



PEABODY

RESIDENT SCRUTINY PANEL

**REVIEW OF THE ESTATE CONTROLLED
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET
(ECEIB)**

DECEMBER 2013

Final Version – Agreed 04 December 2013

CONTENTS

Section		Page
1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Executive summary	4
3.0	Methodology	5
4.0	Findings	6
5.0	Conclusions	9
6.0	Recommendations	10
7.0	Appendices	13
	Appendix 1 – extract of Panels Terms of reference	14
	Appendix 2 – criteria for choosing topic for scrutiny	15
	Appendix 3 – questions used in interviews	17
	Appendix 4 – questions used in email residents survey	20

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS and TERMS

A2 Dominion	A large London based Housing Association
East and West Forums	Two Forums comprising elected representatives from Tenant and Residents Associations divided geographically
ECEIB	Estate Controlled Environmental Improvement Budget
Engage	Magazine produced by Peabody for residents
GLA	Greater London Authority
IMPROVE	Programme of planned major works carried out to homes across the stock, may include works such as window renewal, improvements to heating systems or kitchen renewals. It also includes communal works to the grounds and common parts.
L&Q	London & Quadrant – a large London housing association
NMs	Neighbourhood Managers – frontline staff managing Peabody housing stock
The Panel	The Resident Scrutiny Panel – resident panel to scrutinise the performance and work of Peabody
RCP	The Residents Consultative Panel – the main elected representative and consultative body for resident interests
TRA	Tenants and Residents Association
Veridian	A large London-based Housing Association

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Residents Scrutiny Panel ('the Panel') was set up to monitor and examine Peabody services in detail, highlighting what is good about the service and what needs to improve. The Panel acts as an independent 'critical friend' examining how services work, comparing Peabody to similar Housing Associations and making recommendations for improvement based on the evidence that has been looked at. (See Appendix 1 for extract from the Panel's Terms of Reference).
- 1.2. This is the first review completed by the Peabody Resident Scrutiny Panel. The panel was formed this year with the first meeting taking place on 1st May 2013. Following a programme of training over the Summer of 2013 the panel met on 10th July 2013 to decide upon the first subject for review. Staff and scrutiny panel members were invited to submit suggestions for review. Each proposal was scored against a set of criteria (see Appendix 2) and as a result the Panel took the decision to select the Estate Controlled Environmental Improvement Budget (ECEIB) as a pilot scrutiny review.
- 1.3. The ECEIB is a scheme that allows residents to bid (through a written application form) for funding for small projects that would not ordinarily be funded by the landlord for improvements to their estates. These could include gardening projects, play areas or works to the tenants and residents hall. The scheme was widened in 2010 to enable estates which did not have a tenants and residents association to bid for funding. The scheme runs annually with a budget of £300,000. This is split between the East and West Forums and each forum hosts a 'bid night' where bids are considered and voted upon. Prior to this each group submitting a bid must meet various criteria for inclusion in the scheme. The works are then carried out under the supervision of Peabody. A recent contract was agreed with EPS to complete these ECEIB works, as part of a larger contractual arrangement with Peabody.
- 1.4. The panel decided upon six key lines of enquiry and the review centred on these. (See section 4). A range of investigation methods were selected with the panel dividing up the work. Residents and staff were interviewed as part of the research. In addition members of the panel that had been involved in ECEIB bids were also able to give information based on their experiences. The review began in September 2013 and the final recommendations were decided at a special meeting on 18 November 2013. The draft report was presented at the December meeting with the final report ready for presentation in January 2014.

- 1.5. The Resident Scrutiny Panel would like to thank all residents and staff who gave up their time to be interviewed. The information given was invaluable and the many suggestions for improvement were welcomed.
- 1.6. The following residents are members of the Panel and all contributed to this report: Steffan Atherton (Chair), Danny Clarke, Alan Courtier, Terry Dalton, Sandra Duncan, Jeff Elmer, Margaret Kerss, Karen Looker, Iona McConnell, Martin McNelis, Andrew Neale, Oye Oduwaiye, Lindon Rankin and Sharon Turner (Vice Chair).
- 1.7. The Resident Scrutiny Panel was supported by Sue Penrose (Peabody Officer) and by an Independent Mentor, Jane Eyles who provided training, advice and guidance to the Panel. The Panel would like to take this opportunity to thank Jane for her energy, commitment and knowledge which has been of great benefit and has ensured a successful start to the work of the Panel.

