

An investment not a cost

The business benefits of tenant involvement



Tenants
Leading Change

Supplementary appendices

Nic Bliss, Blase Lambert, Carole Halfacre
Trevor Bell & Professor David Mullins
March 2015

Funded by the Department for Communities and Local Government

Contents

		Page
Appendix One	Background information	3
Appendix Two	Methodology	8
Appendix Three	Online form data	11
Appendix Four	Analysis of call for evidence information	15
Appendix Five	Attendance at workshops	26

1 Appendix one – background information

1.1 Tenant involvement has been an integral part of social housing since the 1960s. *Tenant Panels: Options for Accountability*¹ outlined the following significant developments in tenant involvement:

- the Right to be Consulted in 1985
- the growth of housing co-ops from the 1970s and the Right to Manage, introduced in 1994, and tenant management
- Compulsory Competitive Tendering panels in the early 1990s
- tenant compacts in the late 1990s
- tenants groups of varying shapes and sizes (including numerous tenants and residents associations and Tenant Federations) and with varying levels of influence
- tenants on the boards of ALMOs & housing associations
- tenant involvement in stock transfer housing associations
- Community Gateway & other tenant owned housing associations
- the Audit Commission's inspection process
- co-regulation and the TSA's focus on tenant involvement and empowerment

Tenant Panels: Options for Accountability – National Tenant Organisations – 2012

1.2 That involvement activities should be based on producing benefits for tenants and landlords has been a trend in thinking since the Audit Commission and Housing Corporation² identified in 2004 that tenant involvement could result in improvements to services and performance, good public relations and an improved reputation.

1.3 Despite an increasing trend of landlords referring to the need for tenant involvement activity to produce outcomes since the early 2000s, the Tenant Services Authority identified in 2010³ that “only one in two tenants is satisfied with the opportunities for involvement and only one in six feels that their landlord takes a lot of notice of their views”.

1.4 This led the Tenant Services Authority to produce its *Making Voices Count*⁴ publication, which clearly set out the need for tenants and landlords to focus on outcomes – “Providers are seeking a range of outcomes from their tenant involvement work: influencing the business objectives of the provider; widening the scope of tenant involvement; providing improved delivery of services”.

¹ *Tenant Panels: Options for Accountability* – National Tenant Organisations – 2012

² *Housing: improving services through resident involvement* - Audit Commission/Housing Corporation, 2004

³ *Tenant involvement: assessing landlords' services* - Tenant Services Authority/Audit Commission, March 2010

⁴ *Making Voices Count* - Tenant Services Authority June 2010

- 1.5 However, they went on to say that many landlords “appear to be struggling” with outcomes and “at times seem to focus on tenant involvement as an end in itself rather than a means to improve services and performance”. As a result, they stressed the importance of assessing the impact of tenant involvement activities, and their regulatory standards included a standard on Value for Money.
- 1.6 This theme was developed by Marianne Hood OBE in 2010⁵ in *Value for Money and Tenant Involvement*. Hood concludes that “regardless of the changing political environment, there is a strong business case for involving tenants in the ... management of their homes. Providers are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of using tenants’ views to shape services and achieve organisational business objectives aimed at delivering better, more responsive, services”.
- 1.7 However, Hood also reiterates the same conclusion that had been drawn earlier that many landlords “appear to lack clearly defined objectives linked to their corporate or business objectives. Some providers still seem to focus on tenant involvement as an end in itself, rather than a means to improve services and performance”.
- 1.8 Hood links this problem to the lack of “a coherent business case for tenant involvement”. She posits that if landlords do not see how involvement activity links to business objectives, then it begs the question *why is this being done?*” Hood identifies that this problem may be partially as a result of confusion between outcomes and outputs, and she provides the following definitions of terminology:

Inputs:	Resources that contribute to a programme of activity (financial expenditure, meetings held, resident and staff hours involved)
Outputs:	Countable units (meetings attended, training courses attended, number of residents attending an event)
Outcomes:	Benefits or changes affecting residents that are usually planned for
Impacts:	All changes resulting from an activity or project – intended/unintended, negative/positive and long-term/short-term. A measurable effect that is both quantitative and qualitative

Value for money and tenant involvement - Marianne Hood OBE published by Housemark - November 2010

- 1.9 Hood suggests that the focus of tenant participation compact frameworks on processes, standards and structures may have contributed to the lack of focus on outcomes in local authorities. But

⁵ *Value for money and tenant involvement* - Marianne Hood OBE published by Housemark - November 2010 – available at www.housemark.co.uk

she also recognises that local authorities have a defined wider community development focus which needs to be linked to tenant involvement strategies. She also suggests that in housing associations, there had been too much focus in impact assessment processes on how successful tenant involvement has been in getting tenants involved. Hood also usefully produces a template for measuring the Value for Money of tenant involvement and a Value for Money checklist for tenant involvement.

- 1.10 2012 saw the publication of the Homes and Communities Agency's new regulatory framework⁶. It confirmed that "under the Localism Act, the regulator no longer has an active role in monitoring providers' service performance". It reiterated that "boards and councillors who govern service delivery remain responsible for ensuring providers meet the consumer standards". It set out that "others, such as tenant panels, have a more prominent role in scrutinising landlords".
- 1.11 Whilst retaining the elements that had been introduced by the Tenant Services Authority in the Involvement and Empowerment Standard, the Homes and Communities Agency strengthened the standard further with additional requirements to support Tenant Panels and provide opportunities for tenants to influence local delivery of repairs services⁷.
- 1.12 *Options for Accountability* was published in 2012. Based on considerable information provided by tenants and landlords about how tenants were being involved, the NTOs set out that, as well as leading to improved quality of life for tenants, tenants being involved can be "a business asset to the landlord". The NTOs suggest that tenants can:

- make considerable contributions to ensuring that services are what tenants want
- play a role in supporting effective governance and decision-making, particularly in areas such as getting the best possible Value for Money
- be an important component in assessing performance
- provide constructive challenge to the accepted ways that things are done in order to improve them
- be particularly helpful in sorting out tenant problems and issues locally and speedily
- act as service user ambassadors for the landlord

Tenant Panels: Options for Accountability – National Tenant Organisations – 2012

⁶ *Regulatory Framework for Social Housing from April 2012 – Homes and Communities Agency March 2012*

⁷ The Homes and Communities Agency consulted on changes to its regulatory framework in 2014, but changes have not been proposed to the Involvement and Empowerment Standard.

