

TENANT SATISFACTION MEASURES

SUMMARY OF APPROACH

INTRODUCTION

This document provides an overview of the approaches and methodologies used in gathering data in relation to customers' perceptions of the quality of key services delivered by Places for People Group. This data was then used to calculate our Tenant Satisfaction Measures, for the financial year 2023/24.

WHO WE INVITED TO COMPLETE THE PERCEPTION SURVEY

Places for People owns more than 1,000 units of Low Cost Rental Accommodation (LCRA), and more than 1,000 units of Low Cost Home Ownership (LCHO). In line with the specific expectations of the Regulator of Social Housing, we were obliged to collect and report perception data for both categories of tenure. This was something that we were very happy to adhere to.

TIMING OF THE PERCEPTION SURVEY

Our customer surveys were carried out over a six-month period between the end of August 2023 and mid-February 2024. These were conducted in batches and phases, so that survey responses could be managed more effectively. We also wanted to minimise the impact of customers contacting us in relation to the survey. In the event, there were relatively small volumes of follow-up correspondence, which our customer contact centre was able to manage effectively.

WORKING WITH HOUSEMARK

Housemark Ltd was contracted by us to assist with the collection of telephone surveys, analysis of results, and to validate the survey data. We felt that this ensured objectivity, and adherence to industry standards, such as the Market Research Society's Code of Conduct.

Working closely with Housemark also provided us with a robust stamp of authority and assurance that comes with employing a company widely acknowledged as being one of the sector leaders in this type of activity.

We commissioned Housemark to achieve 10,000 survey responses via telephone, which we knew would provide us with a solid base of responses, based on the overall number of homes we own and manage.

To ensure as many customers as possible could have their say, we took a census approach. We aspired to contact as much of our customer base as possible. To achieve this end, Housemark attempted to contact more than four times the number of responses it eventually gleaned.

We felt that this was the right methodology. Taking this approach was very important to Places for People, as engaging with our customers and asking for their feedback is critical. It gave us a rich volume of data, that enhanced the validity of the results and set a clear baseline for benchmarking of performance in relation to customer satisfaction of our services.

That's why the first year of Tenant Satisfaction Measures was so important to us, and why we left no stone unturned to get to the answers and detail that we needed.

SUPPLEMENTING HOUSEMARK'S WORK

While Housemark's work represented the core of all responses, we supplemented this by our own internal work. We took the learnings from a pilot exercise conducted in early 2024, and adopted a multi-channel methodology, comprising email, telephone and face to face, to reach the maximum number of customers as possible.

We conducted in-person surveys with customers who do not have email or phone contact details. Additionally, we inputted customers' survey responses on handheld devices, particularly for residents of later living and supported housing, who required additional support. We sent links to complete the survey where we held email addresses of customers who we had not been able to reach via telephone or in person. We also provided postal cards containing instructions to either complete the survey over the telephone, or by scanning a QR code to access the survey link, when customers were unavailable for contact, or did not answer their doors. We took the decision not to exclude any customers from our sample base.

Housemark collated and analysed all feedback collected across the various contact methods, to report back the findings to us following the conclusion of activities.

No incentives were offered to customer to complete their surveys. We felt that we would not need to rely on this to gather the requisite number of responses.

THE TEMPLATE FOR THE SURVEY

Our survey contained the prescribed twelve questions only. We gave customers the opportunity to provide verbatim comments to understand the reasons for their scores, in relation to TP01 (overall satisfaction) and TP09 (feeling safe in their homes).

For TP01, we followed up with, “*could you please tell us the reason why you gave this score?*” if the customer told us that they were *fairly dissatisfied* or *very dissatisfied*. For TP09, we followed up with, “*could you please tell us the reason why you gave this score?*” if the customer told us that they were *fairly dissatisfied* or *very dissatisfied*.

TESTING THE ROBUSTNESS OF THE SAMPLE BASE

The tenant satisfaction survey conducted achieved a sample size of 10,676 responses, which represents a 25% response rate from the total customer population of all LCRA & LCHO dwellings. This is an extremely robust base of results, with a margin of error of <1%, which is significantly better than the regulatory requirement of 2%.

The representativeness of the sample was assessed against principal characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, disability, and geography. This was to ensure that the sample accurately reflected the diversity of our customer population.

Our methodology to attribute responses back to customers to determine if responses were representative of our customer base was deemed to be successful. The sample's demographics were compared against the overall tenant population to assess representativeness. We found that the various customer groups were well represented, with either full representation, or a non-material difference compared to the customer base. Because of this, weighting of the results was not required.

CONCLUSION

We were pleased to conclude our first year of Tenant Satisfaction Measures. The results have provided us with rich data that we can use to improve frontline services to our customers. We are accountable for that, and customers will judge us on our performance in Year 2, and future years. We will review, evaluate, and refine our approach to getting data in 2024/25, based on the valuable learning derived from the first year.