



**Different structures for delivering public services
using social housing as a case study area**

Welsh Government

August 2013



Contents

Page No.

Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction.....	5
2. Approach.....	7
3. Social housing provision in Wales	9
4. The findings	12
5. Conclusions and recommendations.....	20
Appendix A: Briefing Note.....	23
Appendix B: Tables.....	28



This report is addressed to Welsh Government. We stress that our report is confidential and prepared for the addressees only. It should not be used, reproduced or circulated for any other purpose, whether in whole or in part without our prior written consent, which consent will only be given after full consideration of the circumstances at the time.

If the report is released to a third party without prior consent from Altair, we do not acknowledge any duty of care to the third party and do not accept liability for any reliance placed on the report.



Executive Summary

About the research

In July 2013 Welsh Government, acting on behalf of the Welsh Co-operative and Mutuals Commission (the Commission), appointed Altair Consultancy and Advisory Services Ltd (Altair) to carry out research into different structures for delivering public services using social housing as a case study area. Housing was seen as a good case study area as there are a range of delivery models, including community mutuals, for the provision of social housing services.

The brief for the research was to examine and compare the experiences in the social housing sector in relation to:

- Public Service Values
- Fair Allocation of Resources
- Financial Sustainability
- Fair Employee Terms and Conditions.

These were four areas of concern which had been raised in academic research into the mutuals programme in England.

The projected case study sample was twelve organisations with three different organisational forms: local authority, community mutual and housing association. The approach to the study was to carry out semi-structured interviews with representatives of management, unions and tenants.

The organisations participating in the study were:

Local authorities

Anglesey, Cardiff, Denbighshire and Flintshire Councils

Registered Social Landlords

Gwalia Group, Newport City Homes, Taff Housing Association, Valleys to Coast

Community Mutuals

Bron Afon Community Housing, NPT Homes, Tai Calon Community Housing

The fourth community mutual, RCT Homes, had already provided evidence direct to the Commission and was unable to commit to the study. Eleven organisations, therefore, took part in the research.

During July and August 2013, the Altair researcher carried out 28 semi-structured interviews: 11 with management, 8 with union and 9 with tenant representatives.

Structure of the report

The research report covers the following:

- Section One explains the background to the research and objectives of the study
- Section Two sets out the approach to the research



- Section Three provides a short summary of social housing provision, setting out some of the key features of local authorities, housing associations and community mutuals.
- Section Four has the detailed findings
- Section Five has the conclusions and recommendations of the study. These are also set out below.

Conclusions and recommendations

This report has considered the responses of a sample of Welsh local authorities, housing associations and community mutuals in relation to the four areas of concern: public sector values, fair allocation of resources, financial sustainability and employee terms and conditions. Management, union and tenant representatives from the eleven organisations provided the information which has been drawn together by the researcher.

Using the research from these Welsh social housing case studies points to a markedly different picture of how housing associations and community mutuals operate to that painted by the research into the public service mutuals programme in England.

Public sector values – the issue

The concern was that co-operative and mutual delivery bodies may not necessarily hold 'public sector values' and that an absence of these values could reduce the standards of accountability, equality and political neutrality.

Public sector values – the findings

There is a clear commitment to public service values in all the organisations in the housing case study sample, and many respondents were able to give examples of this. It would be valuable if all categories of organisation, local authority, housing association and community mutual, considered how best to articulate clearly their commitment to these values, as there is scope for greater understanding of how they are 'lived' in practice.

Fair allocation of resources – the issue

The concern raised was that a multiplicity of different local arrangements for services may cause differing levels of service, or different standards or conditions, risking 'postcode lottery' type criticism.

Fair allocation of resources – the findings

There is little difference between the organisational types in the nature of services provided internally and those procured from external suppliers. There also appears to be no appetite for outsourcing services and, if anything, the trend seems to be the reverse. Service users have a sound understanding of what services they should be receiving and the organisations communicate using a number of different mechanisms.



Financial sustainability – the issue

The concern raised was that public sector mutuals operate in a high risk and highly competitive environment and that consequently they can go 'bust', putting jobs at risk and disrupting services.

Financial sustainability – the findings

Welsh housing associations and community mutuals operate within a regulatory environment which provides an annual assessment of financial viability. Welsh Government has powers to require local authorities, housing associations and mutuals to bring in external support to deal with service failures.

The biggest financial risk to all housing organisations is the impact of welfare reform, both through pressure on services and loss of income streams. While the risk of assets being transferred is minimal, with controls operating within organisations and through Welsh Government, there is a lack of awareness and understanding as to the mechanisms by which an 'asset lock' operates. This is an area where all housing organisations could make clearer statements, thus providing a greater level of assurance to staff and service users about the circumstances in which assets are retained or might be transferred out of the business in the case of failure.

Employee terms and conditions – the issue

The concern raised was that, due to competition, pressure on costs will inevitably lead to an erosion of employee terms and conditions after organisations have left the mainstream public sector.

Employee terms and conditions – the findings

There are differences in employee terms and conditions, particularly in the housing association group where there are different reward schemes compared to local government, where the nationally negotiated terms and conditions are the basis of the reward structure. This does not necessarily make terms and conditions worse. From the information provided, the conclusion could be drawn that staff in housing associations and community mutuals not on National Joint Council (NJC) terms and conditions have done at least as well, if not better, for salaries than local authority staff.

Staff with local authority terms and conditions have been subject to a pay freeze until this year (2013/14), whereas other organisations have had more flexibility and seen some salary increases for cost of living rises. There is also an indication that the range of benefits offered to staff is greater in the housing association and community mutual organisations in the sample.

While it was not straightforward to compare lowest to highest pay ratios, due to the range of different functions which local authorities perform compared to the housing associations and community mutuals, there were no major differences in the ratio of lowest to highest paid staff.

There is some evidence of moves away from defined benefit pension schemes by older stock transfer bodies, although to date there has been a variety of schemes available, both defined benefit and defined contribution.



The table below provides the overall comparison between the different types of organisations in relation to the four categories: public sector values, fair allocation of resources, financial sustainability, and fair employee terms and conditions.

Housing type comparison				
	Lives public service values	Fair allocation of resources	Financial sustainability	Fair employee terms and conditions
Local authorities	Tries to or considers that this is achieved	Manages the majority of services in-house No major outsourcing plans	Major risk: welfare reform Other: government cutbacks Surpluses reinvested Minimal risk of assets being transferred	NJC terms and conditions Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Continuous reviews of the establishment, budget cuts may affect establishment
Housing associations	Tries to or considers that this is achieved	Manages the majority of services in-house No major outsourcing plans; there are moves towards bringing more services in-house	Major risk: welfare reform Other: loan portfolio risks Surpluses reinvested Minimal risk of assets being transferred	A variety of employee terms and benefits A variety of pension schemes Continuous reviews of the establishment Budget/welfare reform cuts projected longer term
Community Mutuels	Tries to or considers that this is achieved	Manages the majority of services in-house No major outsourcing plans; there are moves towards bringing more services in-house	Major risk: welfare reform Other: loan portfolio risks Surpluses reinvested Minimal risk of assets being transferred	NJC terms and conditions LGPS pension scheme No reductions in establishment Redeployment as work programme comes to an end

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

In July 2013 Welsh Government, acting on behalf of the Welsh Co-operative and Mutuals Commission (the Commission), appointed Altair Consultancy and Advisory Services Ltd (Altair) to carry out research into different structures for delivering public services using social housing as a case study area.

One area of interest to the Commission is the potential transfer of public services to a mutual model of delivery. Housing was seen as a good case study area as there is a range of delivery models. Housing case studies would enable the Commission to compare the performance of mutualised public services against other comparable services by organisations with the same essential aim, that is, the delivery of social housing.

The brief for the research was to examine and compare experiences in the social housing sector in relation to:

- Public Service Values
- Fair Allocation of Resources
- Financial Sustainability
- Fair Employee Terms and Conditions.

These were described in the brief as follows:

- *“Public Service Values: the concern is that co-operative and mutual delivery bodies may not necessarily hold ‘public sector values’. It is argued that an absence of these values could reduce the standards of accountability, equality and political neutrality.*
- *Fair Allocation of Resources: the concern is that a multiplicity of different local arrangements for services may cause differing levels of service, or different standards or conditions, risking ‘postcode lottery’ type criticism, which has had a strong political impact in the past.*
- *Financial Sustainability: the paper argues that public sector procurement necessarily requires over supply in the market, coupled with short contracts mean that the public sector mutuals are highly competitive and operate in a high risk environment. Consequently, public sector mutuals can go ‘bust’, putting jobs at risk and disrupting services.*
- *Employee Terms and Conditions: the paper suggests that there is no consensus amongst the proponents of the alternative delivery models about whether public sector pay and conditions (particularly pensions) can be maintained outside the public sector. The paper argues that due to the competition in the sector, pressure on costs will inevitably lead to an erosion of employee terms and conditions after they have left the mainstream public sector.”*

Previous academic research¹ highlighted specific concerns about the mutuals programme in England and concluded that the benefits of the social enterprise approach to public services (e.g. engagement of the workforce, involvement of clients, innovation and flexibility) could be achieved without changing the delivery model.