- 1.13 The NTOs also point out that “all tenant involvement activity must be about achieving outcomes” and also defined inputs, outputs and outcomes.
- 1.14 Since that time, there have been no studies specifically on tenant involvement, and limited reference to business benefits of tenant involvement in any documentation. Two publications by CIH on tenant insight and tenant scrutiny focus primarily on how to carry out particular tenant involvement activities⁸.
- 1.15 However, the paper on Tenant Scrutiny suggests that scrutiny “can deliver better outcomes for you and your tenants in different ways: from ensuring effective governance and delivering business services; to supporting individual and community empowerment”. It argues that scrutiny can be effective because it provides “a valuable reality check about quality of services; it ensures tenant experiences are routinely considered alongside other forms of performance data, it provides a mechanism to ensure that landlords are delivering the services tenants want, which means they can tailor their services to reflect local needs and priorities, and tenants can be powerful advocates for efficiency and value for money”.
- 1.16 Some of the case studies identified in the Tenant Scrutiny report detail benefits achieved through scrutiny, but several do not.
- 1.17 A further report discussed by some during our evidence gathering was the recently produced HACT guide on Measuring the Social Impact of Community Investment⁹. In this report, Trotter et al discuss how a *Wellbeing Valuation* can be applied to housing provider community investment programmes. Some of the respondents to the TLC Call for Evidence discussed how they had considered the social value of their tenant involvement using HACT’s methodology.
- 1.18 Also of note is a recent publication by CIH Consultancy and Jon Warnock¹⁰ entitled “Challenging the future of tenant involvement” which identifies a more market orientated environment and changing drivers for tenant involvement as :

- the value of ‘customer’ focused business principles
- mirroring the commercial (and particularly the retail) sector

⁸ *New approaches to tenant insight* – CIH – March 2014; *New approaches to tenant scrutiny* – CIH - September 2014

⁹ *Measuring the Social Impact of Community Investment* - Lizzie Trotter, Jim Vine, Matt Leach, Daniel Fujiwara – published by HACT - March 2014 – available at www.hact.org.uk/measuring-social-impact-community-investment-guide-using-wellbeing-valuation-approach

¹⁰ *Challenging the future of tenant involvement* – CIH Consultancy and Jon Warnock - 2014

- collection, interpretation, and application of 'customer insight'
- the principle involvement mechanism through targeted market research, informal interaction and social media
- greater emphasis on evidence based decision making
- the need to demonstrate value for money through cost benefit analysis and greater efficiency
- conflicting demands on resources and the temptation to divert away from tenant involvement and towards income management
- increasing competition from the private sector and resulting need to adopt more commercial approach to the notion of *customer*
- emergence of the Business Board approach to governance and corresponding demands on greater strategic input from tenants below *main board*
- the value of social investment and community development in complimenting neighbourhood interventions
- increased expectations of customers as a result of increased competition

Challenging the future of tenant involvement – CIH Consultancy and Jon Warnock - 2014

Tenant and community controlled housing solutions

- 1.19 Tenant and community controlled housing solutions have tended to attract more research and analysis of benefits. These are best and most recently summed up in the Commission for Co-operative and Mutual Housing's *Bringing Democracy Home*¹¹ in 2009, which identifies a number of publications and evidence that point to higher tenant satisfaction, effective statistical performance (in relation to arrears, voids and repairs management), in building communities, in developing skills in individuals involved and in other areas.
- 1.20 However, the report also points out that there is an "evidence gap" in the tenant controlled housing sector. The culture of most tenant controlled housing organisations tends towards service delivery based in communities rather than performance analysis.

¹¹ *Bringing Democracy Home* - Commission for Co-operative and Mutual Housing (2009). As well as research gathered by the Commission, it referred to the following research that outlines the benefits of tenant control - *Exceeding expectations: the nature and extent of resident and community controlled housing*- Human City Institute (2009); *National Conversation phase one findings* – TSA (2009); *Forging Mutual Futures* – University of Birmingham Centre for Urban and Regional Studies (2008); *An Evaluation of Tenant Management Organisations in England* – Oxford Brookes University (2002); *Tenant Control and Social Exclusion* – Clapham, O' Neill & Bliss (2001); *Tenants in Control: an evaluation of tenant led housing* – Price Waterhouse & DOE (1995); *Management Performance in Housing Co-operatives* – Clapham & Satsangi (1990)

2 Appendix Two – methodology

2.1 Evidence gathering consisted of the following elements:

- an online form on the National Tenant Organisation website
- a Call for Evidence also on the website seeking more detailed information calling for evidence of benefits of tenant involvement
- a series of 9 workshops during November 2014
- more detailed investigation of five case study organisations

2.2 Online form responses were collected from 13th October 2014 to 24th November 2014, during which time 404 responses were received (194 from tenants, leaseholders or residents and 210 from staff or other landlord representatives)¹². The online form asked four graded questions about perceptions of:

- which methods of tenant involvement are most effective
- which outcomes and benefits involvement leads to
- factors behind effective tenant involvement
- barriers to effective tenant involvement

2.3 Responses have been ranked to these graded questions to enable comparison between responses received. The number of responses to each grade has been multiplied by 1 point for the lowest grade, running up to either 4 or 5 for the highest (dependent on the number of grade options) and has then been divided by the number of responses¹³ received. This produces a ranking figure between 1 and 5 (five answer options) and between 1 and 4 (four answer options).

2.4 The online form data has been analysed between:

- tenants and landlord representative respondents
- local authority, housing association and co-op respondents
- respondents where homes are managed by ALMOs or TMOs
- size bands/geographic regions of landlords (4 regions/national)

¹² Tenants, leaseholders and other residents are collectively referred to as *tenants* and staff and other landlord representatives as *staff* in this report. The lines between tenant and landlord representative are blurred in relation to tenants who are members of governing bodies (ie. particularly in housing co-ops) but all tenant board members who responded did so as tenants.

¹³ Approximately 100 respondents did not return answers to the graded questions (not always the same respondents). These have been disregarded in the development of ranking numbers, meaning that most ranking numbers have been calculated on the basis of about 300 respondents.

