

Public Document Pack

Late information for Tenant Scrutiny Board on 13 November 2014

Pages 1-4: Agenda item 7: Performance information – Responses to questions asked by Board Members at the October meeting. Also attached is a ward summary of annual tenancy visit performance.

This page is intentionally left blank

Performance information

At the October meeting of Tenant Scrutiny Board, Board Members asked a series of questions arising from the performance information template that had been presented.

Responses to the questions have been provided as follows:

1. Why no target for % Decent Council Homes?

The decency indicator is presently being used as a Management Indicator rather than a Performance Indicator which is why there is no target. Due to changes made by Strategic Landlord just before the ALMO merger, it was agreed that an 'area based approach to decency and capital investment' would be taken across the city concentrating on whole neighbourhoods and properties over a 5 year period therefore delivering a greater value for money and effectiveness of the programmes. This approach has been going through Housing Advisory Board (HAB) and various papers have been submitted to HAB and Executive Board. The team are now working on how we will measure the new way of working but will need more time to inform their decisions. As soon as this becomes available we will change the indicator given to Tenant Scrutiny Board.

2. Why no target for % Rent loss from voids?

Due to the restructure the Voids Manager had only just taken on their new role. The target that we have now received is 0.90% and this will be reflected in the next report.

3. Why no target for complaints satisfaction and no date for August?

For this survey there is a very strong link between levels of satisfaction and getting the desired outcome, which we are often unable to grant. Therefore it may be unreasonable to expect the service to be able to improve satisfaction with the service beyond a certain point. Because of this, it is suggested that responses are monitored by trend and analysed by satisfaction with the outcome, in order to develop service improvements, but our feeling at present is that an overall, global target would not be meaningful.

August was the main recruitment period of the restructure, which impacted on the capacity of the team to carry out surveys.

4. Why no target for independent living satisfaction and also an explanation of the source of the data?

Previously the housing services had dedicated Independent Living Teams. Surveys were carried out by staff within these teams, contacting tenants after they stopped being supported by the service. This work has very recently been subsumed into the Lettings teams within Tenancy Management, with a renewed focus on sustaining tenancies.

A target of 90% for satisfaction is suggested – however it may be necessary to pause the survey for a few months whilst the new service is developed, and questions and method are reconsidered for relevance.

5. Board Members requested further detail on % complaints responded to within 10 working days, i.e. is that acknowledgement of complaint or resolution (any data on the type of complaint would also be helpful.)

% complaints responded to within 10 working days is resolution. We are currently undertaking a review of complaints measurement and will be setting the team up with a new framework of data which will delve into areas such as type of complaint. If the Board could give us until our next quarterly report we will be able to give a more in depth analysis.

6. Tenant Scrutiny Board is currently doing a piece of work on Annual Tenancy Visits and would be grateful to receive any additional data you might have, for example completion by housing office?

We can't at the moment give a breakdown by Housing Office. This is due to Patch changes taking place on the IT systems that produce our reports. We can however show a breakdown by ward area which I have attached. The IT changes will be resolved by our next report and at that stage we will be able to give you the breakdown you've requested.

Annual Tenancy Visit Performance - Ward Summary

Milestone Measure = 58%

Count of TenancyNbr WARD	Column Labels			Complete	
	Not Visited	PASS	Grand Total		
ADEL & WHARFEDALE	365	280	645	✗	43%
ALWOODLEY	624	536	1160	✗	46%
ARDSLEY & ROBIN HOOD	538	327	865	✗	38%
ARMLEY	1138	1592	2730	✓	58%
BEESTON & HOLBECK	1304	875	2179	✗	40%
BRAMLEY & STANNINGLEY	1570	1150	2720	✗	42%
BURMANTOFTS & RICHMOND HILL	2648	1700	4348	✗	39%
CALVERLEY & FARSLEY	378	377	755	✗	50%
CHAPEL ALLERTON	919	1010	1929	✗	52%
CITY & HUNSLET	867	869	1736	✗	50%
CROSSGATES & WHINMOOR	1110	720	1830	✗	39%
FARNLEY & WORTLEY	1491	981	2472	✗	40%
GARFORTH & SWILLINGTON	222	675	897	✓	75%
GIPTON & HAREHILLS	1004	1672	2676	✓	62%
GUISELEY & RAWDON	403	291	694	✗	42%
HAREWOOD	128	268	396	✓	68%
HEADINGLEY	129	26	155	✗	17%
HORSFORTH	676	213	889	✗	24%
HYDE PARK & WOODHOUSE	985	1102	2087	✗	53%
KILLINGBECK & SEACROFT	2053	2306	4359	✗	53%
KIPPAX & METHLEY	344	785	1129	✓	70%
KIRKSTALL	1280	1122	2402	✗	47%
MIDDLETON PARK	2166	1821	3987	✗	46%
MOORTOWN	136	355	491	✓	72%
MORLEY NORTH	512	410	922	✗	44%
MORLEY SOUTH	574	513	1087	✗	47%
OTLEY & YEADON	871	478	1349	✗	35%
PUDSEY	929	740	1669	✗	44%
ROTHWELL	668	597	1265	✗	47%
ROUNDHAY	179	431	610	✓	71%
TEMPLE NEWSAM	950	572	1522	✗	38%
WEETWOOD	744	625	1369	✗	46%
WETHERBY	309	531	840	✓	63%
Grand Total	28214	25950	54164	●	48%

This page is intentionally left blank