used Geosupport Desktop Edition™ in the geocoding process. In addition to eliminating addresses outside the New York City boundaries, two other types of addresses were eliminated from the final list before sampling: first, all multi-family units that did not have unique addresses for each unit were removed because it would not be possible to randomly select a unit/household, making it impossible to ensure the survey was delivered to the same unit for each survey contact; second, all PO Boxes were removed from the list because PO Boxes typically belong to residents who either also have a home address (meaning they could be selected twice) or to businesses (who were not eligible for the resident survey). Households were then randomly selected from within each CB.

Sample Size by Community Board

The target number of households to be reached in each CB was determined separately, projecting response rates based on poverty rates, so that the minimum number of respondents would be attained in each case. The use of poverty rates is a proxy for the many characteristics than can influence response rates. Large initial samples were selected from CBs with higher

poverty rates than from CBs with lower poverty rates, because residents of lower income typically respond at lower rates to surveys than do those of higher income. The overall response rate for the City was assumed to be between 15% and 20% because surveys from larger cities are classically lower than those from smaller communities. The table below shows the assumed response rate for each poverty level rate and the corresponding number of households sampled.

Table 1: Number of Households Sampled by Community Board

Percent of Residents in Community Board Below the Poverty Rate*	Estimated Response Rate in Community Board	Number of Households Sampled in Community Board
Less than 11%	25%	1,200
11 to 17%	20%	1,500
18 to 24%	15%	2,000
25% or higher	10%	3,000

**Source: Population Division, NYC Department of City Planning 2006 American Community Survey*

A total of 112,500 households were randomly selected to receive the survey. Each survey was given a unique ID. This ID served three purposes. First, the ID acted as a password for the Web survey. This ensured that only residents who were randomly selected to complete the survey had access to the Web survey. Second, it allowed the dataset to be cleaned of any duplicate responses. Because each household selected received the survey in the mail twice and could take the survey online a household could potentially submit three surveys. By placing IDs on the survey, all duplicate IDs could be removed. Finally, the ID helped the survey consultants to look at results by geography. The IDs indicated respondents' boroughs and CBs. This allows the City to look at how, for example, respondents in Brooklyn CB 1 felt about quality of life in NYC.

Selecting the Individual

An individual within each household also was randomly selected to complete the survey using the birthday method. The birthday method selects an adult within the household by requesting that "the adult (18 years or older) in your household who most recently had a birthday" complete the questionnaire. The underlying assumption in this method is that day of birth has no relationship to the way people respond to surveys. This instruction was contained in the cover letter accompanying the questionnaire.

Supplementing the Sample

The NYC Feedback Citywide Survey aimed to receive at least 250 completed surveys from each CB so that the margin of error would be no more than plus or minus 6%. Using the first 7,000 surveys collected the survey consultants estimated how many additional households would need to be surveyed to each this desired target, if any. An additional sample of 24,142 households was pulled using the methods described previously, and all addresses were checked against the previous mailing to ensure no household was selected more than once.

Survey Administration and Response

Each selected household was contacted four times. First, a prenotification announcement, informing the household members that they had been selected to participate in the NYC Feedback Citywide Customer Survey, was sent. This announcement contained a detachable postage-paid postcard that residents could mail back to the survey consultants if they wanted to receive the survey in Spanish, Russian, Simplified Chinese or Traditional Chinese.

Approximately one week after mailing the prenotification, each household was mailed a survey containing a cover letter signed by Mayor Bloomberg and Public Advocate Gotbaum requesting participation. The cover letter provided respondents with a Web address (or URL) where they could go to complete the survey, as well as a unique ID to allow them access to the survey. At the top of the cover letter a message in Spanish, Russian, Simplified Chinese and Traditional Chinese asked residents to turn the cover letter over. On the back of the cover letter a brief message in each of the four languages explained the survey and instructed residents:

> *We want to hear from you! The City of New York is providing you with an important opportunity to tell us what you think about the Ctiy's service delivery and how you view the quality of life in New York. Your household was randomly selected to participate in this survey, and your opinion is important to us.*
>
> *If you are unable to complete the enclosed survey in English, you may have a friend or family member help you with it, and return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.*
>
> *If you would like to receive a copy of the survey in* [corresponding language], *you may call* [a toll free number]. *You will be requested to leave a message with your address and a* [corresponding survey] *version of the survey will be mailed to you. You can also take the survey in* [corresponding language] *online. Just go to* [Web address for corresponding language] *and enter your unique Password. Your password can be found at the top of the previous page.*
>
> *All of the responses are completely confidential, and will be reported in group form only.*
>
> *Thank You.*

The packet also contained a postage paid return envelope in which the survey recipients could return the completed questionnaire directly to the survey consultants. A reminder letter and survey was scheduled to arrive one week after the first survey. The second cover letter was identical to the first cover letter, except that it asked those who had not completed the survey to do so and those who had already done so to refrain from turning in another survey. A reminder postcard encouraging residents who had not completed the survey to please complete it was sent one week after the second survey packet, and was the final contact. The reminder postcard also contained the Web address where residents could complete the survey and the residents' unique ID to log in and complete the survey.