2.5 Responses were received by landlord type as follows:

Ownership of homes	Tenants	Staff	Totals	%
Local authority	53	75	128	32
Housing association	118	106	224	55
Housing co-op	7	1	8	2
Landlord not known	16	28	44	11
Totals	194	210	404	

Table one: online form responses by landlord type

2.6 Responses were received from respondents whose homes are managed by an ALMO or TMO as follows:

Management of homes	Arms Length Management Organisation		Tenant Management Organisation	
	Tenants	Staff	Tenants	Staff
Local authority	9	27	22	18
Housing association			6	7
Landlord not known			1	
Totals	9	27	29	25

Table two: online form responses from respondents whose homes are managed by ALMOs or TMOs

2.7 Responses were received from respondents in areas as follows:

Areas	Tenants	Staff	Total	%
National	44	20	64	16
London	32	28	60	15
North	30	37	67	17
Midlands	37	40	77	19
South	15	23	37	9
Not known	37	62	99	25

Table three: online form responses by region

2.8 Responses were received from respondents in landlord sizes as follows:

Size bands	Local authorities	Housing associations	Totals	%
>30,000	19	46	65	16
<30,000	19	21	40	10
<20,000	27	62	89	22
<10,000	29	40	69	17
<5,000	25	43	67	17
<1,000		11	11	5
Not known			55	14

Table four: online form responses by size bands (numbers of homes in ownership)

- 2.9 All 8 responses received from tenants and staff of housing co-ops were in the smallest size band. Comments received from co-op respondents are considered in the report, but the small number of responses is considered statistically insignificant and is therefore not included within the ranking analysis.
- 2.10 A total of 86 responses to the Call for Evidence were received (either through response to the Call for Evidence on the website or through attendees at workshops informing us of specific benefits). These 86 responses are detailed in *Appendix Four*.
- 2.11 Attendance at the focus group workshops was as follows (attendees are listed in *Appendix Five*):

Dates in November	Location	Type	Attendance	
			Tenants	Staff
11 th	Peterborough	Mixed	5	10
18 th	Preston	Tenant	10	
18 th	Preston	Landlord		16
18 th	Bristol	Mixed	12	11
21 st	Hull	Mixed	13	7
24 th	Croydon	Tenant	19	
24 th	Croydon	Landlord		17
25 th	Southwark	TMO	9	9
27 th	Birmingham	Mixed	13	14
Totals			81	84

Table five: attendance at focus group workshops

- 2.12 The workshops were hosted by Cross Keys Homes, Community Gateway Association, Bristol City Council, Hull City Council, Amicus Horizon, LB Southwark and Optima Housing.
- 2.13 120 landlords, particularly in the Eastern, North West, London and South East areas were telephoned to encourage them to send tenant or staff representatives to the workshops.
- 2.14 The workshops had some element of stratification in each workshop between tenants and landlord representatives. Tenants and landlord representatives were either split into different groups for parts of mixed workshops, or some workshops were specifically held for either tenant or landlord representatives. The TMO workshop was arranged specifically for TMO tenants and staff and their host landlord staff (who in two cases were from ALMOs).

3 Appendix Three – online form data

3.1 Tenants respondents to the online form were asked if they considered that tenants being involved in any of the activities listed¹⁴ make a difference. 81% of those who responded said that they did. 11% said they didn't. Responses were as follows:

Tenant respondents	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
Housing association	81	11	11	15
Local authority	40	5	0	18
Housing co-op	7	0	0	0
Other/ not known	2	1	2	11
Totals	130	17	13	34

Table eight: numbers of tenants who considered tenant involvement makes a difference

3.2 Staff respondents to the online form were asked if they could identify specific examples of beneficial outcomes (financial or other) that could reasonably be attributed to tenant involvement. 78% of those who responded said they could. 11% said they couldn't. Responses were as follows:

Staff respondents	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
Housing association	71	6	12	17
Local authority	52	10	5	18
Housing co-op	1	0	0	0
Other/ not known	2	1	1	24
Totals	126	17	18	49

Table nine: number of landlords who can identify examples of beneficial outcomes of involvement

3.3 Respondents to the online form were asked how much involvement produces the benefits listed below. Respondents ranked benefits from tenant involvement as follows:

¹⁴ Involvement in services in local neighbourhoods, tenant scrutiny, involvement in governance (eg. tenant board members), tenant panels, social activities, involvement in complaints, involvement in staff/contractor recruitment, surveys and other market research, tenant management, online involvement, smaller tenant control (eg. ground maintenance)

Perceptions of how much involvement produces benefits	Tenants		Staff		All
	HA	LA	HA	LA	
Housing service quality	3.11	3.48	3.49	3.44	3.35
Tenant satisfaction	3.12	3.43	3.36	3.38	3.29
Feelings of ownership through influencing change	3.28	3.32	3.55	3.36	3.25
More responsive appointments system	2.97	3.39	3.14	3.16	3.09
Cost savings	2.97	3.31	3.03	2.91	3.03
Employment and other opportunities for involved	2.80	2.90	3.29	3.03	2.99
Improved design/layout of neighbourhoods/estates	2.71	3.05	2.96	3.00	2.91

Table ten: rankings of involvement benefits – four options were given to these questions – not at all, a little, some, a lot – resulting in a ranking scale from 1 to 4

- 3.4 Staff respondents to the online form were asked if they have a cost/benefit analysis that shows the financial benefits of greater tenant involvement. 23% of those who responded said they do. 67% said they don't. Responses were as follows:

Staff respondents	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
Housing association	20	60	9	17
Local authority	15	45	6	9
Housing co-op	0	1	0	0
Other/not known	1	1	2	24
Totals	36	107	17	50

Table eleven: number of landlords who have cost/benefit analyses of tenant involvement

- 3.5 Staff respondents to the online form were asked if they have any tenant satisfaction data that shows benefits/increase in tenant satisfaction from greater tenant involvement. 38.13% of those who responded said they do. 45.63% said they don't. Responses were as follows:

Staff respondents	Yes	No	Don't know	No response
Housing association	29	46	14	17
Local authority	30	26	10	9
Housing co-op	0	1	0	
Other/not known	2	0	2	24
Totals	61	73	26	50

