**Hexagon Housing Association**

**Performance Review Group**

**Minutes of Meeting held on 14 May 2015**

**Present:**

Claudina Tuitt - Chair

Barbara Jacobs

Sarah Cully

Valerie Oldfield

Pamela Daley

Doreen Davies

Joanne Best

Robbiann Miller

Chris Matthews

**Also present:**

Chris Melville – Operations Director

Brian Hughes - Resident Involvement Manager

Kathleen Richards –Resident Involvement Officer

Nicky Gelder – Community Investment Manager

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Introductions and Welcome**Chair welcomed everyone and introductions made**.** |  |
| **2.** | **Apologies** None were received. |  |
| **3.** | **Matters Arising from the previous minutes** The meeting on the 12 February was inquorate. Item 9 on Scrutiny Training was included in tonight’s agenda. |  |
| **4.** | **Community Investment**Nicky had circulated three documents to the group prior to the meeting: the Community Investment Performance Indicators 2014/15; the timetable for the Community Investment Strategy 2015/18; and the Local Offers on Building Communities. The Local Offers were agreed in 2010/2011 and do not reflect the current work of the Community Investment Team who are in the process of consulting on the 2015/18 strategy.***Growing the economy:***The Academy figures are now focusing on those going into employment which was significantly lower than previous years however there was an increase in demand for the Business Start Up training. 18 residents had completed this training and 5 of those were already trading.***Building Communities:***9 different community activities had taken place. Two over 50’s activities had generated 22 residents to register however only a total of 4 attended.***Investing in young people:***75 young residents had expressed an interest in boot camp however only 9 had completed. The meeting asked why were so many young people not completing the boot camp after showing an initial interest? Nicky replied that it seemed that many young people had other commitments, such as college, or other personal reasons.***Financial Inclusion:***Jason Herbert has worked with 90 residents on a 1-2-1 basis and £97,146 has come directly back to Hexagon though Discretionary Housing Payments and Housing Benefit.The PRG asked for research into the high drop off rate and whether the activities that had been arranged had been asked for and if not how did Community Investment go about choosing the events.Regarding the Building Communities Local Offer, Nicky explained that she will be engaging with residents through a series of focus groups and would hope to present a new set of Offers to the PRG after SeptemberThe Chair thanked Nicky for attending and members commented on the success of the Business Start Ups; golf; and the computer training which they had personal experience with. | **NG** |
|  |  |  |
| **5.** | **Performance Information**Chris Melville presented the performance information for Quarter 4 (January to March) There were 7 indicators showing improvements and 5 indicators getting worse.