2. **Executive Summary**

- 2.1 The Scrutiny Panel found overall that the ECEIB was a positive scheme, valued by staff and residents working together to achieve common goals. The Panel were impressed by the dedication shown to the scheme by involved residents and staff alike. The level of the budget shows an excellent commitment to resident-led spending initiatives to improve local areas. Peabody and residents showed that they had been working well in partnership and the decision to improve the scheme through the use of a single contractor showed that improvements had been brought in.
- 2.2 However, all schemes that have been in existence over a long period, will have room for improvement, and the Panel make the following recommendations, summarised here but outlined in more detail at the end of this report:
 - a. Introduce a new procedure with resident involvement that has clarity around roles, eligibility, criteria, consultation and impact assessment and ensure it is implemented.
 - b. Identify a single senior manager to own the process and ensure all key actions are completed
 - c. Introduce a new application form with resident involvement that links to the procedure which is tracked from start to completion
 - d. Ensure all bids evidence consultation to ensure value for money
 - e. Monitor the process, costs, completion and impact of the ECEIB and report this annually to the Forums – all bids should be tracked
 - f. Increase awareness of the scheme through increased and smarter publicity, targeted at those areas who have not previously benefitted

- g. Improve decision making by officers ensuring all criteria in the procedure are met before submitting for decision by residents 10 days in advance
- h. Improve inconsistent decision making by a joint decision making body – possibly the Residents Consultative Panel – deciding or recommending the bids. This will ensure that residents are not deciding their own bids
- i. Exclude bids that qualify for capital programme or for external funding
- j. Rename the ECEIB to increase its accessibility and facilitate understanding of its function.

2.3 The Panel looks forward to receiving an action plan from Peabody within 28 days of the publication of the report showing how our recommendations have been considered and what action will be taken to improve the ECEIB.

3. Methodology

3.1. The review was carried out in two phases. The first phase was a desktop review where all the available documents were reviewed including those held online. This also included a benchmarking review where similar schemes offered by other London housing providers were considered. The second phase of interviewing was informed by the results of the desktop review. This used both a survey along with interviews of residents and staff. Case tracking was also completed.

3.2. The desktop review started with the policy itself. The group assigned to this task also reviewed the application form, complaints submitted about the ECEIB, the spreadsheets for monitoring the bids and completed application forms. Existing publicity was also examined and a test was done of various searches on the Peabody website using likely terms that a resident may use when looking for funding. Finally a review of 7 other London landlords was completed reviewing the details of their schemes for estate improvements.

3.3. An email survey of 100 residents was completed which had a 25% response rate. This survey checked on awareness of the ECEIB and also asked about interest in using this. (See Appendix 4).

3.4. The following members of staff were interviewed during October; Asset Manager, Surveyor, Heads of Neighbourhoods (East & West), Assistant Head of Neighbourhoods (two), Neighbourhood Managers (two). The questions were tailored to their roles and followed up on issues that arose from the desktop survey. (See Appendix 3).

3.5. Seven residents were interviewed during October including the Chairs of both East and West forum. (See Appendix 3 for questions). Residents were chosen who had submitted bids for the ECEIB both those in established Tenants and Residents

Associations and those outside the formal structure. Three members of the Resident Scrutiny Panel also completed questionnaires about their own experiences of submitting an ECEIB bid.

- 3.6. The desktop review highlighted 9 bids which were considered interesting for various reasons and these were followed through in detailed case tracking which included reviewing the application form, the minutes from the relevant area forum meeting and follow up using the monitoring spreadsheet. Further questions were asked to clarify points arising from this.
- 3.7. Once the research was completed, the findings were discussed and recommendations agreed over two meetings in November. These were then written up by a Panel member into a report which was agreed at the December meeting ready for presentation to Peabody senior managers and publication at the January meeting. The report was passed to the Chair and Vice-Chair of the RCP for their comments prior to presentation of the report.

4. Findings

EXAMINATION OF PROCESS – IS IT FIT FOR PURPOSE?