Table fourteen: number of landlords who have relevant tenant satisfaction data

3.6 Rankings from the online form on what methods respondents considered to be the most effective forms of involvement are for producing benefits are shown in the table below:

Perceptions of effectiveness	Tenants		Staff		All
	HA	LA	HA	LA	
Involvement in services in local neighbourhoods	3.73	3.95	4.31	4.17	4.05
Tenant scrutiny	3.68	3.54	4.35	4.28	4.01
Involvement in governance (eg. Tenant Board Members)	3.52	3.72	3.98	4.19	3.85
Tenant Panels	3.61	3.73	3.94	3.97	3.81
Social activities	3.48	3.95	3.87	3.81	3.76
Involvement in complaints	3.43	3.94	3.89	3.77	3.72
Involvement in staff/contractor recruitment	3.33	3.72	3.86	3.97	3.71
Surveys and other market research	3.36	3.54	4.07	3.83	3.71
Tenant management	3.27	3.91	3.46	4.02	3.61
Online involvement	3.33	3.34	3.77	3.42	3.48
Smaller tenant control (eg. grounds maintenance)	3.15	3.80	3.54	3.62	3.47

Table fifteen: perceived effectiveness of tenant involvement methods – five options were given to these questions – very ineffective, ineffective, neither effective nor ineffective, effective, very effective – resulting in a ranking scale from 1 to 5

3.7 Respondents to the online form were asked their perceptions of what factors particularly supported effective tenant involvement and what factors were barriers:

Factors perceived to support effective tenant involvement	Tenants		Staff		All
	HA	LA	HA	LA	
Developing trust between the landlord and tenants	3.84	3.89	3.84	3.86	3.86
Staff being approachable and willing	3.75	3.87	3.80	3.85	3.80
Culture of the landlord	3.40	3.42	3.72	3.70	3.56
Leadership in the landlord	3.49	3.45	3.60	3.65	3.55
Being prepared to be innovative	3.54	3.36	3.42	3.58	3.49
Leadership amongst involved tenants	3.44	3.49	3.42	3.53	3.47

Table sixteen: factors particularly important to delivering positive benefits through tenant involvement – four options were given to these questions – not important, a little important, important, very important – resulting in a ranking scale from 1 to 4

Factors perceived to be barriers to effective tenant involvement	Tenants		Staff		All
	HA	LA	HA	LA	
Difficulties in getting tenants to participate	3.00	3.31	3.00	3.20	3.09
A lack of diversity amongst involved tenants	2.63	2.73	2.41	2.30	2.54
Resistance to tenant involvement within landlord	2.58	2.36	2.49	2.63	2.53
Few opportunities for tenants to influence change	2.40	2.38	2.65	2.64	2.53
Lack of infrastructure for involvement	2.43	2.36	2.46	2.53	2.45
Fear of change amongst tenants	2.18	2.23	2.26	2.29	2.26

Table seventeen: barriers to effective tenant involvement – four options were given to these questions – not a barrier, a slight barrier, a barrier, a very significant barrier – resulting in a ranking scale from 1 to 4

Appendix four – analysis of Call for Evidence information

LA – local authority; HA – housing association; ALMO – Arms Length Management Organisation; TMC – tenant management co-operative; TMO – tenant management organisation; RMO – Resident Management Organisation; EMB – Estate Management Board; EMA – Estate Management Association

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
Abbey Road Housing Co-op	London	280	LA TMC	Managing housing service from local office	Community spirit and large attendance at co-op events; no ASB
ABC Southwark Housing Co-op	London	40	HA TMC	Managing housing service with some volunteers delivering services	Saving between £5K and £10K per annum enabling them to resource major works
Accent Group	National	20,500	HA	Scrutiny panel recommendation led to changed timescale and focus on early informal resolution of complaints	Saved money and led to increased satisfaction with complaints handling
Accord Group - Ashram Housing	Midlands	13,000 (2,800)	HA	Arden Park Residents Association set up to tackle problems relating to boiler replacement programme	Increased satisfaction and closer relationship between tenants and HA; RA chair put forward for Board membership
Accord Group - Caldmore Housing	Midlands	13,000 (7,200)	HA	Report on leaseholder consultation about parking problem	Problem resolved to satisfaction of residents; removal of potential for confrontation relating to parking problem; closer working relationship between leaseholders and HA
Adactus	North	13,000	HA	Tenants run community grants scheme	Individual and community relationships; landlord reputation
Alliance Homes	South	6,500	HA	Intergenerational festivals	Tackling ASB & isolation
AmicusHorizon	London & South	28,000	HA	Various activities	See case study
Asra Group	Midlands & London	14,000	HA	(a) complaints, voids and other scrutiny exercises resulting in multiple changes (b) Braunstone action day	(a) increase in satisfaction with complaints handling from 29% to 93%; drop in compensation payments from £1250 average per month in 2012 to £143 per month in 2013 with 60% paid by contractor; reduction of numbers of voids from 471 in 2012 to 147 in 2014 (b) residents taking "ownership" - ASB reduction and use of park

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
Barnet Homes	London	15,000	ALMO	Tenant involvement in gas service contract; BME volunteers involved in discussing arrears with BME residents	7% increase in gas satisfaction; reduction in BME arrears
Belle Isle TMO	North	2,000	LA TMO	TMO managing most aspects of management	Satisfaction increase 75% (2011) to 85% (2013); increase in community involvement; annual costs savings; improved performance across all KPIs
Blenheim Gardens RMO	London	440	LA TMO	Tenant led TMO supporting a study support group for key stages of education	Breaking the cycle of low educational attainment on an estate with many families from disadvantaged backgrounds
Bloomsbury EMB	Midlands	700	LA TMO	TMO managing housing services at local office	Rent collection and arrears performance better than landlord
Boston Mayflower	Midlands	4,800	HA	Scrutiny activities	Led to improvements in fencing, for example, which in turn led to improved satisfaction
Bracknell Forest Homes	Midlands	7,000	HA	Scrutiny reviews into mobile caretaking service, customer involvement, responsive repairs and voids and lettings services	Customer point of view in reviews - looking at things differently from staff; service improvements & cost savings; better relations between staff and tenants; better understanding of tenant needs (by staff) and business needs (by tenants); estimate that voluntary contribution saves one FT staff post; benefits for those involved; pride in their achievements
Brighton & Hove Council	South	12,000	LA	(a) Tenant Disability Network working on new adaptations leaflet (b) RA working with staff to redesign cleaning services in a block (c) housing customer team scrutiny review	(a) greater understanding of services from the perspective of disabled people; made leaflet easily accessible for customer base (b) produced a less "one size fits all service"; better understanding of resources available and how best to use them (c) recommendations to introduce new ICT system and relocate team - leading to operational benefits
Bristol City Council	South	30,000	LA	Tenants involved in redesigning repairs service and in procuring, monitoring and inspecting contractors	Record levels of customer satisfaction - most improved service; high levels of satisfaction with planned programmes; reduction in time to complete standard repairs; improved relet standard; £1m savings from use of new contractor