The mailings were sent in late June through the end of July. Completed surveys were collected over an eight week period. Of the 135,171 households received a survey, 24,339 completed the survey (22,193 by mail and 2,146 via the Web), providing a response rate of 18%.

Margin of Error

The margin of error (or confidence interval) quantifies the "sampling error" or precision of the estimates made from the survey results. The margin of error (at the 95% confidence level) can be calculated for any sample size, and indicates that in 95 of 100 surveys conducted like this one, the margin of error (confidence interval) contains the true result that would be found if everyone in the population of interest had been surveyed. The practical difficulties of conducting any resident survey may introduce other sources of error in addition to sampling error. Despite best efforts to boost participation and ensure potential inclusion of all households, some selected households will inevitably decline participation in the survey (referred to as non-response error) and some eligible households may be unintentionally excluded from the listed sources for the sample (referred to as coverage error).

The margin of error for specific subgroups analyzed for this report are listed in the table below.

Table 2: Margins of Error for Respondent Subgroups

Results for Each	Sample Size Range	Margin of Error
Citywide	24,339	+/- 1%
Borough	1,138 – 7,214	+/- 3%
Community board	253 – 645	+/- 6%
Gender	8,824 – 14,389	+/- 1%
Age	4,059 – 10,179	+/- 2%
Household income	1,138 – 5,948	+/- 3%
Ethnicity	4,630 – 18,441	+/- 1%
Race	2,106 – 11,255	+/- 2%
Preferred first language (*English, Spanish, Russian and Chinese*)	520 – 18,129	+/- 4%
User Questions (*respondents who did/did not use a service within the past 12 months*)	530 – 15,969	+/- 4%
Length of residency (*less than 5 years, 5 to 9 years, 10 to 14 years, 15 to 24 years, 25 to 39 years, 40 years or more*)	1,447 – 9,862	+/- 3%
Presence of children in household (*none, one, two, three or more*)	1,075 – 16,439	+/- 3%
Living in public housing (*yes, living in New York City public housing; yes, receiving a rent subsidy, like Section 8; No)*	1,875 – 19,002	+/- 2%

Data Entry

Mailed surveys were returned via postage-paid business reply envelopes to a NYC address. Each survey was electronically scanned as an image and stored as its own individual electronic file.

Once all surveys were scanned, they were entered into an electronic dataset. Each survey image was reviewed and "cleaned" as necessary. For example, a question may have asked a respondent to pick two items out of a list of five, but the respondent checked three; the survey consultants randomly select two of the three selected items to be coded in the dataset. The entered data was subject to a data entry protocol of "key and verify," in which survey data were entered twice into an electronic dataset and then compared. Discrepancies were evaluated against the stored image of the survey form and corrected.

Surveys taken online were automatically stored into an electronic dataset as respondents completed their surveys. The survey consultants then downloaded the data and merged it with data received from the mail survey. The combined dataset was checked for duplicate IDs. When duplicates were found, a priority was established that kept the first survey submitted by mail (if both submitted by mail) or the first survey submitted via the Web (if both submitted online), and then kept a mailed survey over a Web survey.

Range checks as well as other forms of quality control were performed on the final combined dataset, ensuring that any invalid values are identified and corrected. Discrepancies were evaluated against the stored image of the survey form and corrected.

Finally, IDs were linked to respondent addresses. These addresses were geocoded at the Census Block level. After Census Block was identified for each response, addresses were removed from the dataset to ensure confidentiality.

Survey Analysis

Weighting the Data

Weighting is used to compensate for uneven sample selection probabilities and uneven survey response rates within certain demographic subgroups or geographic regions.

