

KLOE 6: Tenancy and Estate Management

6.1.1 **How effectively does the organisation communicate with its service users and stakeholders about tenancy and estate management issues?**

Improvements since 2006 review (fair) are a result of Mary Gober training, UH upgrade (giving us more IT functionality), feedback framework, development of focus groups.

Training and UH is moving us towards a greater user focus and providing staff with the tools to deal with enquiries. Mystery shopping is testing this.

Feedback framework and focus groups give a great deal more structure to canvassing customers views. The Status survey in 2007 demonstrated improved confidence that customers feel their views are taken into account.

Issues for service review

Hard to reach users – we monitor involvement but little to pro-actively seeks views. Possibility to extend mystery shopping, maybe using the customer care model of involving focus group in targeted telephone surveys.

Use of tenancy audits to canvass views?

New tenants an identified hard to reach group

Should our goal be to deal with queries by the person answering the phone, by the end of the call? How to define – and what targets?

Current position - good

6.1.2 **How easily do service users access the service?**

Improvements since 2006 (fair) are primarily around UH upgrade which is enabling us to identify and record customers needs and preferences, empowering staff to deliver the right service.

There is still a way to go – embedding what this can achieve.

Mystery shopping is measuring this – and will be reporting shortly

Internally clearer at 'who does what', and Redletter articles featuring "teams" aimed at this becoming clearer for residents

Issues for service review

e-targets; developing wider methods of contact

Direct debit

Outcomes of mystery shopping should give us direction

Clarity for residents on who to contact – this could include issues above on enabling queries to be dealt with at first point of contact – to include use of direct line numbers. e mail addresses etc.

Current position – fair (rising)

6.1.3 How clear and comprehensive are service standards from a service users perspective?

Service standards have been set with good user involvement; we now need to monitor, publish these – this is in hand

Mystery shopping objective is to inform whether standards are known and achieved.

Issues for service review

Monitor progress on above

Current position – fair (but potentially excellent by year end)

6.1.4 How does the organisation consult with and respond to service users

Improvements since 2006 (fair) are the development of new complaints and compensation policies and the increased number of focus groups along with clarity as to their purpose. Monitoring of compensation now takes place, and we have made progress in the way we monitor and

learn from informal as well as formal complaints

Issues for service review

Feedback from estate inspections – we do these but only to a ‘fair’ standard at best?

How to use the tenancy management focus group; this has yet to be set up (one of the last) and the review could usefully help determine its role in relation to tenancy management issues.

Current position - good

6.1.5 **What service user satisfaction has been achieved in this area?**

Improvements since 2006 (fair): high satisfaction on void management. Reasonable satisfaction on nuisance/ASB and on complaints maintained (but ? usefulness of survey format).

STATUS satisfaction with area to live in good, and evidence of using the survey to determine strategic priorities (estate improvements focus on dogs and parking).

Feedback from surveys is going to focus groups to help determine service standards, and along with complaints feedback is being used internally for service improvement.

Issues for review

Evidencing the effectiveness of our complaints process

Set up and use the tenancy management focus group to look at standards for tenancy management (nb already have these for estate mgt and some tenancy issues eg ASB)

Current position - good

6.2.1 **How does the organisation respond to the diversity of its community to ensure all users have equal access to tenancy and estate management services?**

Similar position to 2006 (good): breakdown of residents exceeds ‘fair’ but not yet ‘excellent’: the census has improved this

Ditto communication methods

Translation and interpretation available: communications at group level improving but RHA provides training for staff, maintains register of large print needs

Communications methods has been a considerable improvement since 2006, database is better and work is underway to make use of the info.

Issues for service review

Set up systems for reporting demographics – we have more info but hard to report; why and how will we want to use it?

Follow up census

DV and harassment – a role for the focus group

Disabled access to common areas (perhaps linked with recycling and Status issues) is a key area for improvement.

Engagement with local communities on tenancy management matters

Current position - good

6.3.1 **Does the organisation comply with statutory and regulatory requirements in providing tenancy management services?**

Improved since 2006 (fair – but included much of 6.3.2 in 2006) by assurance that tenancy agreement complies with fair contract legislation. Also programmed update of handbook this year.

Issues for service review

Positive practice from CRE code and from DRC guide; we comply with both but there is little positive practice

Current position - good

6.3.2 **Has the organisation developed and promoted good quality tenancy management services which help to ensure tenancies are sustainable**

New since 2006 (but includes much of previous 6.3.1)
Good in relation to new tenancy work, and have achieved Respect standard. Close to excellence on service standards.

Issues for service review

Evaluate a reward and incentive scheme

Consider how we give advice about tenancy management issues and rights – is it consistent and given at first point of contact (see similar in customer care sections above); is the leaflet series appropriate – do we need more, how are they distributed

Particular issue on tenancy rights with tolerated trespassers.

Tenancy management focus group should be the focus for consultation on the issues here – succession, RTB, improvements etc.