The housing case studies which are considered in this report will provide insight into the Welsh social housing experience.

1.2. Research objectives

The objectives of the research project are to:

(1) Examine and compare experiences in the social housing sector in relation to the four areas above, using twelve organisations for the case study, across three different organisational forms for the provision of housing services:

- 4 run directly by local authorities
- 4 run as mutuals
- 4 run by another form (Registered Social Landlords).

(2) Make a series of recommendations to address the concerns expressed by colleagues in the Trade Union movement.

The findings will be reported to the Commission, which was set up to make recommendations to the Welsh Government on growing and developing the co-operative and mutual economy in Wales. The Commission has taken evidence from a range of bodies and is due to report its findings in September 2013.

The Welsh Government client for the research was Matthew Nobbs, Communications and Policy Manager, Welsh Co-operative and Mutual Commission.

The research was carried out during July and August 2013 by Judith Wayne, Director, Altair. Her thanks are due to all participants for their willingness to share their experience and understanding; their input is much appreciated.

¹ Mutual Benefit? Should mutual, co-operatives and social enterprises deliver public services? Unison, 2011

2. Approach

The research was carried out through a series of semi-structured interviews with representatives from case study organisations. Jim McKirdle, Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA), gave advice on suitable local authorities to contact, and Nick Bennett, Community Housing Cymru (CHC), advised on Registered Social Landlords. There are four Community Mutuals established in Wales so, in this sector, no selection process was required.

Having been given this steer by the WLGA and CHC, the final selection of local authorities and housing associations for the study was the decision of the Altair researcher. While only a small number of organisations was required for the study, care was taken to provide a varied range of characteristics.

The local authorities included those which had decided to retain their housing services in-house (e.g. Denbighshire, Anglesey and Cardiff) and those which had consulted tenants about transferring out of the local authority sector, but where tenants had voted against (e.g. Flintshire and Swansea). The size of the housing stock and whether in a predominantly urban or rural location was another characteristic taken into consideration.

The housing associations included those which were formed following transfer local authorities (Newport City Homes and Valleys to Coast), as well as traditional housing associations (Gwalia Group and Taff Housing Association), i.e. those which were set up initially as housing associations. Size and range of services provided (e.g. mainly housing (Taff HA), or housing, care and other services (Gwalia Group), as well as locality, were other features considered.

The organisations participating in the study were:

Local authorities

Anglesey, Cardiff, Denbighshire and Flintshire Councils

Registered Social Landlords

Gwalia Group, Newport City Homes, Taff Housing Association, Valleys to Coast

Community Mutuals

Bron Afon Community Housing, NPT Homes, Tai Calon Community Housing

Swansea Council (local authority) and RCT Homes (Community Mutual) were both invited to participate. Neither was able to commit to the timescale for the study; RCT Homes noted that they had already provided evidence direct to The Commission.

Eleven organisations, therefore, took part in the research. The intention, as set out in the brief, was for Altair to interview a management and union representative and, where possible, a tenant representative as well: in total, 33 possible interviewees. The union and involved tenant contact details were provided by managers.

28 interviews were carried out, 11 with management, 8 with union and 9 with tenant representatives.

Altair prepared a briefing note about the study and developed a questionnaire which was sent in advance to participants. A copy of the briefing note and the master



questionnaire is attached at Appendix A. The master copy of the questionnaire shows which questions were to be answered by the different categories of participant, and also the prompts for individual questions.

The interviews were a mixture of telephone and face-to-face interviews, with the majority being carried out by telephone. While the questions and prompts provided a steer, the answers recorded reflected how the interviewees understood the question. Altair collated the responses and these are analysed in Section Four. Appendix B provides tables showing the detailed interview responses.

3. Social housing provision in Wales

Social housing provision in Wales

Social housing in Wales is provided by local authorities and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). Local authorities have been providing housing for nearly a hundred years, with major council house building programmes in the 1950s and 1970s. The majority of RSLs in Wales (the generic term for housing associations and community mutuals) were set up in the 1970s and started developing new homes with government grants. They increased their building programmes in the 1980s after they were able to access private finance from banks and building societies to supplement grant funding. From 2002 onwards the RSL sector grew substantially, with eleven transfers of housing stock from local authorities to RSLs.

The stock transfer process

In Wales the large-scale transfer of stock from local authorities to housing associations began in 2002, although there were some estate transfers previously (most notably the 1993 Glyntaff Farm stock transfer from Taff Ely Borough Council to Newydd Housing Association, which was a Tenants Choice (tenant-led) transfer). The main reason for considering large scale transfer was the lack of resources for local authorities to meet the investment needs of the Welsh Housing Quality Standard (WHQS).

Welsh Government provided guidance to local authorities on the stock transfer process. The starting point for a local authority considering transfer was to carry out an options appraisal to assess the implications of stock transfer or stock retention for the council and its tenants. Once a council had decided that stock transfer was its preferred option, the next steps included forming a new not-for-profit body which would take over the housing stock, if tenants voted in favour of transfer, and preparing an 'Offer Document' which provided full details of what transfer would mean. This included information on the continuing role of a council, the services the new landlord would provide, the works to be carried out to properties, and the way that tenants could become engaged with the new landlord. The Offer Document also provided a comparison between what the council could offer in future and what the new landlord could provide.

Tenants were given the choice as to whether they wished to transfer to the new landlord body which the council had set up or stay with the council. Following an independent ballot process, if transfer was supported, ownership and management of the stock went to the new landlord.

Local authorities

There are twenty-two local authorities in Wales. Eleven are stock-retained councils and eleven have transferred their housing stock to newly established housing associations, following positive tenant ballots for transfer. Four of the transfers were to community mutuals, one to a hybrid model (Newport City Homes – Bridge model) and six to another constitutional form, more aligned to a traditional housing association.

Four of the stock-retained authorities had balloted their tenants over whether to transfer to newly-established housing bodies but the tenants voted against. The four

were Caerphilly, Flintshire, Swansea and Wrexham. Welsh Government recently announced that it had reached agreement with the UK Treasury for a new self-financing regime for local authorities which will provide additional freedoms for local authority housing funding. This should enable the stock-retained authorities to either invest more in their stock and/or build additional homes. Thus no further stock transfers of local authority stock to other forms of ownership are anticipated.

Local authorities are governed by councillors who are elected by those constituents registered and eligible to vote in the local authority area concerned.

Registered social landlords

There are 37 major RSLs in Wales, all of whom are registered with, and regulated by, Welsh Government². RSLs are also called housing associations. All work within a regulatory framework set and assessed by Welsh Government. From 2012 the framework has included a set of Delivery Outcomes which have had to be met, one of which is that the organisations will live by Public Service Values.

RSLs are not-for-profit organisations governed by boards whose composition is set out in their governing instruments (Rules or Memorandum and Articles). Board members work within the constitutional requirements of their organisation, and to good practice guidance from Community Housing Cymru, the representative body for Welsh RSLs.

Some RSLs operate a group structure, with other members of the group providing housing-related services. These range from social enterprise activities focusing on employment and training, market and intermediate rent, housing for sale, residential care, and support for vulnerable people. Other RSLs are stand-alone organisations. The majority are established as charitable Industrial and Provident Societies (I&P); a few are non-charitable Companies Limited by Guarantee, or have members of their group with this constitutional form.

Eleven of the RSLs are stock transfers from local authorities where tenants voted in favour of transfer. They include two of the housing associations in the research study - Newport City Homes and Valleys to Coast (V2C)³, and the three community mutuals – Bron Afon, NPT Homes and Tai Calon.

Community mutual and other stock transfers

There are both similarities and differences between the community mutual and other stock transfer organisations; the main ones being:

Similarities

Tenants, prior to ballot, would have received an Offer Document setting out information on the nature of the organisation, how it would be governed, the way it would be run, and differences between what the council and new landlord could provide. The Offer Document would also have set out the nature of proposed

² This figure excludes Abbeyfield Societies and a number of small associations which manage very small numbers of stock

³ The V2C transfer took place before the WHQS standard was implemented, although the rationale for transfer was similar: the need for investment in the stock.

improvements to the housing stock and service, and details of tenant involvement mechanisms.

