

## Tenant Scrutiny Group

### Minutes

Sunday 28 January 2024

10- 2pm, at Saffron Barn

#### Attendees

**Tenants:** Lauren Bromage (LB), Steve Hastings (SH), Fiona McGregor (FM), Mary Riddell (MR), Peter White (PW)

**Staff:** Emilie Hildreth (EH) Tenants & Communities Manager, Rebecca LeCaille (RL) Tenants & Communities Officer

**Apologies:** None

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Actions
<b>-Apologies</b>	There were no apologies.	
<b>-Agree last Minutes</b>	LB welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked if there were any declarations of interest. RL explained what this meant. There were no declarations of interest.	
<b>-Declarations of interest</b>	The minutes of the last meeting were agreed.	
<b>Review TSG Reports &amp; Updates</b>	<p>LB explained to members that they would be looking at all the TSG reports over Q1, Q2 and Q3 and reviewing what has happened as a result of their recommendations. Members would be looking at Q1 and Q2 during the meeting and at the next virtual meeting will be looking at the progress and the status of the Q3 report.</p> <p>This will be the basis of the Q4 as a wrap up report for the year. LB explained its closing the full loop and checking that something has happened because of the group's recommendations.</p> <p>SH asked if there are deadlines on the actions and recommendations. RL responded that the future reports will go to the service manager before SQC, so that the manager can respond and feedback to their recommendations and</p>	

submit their own report on these to SQC, at the same time their report is submitted. This would be discussed at the SQC meeting and actions are put on a live document that goes to the service manager to take forward.

### **Q1 report – CCT Repairs call handing**

Kim Jones had provided a response to the recommendations in the reports.

**Recommendations** - Review in 6-9 months' time review the new questions flows (Keyfax) to see if this has been fully rolled out and is effective.

**Response:** *It is believed Business Transformation have this down as a follow up action as part of the Repairs Review Project. Two new members to the Keyfax Working group have been recruited, and this will be more joined into Maintenance Scheduling also.*

*At present Change team haven't done the 6 months check due, to resourcing and urgency with other projects. However, all repairs raised via CCT automatically conform to a certain format, example below, which captures trade, location (including interior/exterior, which floor is it on or which area of the garden, whereabouts is the component to be fixed in the room/garden and what needs doing). There's also an SOR code which describes the repair type (e.g. P066 – Renew Shower) which is a mandatory requirement in every job raised to operatives.*

**Example:** *SYSTEM GENERATED TEXT: Shower: Not working. Interior Repair; Ground Floor; Bathroom; Uncontainable Leak.*

*ADDITIONAL FREETEXT: Electric shower is leaking, not getting hot and making unusual noises. This is the only means of washing.*

*SOR CODES: PX01 – Internal water leak, P066 – Renew Shower*

*Not all repairs raised outside of CCT use the same repairs diagnosis system (Keyfax) and some of these teams were out of scope for the repairs review. These repairs are all raised manually (everything is freetext other than the SOR codes).*

**Action:** LB asked if the Group could do a random spot check of approx. ten to twenty repairs jobs raised to see if people are filling information on jobs correctly.

To be added to TSG Q4 report

	<p><b>Action:</b> SH suggested to check what the craftworkers can access and see about jobs on their devices. After the report on Q3 there is a disconnect on what the craftworkers are saying and the response to this recommendation in the Q1 report.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> LB ask if it could be found out when the Teams outside of the scope for the repairs review, will be looked at as part of the on-going repairs review.</p> <p>SH felt the process for heating worked well and questioned whether it could be replicated across the rest. RL explained this difficult because of the wide breadth of general day to day repairs.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b> CCT do not know about the Tenant Volunteer Groups.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <i>A script for call handlers to use when speaking with tenants and for a period this was monitored as part of a time scaled soft launch but to note is not a continual part of call monitoring. Information relating to the groups is being added to the automatic telephone response. The tenant group FAQ is being sent when we acknowledge and issue stage 1 responses. New starters in team also aware.</i></p> <p><b>Action:</b> LB asked if a spot check to see if those things are being done.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> Damp &amp; Mould appears to come up a lot in email and portal enquiries. We were advised that call handlers should be sending out an advice sheet or direct tenants to the website.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <i>This was done, and the group were asked to note that the help sheet is currently being updated again and will include information for New Build properties also.</i></p> <p>The Group also recommended that ore proactive work before the season when damp and mould is most prevalent. Encourage tenants to check boilers, open windows regularly and share information sheets earlier. Comms Team started doing some information on Facebook there was some feedback from TSCG was that this was not useful to tenants and that we were implying it was tenants' faults that they have damp and mould. Members of TSG disagreed with this and felt that Saffron should ask tenants what would be useful to know about damp and mould. Members liked the how to prevent mould and damp messages.</p>	<p>RL to find out and report back to group</p> <p>Added to Q4 Report</p> <p>RL to arrange</p>
--	---	---