- 4.1. The first key line of enquiry was Examination of Process – Is It Fit for Purpose? We felt this got to the heart of the policy and examined the inherent value of this scheme.
- 4.2. The first finding from the research was that the residents felt it was a straightforward, simple and accessible process. This is to be welcomed as it should be possible for any resident to submit a successful bid.
- 4.3. The second finding from the research was the support for larger bids that can be spread across several years in some cases. Both residents and staff appreciated this flexibility.
- 4.4. The policy itself is in places complex and unclear, with a lack of paragraphs and headings and does not have a clear aim. It should be written in plain English. It is undated as is the application form and more than one version of the latter is in circulation.
- 4.5. The procedure lacks clarity around roles. It was evident from the interviews that there is no ownership of the ECEIB and there is no shared understanding of the roles played by both residents and staff. Residents believed that bids were not given to the forums for 'bid night' unless they had met the criteria whilst staff felt it was not their role to review the bids. The sign off process appears to be cursory (where it takes place).

- 4.6. The procedure does not fully clarify what is eligible and what is not. There is uncertainty from both residents and staff.
- 4.7. The application form needs improvement, it is not date stamped and bids are often incomplete or provide very little detail. There is no consistency across bids submitted. It is often not clear why a bid has been submitted i.e. what the problem or issue is that the bid is intended to resolve.
- 4.8. The bid tracking is limited and should include much more detail. The spreadsheets are often incomplete. Residents, particularly those who do not attend area forums, are often unaware of the progress of their bids. However we note that this has recently improved.
- 4.9. The decision making process is inconsistent across the two forums, with different eligibility standards and different requirements for attendance. We welcome that this has been addressed by the forums themselves in the November RCP review.
- 4.10. Case tracking and reviews of the bids showed an inconsistency with consultation. There were some excellent examples of thorough consultation carried out using a variety of methods. However some bids had little or no evidence of consultation. It became clear from the interviews that this had caused problems in the past.

RESIDENT SATISFACTION

- 4.11. The evidence from the case tracking, desktop review and interviews was that there was insufficient monitoring and reporting on performance. Residents were not clear what was happening with their bids and staff were not informed either.
- 4.12. The procedure requires reporting back on the outcome of works but this is not done in practice. Both residents and staff agreed this was an area which could be improved on. This links to other areas such as publicity, one suggestion from the interviews was that details of successful bids could be used to promote the scheme, to give ideas to other estates of what can be done with a bid. Value for money is covered later in this report however interviewees noted that it was hard to assess value for money without having a review of the works.

EXTENT OF RESIDENT INFLUENCE ON ECEIB

- 4.13. The overwhelming consensus across both residents and staff was that this was a valued scheme that delivered resident-led improvements across estates. It was welcomed that residents had the power to directly influence spending and determine what needed to be done on their estate.

- 4.14. The desktop review and interviews with residents showed that the regional forums had been able to discuss and comment on changes to the policy in the past.
- 4.15. It was interesting that there was very limited understanding of how the budget was set. It has been £300k for some time and different departments of Peabody staff thought the decision on the amount of budget set aside was determined by each other. Residents were also unclear about how this set amount was reached.

ACCESSIBILITY OF THE ECEIB AND FAIRNESS

- 4.16. Fairness and equality was considered throughout the scrutiny process and some aspects of this have been highlighted earlier in the report. However there were other findings in addition to these. The first is that there is a sense that each year the same Tenants and Residents Association's bid and receive funding. This was a concern raised by both staff and residents during the interviews. This is also borne out to a lesser degree in the case tracking, this process highlighted two cases where bids were originally accepted but did not go ahead under ECEIB for various reasons. These estates then put in fresh bids for different works which raised concerns that the money was seen as a right or that bids were put in to 'use up' the funding.
- 4.17. The second issue raised was that the survey highlighted a considerable lack of knowledge of the ECEIB process (84% of those surveyed had not heard of it). In fact several respondents had found out about it via our survey and went on to express an interest in putting in a bid for their estate.
- 4.18. There were concerns raised about consistency across East and West Forums. There is an issue here of equity as some leaseholders may not have to pay for works that would ordinarily be included in service charges as they have been funded by the ECEIB.
- 4.19. Concerns were raised that forum members vote on their own bids and feedback from resident interview suggests that non-forum members are perceived to be treated less favourably.

VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.20. Evidence showed that appointing a single contractor for the works had improved the efficiency and there was much support for this from the residents interviewed.
- 4.21. Case tracking threw up some interesting points, a significant number of the bids approved did not actually take place via the ECEIB. This was because they were taken up under a different programme such as IMPROVE, by repairs and maintenance or under a different scheme of works. There were concerns that ECEIB was used to

highlight issues that were otherwise being ignored and this was felt to be an inappropriate use of ECEIB. It is a waste of time for both residents and staff. Some bids were for items which can be obtained free of charge via alternative schemes such as bike racks from the GLA. Other observations were that works could be packaged together across estates to achieve economies of scale.

- 4.22. 'Underspends' came out as a thorny issue. As this is a Capital budget there is pressure to spend all the money. There seemed to be inconsistencies in the way any underspend was dealt with, both in terms of East and West and also from year to year. One set of minutes noted that there was an underspend so all bids were uprated! At other times, late bids have been accepted or there has been a second round of bidding.

BENCHMARKING

- 4.23. The first finding from benchmarking was the budget size. When compared to other London landlords (taking stock size into account) the Peabody scheme is generous.
- 4.24. Various examples of good practice were noted from a number of landlords and these are listed in the recommendations.

5.0 Conclusions

- 5.1 Overall we felt the scheme is an asset to Peabody residents. It is important that residents direct spending on their estates as they are most easily able to identify priorities and select works which would have the greatest impact. Residents who had participated in the scheme felt it had been successful and were happy with the outcome.
- 5.2 However there are areas which we have identified as not working so well and the first of these stems from the policy itself. The lack of clarity around this has resulted in problems such as a lack of consistency between East and West Forums, a lack of understanding of roles and confusion about eligible works. In some areas, the policy is specific but is not being adhered to. This is resulting in further problems, the requirement for consultation was one of these. The lack of monitoring or review once works are completed is another.
- 5.3 The second key area is the monitoring and tracking, this is unevenly carried out at present and there is no overall monitoring from start to finish of the bids and residents are sometimes unaware of the progress of their bids.

- 5.4 Finally there are concerns at the lack of awareness of the scheme. This was evidenced both in the survey and in the interviews. The publicity is not as comprehensive as staff may believe and the evidence suggests there are residents who would make use of the ECEIB if only they were aware of it. This has the unfortunate consequence of allowing the scheme to be perceived as less than fair as there are a number of repeat estates who receive funding.
- 5.5 These are only broad areas that we have considered, we have made a number of specific recommendations that are listed below that tackle each of these themes in more detail and include some other issues.

6.0 Recommendations

6.1 Table summarising comments from Key Lines of Enquiry and recommendations:

No.	Comment	Recommendation
1.	It is important to ensure that recommendations are considered fully and appropriate plans in place for monitoring the implementation of these.	An action plan to be drawn up by Peabody Executive Committee to address the recommendations and presented back to the Scrutiny panel within 28 days of publishing. Scrutiny panel to review and monitor this with residents.
Examination of process is it fit for purpose?		
No.	Comment	Recommendation
2.	The process is simple and accessible	Any revision is kept simple
3.	The bid can be spread across several years	This is retained and clarified within the policy. This should be project managed (see point 9)
4.	The policy is complex and unclear.	Write a new policy that addresses these problems in consultation with residents
5.	The policy lacks a clarity of roles	Ensure there is ownership of the whole process by a senior manager. The procedure should include clear division of roles and expectations of both staff and residents.
6.	The policy does not clarify what is eligible and what is not	Determine set criteria with resident consultation and ensure clarity within the procedure. This should consider the impact on leaseholders.
7.	The application form needs improvement – it is not date stamped or countersigned by the surveyor or sometimes Neighbourhood Managers	New application form that can be used for monitoring and tracking purposes from start to completion. The form should contain guidance on how to complete. The form should state clearly whether it is TRA, resident or staff led. The form should also collect diversity monitoring information.
8.	Bids are incomplete and lack	All bids meet the criteria before they are