There is a Transfer Agreement between the local authority and the stock transfer landlord which is a legally binding document and commits the new landlord to deliver the Offer Document promises.

Local authorities have a continuing role with the new organisations. The way in which this is implemented is set out in the constitution (Rules or Memorandum and Articles). In particular, local authorities nominate councillors (or other representatives) to the boards of the stock transfer organisations, where their role is to act in the best interests of the RSL.

Differences

The community mutual stock transfers have differing constitutions from other transfer organisations, particularly concerning the ownership of the organisation by their members and involvement of tenants in the way that the organisation is governed. Opening up shareholding membership to tenants (and in some cases to other members of the community) is a central feature of community mutuals. For example, Tai Calon Community Housing has 900 tenants who are shareholding members. There is a particular emphasis on making shareholding ownership meaningful.

Definitions

There are various definitions used for community mutuals; sometimes the term is used inter-changeably with 'co-operative'. In this report the term community mutual is used solely to mean those RSLs which were set up as community mutuals (Bron Afon Community Housing, NPT Homes, RCT Homes, and Tai Calon Community Housing).

A number of the RSLs, including community mutuals, describe themselves as social enterprises. An appropriate definition for Welsh RSLs is:

“businesses or services with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners.”

4. The findings

4.1 Public service values

The nature of the organisations providing housing services

All interviewees were asked to describe the nature of the organisation providing housing services. As might be expected, there was a good understanding of this question. The union and tenant respondents of one of the housing associations described the services provided rather than saying that the organisation was a housing association. Both union respondees and one of the tenants clearly identified the term ‘community mutual’.

Overall purpose

All respondents were clear about the purpose of their organisation in providing housing services, with some taking a wider perspective and others more housing focused. There are no marked differences in the purpose of the different types of organisation in our sample.

Table One: Organisational purpose

LA management responses

- To give best, most efficient services to citizens [...] and respond to need within legal expectations as a landlord.
- Decent Homes for people. Safe neighbourhoods, clean environment, people achieving their full potential.
- Core values – pride, respect, unity and integrity. Bring the council closer to the community.
- To work with people to achieve independent, fulfilling lives, safeguarding vulnerable local people and building strong communities.

LA union responses

- To deliver housing and maintenance services to its tenants.
- To provide a good service for the public and look after the housing stock.

LA tenant responses

- To provide services for people living in social housing.
- To provide housing services.
- To provide housing fit-for-purpose for people on the council waiting list.

HA management responses

- Housing, support and social care services, for a large range of different needs for vulnerable people.
- First for people, for places and excellent services, improve homes and neighbourhood and adding value to residents in the city. Financial stewardship, training and employment, including younger people.
- To be a partner and employer of choice. The focus is on customers, partners and staff.
- To provide homes in thriving communities where people feel safe and want to live.

HA union responses

- To provide affordable and efficient services for tenants in housing need and people in supported housing and communities.
- Provision of social housing for the benefit of residents.
- To be a compassionate landlord, housing for disadvantaged people in need of social housing, provided affordably.

- Social housing needs in the local borough – to provide affordable and sustainable homes for tenants.
- HA tenant responses
- Originally affordable housing, so many in need. Now care and support and general needs. Tenants very important – they are the purpose of the organisation.
 - To provide homes and help to people in situations where they need a helping hand.
 - To provide low cost accommodation to people on low incomes, with difficulties in families, provide for the elderly (sheltered), mums and babies.
 - To provide homes, thriving communities in places where people want to live.
- Community mutual management responses
- Improving quality of life and life chances in the borough and neighbouring communities; focus on people who face disadvantage.
 - Upgrade and then provide good quality housing in the borough to people in need of housing; ancillary service, tenant support, empowerment, financial inclusion.
 - To deliver excellent homes and services and to make our service proud. Initially for tenants, broader aim is the wider community.
- Community mutual union responses
- To provide affordable social housing for residents of the local borough.
 - Better homes and estate management services to tenants.
- Community mutual tenant responses
- Delivering WHQS, maintenance and control of over 9000 homes; in future to build new homes.
 - Everything for the tenant.

How the organisation is governed

There was considerable knowledge among the participants about how their organisation was governed. The majority were able to distinguish between council/cabinet or board responsibilities for decision-making, and responsibilities for operational management by a director or chief executive and senior staff.

For both the housing associations and community mutuals, the majority of those interviewed knew the composition of the main board, and the level of tenant and other representation. There was some reference to shareholding membership; this is further discussed in the section on ways that tenants can become involved.

The ways staff/service users can become involved with the organisation

This question produced a range of replies. The responses are shown separately for staff involvement and service user involvement in the tables in Appendix B.

Staff involvement mechanisms included consultation exercises, staff forums and conferences, an ‘open-door’ approach by directors and other senior staff. Tenant responses to this question reflected more on the ways that staff were involved in tenant participation activities, such as attending meetings and working with resident forums.

All respondents were able to list a variety of ways that service users can become involved, both formal (e.g. through constituted panels and forums) and informal (fun days).

Whether the organisation lives public service values, and examples of these

The interviewees were provided with a definition of public service values, as follows:

“Public service values mean that the organisation serves, and is accountable, to the citizen. There is an emphasis on equity, impartiality, political neutrality, probity, and trustworthiness for all.

The **Mutual Benefit?** Report, referenced earlier in this document, raised the concern that co-operative and mutual delivery bodies may not necessarily hold public sector values and that the absence of these values could reduce standards of accountability, equality and political neutrality.

The report implied that public sector values are inherent to, and integral within, public bodies. As is apparent from the responses of the local authority managers in our sample, that is not necessarily perceived as the case; furthermore, the housing association management responses were positive that public sector values were lived in their organisations. There was no substantial difference between the housing association and community mutual management responses to this question.

Union respondents thought that their organisations were living public service values, or were trying to.

Tenants could see progress towards public sector values; overall they were less certain that the organisations were fully living them than in the other two categories of respondent, as is shown from the examples given below.

The Welsh Government’s Commission on Public Service Governance and Delivery was established in April 2013 to “*look hard, honestly and objectively at the way public services are governed and delivered in Wales*”; its findings will provide a much more comprehensive assessment of how public service values are being lived within Welsh public bodies.

Examples of living public sector values

Most respondents were able to give some examples of how they thought that their organisations lived public service values, and the full list is provided in the table in the appendix. Specific examples included: clear policies and guidance on the level and type of gifts and hospitality which could be accepted (e.g. zero tolerance); residents involved in staff or contractor appointments; and changing opening hours to better meet tenants’ needs.

4.2 Service Delivery (Fair allocation of resources)

Service delivery: in-house or external

Two questions were asked of interviewees concerning how services were provided by their organisation, whether there was in-house or external provision. In all types of organisations there was strong commitment to both providing in-house services and extending the range of in-house services where possible.

One of the community mutual management responses included the comment that they are *"100% committed to in-house, better quality and control."* A local authority tenant observed that the council is *"looking at employing a handyman to do jobs for elderly people."*

The main services which were provided externally were maintenance, particularly those related to meeting the requirements of the WHQS. Other services commonly mentioned were those which required specialist expertise or equipment, such as legal advice, dealing with asbestos, or were small-scale in nature, such as mending aerials, which would not require a full-time member of staff.

Outsourcing of services in the past two years

Management and union representatives were asked whether their organisations had outsourced services in the last two years which had previously been provided in-house. The reason for asking this question was to examine whether local authorities are more likely to retain services in-house than housing associations or community mutuals.

The only area of activity which had been outsourced was the provision of stores (i.e. stocks of equipment for maintenance services). This was referenced by both local authority and community mutual respondents; the majority of Welsh housing associations do not have in-house stores, so how to manage this function is not an issue for them.

Conversely, there was evidence from the housing associations and community mutuals that services which were previously procured externally are now being managed in-house. The examples given included planned and cyclical maintenance, gas boiler servicing, electrical testing, PR and marketing, and internal audit. In the local authority sector, many of these services are already an in-house function, except major works programmes (planned maintenance).

Plans to outsource services next year

The follow-up question asked whether there were plans for future outsourcing. The responses showed another example of a planned outsourcing of stores by a local authority.