	<p><b>Action:</b> To find out when the updated sheet will be done and to ask tenants what information would be useful to know about regarding damp and mould.</p> <p><b>It was Agreed</b> that the Group look at some anonymised tenant journeys in relation to damp and mould, and to note that this could be a project for next year looking at the feedback and would include working with the TSCG.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> There is Disconnect between CCT and other departments in both emails and calls. CCT have 10 days to respond to an email, but other departments and staff do not appear to have these service standards so all departments should send an acknowledge email when receiving an action request or case from CCT. The email should include the departments Service Level Agreement (SLA) if they are not able to answer the query immediately. CCT should be provided with the Service Level Agreements for each department so they can advise tenants when they call.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <i>No official movement on this. RL went on to explain departments have been asked to come up with Internal Service Level Agreements. This is in motion and all departments have submitted theirs and these will form part of the tenant service standards. EH added that these are no longer with Lou Chapman and have been passed to Paula Tuck (PT).</i></p> <p><b>Action:</b> LB asked for an update of where the Service Standards are.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> CCT not able to pass tenant calls through to the relevant department or person. We understand that Neighbourhood Officers do not always get the opportunity to take calls due to the nature of their job roles. Housing management to provide feedback to SQC on the possibility of Neighbourhood Officers going back to having duty days and dealing with all enquiries regarding neighbourhood matters. Including pros/cons, work level implications, staffing levels etc.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <i>RL reported that nothing has been actioned for this recommendation which was looking at the possibilities of Neighbourhood looking at duty days. IT was agreed that this recommendation was not picked up and needs to be followed up.</i></p>	<p>RL to find out and report back to group</p> <p>To be considered for Scrutiny Project next year</p> <p>To be added to TSG Q4 report</p> <p>To be added to TSG Q4 report</p>
--	--	---

	<p><b>Q2 Report – Shadowing the Maintenance Schedulers</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Review quality of Inspectors role and update training to include necessary information required to remove the additional rework and duplicate attendance.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <i>As we have two inspectors, sometimes the level of detail can be inconsistent. Proposed changes to the structure of this side of the business have been planned in the new financial year which will improve consistency if approved.</i></p> <p><b>It was agreed:</b> that the group will do a follow up in the new financial year in Q2.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Review Craftworker holiday procedures and Saffron holiday policy. There should be a maximum number of staff off at a time and ideally holiday booked in advance to allow for schedulers to be able to manage diaries, except for emergency leave.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <i>A rota has been produced and is currently being held by MS Team to monitor and approve holiday. Rules have been put in place regarding number of same trades on leave at one time.</i></p> <p><b>Action:</b> The group would like the Maintenance Schedulers to be asked whether the holiday approval system is working better.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Improved inter-management between craftworkers and schedulers. This would create better working between staff and reduce diary cancellations. The improvement in output and reduced costs in wasted manpower and revisits could be put back into the business.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <i>New role will supervise / manage both craftworkers and MS Team, so will fall under same umbrella.</i></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Create a skills matrix for schedulers to ensure the right craftworker is assigned the job first time. Provide the opportunity for Craftworkers to upskill.</p>	<p>Consider for next FY.</p> <p>RL to find out and report back to Group</p>
--	---	---



**Recommendations:** Consideration to the possibility of fining tenants for not being there for booked appointments. Exceptions for genuine reasons but serial offenders should be easy to spot. Compensation for tenants when Saffron fails to make an appointment as agreed.

RL read out a email response from Josh Warden (JW) . The Compensation policy does include that we can offer compensation where we cancel appointments.