	consistency – unsigned, some contain no or little information. There is a risk the process would not meet a financial audit	submitted for decision. No bid that lacks sufficient detail can be approved
9.	The process is not tracked – spreadsheets are incomplete	Introduce project management system owned by senior manager and ensure it is tracked, including all stages of the process, not just after the bids have been awarded.
10.	Participants receive little in the way of updates	Ensure regular updates built into the project management system
11.	Inconsistent decision making process – Forums have different criteria. One Forum does not see forms, one excludes security, one insists on personal bid	One panel to decide all bids to ensure consistency – The RCP could be the decision making body or at least make recommendations to the Forums All bids need to be seen by panel deciding at least 10 days before the decision is made. Personal appearance to support bids should be optional.
12.	Concern that Forum members decide their own bids resulting in a risk of perceived lack of transparency. Evidence of non Forum members being treated differently.	See above – with any relevant RCP member leaving the room for their own bid
13.	Inconsistent consultation – does not comply with procedure	All bids must evidence consultation before being decided in proportion to the value of the bid. If low response - efforts must be evidenced rather than a %. The Panel note that on large estates a 20% minimum may be hard to achieve however we consider serious consultation should take place before funds are spent. NMs should be available to help with this on request
Resident satisfaction		
	Comment	Recommendation
14.	There is not enough monitoring or reporting of performance	Performance information on ECEIB should be added annually to the KPI information received by the Panel.
15.	Impact of the works is not assessed – does not comply with procedure	Impact should be assessed and tracked, monitored and reported upon. We suggest that the bidder completes an impact form once work is completed and compiles a short report with photographs (this can also be uploaded onto the website) Also suggest questionnaire to residents or a

		question in surveys already undertaken to monitor resident satisfaction.
Extent of customer influence on ECEIB		
	Comment	Recommendation
16.	All agreed that this was very positive in that the scheme was resident led and empowered residents to make decisions and direct spending decisions	To keep this aspect of the scheme and consult on all changes in the future
17.	Forums had been able to discuss and agree changes in policy	To keep this aspect of the scheme and to record this. Consult on all changes in the future
18.	Residents and staff were unclear how the budget is set each year	Consult on budget setting process and ensure there is clarity within Peabody staff as to ownership of the budget.
Accessibility of the ECEIB and fairness		
	Comment	Recommendation
19.	Repeat grants given to repeat estates	Better publicity such as roadshows, displays and articles of success stories, website (including easyread) and a yearly design award. Target publicity at those estates that have never bid. Ensure articles are in Engage every time the ECEIB opens for the year.
20.	Residents outside of the Forums were not aware of the ECEIB	See above
Value for Money		
	Comment	Recommendation
21.	Evidence showed that the introduction of a single contractor enhanced the process	Keep single contractor
22.	Improve value for money	Exclude bids that qualify for capital programme Exclude bids that qualify for external funding such as bike racks under GLA and provide support to groups to obtain this funding. Attempt to join bids up to gain economies of scale i.e. gardening equipment over several bids The decision makers should give consideration to whether to place an upper cost limit to bids to make the money stretch further. If no upper limit is agreed upon, then the guidance should be removed as is confusing and not helpful. This is related to point three.
23.	Evidence that underspends can	Devise proper process to ensure money is well

	be decided at short notice without full applications	spent
Benchmarking		
	Comment	Recommendation
24.	Peabody seems well funded compared to small grants elsewhere	We recommend that this is publicised.
25.	Publicity	We note Viridian website is best practice for this and recommend their website is researched.
26.	Tracking/monitoring	A2 Dominion has a tracking form for their scheme and we consider this to be good practice.
27.	ECEIB is considered to be a cumbersome name which is hard to remember and does not indicate the nature of the scheme.	Other schemes have names which are more suited and reflect their nature. Consideration should be given to renaming the ECEIB. The Panel recommend a competition for renaming is set up with a small prize or certificate as an award. The publicity around this would also publicise the scheme.
28.	Conflict of interest by decision makers	L&Q are reviewing policy to avoid this and we recommend assessing their changes for best practice.

7.0 APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Purpose and Aims for Resident Scrutiny Panel (extract from Terms of reference)

Appendix 2: Scoring Criteria for Scrutiny Topics

Appendix 3: Questions from interviews

Appendix 4: Email survey sent to residents

Appendix 1 - The Resident Scrutiny Panel – extract from terms of reference

“1. Purpose

- 1.1 The Resident Scrutiny Panel will be Peabody’s resident body focusing on performance monitoring across the whole business, and ensuring residents’ views and priorities influence the business at a strategic level.