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
Browning EMA	London	432	LA TMO	(a) TMO management committee (b) support for Lockwood Football Academy	(a) savings on management allowance; a focus on planned maintenance through MOTs; better targeting of whole community (eg. an app for younger generation) (b) engagement of young people - ASB down 15%
Bushbury Hill EMB	Midlands	847	LA TMO	(a) tenant controlled Board (b) sponsoring football club	High service performance - low rent arrears (with intensive welfare reform strategy); same day repairs service (saved £25K pa on repairs budget); high levels of engagement (620 responses in recent survey) (b) strengthening community & tackling ASB
Cambridge Housing Society	Midlands	2,700	HA	Scrutiny of voids handling	Scrutiny panel recommendation saved about £10K and void turnaround times dropped from 20 to 10 days
Central & Cecil Housing Trust	London	Sprrted housing	HA	Resident request for less paper; scrutiny on security/communications	£2K per annum savings; improved CCTV and signage; improved communications
Cheltenham Borough Homes	South West	4,500	ALMO	(a) work with senior, leaseholder, disabled and Polish groups (b) Tenant Scrutiny of voids, ASB, Grounds maintenance and repairs	(a) building trust with potentially disadvantaged groups, improving services and confidence for those involved (b) various service improvements and building trust with tenants
Childwall Valley EMB	North West	1,300	HA TMO	Tenant controlled Board	Turning around an estate with a poor reputation; tackling ASB; achieving a 9 day turnaround for voids; 92% satisfaction rate
Circle Housing Group	National	66,000	HA group	4 year repairs and maintenance review - ongoing customer engagement panels - 400 residents involved in process	Social dividend: Increase in customer loyalty, customers felt valued, included and heard, personal skill development, customer understanding of the change journey; savings from revised approach estimated at £100m over 10 years

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
City of Lincoln	Midlands	9,000	LA	(a) Lincoln Tenant Panel (b) tenant void inspections (c) consultation on tenancy agreement (d) lease of community office on Tower estate (e) Gaunt Street garden project	(a) dialogue between panel and residents cuts down issues, problems and complaints amongst tenants (b) low cost high quality void inspections (c) fairer and better accepted new tenancy agreement (d) tackling ASB (e) greater sense of community and engagement - generally tackling loneliness and isolation for elderly and vulnerable people
CityWest Housing	London	21,000	ALMO	CityWest Factor – tenant run scheme to allocate funding to youth schemes	Benefits regarding perceptions of young people - helping them to develop skills and good local community projects
Coastline Housing	South	4,000	HA	Scrutiny exercise on void and lettings procedure	Increased satisfaction with lettings process and better understanding for new tenants of services
Cobalt	North	5,800	HA	Tenant review of contractor performance	Better quality contractor and cost savings through local knowledge
Colchester Borough Homes	Midlands	7,200	ALMO	Task and finish policy and strategy groups/ consultations	Tenant perspective; demonstrating listening and acting; confidence, trust and knowledge building amongst tenants involved; socialising & networking
Community Gateway Association	North	6,000	HA	Various activities	See case study
Cornwall Housing	South	10,500	ALMO	Example of development of tenants group in an over 65's scheme	Self-sufficient local group that has raised £10K in funding; broadband in scheme; tackling isolation; building community
Cowley RMO	London	366	LA TMO	TMO supporting a community food farm; community kitchen; silver surfer scheme	Integrating BME (eg. Bangladeshi people) and all residents; products harvested and shared; educational benefits for young people and teaching single mums the basics of cooking
Crawley Council	South	8,000	LA	Tenant & Leaseholder Panel carried out repairs review	Service improvements - improvement in customer experience and contractors have a better understanding of what is going on; improvements in appointments system; improvements in early stage complaints handling
Cross Keys Homes	Midlands	10,000	HA	Cross Keys Residents Board with devolved powers set up in 2014	Better VFM – eg. tenant scrutiny identified that tenants should be charged for missed appointments

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
East Kent Housing (4 LA ALMO)	South	18,000	ALMO	(a) scrutiny of sheltered housing (b) neighbourhood volunteer inspectors (c) "Can you click it" digital champions	(a) tenants wanted less of a one size fits all service - resulted in personalised service; better focused but no additional resources (b) has helped focus local resources where they are needed (c) tenants trained to support other tenants become digitally active - tenants helped shape courses for local people - little cost but good local benefits
East Riding of Yorkshire	North	11,000	LA	(a) Tenant Forum; local standards survey (b) Tenant voids inspections (c) scrutiny on ASB and grounds maintenance	(a) Service based on tenant priorities; accountability to tenants in annual report (b) voids - meeting customer needs and expectations; increased satisfaction; fewer visits from maintenance staff (c) local ownership - policy involvement results in fairness, user friendliness and accessibility
Hastoe Housing Group	South	6,500	HA	Tenant scrutiny, consultation and role in estate improvements	Community strategy action plans resulted in £66K budgeted for improvements directly requested by tenants. Individuals benefit from training.
Holland Rise & Whitebeam Close TMO	London	110	TMO	TMO managing estate via local estate office.	Lower costs and higher satisfaction than LB Lambeth for similar block
Home Group	National	55,000	HA	6,913 customers and clients involved locally, regionally and nationally; Human Library enabling discussion about diversity issues; customers involved in staff induction/training & VFM assessments; involvement champions recruiting involvement volunteers	Increased skills and confidence of involved residents; case study of estate services in south region resulting in £400K per annum savings; involvement helping clients with support needs move on - case study in Cornwall where 75% of clients now seeking work or doing voluntary work; 50% involved in other voluntary activities; 25% doing training courses - and high satisfaction rate in involvement opportunities.
Homes in Sedgemoor	South	4,200	ALMO	Sedgemoor Tenants Voice; tenants involved in voids inspections, decent homes surveys and complaints review	Increased tenant awareness passed on to other tenants; improved services and procedures
Hull City Council	North	25,000	LA	Various activities	See case study