Response:

- 1) *Compensation Policy – this is ready for consult on 16<sup>th</sup> Feb. Procedure is formed to advise teams and this will include claim form on website. Current content does include offer of compensation for missed appointments where 24 hours’ notice is not given. This is still subject to final discussions internally as we are not compelled to offer this as per HOS guidance. This will not include cancellations that are beyond our control such as sickness and inclement weather – however it could get very messy evidencing this to customers so this may be removed at this very late stage. Current offer is 1<sup>st</sup> missed appointment = apology and new appointment. 2<sup>nd</sup> appointment for identical work = £10. 3<sup>rd</sup> Appointment for identical work = £25. We have however agreed that we will compensate for loss of earnings (quantified with proof from employer) where we do not show up, so we need to think if we need the token award for missed appointment as well. Secondly, for this to work it will mean we have to be watertight on operatives obtaining proof of attendance for no access. I think at this time we should let them know it is being considered but confirm we are certainly including compensating for quantifiable loss of earnings where we do not show up.*
  
- 2) *Recharge Policy is on backburner and has been since Oct for me and since returning from extended sick leave. I am now focussing on Unacceptable Behaviour and Reasonable Adjustments in addition to Compensation and Goodwill. I do not really think Recharge sits with me anyway – its Asset’s budget and service. My initial proposal with Andrea and Colin as that we would charge for missed appointments where they have been 2 consecutive or within a period of 6 months. 1<sup>st</sup> would be reappointed with a warning; 2<sup>nd</sup> would be a charge in first instance. Issue here is we would need clear evidence on system that notice of appointments have been sent, including text messages (proof of receipt) and/or emails (proof of receipt) so it is not as simple as just implementing without process consideration. Also, we would not want to recharge tenants where there is a good reason, they have not cancelled with 24 hours’ notice. I think however, that*

*the prospect of charge would add an adequate element of disincentivise missing appointments rather than an ultimate charge being made very often. There would also need to be a right to appeal.*

**Recommendation:** Carry out a review of out of hours working for duty staff. Suggestion that any work done ending between 10pm- 1am should allow a start time of 10 am rather than 8am, with the proviso that the duty worker must email the schedulers that evening to inform them so they can rearrange the early morning diary accordingly when they come into work in the morning. Any work finishing after 1am allowed a start time of 12 noon with the same proviso as above. This way it ensures workers are suitably rested and fresh to work removing the potential legal liability from Saffron on their duty of care.

**Response:** *The teams on out of hours do currently have the flexibility to start or finish early on the day following any late callouts. We are working with HR colleagues for a process that both satisfies the teams safety/welfare and meets the need of the business. This is likely to include morning slots being left “free” for on call staff, and we have communal area works waiting if we need to find them work.*

**It was agreed:** The group wanted reassurance those on call understand that they have that flexibility to do this, and that this needs to be followed up later in Q2.

The group held a discussion about the round up of Q1 and Q2.

LB asked if the Group felt that any of their input over the last year has made difference. MR felt that the heating letters have. SH feel that if the health and safety issues raised get resolved that would really make a difference. PW also felt that an on-going check of what’s happened is needed. FM feels now that she is seeing a change and that the Group are making a difference.

It was felt that the next year the groups’ activities incorporate more activities with other tenants, such as more Task and Finish and working groups.