The planned outsourcing of Telecare by one housing association was explained in detail to the researcher. Before transfer, Telecare was subsidised by the Council's General Fund (i.e. underwritten by all residents of the city). The expectation was that the service would grow through the provision of services to elderly people in the private sector; this did not occur, partly because of the economic climate, and the service continued to be loss-making. It was not considered equitable that tenants

should subsidise services to the general public. The service is now provided by another organisation following an OJEU procurement process and all staff redeployed.

One association also mentioned possible plans to outsource the collection of former tenant arrears. This is being considered so that in-house staff can focus on the impact of welfare reform changes on the collection of current tenant arrears.

One local authority mentioned possible plans to tender the grounds maintenance service.

Knowledge by service users of the services that they should be receiving, how they are being delivered and the benefits of these

Respondents from each of the local authorities, housing associations and community mutuels were able to provide details of a range of ways that service users could find out about the services that they should receive and the benefits of these. These methods ranged from using social media and web-based information sources, to tenants' handbooks, magazines, direct contact with staff and a variety of resident participation and engagement options. There were no marked differences of approach between the three types of organisations.

4.3 Financial sustainability

The business planning cycle and who decides what you spend

This question was only asked of the management respondents.

There were some variations, for example, one community mutual referred to establishing the budget principles in July; another referred to tenants seeing the draft business plan through their role on the membership and scrutiny committee. However, processes and timescales are similar to all the organisational types, with a yearly planning process, 30-year financial model, and shorter term more detailed plan.

Financial risks faced by the organisations in delivering services to users

Everyone was asked this question. There was a good level of understanding of the financial risks by management, unions and tenants, with only one tenant not being able to name any financial risk.

The most serious risk which was directly mentioned by 22 of the 28 people interviewed was the impact of welfare reform. This covered both the introduction of the 'bedroom tax' and the implementation of Universal Credit in future. There were significant concerns about the loss of rental income as tenants potentially struggled to cover their housing costs, and the impact that this would have on the delivery of services.

Austerity cuts and cutbacks in Welsh Government funding, including Supporting People funding⁴, were also raised. As identified in the section below concerning

⁴ Supporting People Grant funding is for housing-related support, to help vulnerable people develop or maintain the skills and confidence necessary to live as independently as possible.

employee terms and conditions, organisations are restructuring services to manage cutbacks, at the same time having to provide additional staff for income recovery.

The risks associated with their loan portfolios were mentioned by both housing associations and community mutuals; this included borrowing, gearing and cash-flow matters.

One particular concern raised related to the annual gap funding⁵ payments to stock transfer organisations by Welsh Government. The amount and length of time that these will continue has been factored into the business plans and funding agreements, and any changes to these arrangements could lead to repricing by lenders. While there is no evidence that Welsh Government is intending to change the current arrangements, it was voiced as a potential significant major impact on viability.

Financial surpluses

The main response to the question, what happens to surpluses?, was “*surpluses are reinvested*”. This covered both reallocations of budgets within year, and allocating surpluses into designated reserves, such as to be used for major repairs and community investment. Local authorities have ring-fenced Housing Revenue Accounts for their social housing activities, which enable budget underspends to be re-invested into other areas of the business.

One of the housing associations provided details of their strategy, which is “*to make yearly surpluses to fund development and improve gearing, and to grow other income streams to enable funds to go to communities.*”

Two of the community mutuals identified that they are not currently making any surpluses but, when they do, the finance will be reinvested.

All the union respondents identified that surpluses are fed back into the business, even if they are not aware of the detail. As one said, “*surpluses in the 30-year plan are re-invested into provision for residents.*”

Three residents said that their organisations ploughed everything back into the business, and that their landlords were not-for-profit or registered charities. Two residents did not know what happened to surpluses.

Controls to stop assets being transferred (asset lock)

This was the question that respondents had the most difficulty in answering. There were a number of people who did not know and others who thought that controls were in place. There was some awareness that there were controls due to the charitable or public service nature of the organisations. Stock transfer organisations may also have controls in place through the terms of their transfer agreements.

⁵ The sale price for the housing stock is calculated on a net present value basis. All Welsh transfers had a negative valuation, due to the high investment needs of the stock. Welsh Government provided funding equivalent to the annual local authority Major Repairs Allowance. For some transfer organisations this is built into their business plans for 30 years.

4.4 Employee terms and conditions

The concern raised in the *Mutual Benefit?* paper is whether public sector pay and conditions (particularly pensions) can be maintained outside the public sector. The paper argues that due to the competition in the sector, pressure on costs will inevitably lead to an erosion of employee terms and conditions after they have left the mainstream public sector.

Management and union representatives only were asked questions about employee terms and conditions. As might be expected there was considerable overlap in the responses. These are reported as one summary unless there were specific differences.

How salaries are set

The main difference in the way that salaries are set is whether the organisation is using the National Joint Committee (NJC) terms and conditions. All local authorities use NJC terms and conditions, and recent stock transfer housing associations and community mutuels use these also. There is evidence of a move away from NJC as the stock transfer organisations mature. In the current economic climate this does not necessarily mean relative worsening of salaries given the pay restraint that has been imposed on public sector workers.

Salaries increases last year

In 2012/13 there was no cost of living increase for staff on NJC terms and conditions; they would have been eligible for a progression through the salary scales, unless at the top of the grade. This covered both staff in local authorities and those in some of the housing associations and community mutuels.

Last year staff in organisations with other reward schemes had average increases between 1.7% and 2.5%.

For this year, 2013/14, staff on NJC terms and conditions are due to receive a 1% increase. There is a similar picture for staff in organisations with other reward structures, with the exception of a 5% average increase in one of the housing associations which followed the introduction of a new reward scheme after leaving NJC arrangements.

The conclusion from the information provided is that staff not on NJC terms and conditions, in housing associations and mutuels, have done at least as well, if not better, for salaries than local authority staff.

The lowest to highest pay ratio

A number of the union representatives were unable to answer this question. It should be noted that there are differences in the way that the ratios were presented. The lower three local authority ratios (1:4, 1:5, 1:6) did not include posts at heads of service, executive directors and chief executive; the other organisations covered all posts. The highest ratio, 1:9, was seen in one local authority that provided a range from lowest (living wage) to chief executive, and in one housing association which also provides a diverse range of care and support services and has a very large

workforce. If senior local authority posts are included, the assumption is that the staff ratio will be in the region of 1:6 to 1:8.

Other benefits offered to staff

All organisations in the sample offered a wide range of employee benefits. Employees with NJC negotiated benefits either had Green Book or Red Book terms and conditions, the latter applying to craft workers, such as employees providing maintenance services.

Two of the community mutual union respondents said that the '*benefits were similar to or better than the council*' and '*extra benefits, nurse appointments, flu jabs... debt management advice*'.

Pension arrangements

A particular concern of the ***Mutual Benefit?*** report was changes to pension arrangements when organisations transfer out of the public sector. There is some evidence that change has occurred within the stock transfer organisations to a limited extent.

Local government pensions are currently defined benefit (final salary) schemes, though, from 2014, for new members the basis for calculating pensions will be career average.

The Social Housing Pension Scheme (SHPS), the main provider of RSL pensions, offers both defined benefit (final salary and career average) arrangements. Other pension provision is for defined contribution schemes. In general, these offer lower pensions based on lower contributions.

One of the housing association management respondees commented that younger members of staff are more likely to opt for the defined contribution scheme.

Schemes in place to reduce the size of the workforce last year

All local authorities had voluntary schemes in place for workforce reduction in response to financial cutbacks. There was a mixed picture for the housing associations; where there were structural changes, staff were considered for redeployment and retrained, though in one instance this resulted in compulsory redundancy for one member of staff. To date, none of the community mutuals have reduced staff numbers, and since transfer some have increased their staffing.

Schemes in place to reduce the size of the workforce next year

There is continuing pressure on the size of the local authority workforce due to continuing cuts, and some concerns from housing associations about the loss of local authority contracts for Supporting People services. None of the community mutuals envisage cuts, though one referred to redeployment due to changing work requirements as a major works programme ends.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

This report has considered the responses of a sample of Welsh local authorities, housing associations and community mutuals in relation to the four areas of concern: public sector values, fair allocation of resources, financial sustainability and employee terms and conditions. Management, union and tenant representatives from the eleven organisations provided the information which has been drawn together by the researcher.

Using the research from these Welsh social housing case studies points to a markedly different picture of how housing associations and community mutuals operate to that painted by the research into the public service mutuals programme in England.

Public sector values – the issue

The concern was that co-operative and mutual delivery bodies may not necessarily hold 'public sector values' and that an absence of these values could reduce the standards of accountability, equality and political neutrality.