An example of how weighting works may be helpful. Hypothetically, suppose the population norm for males versus females was 50%/50%, but 70% of the surveys received were from females, and 30% were from males. The weights that would need to be applied to make the sample representative of the population would be 0.7143 for females (thereby giving each response less weight in the overall ratings) and 1.6667 for males (giving each response more weight overall). Further suppose that these two groups had very different ratings of parks; females felt very favorably, giving a rating on average of 80 on a 100-point scale, and males felt much less favorable, giving an average rating of 40 on a 100-point scale. Given that there were more responses from females, if the results were NOT weighted, the user of the data would be left with a rosier picture of the perception of parks by New York City residents than if the dat were weighted. The unweighted average rating would be 68 on a 100-point scale (80x70%+40x30%), while the weighted average would be 60 on a 100-point scale (80x50%+40x50%).

Table 3: Hypothetical Weighting of Survey Results by Gender

Characteristic	Percent in Population	Percent in Sample	Weight	Unweighted Rating of Parks	Weighted Rating of Parks
Females	50%	70%	0.7143	80	80
Males	50%	30%	1.6667	40	40
TOTAL	100%	100%	----	68	60

The demographic characteristics of the survey sample were compared to those found in the 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates for adults within the City's CBs. Sample results were weighted using ACS population norms to reflect the appropriate percent of those residents in each CB's population. Other discrepancies between the whole population and the sample were also aided by the weighting due to the intercorrelation of many socioeconomic characteristics.

The variables used for weighting were age, sex and race. A second tier of weighting was applied where results were adjusted so each CB would be weighted to reflect its correct proportion of the entire City.

The results of the weighting scheme are presented in the following table; the right most column shows the actual weight assigned to responses from each subgroup of respondents.

Table 4: New York City Citizen Survey Weighting Table

Demographic Characteristic	2006 American Community Survey Data	Unweighted Survey Data	Weighted Survey Data
Gender (of Adults age 18+)			
Male	46.6%	38.1%	46.5%
Female	53.4%	61.9%	53.5%
Age			
18-34 years old	32.3%	17.6%	31.9%
35-54 years old	38.7%	38.9%	38.8%
55 years or older	29.1%	43.5%	29.3%
Race/Ethnicity (of Adults age 18+)			
White, Non-Hispanic	37.4%	43.8%	39.3%
Black	23.9%	21.4%	20.8%
Hispanic	25.8%	20.0%	22.8%
Other	12.9%	14.7%	17.0%

Table 4: New York City Citizen Survey Weighting Table (continued)

Demographic Characteristic	2006 American Community Survey Data	Unweighted Survey Data	Weighted Survey Data
Community Board (of Adults age 18+)			
Manhattan CB #1&#2	2.1%	3.0%	2.1%
Manhattan CB #3	2.4%	1.8%	2.4%
Manhattan CB #4&#5	1.9%	2.9%	1.9%
Manhattan CB #6	2.0%	1.5%	2.0%
Manhattan CB #7	2.8%	1.6%	2.8%
Manhattan CB #8	2.9%	1.5%	2.9%
Manhattan CB #9	1.6%	2.4%	1.6%
Manhattan CB #10	1.4%	2.3%	1.4%
Manhattan CB #11	1.5%	2.3%	1.6%
Manhattan CB #12	2.6%	1.6%	2.6%
Bronx CB #1&#2	1.5%	3.6%	1.6%
Bronx CB #3&#6	1.6%	3.5%	1.6%
Bronx CB #4	1.4%	1.6%	1.3%
Bronx CB #5	1.4%	1.7%	1.4%
Bronx CB #7	1.4%	1.8%	1.4%
Bronx CB #8	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%
Bronx CB #9	2.1%	1.6%	2.1%
Bronx CB #10	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
Bronx CB #11	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%
Bronx CB #12	1.7%	1.2%	1.6%
Brooklyn CB #1	1.6%	2.2%	1.7%
Brooklyn CB #2	1.4%	2.1%	1.5%
Brooklyn CB #3	1.4%	2.2%	1.4%
Brooklyn CB #4	1.4%	1.8%	1.4%
Brooklyn CB #5	1.7%	2.2%	1.8%
Brooklyn CB #6	1.4%	1.8%	1.4%
Brooklyn CB #7	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%
Brooklyn CB #8	1.5%	1.8%	1.5%
Brooklyn CB #9	1.3%	1.6%	1.3%
Brooklyn CB #10	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%
Brooklyn CB #11	2.2%	1.7%	2.2%
Brooklyn CB #12	1.6%	1.7%	1.6%
Brooklyn CB #13	1.4%	1.9%	1.4%
Brooklyn CB #14	1.9%	1.5%	1.9%
Brooklyn CB #15	1.9%	1.6%	1.9%
Brooklyn CB #16	1.2%	2.1%	1.2%
Brooklyn CB #17	1.7%	1.2%	1.7%
Brooklyn CB #18	2.4%	1.5%	2.4%
Queens CB #1	2.4%	2.9%	2.5%
Queens CB #2	1.7%	1.5%	1.7%
Queens CB #3	2.2%	1.6%	2.2%
Queens CB #4	1.7%	1.4%	1.7%
Queens CB #5	2.2%	1.5%	2.1%
Queens CB #6	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
Queens CB #7	3.2%	1.4%	3.3%
Queens CB #8	1.8%	1.5%	1.8%
Queens CB #9	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%
Queens CB #10	1.5%	1.2%	1.5%
Queens CB #11	1.5%	1.7%	1.5%
Queens CB #12	2.5%	1.1%	2.4%
Queens CB #13	2.6%	1.4%	2.6%
Queens CB #14	1.3%	1.5%	1.3%
Staten Island CB #1	2.0%	1.8%	2.0%
Staten Island CB #2	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%
Staten Island CB #3	2.1%	1.6%	2.1%