Add to TSG Report

RL to arrange with JW



	<p><b>Action:</b> EH suggested that the group have some complaints training. LB wanted to know what complaint information the group are given – does it include expressions of dissatisfaction.</p>	
<b>LUNCH</b>		
<p><b>C-Sat Feedback</b></p>	<p>The group looked at the Customer Satisfaction figures and comments. The surveys are from a selection conducted between 1<sup>st</sup> August 2023 to the 25<sup>th</sup> of January 2024.</p> <p><b>ASB:</b> These are sent to all people who have an anti-social behaviour case .  Q1a positive 31 (55.4%) Neutral 11 (19.6%) Negative 14 (25%) Total 56  Q1b Positive 34 (60.7%) Neutral 2(3.6%) Negative 20 (35.7%) Total 56  Q1c Positive 34 (60.7%) Neutral 8 (14.3%) Negative 14 (25%) Total 56  Q1d Positive 32 (57.1%) Neutral 8 (14.3%) Negative 16 (28.6%) Total 56  Q2 Positive 36 (65.2%) Neutral 4 (7.3%) Negative 15 (27.3%) Total 55</p> <p>The group went through the comments. PW asked if people’s expectations are managed throughout the process or is it poor understanding from the tenant. LB asked if there is a possibility of doing some Mystery Shopping. SH if the Neighbourhood Officer is following a process and script, it feels they can’t do anymore. LB would like to be reassured the concerning comments, where tenants feel unsafe are followed up.</p> <p>LB felt the main issue is the time it taking to responding to cases. Timescales need to be confirmed for the group. LB asked if when people make initial ASB enquiries are they advised about timescales.</p> <p><b>CCT:</b> The responses were 275 over the last 6 months  Q1a positive 212 (77.7%) Neutral 19 (0.7%) Negative 42 (15.4%) Total 273  Q1b Positive 227 (82.5%) Neutral 20 (7.3%) Negative 28 (10.2%) Total 275  Q1c Positive 221 (80.4%) Neutral 17 (6.2%) Negative 37 (13.5%) Total 275  Q1d Positive 251 (91.9%) Neutral 11 (4.0%) Negative 11 (4.0%) Total 273  Q2 Positive 236 (86.1%) Neutral 21 (7.7%) Negative 17 (6.2%) Total 274</p>	<p>RL to find out and report back to the group</p> <p>RL to find out and report back to group</p>

	<p>These are felt statistically confident due to the volume. No queries or concerns around these.</p> <p><b>Complaints:</b> The responses were 21 over the last 6 months  Q1 positive 10 (47.6%) Neutral 3 (14.3%) Negative 8 (38.1%) Total 21  Q2 Positive 10 (47.6%) Neutral 3 (14.3%) Negative 8 (38.1%) Total 21  Q3 Positive 16 (80%) Neutral 3 (15.0%) Negative 1 (5.0%) Total 20</p> <p>It was commented on those 20 surveys over the last 6 months was low. The group asked how many complaints does Saffron handle over a year. EH said she thought it was 700 but that can be checked.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Find out how many complaints on average we get in a year.</p> <p>A discussion about statistical confident.</p> <p><b>It was agreed:</b> to add a recommendation to the Q4 report that statistical confidence reporting, and outcomes needs reviewing.</p> <p><b>It was agreed:</b> Members would like to know what outcomes and changes has happened as a result and feedback to the group.</p> <p>LB asked if anonymised could the group see what responses we are sending out. It was agreed that this is a suggestion for next year.</p> <p>Another suggestion was to look at the tenant journey when calls are for housing such as ASB, lettings, etc.</p> <p><b>Electrical testing:</b> The responses for 6 months have been 11 responses.  Q1a positive 10 (90.9%) Neutral 0 (0%) Negative 1 (9.1%) Total 11  Q1b Positive 10 (90.9%) Neutral 0 (0%) Negative 1 (9.1%) Total 11  Q1c Positive 11 (100%) Neutral 0 (0%) Negative 0 (0%) Total 11  Q1d Positive 11 (100%) Neutral 0 (0%) Negative 0 (0%) Total 11  Q1e Positive 11 (100%) Neutral 0 (0%) Negative 0 (0%) Total 11</p>	<p>Action to find out and report back to the group</p> <p>Add to TSG Report</p> <p>Add to TSG Report</p> <p>RL to find out and report back to group</p>
--	--	---