Public sector values – the findings

There is a clear commitment to public service values in all the organisations in the housing case study sample, and many respondents were able to give examples of this. It would be valuable if all categories of organisation, local authority, housing association and community mutual, considered how best to articulate clearly their commitment to these values, as there is scope for greater understanding of how they are 'lived' in practice.

Fair allocation of resources – the issue

The concern raised was that a multiplicity of different local arrangements for services may cause differing levels of service, or different standards or conditions, risking 'postcode lottery' type criticism.

Fair allocation of resources – the findings

There is little difference between the organisational types in the nature of services provided internally and those procured from external suppliers. There also appears to be no appetite for outsourcing services and, if anything, the trend seems to be the reverse. Service users have a sound understanding of what services they should be receiving and the organisations communicate using a number of different mechanisms.

Financial sustainability – the issue

The concern raised was that public sector mutuals operate in a high risk and highly competitive environment and that consequently they can go 'bust', putting jobs at risk and disrupting services.

Financial sustainability – the findings

Welsh housing associations and community mutuals operate within a regulatory environment which provides an annual assessment of financial viability. Welsh Government has powers to require local authorities, housing associations and mutuals to bring in external support to deal with service failures.

The biggest financial risk to all housing organisations is the impact of welfare reform, both through pressure on services and loss of income streams. While the risk of assets being transferred is minimal, with controls operating within organisations and through Welsh Government, there is a lack of awareness and understanding as to the mechanisms by which an 'asset lock' operates. This is an area where all housing organisations could make clearer statements, thus providing a greater level of assurance to staff and service users about the circumstances in which assets are retained or might be transferred out of the business in the case of failure.

Employee terms and conditions – the issue

The concern raised was that, due to competition, pressure on costs will inevitably lead to an erosion of employee terms and conditions after organisations have left the mainstream public sector.

Employee terms and conditions – the findings

There are differences in employee terms and conditions, particularly in the housing association group where there are different reward schemes compared to local government, where the nationally negotiated terms and conditions are the basis of the reward structure. This does not necessarily make terms and conditions worse. From the information provided, the conclusion could be drawn that staff in housing associations and community mutuals not on NJC terms and conditions have done at least as well, if not better, for salaries than local authority staff.

Staff with local authority terms and conditions have been subject to a pay freeze until this year (2013/14), whereas other organisations have had more flexibility and seen some salary increases for cost of living rises. There is also an indication that the range of benefits offered to staff is greater in the housing association and community mutual organisations in the sample.

While it was not straightforward to compare lowest to highest pay ratios, due to the range of different functions which local authorities perform compared to the housing associations and community mutuals, there were no major differences in the ratio of lowest to highest paid staff.

There is some evidence of moves away from defined benefit pension schemes by older stock transfer bodies, although to date there has been a variety of schemes available, both defined benefit and defined contribution.

The table below provides the overall comparison between the different types of organisations in relation to the four categories: public sector values, fair allocation of resources, financial sustainability, and fair employee terms and conditions.

Table Two – housing type comparison				
	Lives public service values	Fair allocation of resources	Financial sustainability	Fair employee terms and conditions
Local authorities	Tries to or considers that this is achieved	Manages the majority of services in-house No major outsourcing plans	Major risk welfare reform Other: government cutbacks Surpluses reinvested Minimal risk of assets being transferred	NJC terms and conditions Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Continuous reviews of the establishment, budget cuts may affect establishment
Housing associations	Tries to or considers that this is achieved	Manages the majority of services in-house No major outsourcing plans, and moves towards bringing more services in-house	Major risk welfare reform Other: loan portfolio risks Surpluses reinvested Minimal risk of assets being transferred	A variety of employee terms and benefits A variety of pension schemes Continuous reviews of the establishment, Budget/welfare reform cuts projected longer term
Community Mutuels	Tries to or considers that this is achieved	Manages the majority of services in-house No major outsourcing plans, and moves towards bringing more services in-house	Major risk welfare reform Other: loan portfolio risks Surpluses reinvested Minimal risk of assets being transferred	NJC terms and conditions LGPS pension scheme No reductions in establishment Redeployment as work programme comes to an end



Appendix A: Briefing Note

Different structures for delivering Public Services; using Social Housing as case study area.

Background

Welsh Government has commissioned Judy Wayne of Altair Consultancy and Advisory Service Ltd (Altair) to carry out research into different structures for delivering public services, using social housing as the case study area.

The research will be reported to the Welsh Co-operative and Mutuals Commission (The Commission). The Commission is an independent body that has been set up to make recommendations to the Welsh Government on growing and developing the co-operative and mutual economy in Wales.

Further details about The Commission can be found at the following link:

<http://wales.gov.uk/topics/businessandconomy/policy/coopmutualscommission/?lang=en>

Previous academic research in the field has highlighted specific concerns around:

- **Public Service Values:** the concern is that co-operative and mutual delivery bodies may not necessarily hold 'public sector values'. It is argued that an absence of these values could reduce the standards of accountability, equality and political neutrality.
- **Fair Allocation of Resources:** that a multiplicity of different local arrangements for services may cause differing levels of service, or different standards or conditions, risking 'postcode lottery' type criticism, which has had a strong political impact in the past.
- **Financial Sustainability:** that public sector procurement necessarily requires over supply in the market, coupled with short contracts mean that the public sector mutuals are highly competitive and operate in a high risk environment. Consequently, public sector mutuals can go 'bust', putting jobs at risk and disrupting services.
- **Employee Terms and Conditions:** that there is no consensus amongst the proponents of the alternative delivery models about whether public sector pay and conditions (particularly pensions) can be maintained outside the public sector. The paper argues that due to the competition in the sector, pressure on costs will inevitably lead to an erosion of employee terms and conditions after they have left the mainstream public sector

Purpose of the Welsh Government Research

The objective is to examine and compare the experiences in the Welsh social housing sector in relation to the four areas of concern:

- Public Service Values
- Fair Allocation of resources
- Financial Sustainability
- Fair Employee Terms and Conditions.



12 social housing organisations will be the case studies for the research of which

- 4 are run directly by local authorities
- 4 are run as a community mutual
- 4 are run as a housing association (Registered Social Landlord).

The research will analyse the experience of the case study organisations and assess whether the concerns outlined apply in the Welsh social housing context and make recommendations.

How the research is being carried out

For each case study organisation, semi-structured interviews are being carried by the researcher. Separate interviews are being arranged with:

- A representative of management
- A trade union representative
- An involved tenant representative

The interviews (telephone or face-to-face depending on location) are planned to take no more than an hour. The same questions will be asked of each interviewee, though not everyone will be asked all questions. Specifically questions about employee terms and conditions will not be discussed with tenants.

A report of findings will be produced. No individual or organisation will be named in the analysis of findings. The intention is to draw comparisons, with a particular emphasis placed on how the mutual models perform against other models.

Timetable

The research is being carried out within a short timeframe. It was commissioned on 14/7/13. The majority of the interviews will be carried out in the week of 29/7/13 and a first draft report sent to Welsh Government on 5/8/13.. A final report will be provided to Welsh Government by 12/8/13.

Altair contact

The Altair contact details are as follows:

Judy Wayne
Phone: 029 2037 7268
Mobile: 07880 606067
Email: judy.wayne@altairltd.co.uk

Welsh Government contact

The client for the research at Welsh Government is Matthew Nobbs who can be contacted as follows:

Phone: 0300 062 2135
Email: Matthew.nobbs@wales.gsi.gov.uk



Master questionnaire

The approaches of different structures for delivering Public Services; using Social Housing as case study area

Questionnaire

Short summary introduction to the research

Welsh Government has commissioned Altair Consultancy and Advisory Service Ltd (Altair) to look at different structures for delivering public services using social housing as a case study. Twelve organisations are participating in the study: four local authorities, four community mutual housing organisations and four Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). In each organisation, where possible, views are being sought from three categories of respondents: a member of the senior executive team, a trade union or staff council representative, and an involved tenant.

Reference to further information about the research and background to it

Further details about the research are contained in the briefing note provided.

Short introduction to the questionnaire

Thank you for participating in the research. These questions will form the basis of a structured telephone interview or meeting with Judy Wayne of Altair. The questions are provided in advance of the meeting to enable you to be ready with your responses.

The discussions will cover four areas: public service values; service delivery (resource allocation); financial sustainability; employee terms and conditions of employment. Some questions are specific to particular categories of respondents.