2. Aims of the Resident Scrutiny Panel (‘the Panel’)

- 2.1 The overall aims of the Panel are to:

- Act as a driver for continuous improvement in performance and service excellence through the process of resident led scrutiny.
- Ensure that residents’ views, aspirations and priorities are central to Peabody’s direction, behaviour and performance monitoring.
- Establish meaningful and customer-focused performance indicators across Peabody.
- Influence the setting of service standards across Peabody’s key service areas.
- Monitor and scrutinise performance in delivery of Peabody’s housing services and identify residents’ priorities for improvement.
- Hold Peabody to account where performance fails to meet expected standards.
- Consider performance and best practice from other organisations as part of scrutiny reviews to ensure Peabody delivers excellent services.
- Contribute to Peabody’s strategic and business-planning processes and annual report to ensure that resident priorities remain central to the organisation”

Appendix 2 - Selecting a topic for scrutiny – guidance notes used by Panel

It has been decided between Peabody and the Resident Scrutiny Panel that the approach to scheduling its scrutiny reviews will fit with the self-regulation and business improvement aspirations of Peabody.

An annual programme of scrutiny reviews (probably 2 or 3 per year) will be planned by the Panel. Each scrutiny will be based on *at least one* of the following:

1. **Evidence from performance and monitoring information.** For example, low or falling resident satisfaction (shown through surveys), high or increasing numbers of complaints in a particular area, performance that does not compare well with other organisations (using benchmarking), or low/declining performance
2. **Feedback from residents groups,** including subjects raised through Regional Forums and/or the Resident Consultative Panel
3. **Peabody's priority areas** as identified by management teams – where scrutiny could feed into and benefit the service review / improvement plans
4. **Legislative or regulative changes** resulting from serious incidents, which may prompt the need to scrutinise within Peabody
5. **Service areas that impact most on residents** – subjects that matter most to residents

In addition, when planning scrutiny activities, the Panel will take into account that scrutiny review topics are:

- of a manageable 'size' to undertake
- likely to make a difference and bring improvements for residents

A topic (or comparison of a number of possible topics) can be assessed against the above criteria using the 'scorecard' attached.

Selecting a topic for scrutiny – How well does it meet the criteria?

Criteria	Possible score	Score given by Panel
What is it based on? (at least one of these <i>must</i> apply)		
1. Performance evidence (give brief details)	0 to 4, where '0' does not apply, and '4' means strongly meets the criteria	
2. Feedback from residents groups (give brief details)		
3. Identified by Peabody as a topic for review (give brief details)		
4. Legislative or regulative changes (give brief details)		
5. A service area that impacts highly on residents?		
TOTAL		
In addition, is it:		Tick if it applies
Of a manageable 'size' to undertake? (if not, topic should be re-defined or disregarded)		
Likely to make a difference and improvements for residents (if not, are you sure you want to do it?)		
Any other comments or considerations?		

Appendix 3 – Interview questions

Each interview began with an introduction – Introduce yourself and partner, thank for their time, explain how long interview will last –half hour to 45 minutes. Explain about scrutiny, and all the ways you are reviewing the service and timescales for reporting on findings

Confidentiality – reassure that comments will not be personally attributed in the final report

The questions asked varied for different interview, and the questions are detailed below:

Interview Questions for Chairs of East and West Forums

1. How does the ECEIB work? (take us through the forum's role)
2. Does the Forum find the application form submitted useful?
3. Is the forum aware of the total ECEIB budget at the start of the process and how the budget amount was agreed?
4. How does the forum differentiate between what qualifies as works that can be included under the ECEIB and what should be Peabody's responsibility?
5. How does your forum decide whether a bid is successful?
6. How do you know that a bid is supported by local residents?
7. What happens if submitted bids are incomplete?
8. How do you ensure fairness during the applicants interview process?
9. What do you think works well about the ECEIB?
10. What do you think needs improving?
11. How did the forum know that any works made a difference once they were done?

Interview Questions for Residents who had submitted bids

1. How did you find out about the ECEIB?
2. How did it work?
3. How did you find completing the application form?
4. How did you consult residents on what to bid for?
5. How did you estimate the cost of the works?
6. Were you happy with the works?
7. How do the forums decide on bids?
8. What works well with the whole ECEIB scheme as regards your own bid?
9. What would you improve and how?
10. How did you prove that your works made a difference once they were done?