**Heating, repairs, installs and upgrades:** they had 7 responses of the 6 months.

Q1a positive 82(94.3%) Neutral 4 (4.6%) Negative 1 (1.1%) Total 87

Q1b Positive 82(95.3%) Neutral 2 (2.3%) Negative 2 (2.3%) Total 86

Q1c Positive 83 (95.4%) Neutral 3 (3.4%) Negative 1 (1.1%) Total 87

Q1d Positive 80 (93.0%) Neutral 6 (7.0%) Negative 0 (0%) Total 86

Q1e Positive 44 (86.3%) Neutral 5 (9.8%) Negative 2 (3.9%) Total 51 N/A 33

Q1f Positive 56 (80.0%) Neutral 13 (18.6%) Negative 1 (1.4%) Total 70 N/A 14

Q1g Positive 60 (84.5%) Neutral 7 (9.9%) Negative 4 (5.6%) Total 71 N/A 15

**Improvements:** The responses were 24 over the 6 months.

Q1a positive 15 (62.5%) Neutral 4 (16.7%) Negative 5 (20.8%) Total 24

Q1b Positive 15 (62.5%) Neutral 5 (20.8%) Negative 4 (16.7%) Total 24

Q1c Positive 16 (66.7%) Neutral 3 (12.5%) Negative 5 (20.8%) Total 24

Q1d Positive 20 (83.3%) Neutral 3 (12.5%) Negative 1 (4.2%) Total 24

Q1e Positive 19 (79.2%) Neutral 3 (12.5%) Negative 2 (8.3%) Total 24

Q1e Positive 20 (83.3%) Neutral 3 (12.5%) Negative 1 (4.2%) Total 24

**Income:** The responses were 69 over the 6 months.

Q1a positive (81.2%) 56 Neutral (8.7%) 6 Negative 7 (10.1%) Total 69

Q1b Positive (78.3%) 54 Neutral (11.6%) 8 Negative 7 (10.1%) Total 69

Q1c Positive 52 (75.4%) Neutral (13.0%) 9 Negative 8 (11.6%) Total 69

Q1d Positive 57 (82.6%) Neutral (13.0%) 9 Negative 3 (4.3%) Total 69

Q1e Positive 58 (84.1%) Neutral 8 (11.6%) Negative 3 (4.3%) Total 69

Q1f Positive 46 (66.7%) Neutral 15 (21.7%) Negative 8 (11.6%) Total 69

**Lettings:** The responses were 55 over the 6 months.

Q1a positive 49 (89.1%) Neutral 4 (7.3%) Negative 2 (3.6%) Total 55

Q1b Positive 49 (94.2%) Neutral 3 (5.8%) Negative 0 (0%) Total 55

Q1c Positive 52 (98.1%) Neutral 0 (0%) Negative 1 (1.9%) Total 53

Q1d Positive 51 (92.7%) Neutral 2 (3.6%) Negative 2 (3.6%) Total 55

	<p>Q1e Positive 44 (80.0%) Neutral 5 (9.1%) Negative 6 (10.9%) Total 55  Q1f Positive 40 (85.1%) Neutral 4 (8.5%) Negative 3 (6.4%) Total 47 N/A 5</p> <p><b>Repairs:</b> The responses were 47 over the 6 months.  Q1a positive 38 (80.9%) Neutral 5 (10.6%) Negative 4 (8.5%) Total 47  Q1b Positive 38 (82.6%) Neutral 3 (10.9%) Negative 5 (10.9%) Total 46  Q1c Positive 43 (93.5%) Neutral 3 (0%) Negative 0 (0%) Total 46  Q1d Positive 39 (84.8%) Neutral 3 (8.7%) Negative 4 (8.7%) Total 46  Q1e Positive 37 (78.7%) Neutral 6 (8.5%) Negative 4 (8.5%) Total 46</p> <p>It was questioned who is responsible of getting the repairs surveys carried out. It was commented that they are exceptionally low figures. PW asked if repairs surveys could be left after the job has been completed.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> PW asked approximately how many repairs are conducted over the 6-month period.</p> <p>A discussion took place over the best approach of getting honest reliable feedback back from tenants having repairs that is not skewed or biased.</p> <p><b>It was agreed:</b> To investigated different avenues of gathering the repairs feedback.</p> <p>Due to time TPM results were not looked at.</p>	<p>RL to find out and report back to the group</p> <p>Add to TSG Report</p>
<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Dates for the year</b></li> <li>• <b>Team date/Evening</b></li> <li>• <b>TPAS Update</b></li> </ul>	<p>The group decided the following meeting dates:</p> <p>Sunday 7<sup>th</sup> April face to face 10am -2pm  Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> May Online 5-7pm (write report)  Sunday 7<sup>th</sup> July face to face 10am – 2pm  Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> September Online 5-7pm (write report)  Sunday 6<sup>th</sup> October Face to Face 10am – 4pm (write report) Combined  Sunday 26<sup>th</sup> January Face to Face 10am -2pm (write report)</p>	

	<p>The Group discussed what they may like to do for the team building. It was agreed the Murder Mystery was not an option, but they will think of other ideas and let RL know.</p> <p>Action: LB to let RL know what the Group wishes to do for their Team Building activity.</p> <p>Tpas scoping session is next Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> January and the Task and Finish sessions will be decided at the scoping session.</p>	
--	--	--