Public service values	Exec	Union	Tenant
1. Can you please describe the nature of the organisation which provides housing services <i>Prompt for constitutional form - Local Authority/Industrial and Provident Society/Company Ltd by Shares/Company Ltd by Guarantee/Community Interest Company/Other</i> <i>For community mutuals, indicate whether the interviewee uses the term mutual</i> If group structure, please answer for the part of the organisation providing housing management and maintenance services	Y	Y	Y
2. What is its overall purpose? <i>Expect reference here to values, aims and objectives</i>	Y	Y	Y
3. How is the organisation governed? <i>e.g. Cabinet/committees, board of management, scrutiny committee</i>	Y	Y	Y
4. If not covered in question 3, what ways can staff/service users become involved with the organisation? <i>Responses will vary depending upon type of organisation and type of respondent. This is the question to explore levels of engagement; for community mutuals and potentially RSLs this will cover membership as well.</i>	Y	Y	Y
5. Public service values mean that the organisation serves, and is accountable, to the citizen. There is an emphasis on equity, impartiality, political neutrality, probity, and trustworthiness for all. Do you think that your organisation lives public service values? Can you please give me a couple of examples to show how it does this. <i>Understanding of public service values and ease of response will be critical here</i>	Y	Y	Y

Service Delivery (Fair allocation of resources)	Exec	Union	Tenant
1. Can you tell me which services are provided in-house (i.e. by the organisation)?	Y	Y	Y
2. And can you say which services are provided externally? <i>Expect responses to include planned maintenance contracts. Prompt for corporate services (e.g. IT/HR/Finance/Legal/Marketing)</i>	Y	Y	Y
3. In the past two years have you seen services outsourced which were previously delivered in-house <i>If yes, please say which and, if known, to whom, and how it was done – procurement, in-house service spun-out, etc.</i>	Y	Y	N
4. Are there any plans to outsource services in the next year which are currently delivered in-house? <i>If yes, please say which services and how it is planned to outsource them (e.g. procure services, spin-out the in-house provision, etc.)</i>	Y	Y	N
5. How do service users know what services they should be receiving, how they are being delivered and the benefits of these?	Y	Y	Y

<i>Prompt for awareness of Delivery Outcomes, Key Performance Indicators, reporting to service users, annual reports etc.</i>			
---	--	--	--

Financial sustainability	Exec	Union	Tenant
1. Please explain your business planning cycle and who decides what you spend. <i>Expect reference to 30-year Housing Business Plans, annual returns to Welsh Government, reporting to Committee/Board</i>	Y	N	N
2. What financial risks does your organisation face to delivering the services that your users require?	Y	Y	Y
3. What happens to financial surpluses (if any) in your organisation? <i>Re-investment, available for community benefit etc.</i>	Y	Y	Y
4. What controls are there to stop assets being transferred (asset lock)? <i>Check understanding of statutory and legal constraints. (NB, housing organisations may have to sell properties to tenants under the Right to Buy/Right to Acquire schemes)</i>	Y	Y	Y

Employee terms and conditions	Exec	Union	Tenant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you briefly describe the way that salaries are set in the organisation, and what is the lowest to highest pay ratio? <i>Prompt – job evaluation, incremental scales/market conditions</i> 	Y	Y	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the organisation increase salaries last year? <i>Check for cost of living increases/annual increments/no increase</i> 	Y	Y	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from salaries, can you tell me about other benefits that are offered to staff? <i>Range of benefits – could include car/mileage allowance/flexi-time. Check for flexible benefits (e.g. buying/selling leave)</i> 	Y	Y	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What pension arrangements are in place for staff? <i>Confirm if LGPS/SHPs/other (final salary/open/closed etc.) and whether pension arrangements have changed in recent years</i> 	Y	Y	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the last year, have there been schemes in place to reduce the size of the workforce? <i>If so, establish reason if possible, and types of scheme (voluntary exit, early retirement, redundancy schemes). Check also for any no redundancy clauses.</i> 	Y	Y	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware of any being planned for the next year? 	Y	Y	N

Appendix B – Tables

Public service values

The nature of the organisations providing housing services

Table Three - Description of organisation by type of respondent			
	Management	Unions	Tenants
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local authority
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Charitable I&P ▪ Large Scale Voluntary Transfer (LSVT), charitable I&P ▪ Charitable I&P ▪ LSVT, charitable I&P 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Described nature of housing services provided ▪ Stock transfer housing association ▪ Social landlord housing association ▪ Not-for-profit RSL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Described nature of housing services provided ▪ Charitable I&P ▪ I&P Stock transfer RSL
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community owned social enterprise RSL & charitable I&P ▪ Community mutual I&P, charitable rules, not-for-profit ▪ Community mutual housing association 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community mutual ▪ Stand-alone community mutual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social landlord, stock transfer organisation ▪ Community mutual



How the organisation is governed

Table Four - Description of organisation by governance			
	Management	Unions	Tenants
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council, scrutiny, other committee ▪ Cabinet and corporate leadership ▪ Council, cabinet, three scrutiny committees: performance, partnership and communities ▪ Elected members, cabinet, management structure – chief executive, directors, heads of service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cabinet and scrutiny, with internal management structure of head of service, senior management team ▪ Elected members and cabinet with senior leadership team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elected council, cabinet ▪ Council, cabinet, executive director ▪ Member for housing, chief executive, community services and housing director, head of housing, three area teams
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A board of management – combined board (13) including 3 tenants and 1 leaseholder. Audit Committee, Housing, Property, Remuneration, Care and Support, and Older Adults Forum. Only shareholding members can become board members ▪ A Board of Management of 15. Was 3/3/3 constituencies, moving to 4 councillors and 6 tenants. Plus co-optees. Rule change will enable up to 7 tenants. Annual elections independents and tenants. Shareholders vote for independents that board puts forward. Use Electoral Reform Society for voting; all tenants select tenant board members. Audit Committee. Tenants on board and scrutiny ▪ A Board of Management of 12. One third are tenants. Also up to 3 co-optees if there are skill shortages. Audit Committee and a Remuneration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board, chief executive, attends and reports, executive team ▪ Board of directors – four tenants, four councillors, four independents, chief executive and directors ▪ Board of trustees, with two tenants and external people. Management is through directors and staff ▪ Board was 4/4/4, now 3/3/3 plus co-optees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Combined board, committees for each organisation ▪ A board of 15. Initially 5/5/5 councillors, tenants, independents. Now 4/6/5 and could move to 7 councillors and 3 tenants. 4 sub-committees, will be 2 next year ▪ A family organisation, everyone approachable ▪ A board of 9. 3/3/3 councillors, tenants, independents, and co-optees. Management team of officers

	<p>Committee. Various Task and Finish Groups which are a mixture of Board/Staff – e.g. for development strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A Board of Management of 12. 3/3/3 and up to 5 co-optees. Considering moving away from equal representation by constituency. Audit and Remuneration Committee: usual schedule of delegated authorities 		
<p>CM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A Board of Management of 15, comprising third each tenants, councillors and independents. Two committees – staffing; ethics and audit. Membership structure. Members/staff task and finish group for scrutiny and policy, review quality of services, etc. Publish non-confidential papers. Open board meetings ▪ A Board of Management of 15, comprising third each tenants, councillors and independents. Councillors all nominees. Proposing rule change to go to 12 members. Audit and Risk, Schedule 1 committee (virtual) ▪ A Board of Management of 15, comprising third each tenants, councillors and independents. Membership and scrutiny committee. Sub-committees for assets, performance, audit and risk, remuneration. Board, chief executive and executive team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board, chief executive, attends and reports, executive team ▪ Board of Directors – 4/4/4, chief executive and directors ▪ Board of Trustees, with two tenants and external people. Management is through directors and staff ▪ Board was 4/4/4, now 3/3/3 plus co-optees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board, chief executive responsible to the Board, and senior management team for day-to-day decision-making ▪ Board 5/5/5. Assets Committee, chief executive

The ways staff/service users can become involved with the organisation

Table Five– Staff involvement			
	Management	Unions	Tenants
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual appraisals, look at contribution to LA aims and objectives, have targets, PIs, monthly. Staff involved revising the vision and values. All staff surveyed re staff morale. Head of Housing monthly forum meetings with staff, corporate matters discussed, e.g. safeguarding. Monthly management team meetings. Staff team meetings. Structured appraisals. The senior management team of the LA has held 20 workshops with staff re transformation plans, good communications, staff can be involved in task and finish groups ▪ Personal performance interviews, where staff fit into the aims of the council, what council is trying to achieve; corporate plan, service plans. Staff suggestion boxes, emails, can knock on chief executive's /corporate directors' doors. Have the opportunity to engage with the council. ▪ Staff – new teams following restructure. Culture and change management is starting. Fortnightly heads of service meetings, 3-monthly middle managers conference. ▪ Six-monthly meetings with DLO operatives, (taken on extras for adaptations), review improvement projects, service plan, PIs versus targets. Management team staff meetings, tool box talks, look at performance, offer training, have appraisals. Involve staff in setting service plan, breakfast meetings with directors. Intranet and update blogs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff and service users can provide input to the transformation agenda; chance for the public to have their say about council services ▪ Staff (trades) – little involvement in the organisation. Some communications problems though not with Head of Service or senior managers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involved in tenant participation in all sorts of ways, groups, WHQS – lots of staff and tenant involvement ▪ Not sure ▪ Tenant liaison officer, good changes with Head of Housing; enhanced tenant awareness by DLO