Current position – fair to good

6.4.1.1 **Does the organisation have a holistic approach to tackling ASB**

Improvements since 2006 (good) are around sign up for Respect standard following external audit and action plan completion. Tenancy agreement has been reviewed, more use being made of injunctions, ABCs, able to demonstrate their effectiveness (case review meetings) and we have now publicised outcomes (a service standard).

Carrying out support assessments at start of tenancy.

Use of starter tenancies (effectiveness to be evaluated)

Issues for service review

ASB prevention

Current position – good plus

6.4.1.2 **Have effective partnership been formed at local levels?**

Still an area where “appropriateness” is an issue, given our geography but improvements since 2006 (good) are proactive adoption of common reporting system, and increased knowledge and use of multi agency

meetings in Bristol (evidenced with specific cases Hicks Court)

Issues for service review

None

Current position – good plus

6.4.2.1 **Does the organisation provide appropriate and sufficient support to victims and witnesses?**

Improvements since 2006 (fair)

Satisfaction survey suggests methods of reporting are easy.
Design and production of new, much more friendly, recording log.

Witness statement training – clear evidence this is welcomed by victims

Better at agreeing plans and actions with victims and at ‘progress reports’

Have worked proactively to support victims at court – eg Drummond case

Issues for service review

Measuring satisfaction

Clarity on how we agree actions – by letter rather than a formal plan.

Current position – fair but approaching good

6.4.2.2 **Does the organisation provide appropriate support to tackle causes of ASB.**

Improvements since 2006 (fair)

Development of Housing Support role to explicitly include support to perpetrators.

Can demonstrate linking enforcement to support (Coltman case)

Geography remains an issue

Issues for service review

Links to external support

Current position - good

6.4.3.1 **Does the organisation deal quickly and appropriately with all incidents of nuisance/ASB?**

Improvements from 2006 (fair)

Removal of graffiti now a service standard

Systematic and consistent working achieved through case review meetings

Meetings evidence use of an increased range of methods

Training for witness statements

Partnership working remains ad hoc to an extent that is inevitable for RHA

No issues for service review

Current position - good

6.5.1 **Does the organisation comply with statutory requirements and good practice in estate management?**

Improvements since 2006 (Good)

High satisfaction with neighbourhoods (Status survey)

Monitoring of service standards (inc graffiti)

Issues from status survey (dogs and parking) made estate improvement priorities

Continue effective management of abandoned vehicles, recycling etc.

No issues for service review

Current position – good

6.5.2 **Are estate grounds and other communal areas kept clean tidy and attractive by working with service users and external agencies**

New since 2006, but includes many elements of 6.5.1 above

Issues for service review

How to improve estate inspections – involving more residents, feeding back on outcomes – a role for new Hsg Officer?

Recycling – more progress

“Design out” crime – how to use estate inspects and estate improvement budget to address this

Current position - good

6.6.1 **How promptly are empty properties identified and re-let and is this in accordance with published procedures and service standards?**

Improvements since 2006 (good)

CBL schemes provide info about neighbourhood before letting

Tenancy audits

Focus group agree relet standard

Some excellent areas, including satisfaction, but relet time does not achieve target

Issues for service review

More local information at sign up

Information about refusals

Relet standard review – and include decent homes (new standard) commitment – possibly decent homes +

Current position - good

6.6.2 **Does the organisation have a strategic approach to tackling low demand and difficult to let property?**

No significant issues for RHA, but (perhaps because of that) refusal reasons collected but not monitored

Current position - good

6.7.1 **How do costs and standards of service compare with other similar services?**

PIs compare with top quartile benchmarks. Management costs compared with others and with Group. Costs not significantly higher.

Issues for service review

Review overall management costs with others

6.7.2 + 3 **Are costs commensurate with service delivery, performance and outcomes achieved. Does the organisation provide service users with accurate information on services**

Limited information on costs, and none provided to residents – a key issue for service review, as in 2006. More information about services is now provided – substantial changes to performance summary since 2006, and focus groups receive info – but little on costs.

Issues for service review

A key issue; how to demonstrate costs are commensurate with service delivery – how to provide info to residents

Current position - poor

6.7.4 **Are modern procurement methods and partnerships used**

Improvements since 2006 (fair)
Procurement officer in post (Group)

Joint procurement evaluated and in place : through Group with SCHAT (eg of FTA officer), Through RSL forums (eg of S.Glos mediation)

Training for witness statements

Issues for service review

How to demonstrate awareness of these issues

Need to consider individual functions and their cost/procurement

Current position – fair

6.7.5 **Do value for money considerations focus on costs and benefits to customers**

Evidence of analysis of cost/benefit in void management review, and in routine action plan reviews of new initiatives. Small size means c b analysis is usually more about use of fixed resources.

Service reviews carried out and aim to improve efficiency.

Issues for service review

Benchmarking services

How to demonstrate cost benefits of tenancy and estate management initiatives

How to demonstrate competitiveness and efficiency of service

Current position - fair