Interview Questions for Asset Manager

1. Tell us how the ECEIB works and what your role in it is?
2. How is the budget set?
3. Who Decides

4. How do residents differentiate, between works that are a landlords responsibility and what comes under ECEIB
5. How are the bids recorded or tracked from start to finish
6. How do you ensure the works and the way they are done (through the ECEIB) are value for money.
7. What works well with the whole ECEIB scheme?
8. What would you improve and how

Interview Questions for Surveyor

1. Tell us how the ECEIB works and what your role in it is? (Prompt: what % of your workload?)
2. Is there are form you have to sign – how useful to your job is this form?
3. How do residents differentiate between works that are a landlords responsibility and what comes under the ECEIB?
4. Can you explain the consultation process if the bids affect leaseholders and also how
5. How is the bid recorded or tracked from start to finish?
6. How do you ensure the works and the way they are done (through the ECEIB) are value for money
7. What works well with the whole ECEIB scheme?
8. What would you improve and how?

Interview Questions for Heads of Neighbourhoods

1. Tell us how the ECEIB works and what your role in it is?
2. Prompt: how much of your time?
3. How is the budget set? Prompt is it a fixed amount? Prompt: Who decides?
4. How does Peabody publicise the scheme? Prompt – is this enough?
5. How do you find the application form? Prompt is it useful and easy to complete for you? For residents?
6. How do residents differentiate between works that are a landlords responsibility and what comes under the ECEIB?
7. How is the bid tracked from start to finish?
8. How do the Forums decide on bids? Prompt: How do they and Peabody ensure fairness?
9. Do you know what % of bids are successful?
10. How do you ensure the works have an impact on the community?
11. What works well with the whole ECEIB scheme?
12. What would you improve and how?

Interview Questions for Assistant Head of Neighbourhoods

1. Tell us how the ECEIB works and what your role in it is?
2. How does Peabody publicise the scheme?

3. How do you find the application form? Prompt is it useful and easy to complete for you? For residents?
4. How do the Forums decide on bids?
5. How do you ensure the works have a community impact?
6. What works well with the whole ECEIB scheme?
7. What would you improve and how?

Interview Questions for Neighbourhood Managers

1. Tell us how the ECEIB works and what your role in it is? Prompt: how much of your time does it take up?
2. How do you know that the bid is supported by local resident's? Prompt: do you speak to tenants before and after?
3. How does Peabody publicise the scheme? Prompt – is this enough?
4. How do you find the application form? Prompt: is it useful and easy to complete for you? For residents?
5. How do you differentiate between works that are a landlords responsibility and what comes under the ECEIB? Prompt: what is the difference?
6. What is your part in deciding to agree/forward your signature on bids? Prompt: do you speak to tenants, TA's, etc?
7. Do you follow the bids in your area to see if they go through or not? Prompt: If so how do you track it and offer any help to keep it on track?
8. How do you ensure the works have an impact on the community? Prompt: Do you do any follow ups?
9. What works well and is there any advantages with the ECEIB scheme? Prompt: Is there any advantages from any of the works carried out, does it improve the estate/residence views
10. What would you do to improve and how? Prompt: better publicising, easier forms, knowing what ECEIB means/is.

Appendix 4 – Email survey questions

(The survey was sent to 100 residents taken from database of residents who have shown interest in getting involved and also in completing surveys)

Email sent out said:

“I am writing to you on behalf of our new Residents Scrutiny Panel, who are currently looking at the Estate Controlled Environmental Improvement Budget (sometimes known as ECEIB) and how it works. They would like to find out more about what residents know about making improvements to your area or estate, and would appreciate if you could take a minute to answer a couple of questions.

Please just give your honest answers so don't guess and don't worry if you don't know about it! Please do reply to the survey, even if you don't know about it. (We will email you after the closing date and let you know exactly what this budget is). **Please could you reply by Thursday 24th October.**”

Questions:

- 1. If you wanted a small improvement for your community or estate, who would you contact at Peabody?**

- 2. Have you heard of the Estate Controlled Environmental Improvement Budget ('ECEIB')?**

- 3. If you have heard of it:**
 - would you consider using it and why / why not?**
 - how did you hear of it?**
 - would you consider using it and why / why not?**