<p>HA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff forum, staff conference (next one in New Year). Communications – internet/intranet, website. Magazine published in hard copy ▪ Various mechanisms – forum, recognition agreement Unison and UCATT. Team meetings. etc. Chief executive – 3 monthly meeting with each team for performance improvement ▪ Staff forum with members elected annually (and contested). The Chair is selected by the forum. It meets monthly; every two months the meeting is with managers. Looks at terms and conditions, salaries, pensions, HR policies, etc. Training is provided by ACAS. Staff participate fully. There are cross-functional business plan groups – e.g. back office staff go to events within the community, hostel staff to other events etc. This is to raise awareness of customers. ▪ Business Plan – run sessions for all staff on strategic objectives and the budget; every 5/6 weeks senior and middle managers meet to run through budgets, board agendas, briefings. Staff surveys every 2 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff survey. Lots of ways for staff to get involved through Staff Forum, employment engagement officer. Unison representatives provided with opportunities and time to support. ▪ Not sure have any role apart from directors. Union, limited ability to shape what we do as an organisation ▪ 2/3 business planning groups, everyone involved. Various other groups, i.e. corporate staff involved with tenant matters, staff involved with policies and procedures. Staff Forum. Monthly consultative feedback mechanisms to staff members. Organisation is inclusive and staff are motivated. Staff can be union members, information included in staff induction ▪ Staff – discussion areas focus groups, Trade Union – Joint Consultative Committee, 3 times a year. HR in the same building, is approachable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff – partnership and sub-groups, staff and residents training, encouraged for specific interests. A reasonably good employer, cares for staff = cares for residents. Happy staff = happy residents ▪ Staff come to fundays ▪ Staff involved with sub groups ▪ All staff are invited to come along to the Forum, to say what’s happening.
<p>CM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff forum, look at health plan, interviews, communications – staff/TUs choose the issues e.g. how to improve the office. Go out to trades – breakfast meetings about their service area. Staff involved in new corporate plan workshops ▪ Engaged in self-assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggestion boxes. Partnership Group, trade unions and staff meet three-monthly. e.g. looks at issues of well-being, terms and conditions ▪ Staff survey, one-to-ones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff – there is a tenant empowerment team, officers to facilitate action plans for groups. The organisation wants the involvement of tenants and their views



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Staff one-to-ones, appraisals, core briefings, team meetings, staff suggestions, peer reviews. Formal TU reps and recognition agreement. Project groups and forums. Have a birthday breakfast with the chief executive, ideas and feedback		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Staff attend all meetings with tenants, scrutiny etc.
--	--	--	---

Table Six– Service user involvement

	Management	Unions	Tenants
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tenants Forum, tenant participation team, task and finish groups. Annual tenants’ conference, groups involved in newsletters, WHQS tenant inspectors, steering group with staff and contractors. TP strategy ▪ Tenants consultative committee. Magazine. Special interest groups. Neighbourhood and regional associations. Via councillors and officers. Annual surveys, KPIs, tenant comment on and prioritise ▪ Bi-annual resident survey of residents. Plans for local level intelligence, blog, website use. Tenants and Residents Association and residents’ groups. Developing an environmental works toolkit. Residents can take an NVQ Level 4 in resident inclusion ▪ Tenants Fed meetings – relevant service topic and tenant input. Quarterly tenants’ conference. Service improvement update. Inter-active workshops look at standards/service input. Tenancy audits, reality checkers group – look at performance stats, interview staff, customer experience of contacting the service. e.g. Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB). Give honest views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council website provides details of the ways that tenants can become involved – lots of different options, has tenant participation team ▪ Tenant liaison group, tenant feedback mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tenants looking for people to be engaged. Have staff-tenant group, 4 times a year, look at targets, etc. Meet with maintenance people. Have updated Tenants Handbook/Maintenance Handbook. 3-monthly newsletters ▪ Tenants and Residents Federation, umbrella organisation, and other associations. Good team in the Federation, people work together. Magazine – 3 times a year ▪ Tenants and residents groups and borough-wide Federation of Tenants and Residents, funded by the council, have own Management Committee
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Older adults forum, represents carers, staff, board members with expertise. Care and support committee also has tenants. Residents Forums, touring to care and support venues also, Partnership Board ▪ A pyramid. Local neighbourhood, special interest, BME, Quality Improvement Panel, Area Panel, City-wide Panel. Board papers available in advance, sit in and observe board meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Surveys, magazines, focus groups, through contact centre, officer visits ▪ Involved residents, tenant involvement, membership ▪ Proactive budget for tenant involvement. Quarterly magazine with tenant section, updates on development, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residents’ participation partnership – forums, groups. Have your say sessions, cover day-to-day matters. Resident Home Improvement Panel. The Partnership has formal agendas and minutes, regional forums, have your say sessions. From the Partnership,

	<p>Resident challenge panel. Independent review services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Service users – tenants and residents, have your say group, tenant inspectors for 2/3 years, various groups, diversity, etc., Raise questions about services, issues, Have internal diversity champions ▪ Tenants on the board, scrutiny group - re-organised. Tenants Forum. Bus as mobile office. Share membership open to all – ca. 50 tenants. Good response for voting for tenant board members –1000 responses 	<p>welfare benefits advice. Various groups – disability awareness, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT), knitters and natters, allotment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Share membership, Community Forum, Tenant and Leaseholder involved, sounding board for policy updates 	<p>three tenants are on the board (voted by tenants).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-transfer tenants, staff and board member group looked at policies – it meant better mutual understanding. There is a panel, covering all areas. Everyone in the community can be involved e.g. disability group, BME group. Any shareholder can put their name forward to be on the Board and all tenants can vote. Voting through the Electoral Reform Society. Only tenant shareholders can vote for independents on the Board ▪ Lots of engagement with staff, family funday – rides, face painting, bouncy castle, owls, all attendees had to do was purchase food and drink. Tenants and Residents Association and sub-groups, e.g. Disabled Awareness Groups, organised trips. Time banking – one credit per hour of volunteering, use in swimming pools, to watch rugby, exchange for lunch in café. Tenants acting as inspectors ▪ Local Tenant Participation Service. Tenants involved via magazine, questionnaires. Anyone, whatever tenure can
--	---	---	---



			become involved. All staff are invited to come along to the Forum, to say what's happening. All tenants can become shareholders - £1. Have to be a shareholding member to be on the board
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forums - local and area, leaseholder, young people, Quality Design Forum (QDF), membership forum. About 30-40 different ways to be involved - ca. 400/500 people. 1800 shareholding members. Can be a member from age 10 (youth forum for 13-25 year age group). Provide options – local involvement, borough-wide, scrutinise, provide feedback, review an issue, feedback on works, monitor a piece of land etc. ▪ Any tenant can become a member for a £1. 300 currently. Associate membership for people in the community. Leaseholder members. Member from age of 11. Youth group 11-18 is very active. Groups include communications, tenants tick (all documents scrutinised for jargon), member group organised the AGM, scrutiny group – being reviewed ▪ Tenants – involvement QDF, communications group, equalities panel – effective, has broad range of people engaged, youth panel, scrutiny committee. Wider stakeholder involvement — environmental improvement group (staff, tenants, board), regional partnership. Annual stakeholder survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tenant groups ▪ QDF – influenced what was provided to tenants, possible job opportunities, fundays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tenants can start up own groups, e.g. tenants and leaseholder innovation group, assists if an area is interested in help in setting up groups. Various groups and meetings, also IT. Comms Group ▪ Tenants Compact. Tenants and residents represent areas, Scrutiny Committee, see papers before board. Various forums housing management forum bi-monthly with staff; QDF – look at policies, monthly scrutiny of officer performance, e.g. on voids. Communications Group. Two tenants acting as inspectors

