**Measuring the real value - of the customer involvement service**

1. **Are you interested in shaping the project as part of the steering group?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation/Who** | **Yes/No** |
| **Affinity Sutton/Thurza Cheshire** | **Yes** |
| **Aspire Housing/** **Andrew Powell** | **Yes (only because of other commitments)** |
| **City West Housing Trust/** **Jacqui Holmes** | **Yes** |
| **Community Gateway Association/ Lisa Macdonald** | **Yes** |
| **Great Places Housing Group/** **Mike Glennon** | **Yes** |
| **Helena Partnerships/** **Joanne McMahon** | **Yes** |
| **”Johnnie” Johnson Housing Trust/** **Yen Siang Tan** | **Yes** |
| **Mosscare Housing/ Teyei Chollom** | **Yes** |
| **Progress Housing Group/** **Sian Coulton** | **Yes** |
| **Staffordshire Housing Group/Adrian Foster** | **Yes** |
| **Stockport Homes/Jill Holmes** | **No** |
| **Weaver Vale Housing Trust/** **Alex Hasson** | **Yes** |
| **West Lancashire Borough Council/Tracy Berry** | **Yes** |
| **Wigan and Leigh Homes/Stephen Southern** | **No** |
| **Wulvern/Heather Mullins** | **Yes** |
| **Wythenshawe Community Housing Group/Graham Heslin** | **Yes** |
| **Stafford & Rural Homes/Pam Smith** | **Yes** |
| **Incommunities/Kelly Hargreaves** | **Yes** |
| **Wulvern/Heather Mullins** | **Yes** |
| **Forum Housing Association/Amy Butterworth** | **Not at this moment in time** |
| **East Durham Homes/Stuart Wilson** | **Yes** |
| **Salix Homes/Margaret Connor** | **Yes** |
| **Livin/Sylvia Dodsworth** | **Yes** |
| **Gentoo/Trish Dodds** | **Yes** |

1. **Are you interested In submitting case studies or being involved in the research through unconference/focus groups/provision or collation of data etc – either through the Customer Involvement Team, your Executive or Board or though engaging your customers in this**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation/Who** | **Yes/No** |
| **Affinity Sutton/Thurza Cheshire** | **Yes** |
| **Aspire Housing/ Andrew Powell** | **Yes Definitely** |
| **City West Housing Trust/ Jacqui Holmes** | **-** |
| **Community Gateway Association/ Lisa Macdonald** | **Yes** |
| **Great Places Housing Group/ Mike Glennon** | **Yes** |
| **Helena Partnerships/ Joanne McMahon** | **Yes** |
| **”Johnnie” Johnson Housing Trust/ Yen Siang Tan** | **Yes** |
| **Mosscare Housing/** **Teyei Chollom** | **Yes** |
| **Progress Housing Group/ Sian Coulton** | **Yes** |
| **Staffordshire Housing Group/Adrian Foster** | **Yes, have forward the brief to our executive team who were interested in the project.** |
| **Stockport Homes/Jill Holmes** | **Yes** |
| **Weaver Vale Housing Trust/ Alex Hasson** | **In principle yes for now** |
| **West Lancashire Borough Council/Tracy Berry** | **More than happy to get involved where we can** |
| **Wigan and Leigh Homes/Stephen Southern** | **We are a tentative yes at this stage!** |
| **Wulvern/Heather Mullins** | **Yes** |
| **Wythenshawe Community Housing Group/Graham Heslin** | **Yes** |
| **Stafford & Rural Homes/Pam Smith** | **-** |
| **Incommunities/Kelly Hargreaves** | **Yes** |
| **Wulvern/Heather Mullins** | **-** |
| **Forum Housing Association/Amy Butterworth** | **Yes** |
| **East Durham Homes/Stuart Wilson** | **Yes** |
| **Salix Homes/Margaret Connor** | **Yes** |
| **Livin/Sylvia Dodsworth** | **-** |
| **Gentoo/Trish Dodds** | **Yes** |

1. **How do you currently measure the outcomes/outputs of customer involvement?**