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
Hyde	London & South	49,000	HA	Hydewide Residents Voice; Communications sub-group; Residents Eye carrying out inspections	120 service improvements; improved communications; improvements in ASB, lettings and complaints handling following inspections
Incommunities	North	25,000	HA	Training volunteer interpreters	Making the service more accessible to vulnerable communities and providing employment and other opportunities to the tenants involved; tenant feedback has added kerb appeal to homes hard to let
Ipswich Borough Council	Midlands	8,000	LA	Silver surfers scheme	Boosting tenant skills; helping tenants remain in touch with relatives; tenants training other tenants
Islington TMOs	London	4,000	LA TMOs	25 TMOs and co-ops managing LB Islington homes	High satisfaction; £5mill surplus developed over the years (10% of allowances); better repairs performance than LA; very few complaints;
Kensington and Chelsea TMO	London	10,000	LA TMO	TMO membership, elected board, various engagement, youth and childrens TMO	Strengthening democracy; increasing satisfaction; good performance; good VFM - static management fee; but improved services and engagement and reduced HRA debt
Knightstone	South	11,000	HA	Various tenant-led groups; inspections; tenants involved in procurement - tenants designed the "Doorstep Standard" for contractors; Westford Grange Dream Scheme	Multiple service improvements; cost savings; understanding perspective of tenants; improved communications; improving services relating to customer insight; trust, transparency, challenge; tenant understanding of procurement process; individual skills leading to employment; cost effective way of dealing with estate suffering ASB problems

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
London Borough of Camden	London	23,000	LA & TMOs	(a) estate consultation (b) a focussed regeneration activity (c) community cashback for caretaking and cleaning (d) supporting TMOs	(a) housing services brought to residents and opportunity to meet neighbours - for council - promoting public health and recycling, collecting data from broad cross section of residents, getting staff visible on estates (b) wide benefits relating to the design of the new homes and community (c) tenants tailoring the service and making cost savings which could be used for local community benefits (e) TMOs outperforming LB on complaints; repairs and frontline services
London Borough of Southwark	London	54,000	LA TMOs	4,275 homes managed by 15 TMOs; various community activities; local lettings	Satisfaction statistics higher for TMOs than other LA homes (for tenants and leaseholders - much higher the latter); rent collection better; repairs and voids statistics better; transformation of estates; community benefits; support for elderly people; planned programmes out of surpluses
Leathermarket Joint Management Board	London	1,500	LA TMO	Various activities	See case study
Leeds City Council	North	57,000	LA	Engagement work, including on health, employment, food, environmental; various projects eg. Passion 4 Fashion young people's scheme	Building up local intelligence and information on drug dealing, ASB, benefit enquiries, repairs, estate improvements; dealing with issues earlier, being aware of abuse, saving homes for tenants, saving time and energy of staff, gathering information on vulnerable tenants – supporting various groups - young people budgeting and life skills
Leeds Federated	North	4,000	HA	Leeds Collaborative Group, a tenant group across 6 associations – carries out scrutiny and other activities	Service standards improved - repairs, planned works, lettings standards, complaints appeals. The Collab Group resulted in changes to grounds maintenance, resulting in lower service charges for some tenants.
Lewes District Council	South	3,257	LA	Various engagement methods	Multiple local community benefits (credit union, youth services, community events etc) and service improvements through TRAs/scrutiny reviews

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
Liverpool Housing Trust (part of Symphony)	North	10,000	HA	(a) scrutiny of voids/ allocations (b) scrutiny of sheltered housing (d) welfare reform tenant champions - a tenant led approach to publicity	(a) cost savings used for decorating allowances for hard to lets - fewer complaints and higher satisfaction with new homes - fewer homes refused (b) found high levels of service and satisfaction - but useful to reinforce and support staff involved (d) has helped to bring staff teams together to deal with welfare reform - enabling LHT engage with traditionally hard to reach tenants
L&Q Group	London & South	70,000	HA	Scrutiny of various activities; comments from tenant group	Service quality, costs and time resources outcomes; increased confidence, understanding issues, meeting new friends
Magenta Living	North	12,000	HA	Various social and community activities	Combating social isolation amongst elderly; facilities for children; helping social interaction; environmental benefits; employment skills; tackling ASB; raising local funds; supporting vulnerable people; building skills and confidence; building local community
Merlin Housing Society	South	9,000	HA	Tenant to tenant surveys using mobiles; scrutiny of complaints handling	Gathering information that has improved tenant satisfaction
Mid Devon District Council	South	3,000	LA	Tenants influenced annual report	A report more likely to be read by tenants
Milton Keynes Council	Midlands	14,000	LA	Community engagement; tenants involved in various ways	Increased effectiveness; better targetted services meeting individual needs; increased efficiency; sustainable services; continual evaluation and development
Minster Housing Co-op	South	36	Co-op	Governed by 15 tenant committee; community activities; children's club local charity fund raising	90% satisfaction ratings; strong community; safety and security; people know their neighbours; local contractor makes cost savings; developing business acumen amongst community, particularly women
New Charter	North	19,500	HA	Scrutiny advised bringing grounds maintenance in house; resident furniture recycling scheme	Savings of £1m over 5 years; improvements in satisfaction; reusing furniture left in voids & training/volunteering opportunities for local people; 2 people now employed