Analyzing the Data

Survey Results

The combined electronic dataset (mail data and Web data) was analyzed by the survey consultants using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A complete set of frequencies for each survey question including "don't know" responses and the percent who did not answer the question is presented in Appendix B and a complete set of frequencies excluding "don't know" responses and those who did not answer the question can be found in Appendix C.

Also included are results by respondent characteristics. Results by respondent characteristics can be found in the technical appendices: The complete inventory of technical appendices produced for this project is listed below:

- A: Survey and Reporting Methodology
- B: Frequency of Responses to All Questions (with Don't Knows and No Responses Included)
- C: Frequency of Responses to All Questions (with Don't Knows and No Responses Removed)
- D: Summary of Responses to "Most Important Issues" Facing the City
- E: Customer Service Ratings by Type of Service
- F: Service ratings by Users
- G: Rating of Services by Preferred Language
- H: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Race/Ethnicity
- I: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Household Income
- J: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Age
- K: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Gender
- L: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Length of Residency
- M: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Primary Language
- N: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Presence of Children in Household
- O: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Public Housing Residency
- P: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Borough
- Q1: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Community Board (Manhattan)
- Q2: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Community Board (Bronx)
- Q3: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Community Board (Brooklyn)
- Q4: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Community Board (Queens)
- Q5: Responses to Selected Survey Results by Community Board (Staten Island)
- R: Maps of Selected Survey Results by Community Board

Indices

Creating an index score provides a way to look at a summary of data for each topic area. Items were grouped into indices based on the extent to which they appeared to share a common theme. Reliability analysis of the indices was used to confirm that each had an acceptable level of internal consistency when the items were grouped together. This is generally measured by Cronbach's alpha, a statistic that measures the extent to which question items within a scale measure the same construct. While there are no hard and fast rules about what levels of Cronbach's alpha are acceptable, one author has proposed that levels "of 0.70 or more are generally accepted as representing good reliability" (Litwin, MS., *How to measure survey*

reliability and validity. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1995), while another states that "[a]s a general rule, we believe that reliabilities should not be below 0.80 for widely used scales" (Carmines, EG, Zeller, RA. *Reliability and validity assessment*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications; 1979). All of the factors had an internal consistency of 0.63 or above. Factor analyses were also run on each index, to examine the "factor loadings" (a measure of the contribution of each item to the index) for each item. The "factor loadings" for each item were 0.30 or above in the final set of indices.

The following table shows the items that comprise each of the composite ratings and the factor loadings, as well as the Cronbach's alpha.

Table 5: Statistical Properties of the Indices

Index	Survey Item Number	Item Wording	Factor Loading	Cronbach's alpha
Customer Service Index	q14a	Timeliness of response	0.654	0.842
	q14b	Employee's courtesy	0.740	
	q14c	Employee's willingness to help or understand	0.819	
	q14d	Overall customer service	0.871	
	q14e	Overall satisfaction with response	0.795	
	q6a*	NYC.gov, the City website (*users only)	0.231	
	q10aa	3-1-1 services	0.364	
Health Services Clients Index	q10ii	Public hospital services	0.898	0.929
	q10jj	Public health clinic services	0.861	
	q10kk	Public mental health services	0.949	
	q10ll	Public substance abuse services	0.792	
Social Support Services Index	q6h	Public housing in the City overall	0.664	0.821
	q6i	Public assistance (such as Medicaid, food stamps, etc.)	0.673	
	q6j	Services addressing homelessness	0.756	
	q6k	Availability of youth employment programs	0.707	
	q6l	Services protecting children at risk of abuse and neglect	0.657	
Human Services Clients Index	q10gg	Public community center	0.849	0.890
	q10mm	Public senior center	0.867	
	q10nn	Other public senior services	0.849	
	q10oo	Medicaid services	0.724	