|  |
| --- |
| **We currently measure through information in the annual impact assessment and through actions implemented from recommendations by scrutiny boards, tenant inspectors, complaint panel members and performance auditors.** |
| **Impact assessment** |
| **We do 6 monthly impact assessments and are just in the process of trying to carry out a VFM impact assessment of Customer Scrutiny** |
| **We use TP Tracker and HACT** |
| **Basic annual impact assessment (outcomes & outputs vs cost & resources)**  **Numbers involved**  **Representation (vs general customer population)**  **Satisfaction with views** |
| **Numbers involved, Number of activities** |
| **Annual Impact assessments** |
| **Equality Analysis (impact assessments)**  **Feedback forms / attendance forms**  **Training evaluation forms**  **Case studies – linked to equality analysis** |
| **Questionnaires and customer surveys – completion of annual impact assessment and Scrutiny activities** |
| **The main method is through the annual impact assessment. Up until last years tenants who were on the Customer Services SIP would make a judgement based upon the outputs/outcomes of the activities that had taken place. They would also receive 2 cost ratios to help make a VFM judgment.**  **Cost/No. of customers taking part in the activity**  **Cost/No. of customers affected by the outcome/outputs**  **The impact rating and VFM rating were scored out of 3.**  **Last year we moved away from this rating and used performance indicators instead. The theory being that the indicator should improve or at least be maintained following the changes brought about by CI. These indicators are predominantly customer satisfaction measures.**  **Scrutiny and the Assurance group use our PIs to evidence service improvements brought about through their intervention.**  **Mystery shoppers inspections of empty properties are pretty much self monitoring with comparisons being made on the previous reports standards passed.** |
| **Annual impact assessment, performance data, customer satisfaction surveys** |
| **Impact assessments and cost benefit analysis** |
| **We have nothing in place at the moment** |
| **We only use basic measures such as questionnaires and satisfaction surveys but have been looking recently to utilise HACT model for some aspects of our service.** |
| **In a roundabout way** |
| **Survey after each activity** |
| **‘So What’ forms, feedback forms, D+E** |
| **We have just developed a Involvement database which captures all events which we attend / hold / groups we run and all those actively participating.**  **From this data we produce reports which show us the makeup of the groups, the cost if customers were being paid, gaps in communities / backgrounds and can help target those areas to increase participation. This also helps us produce information at board level for the impact / outcomes as well as monetary costs.**  **As the system is created in house and is being developed, it can change to adapt to our needs or what data we want to capture.** |
| **Not very well, if we do its through Consultation, SORI** |
| **Case studies, testimonies, board reports, engagement events and turn outs, the amount of time they give back** |
| **Housemark, Performance dashboards, surveys** |
| **We have a bespoke data base which allows us to record costs, officer time, numbers attending, record outputs etc but does not allow us to measure the success of the event – i.e. was it worthwhile investment, nor does it calculate social return on investment**  **Previously tracked savings associated with recommendations made by the Customer Senate**  **Currently looking at 3 areas to measure:**   * **Customer influence – service improvements/savings associated with scrutiny and panel reviews** * **Training courses e.g. digital inclusion, health**   **Investment through procurement- apprenticeships, work placements** |
| **Covalent performance management system** |
| **Very soon our Orchard system will capture the activities in relation to customer involvement, this will enable the Group to understand the frequency and type of activities people attend. At the moment registers and excel spreadsheets are used to capture the numbers. Capturing the outcomes is a little more challenging; we do this in a number of ways. The group have a set of planned outcomes, these are the changes the Group expects or wants those who are involved to experience. The current system enables the team to isolate those who have regularly attended and invites them to complete an impact evaluation, from this we can gauge the potential impact. For less intensive interventions attendees are asked to complete a short form, this enables to us to be confident that we are measuring what matters to our customers, and also facilitates regular outcome reporting.** |

1. **Do you have anything you want to ensure the project covers?**

|  |
| --- |
| **VFM and how RI benefits the business. Digital Inclusion** |
| **RI is so subjective e.g what is a service improvement? I think a core set of performance indicators that are easily understood. I like the TPAS accreditation framework. I have developed some indicators if you are interested.**  **The emphasis for me needs to be in regard to what is expected from the empowerment standard in the regulatory framework – that is fairly challenging in it’s own right. I find it surprising that the regulatory framework does not carry any teeth in respect of consumer standards. Not sure if this is covered, but do housing providers need to give any assurances when being assessed for governance and financial viability? If they needed to it might focus the attention a bit?** |
| **No x 2** |
| **How to maximise the value of involvement, the success of involvement is also dependent not only on the quality of involvement activity but also the willingness of the services and management team to listen, evaluate and change.** |
| **You have covered everything, HACT** |
| **Benchmarking**  **Target setting**  **Cost per household of resident involvement – also benchmarked**  **Social value of involvement to organisation and community** |
| **Social value measurements of involvement** |
| **I am interested in developing the VFM element further, I think we made a good start using the ratio’s it was possibly just missing another element linking it to the outcome.**  **Devising some way of defining attribution would be good. I feel that the question, would it have happened anyway in most instances would be answered ‘yes’. However I feel that what scrutiny does is to prioritise and put the spot light on to areas i.e. make something happen quicker and more effectively than it would of.** |
| **Open minded – would be good to understand what currently exists, is being used and works well.** |
| **I have a blank piece of paper so anything is great but looking for something that is easy to complete as it wont always be my team completing the information.** |
| **Listening to the discussions at the last RING meeting it seems that all organisations view aspects of RI differently. My team covers the basic traditional Tenant Participation aspects such as groups and focus groups etc however the team also cover, Employment and Skills and Digital Inclusion which I realise is not directly classed as Resident Involvement therefore I would be interested if these aspects were touched on in the project.** |
| **VFM x 2** |
| **N/A** |
| **Social Value** |
| **To ensure clear / detailed way to capture the qualitative data rather than focusing on cost / saving / VFM.**  **This has no impact to a customer / community and it is the ground level work that it is vital to capture and show what improvements are being made for sustainable communities.** |
| **Discussing different models of engagement and recognition that not one shoe fits all** |
| **Value of outcomes, Budgets** |
| **Any solution needs to be practical and manageable so employees use as a matter of course** |
| **E & D** |
| **Yes, I feel that it would be useful to know and understand “how can we be sure that the interventions are what people what or need”. Also “how can we be sure that the interventions are making a difference to the neighbourhood”, local demographic information is good for this but it is often out of date or not like for like. To do this effectively we would need to speak to everyone in the neighbourhood and this can be subjective and resource intensive.** |