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
North Lincolnshire Homes (part of Ongo Group)	Midlands	10,000	HA	Scrutiny reviews into complaints handling; call handling; aids & adaptations; keeping tenants informed	Cost savings; improved performance; better communications; improved satisfaction ratings;
North Tyneside Council	North	15,000	LA	Service groups and Overview Panel	Various service improvements and added value for tenants
Nottingham City Homes	Midlands	27,000	ALMO	Tenant inspectors; complaints panel; equality panel; communications panel; young inspectors programme; local groups	Reality checks on frontline services; improved policy on translations; investigating and closing 52 complaints; improving the equality and diversity strategy; improved communications; tackling ASB issues; improved appearance of estates and community cohesion; new skills and better understanding amongst young people; opportunities for tenants involved
Ocean Housing	South	4,000	HA	Tenant panel and tenant scrutiny	Improved services; improved satisfaction; better customer insight
One Vision	North	11,000	HA	Tenants rewriting gas letters in plain English	Better communication; less court action; less risk for the association
Paragon	London & South	9,000	HA	Green based activities. Promoting fire safety through young people.	Bringing unused or derelict land back into use; promotion of fire safety issues; benefits for young people involved
Peaks and Plains Housing Trust	North	5,000	HA	Tenant scrutiny of complaints and repairs; development of tenant expenses policy and Tenant Times newsletter	Cost savings and speedier resolution of complaints; increasing satisfaction with repairs; fairer tenant expenses policy; tenant focussed newsletter has encouraged other tenants to engage
Pembroke Street EMB	South	153	HA TMO	TMO manages housing services from local office	High satisfaction levels; cost savings by reducing turnover of homes; successful interventions to reduce levels of vandalism, crime and ASB
Peter Bedford HA	London	Sprrted housing	HA	PBHA tenant forum; volunteering opportunities (editing newsletter, reception/admin, catering and joinery)	Tenants feeling follow up of complaints has improved as a result of issues being raised in forum; forum a good means of tenants meeting people; saving money on communal services; volunteering opportunities not only financially beneficial to PBHA, but also improves confidence, employability and reduces isolation of tenants

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
PETRA TMO	London	146	TMO	Managing housing service from local office	Cost savings from efficient use of allowance; reduction of graffiti, drug dealing and ASB
Rooftop Housing Group	Midlands	6,150	HA	Assessment of various RI activities; ASB & grounds maintenance reviews	Service improvements
Selwood	South	5,800	HA	Scrutiny review of customer service	Service improvements
Soha Housing	Midlands	6,000	HA	Various activities	See case study
Springs Tenant Management Co-op	North	550	LA TMO	Managing housing service from local office	Management KPIs at or above top quartile; good performance on relet time, repairs, rent collection and void loss
Suffolk Housing	Midlands	2,500	HA	Scrutiny on grounds maintenance and income recovery	Increasing tenant satisfaction from service improvements; increased confidence routes to work and personal development for those involved - referred to HACT social value of £780K
Teign Housing	South	3,600	HA	Supporting tenant volunteers to get NVQs in customer service	Tenants getting into employment
Trent and Dove	Midlands	5,700	HA	Local involvement in new schemes; panel monitoring dissatisfaction	Transforming derelict and unused land into desirable homes; improvements in complaints handling
Two Piers Housing Co-op	South	22 (66 in shared housing)	Co-op	All services delivered by volunteer member tenants through 6 management groups	Empowerment of those involved; learning how to solve problems collectively; feeling part of social change; everyone knows and looks out for each other; neighbourliness and tackling isolation (ie. eating together at Christmas); DIY - saving money
Walterton and Elgon CH	London	640	HA	WECH owns and manages homes with a resident majority board	High levels of tenant satisfaction with housing services and community
Wenlock Barn TMO	London	1400	HA TMO	Management of estate through local office; transforming waste land into food growing area and orchard; set up Murray Grove Youth Forum	Improved performance since TMO took more control by employing own staff eg rent arrears and voids performance; garden project - community cohesion - environmental benefits - nutrition etc; training young people in peer advocacy; combating gang culture; bringing together people of different nationalities and ages

Landlord	Area	Size	Type	Activity	Benefits referred to
Wigan and Leigh Housing	North	22,000	ALMO	Tenant scrutiny of investment programmes; financial advice; tenant requests for more social activities for older people	Tenant-led approach to enabling savings to tenant fuel bills; employment of Financial Information Officers - reducing evictions; improved satisfaction; reduced arrears - direct assistance to tenants – elderly people activities - improved confidence; tackling isolation; increased satisfaction; tenants "better able to cope"; equivalent to 3 FTE staff
Wythenshawe Community Housing Group	North	14,000	HA	Scrutiny activities	More rigorous scrutiny than would be possible for an outside organisation and over a 6-12 month period (rather than a day's inspection); Scrutiny panel recommendations required contractor to check on compliance with code of conduct
Yarlington	South	9,500	HA	Yarlington Chat - social media based activity - huge uptake on training	Enables staff to talk to residents, hear view, act on issues; changed attitudes and relationships; improves company; improves lives of residents; less calls to call centre; staff and residents a better understanding of each other
Your Housing	National	34,000	HA	Community projects	Financial and digital inclusion; community benefits
20/20 Housing Co-op	Midlands	49	Co-op	Run by 8 member committee; volunteer input into services	c£20K savings annually because of volunteer input (including £3K for repairs volunteer); high quality service; strong community feel; high satisfaction

Appendix Five – attendance at workshops

Cross Keys Homes, Peterborough	Mixed workshop
Damian Roche	Accent Housing Group
Wendy Dyer	Accent Residents Panel
Kaz Jardine	Boston Mayflower
Diane Johnson	Boston Mayflower
Ken Spilsbury	Bushbury Hill EMB
Karen Williams	Bushbury Hill EMB
John Ide	Cambridge Housing Society
Jan Mills	Circle Housing Group
Chris Morton	City of Lincoln
Dorris	Cross Keys Homes
Christina Malle	Cross Keys Homes
Cindy Cottis	Cross Keys Homes
Sue Clarke	Orbit Group
Russell Heath	Orbit Group
Community Gateway Association, Preston	Tenant workshop
David Yates	CGA
Joan Minard	Childwall Valley EMB
Teresa Edwards	Childwall Valley EMB
Pam O Conn	Home Group
Roger Pearce	Jephson Housing Association
Christine Devine	One Vision Housing
Marjory Marsden	Wigan & Leigh Homes
Branda Stirling	Wythenshawe CHG
Phil Crahan	Your Housing Group
Ursula Vasey	Your Housing Group
Community Gateway Association Preston	Staff workshop
Amy Davis	Adactus Housing
Anita Patel	CGA
Naomi Jordan	City West Housing Trust
Phil Dillon	Cobalt Housing
Debra Berry	First Choice Homes Oldham
Kate O Donnell	Home Group
Alison Leech	Incommunities
Jo Phillips	Liverpool Housing Trust
Sue Cox	New Charter Homes
Melissa Conlen	One Vision Housing
Kate Henderson	Progress Housing Group
Ian Coulton	Progress Housing Group
Mark Hoskisson	Riverside
Dave Bainbridge	Wigan & Leigh Homes
Graham Heslin	Wythenshawe CHG
Kayley Waite	Your Housing Group

