

Challenge for Change

Outcomes and Recommendations



	What is the C4C Judgement?	What evidence do we have to support that judgement?	What impact is this having on customers?	What is our recommendation?
1	Poor service in the eyes of customers, staff and most managers (SH) but PPR took a different view	Surveys Neighbourhood TARA Customer Interviews Customer satisfaction Feedback to TARAs Complaints Focus Groups	<p>Note – these impacts are both specific to issues to the left but many are cross cutting so they are grouped.</p> <p>Lack of tenant satisfaction with the service</p> <p>Environment looks neglected</p> <p>Poor image of SH land and estates</p> <p>Tenants not getting what they pay for</p> <p>More complaints than you would expect</p>	<p>R1. Find out how other RSLs perform and compare best practice / achieve their standards</p> <p>R2. PPR work to gain familiarity with all SH sites that they work on</p> <p>R3 Grounds maintenance should be based on Housing Area boundaries as opposed to Community Assembly boundaries</p> <p>R4 Weed spraying should be done twice as opposed to once a year</p>
2	Standards not adhered to and they are not high enough. There is a lack of tenant input to these standards	Surveys Neighbourhood TARA Customer Interviews Customer satisfaction Feedback to TARAs Complaints Focus Groups	<p>Knock on effects –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents lack pride in their areas and start to neglect their own gardens • Additional fly tipping • More littering etc • General deterioration open space <p>Not best use of money and resources</p>	<p>R5 Review and rewrite the SLA with customer input to ensure it is clear and unambiguous and to make clear the distinction between a contract and an agreement</p>
3	There is a lack of adequate communication	Interviews with staff and managers at both SH and PPR Lack of mutual understanding	<p>Duplication – and sometimes triplication – of resource use and unneeded effort required</p> <p>Lack of trust between tenants and their landlord</p>	<p>R6 Better communication</p> <p>Between SH teams</p> <p>Between PPR teams</p> <p>Between SH and PPR</p> <p>Between Area staff and their Estate Teams</p> <p>Between Area teams and TARAs</p> <p>Ensures all required delegates attend meetings</p>

	What is the C4C Judgement?	What evidence do we have to support that judgement?	What impact is this having on customers?	What is our recommendation?
4	The service is not monitored correctly / effectively / consistently	Lack of standard monitoring forms Lack of standard monitoring Interviews with managers	Confusion and envy with customers not in pilot areas SLA not being delivered so leads to different expectations and interpretations SH estate staff deflected from other tasks and workload with no compensation to SH	R7 Develop and implement a new monitoring system that ensures It is independent Avoids duplication Consistent application A clear monitoring form for Tenant Inspectors The use of area staff The use of TARAs
5	Incorrect /outdated information being used e.g. the mapping system	Interviews with staff and operatives using the Confirm system Tenant Inspectors	Confused Tenant Inspectors – and a lack of effectiveness with a lack of consistency across all areas A lack of clarity on whether value is actually being achieved	R8 Update the Confirm mapping system so all areas can be confident that sites actually exist and that charges are not being made for non existent ones
6	The Service Level Agreement (SLA) is not clear	This is our interpretation	More active Councillor involvement	R5 Review and rewrite the SLA with customer input to ensure it is clear and unambiguous and to make clear the distinction between a contract and an agreement
7	The service is poor Value for Money	Interview with Finance Manager Lack of audit trail Not businesslike Not enough financial rigour Staffing levels vary across areas		R9 An urgent review of pricing mechanisms for different tasks / types of work R10 Payments should be made on a “per cut “ basis and not by “grass height” R11 Enforce the SLA or invoke a penalty clause for work either not done to standard or work not done at all. Allow SH to concentrate on it’s own work and recharge PPR where it does work they should have done

	What is the C4C Judgement?	What evidence do we have to support that judgement?	What impact is this having on customers?	What is our recommendation?
8	It is unclear what the pilot schemes achieve	Staff and manager interviews Lack of information Lack of tenant awareness that things are changing Mixed communication to TARAs Extra cost of SE pilot Continuation seems political not practical		R12 That the service take account of the various pilot schemes and make a prompt decision to ensure Indefinite pilots should be avoided and a city-wide standard needs to be developed Decision on which section will lead on grounds maintenance That C4C are involved in the evaluation of the NE pilot That tenants are involved in pilots
9	SH Estate Teams are responsive but why do they need to do some of their work anyway ? They are accessible to tenants and TARAs, but unrepresented areas suffer	Personal observations Staff interviews Focus groups		R11 Enforce the SLA or invoke a penalty clause for work either not done to standard or work not done at all. Allow SH to concentrate on it's own work and recharge PPR where it does work they should have done R13 Review of SH staffing resources and how they are applied across SH areas
10	Tenants are unclear about what open space is actually managed by SH	Tenant feedback Surveys – as above		R14 Provide up to date maps to TARAs R15 Provide up to date maps in Area offices

	What is the C4C Judgement?	What evidence do we have to support that judgement?	What impact is this having on customers?	What is our recommendation?
11	Tenant Inspectors could be used more effectively / efficiently / consistently across areas	Meeting with Tenant Inspectors Personal information Surveys Meeting with Housing Coordinator at East Area. Lack of audit trail and report back mechanism to Tenant Inspectors		R16 Better use of Tenant Inspectors ensuring That they receive regular feedback That they work consistently Their numbers and role are enhanced
12	Costings / finance pricing structures are dated	Interviews Desktop analysis of financial information Managers accepting things have gone stale		R9 An urgent review of pricing mechanisms for different tasks / types of work
13	Relying on PPR to monitor their own performance seems wrong	SLA analysis / critique Manager interviews		R7 Develop and implement a new monitoring system that ensures It is independent Avoids duplication Consistent application A clear monitoring form for Tenant Inspectors The use of area staff The use of TARAs
14	Allowing PPR to tender and market test the service seems wrong	Discussion with Finance Manager SLA analysis / critique		R17 SH and not PPR should conduct any "market testing" and tendering

This page is intentionally left blank