1. **Do you have a view of what we should exclude from the project**

|  |
| --- |
| **No, I am happy to have a discussion on any ideas put forward. To assess the feasibility of using them in this project.** |
| **No, just keep everything manageable and in short time frames. I think we need some new language in RI circles. The fact that business improvement and governance teams have “taken over” on scrutiny front, for me undermines what we are about – making sure tenants have capacity to take part….** |
| **No x 7** |
| **Community development type activity.** |
| **I think we should steer clear of measuring wider impact upon society and focus on the improvements to service and how we can use PIs rather than rely on satisfaction data.** |
| **Not at present** |
| **Not sure** |
| **N/A** |
| **Savings and Costs, forget about the monetary side and focus on the soft side as such which is usually forgotten.** |
| **Don’t want it to be a crusade to save involvement for the sake of it – needs to make it more meaningful in the current climate** |
| **Not at the moment, I am not aware of what others have suggested but I do know that laborious questionnaires and surveys (however useful) are not conducive for community interventions – I have always found quick and simple questions to be more effective.** |

**Aspire KPIs Performance Matrix – 15/16 Resident Involvement**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TYPE** |  | **TARGET** | **DATA SOURCE** | **DEFINITION** |
| **KPI** | Customer views and Aspire Housing action | XX%\* | STAR Survey | Percentage of customers who feel that they have had their views listened to and acted upon taken as a proportion of lead tenants |
| **KPI** | Service changes influenced by customers | 4 | RI Impact Assessment | Number of services changes that have included the views of customers in their development |
| **KPI** | Service changes implemented. | 75% | RI Impact Assessment | Percentage of services changes that have included the views of customers that have been implemented |
| **KPI** | Keeping Customers Informed | XX%\* | STAR Survey | Percentage of tenants who feel that Aspire Housing is good at keeping them informed about things that affect them as a customer. |
| **OPI** | Involved customer influence. | 90% | Actively Involved Customer survey | Percentage of actively involved customers who feel they are able to influence service changes. |
| **OPI** | Actively involved customers | 150 \* | Actively Involved Customer survey | Number of customers actively involved in the process of shaping and improving services. |
| **OPI** | Complaints | Info only | Feedback Monitoring process | Number of Aspire Housing complaints dealt with |
| **OPI** | Learning actions | Info only | Feedback Monitoring process | Number of learning action that have resulted from complaints |
| **OPI** | Customer training opportunities. | 100  Info only - Learning & Skills Team | Customer Training programme monitoring. | Number of customers engaged in customer training opportunities. |
| **OPI** | Positive learning outcome | 90%  Info only - Learning & Skills Team | Feedback from attendees after each training session. | Percentage of customers indicating they have achieved a positive learning outcome from training opportunities. |
| **OPI** | Scrutiny Panel members. | 10\* | RI database | Number of scrutiny panel members. |
| **OPI** | Scrutiny Panel activities | Info only | RI database | Number of scrutiny panel activities undertaken |
| **OPI** | Scrutiny Panel performance monitoring sessions | 4 - Info only | RI database | Number of scrutiny panel performance monitoring sessions |
| **OPI** | Customer Voice | X\* | RI database | Increased number of underrepresented groups who are able to shape and influence service delivery by Aspire Housing |

**\***these are the only 4 Resident Involvement metrics that the RI Team will be focussed on. Remaining metrics are for management information and control