Bristol City Council	Mixed workshop
Stephen Crew	Alliance Homes
Charles Caritas	Alliance Homes
Dale Durrant	Bristol City Council
Lesha Wilson	Bristol City Council
Pat Rous	East Devon District Council
Jane Reading	East Devon District Council
Janet Fowler	Homes In Sedgemoor
Chris Moseley	Homes in Sedgmoor
Carrie Butcher	Knightstone Housing
Dave Withens	Knightstone Housing
Stella Milsom	Knightstone Housing
Rebecca Knot	Merlin Housing Society
Janet Knight	Merlin Housing Society
Louisa Massey	Merlin Housing Society
Joan Swift	Paragon
Simon Martin	Paragon
Juliana Colhorn	Selwood Housing
Kate Gurner	Selwood Housing
Angela Harding	Soha Housing
Trevor Brewerton	Soha Housing
Lynn Wignall	Soha Housing
Karen Johnson	Teign Housing
Kay Rowlinson	Westward Housing
Hull	Mixed workshop
Emily Thomas	Broadacres
Christine Cunningham	Cross Keys Homes
John Bradbury	Cross Keys Homes
Mr Loveday	East Riding of Yorkshire
Mavis Vine	East Riding of Yorkshire
Cllr Symon Fraser	East Riding of Yorkshire
Jimmy Eyre	Guinness Northern Counties
Victoria Talbot	Guinness Northern Counties
Penny Rodmell	Hull City Council
Sally Smith	Hull City Council
Ian Montgomery	Leeds City Council
Brian Perrior	Leeds Collaborative Forum
Kingsley Iball	Leeds Federated Housing
David Atkinson	Leeds Tenants Federation
Ted Wilson	Leeds Tenants Federation
Jamie Martin	Magenta Living
Karen Harrison	Newcastle Tenants Federation
Elizabeth Stevenson	Places for People
Jenny Cavanagh	Your Homes Newcastle
Val Scholar	Your Homes Newcastle

AmicusHorizon, Croydon	Tenant workshop
Helena Ingham	Amicus Horizon
Matthew Bromley	Amicus Horizon
Linda Scamp	Amicus Horizon
Glen Cady	Amicus Horizon
Merle Johnson	Colchester Borough Homes
Mick O Sullivan	Finsbury Park Housing Co-op
Fay Edwards	Kensington & Chelsea TMO
Kush Kanodia	Kensington & Chelsea TMO
Marilyn Smithies	LB Croydon
Vicky Plummer	Lewes District Council
Debbie Twitchen	Lewes District Council
Ruth Tahsin	Lewes District Council
Fayann Simpson	LQ Group
Peter Crabtree	Metropolitan
Annette Archer	Metropolitan
David Cummins	Phoenix Community Housing
Betti Blatman	Viridian
Leroy Gittens	Viridian
Cherub Esomonu	Viridian
AmicusHorizon, Croydon	Staff workshop
Sharon Terry	Brighton & Hove Council
Masood Hussain	Browning EMA
Robert Hollingsworth	Cambridge City Council
Mark Allen	Chisel
Rebecca McGuinness	East Kent Housing
Yvonne Birch	Kensington & Chelsea TMO
Wendy Mason	Kent Engagement Group
Stephen Driscoll	LB Croydon
Liz Collins	LB Croydon
Ruth Fairbourn	LQ Group
Michele Naclerio	Metropolitan
Karen Orr	Newlon Housing Group
Sandra Franklin	Norwich City Council
Darlene Martin	Phoenix Community Housing
Sue Tew	Saxon Weald
Pauline Rhone	Viridian
Angela During	Wandle

LB Southwark	TMO workshop
Francis Owusu-Sekyere	Abbey Road Co-op
Mike Ford	Abbey Road Co-op
Deborah Beckford	Barnet Homes
Masood Hussain	Browning EMA
Tee Fabikun	Carpenters TMO
Richard Tarling	Charfield Court Co-op
Glenn Martin	Chuckery TMO/WATMOS
Mervyn Thomason	City West Homes
Ronke Ayoola	Cowley TMO
Eoin Queiry	Hackney Homes
Margaret Stoll	Kilburn Square
Kim Thompson	LB Camden
Lee Page	LB Southwark
Len Dalrymple	Leathermarket JMB
Mike Davis	PETRA TMO
Jan Davis	PETRA TMO
Nick Reynolds	Roman Way Estate TMO
Frank Baffour	Wenlock Barn TMO
Optima Homes, Birmingham	Mixed workshop
Ian Cook	Accord Housing
Ashley Lovell	Accord Housing
Ricky Aitken	ASRA Group
Kamal Dhorajja	ASRA Group
Angela Daly	Birmingham City Council
Evangeline Cripps	Birmingham City Council
Graham Raine	Bracknell Forest Homes
Stephanie Verstraeten	Bracknell Forest Homes
Shane Winfield	Cheltenham Borough Homes
Clare Pockett	Cheltenham Borough Homes
Donna Foster	Midland Heart
Jeanette Marling	Milton Keynes District Council
Lizzie Bailes	Milton Keynes District Council
Anne Russell	Optima
Liz Ketland	Optima Homes
Jess Allan	Optima Homes
Paul Kellard	Rooftop Housing Group
Melanie Pilliner	Sevenside Housing
Pat Davis	Stockport Homes
Jeremy Beatty	Stockport Homes
Michael Gelling	TAROE
Richard Collins	TCHG
Phil Roberts	TCHG
Gill Smith	TCHG
Melanie Wilson Davis	Tuntum
Heinz Hoffner	Vale of Aylesbury Homes
Jane Richards	Vale of Aylesbury Homes