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Satisfaction with Landlord (GN)** – 77.6% which is up from the previous Quarter and outside target the target of 79.0%. Chris explained that from now on this indicator will be based on a survey carried out once a year instead of quarterly as at present.  |
|  |
| **Satisfaction with Repairs Service** – 76.0% which is up from 62.4% in Q3. This indicator will also be collected annually instead of quarterly. |
|  |
| **Overall rating with repairs recently done** –The data for was not submitted for Q4 as it was deemed to be unreliable. One of the interim contractors were providing completed satisfaction surveys however the other one was not returning them on time. |
|  |
| **Repairs completed at first visit** – No data provided as again it was deemed to be unreliable. This was partly because the interim contractors were not closing jobs consistently.Pam read out a recent email response from Paul Browning (Service Quality Manager) outlining that data on individual repairs would not be submitted to the Board or PRG because there were serious concerns about the reliability of that data. Q – what about having a system where the tenant fills out the satisfaction survey while the contractor is present?A – that was how the old system worked. However the PDA is a better system because the operative doesn’t get to see the responses. The problem is that the technology doesn’t always workQ – what’s happening with the smaller contractors that were covering during the interim period. Are these still on the books?A – there are a number of smaller contractors on the books, but we are leading with two main contractors plus a back-up contractor |
|  |
| **Repairs within Target Times** – 95.4% (emergency repairs) which is an increase on the previous quarter which had dipped to 89% against a target of 100%. |
| **Gas** **Safety** **Checks** – For Q4 100% had been achieved across the board. |
|  |
| **FRA Reviews –** The total weighted percentage for Q4 is 85.6%. A total of 70 FRA reviews had been completed this quarter and the 6 outstanding were being chased by the Stock Improvement team. Of those 6, three had been completed by co-ops however they had not been sent in.The meeting highlighted that the supported housing (directly managed) properties had 20% of its FRA’s outstanding which affects a very vulnerable group of residents. It was felt that the performance should be better than this |
|  |
| **General Needs Voids** – The target was less than 28 days however in Q4 the void turnaround was 40 days which was the same as Q3. |
|  |
| **Supported Housing Voids** – Q4 voids were 114 days which was an improvement of 126 days in Q3. The figures do not show that the property in Queens Road is block funded and that a quarter of the costs are being met by commissioners. |
|  |
| **General Needs Rent Collection** – 101.1% (social rent collection) was achieved against a 100% target. The social rent arrears and MRR arrears were both 4.7% which were 5.4% and 7.5% respectively in Q3. |
|  |
| **Supported Housing Rent Collection** – 101.9% (social rent collection) Social rent arrears down to 3.6% against a target of 5.0%.Q - it was fantastic to see Hexagon exceeding the target after missing them earlier this year. However, it was important to learn from this. Why had performance improved? Are there other influences which affect tenant’s abilities in paying the rent?A - we don’t fully know the answer to that question. However the Supported Housing team have tightened up in terms of following their procedures. Hexagon will also bring in automation for arrears reminders  |
|  |
| **Complaints** – 75 complaints were made in Q4 of which only 49% were responded to within 15 days. This was less than half of the 100% target.A discussion took place where members of the PRG advised that the complaints procedure had not worked properly for them. There was general dissatisfaction around the table and a request was made for a review of the policy and the procedure.Brian explained that the Residents Forum could review the procedure and policy and the Performance Review Group could monitor the performance.The concern of the meeting is that the figures and individual experiences show that there is a high level of dissatisfaction over complaints performance. There also appeared to be inconsistencies between staff on how complaints are dealt with. It was agreed to recommend to the Board that the Complaints policy and procedure is reviewed.  |
|  |
| **Customer Services** – The service level was 82.7% in Q4 against a target of 80% with 5.3% abandoned calls which was an improvement on 6.5% in Q3 |

 |  |
| **6.** | **Local Offer Performance**Brian presented the Local Offer report that had been written by Tom Harding (Housing Service Manager) and apologised that it had not been circulated prior to the meeting.***Anti-Social Behaviour:***The meeting wanted to know why Hexagon were only carrying out an initial investigation and discussing an action plan with the complainant within 15 working days in 77% of cases against a target of 80%. They thought that the report was vague in places, for example 10% of live cases was too low a base to survey from; 32 satisfaction surveys were carried out however the report does not show the number of reports of ASB. The report shows that 40% of those who were surveyed were fairly dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Brian explained that the Local Offer does not set a target for satisfaction. If the PRG were concerned about ASB performance they could set up a sub group to meet twice a year to review the performance more thoroughly. It was also suggested that the PRG consider revising the Local Offer.***Hexagon Help:***Regarding over 70 room decorations, 49 applications had been received and 10 tenants were assisted with decoration of a room. The PRG asked what criteria was employed for selecting the 10 applicants? | **KR** |
| **7.** | **Election of the Officer Positions**Chair: NOMINATION: Claudina Tuitt  PROPOSED: Pamela SECONDED: BarbaraNo other nominations. The meeting agreed the nomination of Claudina as ChairVice- Chair: NOMINATION: Chris Matthews PROPOSED: Claudina SECONDED: ValNo other nominations. The meeting agreed the nomination of Chris as Vice- Chair |  |
|  |  |  |
| **8.** | **Scrutiny Training**TPAS Training has been arranged at Hexagon Head Office for Saturday 30 May between 10am to 3pm. All members of the PRG and Repair Group have been given priority to book their places. The training will be delivered by Raj Kumar and the title of the session is “Getting to Grips with Scrutiny.” This is the only free training that Hexagon will receive this financial year under the Tenants Central national training programme.The majority of PRG members had already confirmed their places which left one member undecided and one declined by the end of the evening. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **9.****10.** | **Any other business**Due to time constraints the other items on the agenda, (Resident Involvement Impact Assessment, Resident Involvement update, and Report back from the Repairs Group) were covered as instructed by the Chair.Any comments on the Impact Assessment were to be e-mailed to Brian before 18th May**Date of next meeting**16th July |  |