Table 5: Statistical Properties of the Indices (continued)

Index	Survey Item Number	Item Wording	Factor Loading	Cronbach's alpha
Public Education Index	q6c	Public education (kindergarten – 12th grade)	0.765	0.737
	q6d	Public after-school programs	0.765	
Public School Users Index	q10cc	New York City Public Schools	0.806	0.716
	q10dd	Student safety at public schools	0.622	
	q10ee	Public School after-school programs	0.624	
Cleaning and Maintenance Index	q4a	Cleanliness of your neighborhood	0.566	0.699
	q4c	Household garbage pick-up in your neighborhood	0.601	
	q4d	Recycling services in your neighborhood	0.552	
	q4e	Rat control in your neighborhood	0.561	
	q4f	Graffiti control in your neighborhood	0.490	
	q4l	Condition of street trees in your neighborhood	0.372	
	q4m	Storm water drainage and sewer maintenance in your neighborhood	0.400	
Streets and Sidewalks Index	q4b	Removal of snow from city streets in your neighborhood	0.394	0.686
	q4g	Parking enforcement in your neighborhood	0.443	
	q4h	Availability of cultural activities in your neighborhood	0.709	
	q4i	Neighborhood parks	0.710	
	q4j	Neighborhood playgrounds	0.461	
	q4k	Public libraries in your neighborhood	0.400	
Community Amenities Index	q5e	Availability of cultural activities in your neighborhood	0.441	0.698
	q5f	Neighborhood parks	0.872	
	q5ee	Neighborhood playgrounds	0.866	
	q5ff	Public libraries in your neighborhood	0.324	
Mass Transit Index	q4o	Bus services in your neighborhood	0.605	0.774
	q4p	Subway services in your neighborhood	0.632	
	q4q	Bus services in the City overall	0.742	
	q5g	Subway services in the City overall	0.746	
Neighborhood Public Safety Index	q5a	Fire protection services in your neighborhood	0.617	0.685
	q5b	Emergency medical services in your neighborhood	0.679	
	q5c	Police-Community relations in your neighborhood	0.611	
	q5d	Crime control in your neighborhood	0.622	
Citywide Public Safety Index	q5aa	Fire protection services in the City overall	0.518	0.632
	q5bb	Emergency medical services in the City overall	0.593	
	q5cc	Police-Community relations in the City overall	0.617	
	q5dd	Crime control in the City overall	0.601	
	q7b	Prepares the city for an emergency	0.518	

The index scores presented in the body of the report represent the average percent of respondents reporting "excellent," "good," or "fair" for each question included in the index. A different number of respondents may have answered each question included in an index, so the resulting index score is actually a "weighted" average, weighted based on the number of respondents providing an evaluation for each item.

An example computation for the Health Services Clients Index is shown below, where very different number of respondents gave evaluations for each item, as each evaluation was given only by users of the services:

Items	Number of Respondents Rating the Item	Percent Rating: Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Public hospital services	8,888	11%	36%	34%	19%
Public health clinic services	5,534	12%	41%	32%	15%
Public mental health services	1,304	17%	33%	29%	21%
Public substance abuse services	468	19%	29%	29%	22%
Health Services Clients Index Ratings Computation		11% x 8,888 + 12% x 5,534 + 17% x 1,304 + 19% x 468 =1952.36 ÷ 16,194* **=12%**	36% x 8,888 + 41% x 5,534 + 33% x 1,304 + 29% x 468 = 6034.66 ÷ 16,194* **=38%**	34% x 8,888 + 32% x 5,534 + 29% x 1,304 + 29% x 468 = 5306.68 ÷ 16,194* **=33%**	19% x 8,888 + 15% x 5,534 + 21% x 1,304 + 22% x 468 = 2895.62 ÷ 16,194* **=17%**
Health Services Clients Index Score Computation				**12(%) +38(%) +33(%) =73**	

**This number is the sum of the number of responses for each of the four items – i.e., 8,888+5,534+1,304+468.*

This page intentionally left blank.