Whether the organisation lives public service values, and examples of these

Table Seven– Lives public service values			
	Management	Unions	Tenants
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, now seeing a difference ▪ Yes ▪ Starting to, yes. Common corporate values – not yet ▪ Yes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, in fairness ▪ Like to think that we are, and trying our best 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Doesn't always work as expected. [...] things should evolve ▪ Yes, thinks so ▪ Not 100%. When a council is run by elected members there are different political views
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes ▪ Yes, absolutely ▪ Yes ▪ Yes, integrity goes through everything 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, tries to and does its best ▪ Yes, ▪ Yes, definitely the ethos ▪ Customer-focused in delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, partly, as a tenant, the organisation is seen as very supportive ▪ Trying to live these. Some do, others find it difficult and some do not. The ideas are there and we are working to make it happen ▪ Yes, 100% ▪ Hard to answer
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, tries to. Some individuals don't; they let the organisation down ▪ Yes, try to, in everything we do ▪ Yes, generally sound at demonstrating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes ▪ Services much improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, early days, but things being put in place ▪ Tries hard, not 100%, but getting there

Examples of living public sector values

Table Eight – Lives public service values, examples			
	Management	Unions	Tenants
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Zero tolerance - gifts and hospitality acceptance ▪ Corporate governance in place ▪ Equality champion volunteer embedded ▪ Woven throughout what we do ▪ Participatory budgets, areas budgets ▪ Values-led peer review ▪ We consult with the tenants' federation and have their views- e.g. re WHQS. At Tenants Conference give updates on standards for the council. Quarterly reporting PIs ▪ Have tenants as reality checkers – independent reviews of performance standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We still have our housing stock ▪ Changes to repair targets – emergency repairs dealt with within half a day (24-hour target) and follow-up work sanctioned there and then ▪ Changes to operating hours to be more reflective of tenants' needs (after-school visits etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WHQS participation very good ▪ Involve tenants in external meetings that staff attend, e.g. A Welsh Government meeting with LAs and HAs (only 2 LAs took tenants) ▪ The council respects confidentiality ▪ The Federation is making sure that the council does what it said it would do. There is scrutiny committee for accountability ▪ Residents are involved in appointment – survey consultants, awarding of contracts
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strong observance of equality legislation ▪ Schedule 1, Welsh Government as regulator, also ombudsman. Adopts Nolan principles. Strong hospitality register, Bribery Act. Board approval/vetting family members ▪ Board member contract, CHC Charter, good governance ▪ Engage with the Local Service Board, Health organisations, and with Communities First at all levels. ▪ Transparent policies on probity – information on gifts and hospitality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focus on customer needs ▪ Schedule 1 is well understood and taken seriously ▪ Involvement of residents ▪ The needs of BME and disability groups adequately covered ▪ Tenants' needs will come before an admin job – managers would say yes to putting tenants needs first ▪ Good communications and transparency ▪ Responds to what local community wants ▪ Forum and group input 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some things are hidden, but not many. There are six customer service inspectors. Last review was ASB – went to board and was published. ▪ Chief executive now interviews new staff (when in post). This approach came directly from the Partnership ▪ Tenants sitting on interview panel for staff ▪ Schedule 1 – permitted payments and benefits enforced



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> received are available on the website Board briefings are widely circulated. There are strong policies regarding staff use of contractors etc. Schedule 1 – everything declared. Goes to Audit Committee, strictly observed Innovation – do things differently – extra care, self-build charity; partnerships, working with LA and others 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't hide anything, e.g. at AGMs talk about accounting and finance. Know that rent keeps staff employed Different community support for different groups The HA improves the area and housing stock Tries to encourage youngsters
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Six-monthly survey, looks at openness, accountability, respect, tenant satisfaction Staff survey and appraisals – test against our values – these reflect public service values Open and transparent staff/tenants, e.g. engaged in self-assessment – came from a values exercise, over a 12-month period. Over 100 tenants, all staff, board looked at what outcomes appropriate for us and how to deliver them Try to find ways to communicate in different ways. From a health and well-being audit, staff gave communications a high ranking, high level of staff understanding and awareness of public service values. Also, Schedule 1 example Stakeholder survey, complaints, open and transparent. Partnership Pledge Politically neutral 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Now more political neutrality Schedule 1, probity over relations with tenants, clear about gifts that can be accepted (up to certain value) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bedroom tax specialist team/or personal visits, e.g. financial inclusion team Single-minded focus on housing



Service Delivery (Fair allocation of resources)

Service delivery: in-house or external

Table Nine – In-house services			
	Management	Union	Tenant
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All housing management and DLO ▪ Housing management and maintenance. Gas servicing. Back office ▪ DLO, repairs and maintenance, day-to-day landlord activities: lettings, allocations, housing management, housing strategy. Adaptations in-house. Cleaning, grounds maintenance, play-areas. Corporately legal, HR, costs apportioned ▪ DLO, repairs and maintenance including voids, gas servicing. Own electrical works. Housing management services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Main housing and maintenance services ▪ Main housing and maintenance services, safety checks for heating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mix and match internal and external – plumbing in-house, electrical. Rents, DLO ▪ Day-to-day housing management and maintenance. Own DLO, some programmed works
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing management, Direct Service Unit (DSU), repairs, gardens, landscaping, cleaning. HR, communications, marketing, accountancy, legal, IT software, IT helpline, development, social care, in-house – Tier 2 mental health provider ▪ All support, customer facing, DLO, Finance, HR/IT ▪ Housing management and maintenance, HR, management. All now except legal services. ▪ Most housing management, in-house repairs, reactive, voids, sheltered support, HR, payroll, internal, IT. Some gas installation, some asbestos sampling. Health and Safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing management, internal IT support ▪ Most in-house ▪ As much as possible in-house ▪ General needs housing, sheltered, extra-care, main core business, also regeneration. Now have own grounds maintenance team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing management, voids, landscaping ▪ Taken over gas servicing, reactive repairs, rent, ASB and neighbourhood support, financial inclusion, estate caretakers, scheme managers ▪ Gas, electrical services, kitchen and bathroom maintenance, estate cleaning and maintenance. Forensics department for 6-10 months. Tenant support for recovering alcoholics, financial advice, services for the elderly ▪ Responsive repairs, housing management, money matters service to help tenants with

			budgeting and the Welsh Water Assist scheme
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Everything we can – internal improvements, housing management, grounds, community caretaking, gas, asbestos, own stores (some items), legionella testing. Taken on a lawyer. Share internal audit with three others ▪ All landlord services, all repairs and maintenance. HR and IT ▪ Management and maintenance. Some areas of collaborative working – e.g. weed spraying, scaffolding. Asbestos safety work will be in-house after year five 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Main housing services, accountancy, payroll ▪ Most in-house, in-house maintenance, gas servicing, dealing with asbestos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Repairs and maintenance, fly tipping, grass cutting, housing management, maintenance, DLO, voids, gas servicing

Table Ten – Services provided externally			
	Management	Union	Tenant
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agency grant work for disabled adaptations work ▪ Planned maintenance, specialist works (e.g. overcladding high-rise), fire safety, installing boilers ▪ Capital programme, gas servicing ▪ Use contractors for specialist services, bulk clearance. Capital investment programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use contractors for planned works and where needed, e.g. voids, as back-up to own workforce ▪ Do not know 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gas servicing, TV aerials, some electrical ▪ Contractors for repairs ▪ Planned maintenance – kitchens, bathrooms, central heating
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ External contracts for planned maintenance (3 main contractors), some reactive, gas, electrical. External lawyers – funding, conveyancing, employment. IT ▪ WHQS framework contractual, some maintenance external to smooth out workload, specialist asbestos, grounds (social enterprise), legal ▪ Legal services ▪ Major improvements and some voids, tenancy support by other partners. IT – external technical elements; legal for conveyancing, and ASB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintenance external contractors ▪ External contractors WHQS, and part of routine maintenance; legal, lettings commercial properties, surveyors etc. ▪ External maintenance company; specialists, e.g. window latch replacement; property clearance ▪ Use contractors and local labour for smaller areas. Legal services –for conveyancing, sales, where external expertise needed. Extra care catering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contractors for planned maintenance ▪ WHQS planned works, contractors on framework, regeneration, mediation ▪ Contractor for maintenance, external gardeners, window washing, routine testing and monthly overhaul of fire alarms ▪ Main improvement plan (planned maintenance)
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grass, some external specialist maintenance, stores. External lawyer for employment, governance, property ▪ The council does Disabled Facilities Grants. Gas servicing. WHQS work outsourced except some voids by the in-house team. Contractors if DLO overstretched. Contractors must have apprenticeships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Legal services, from the local authority and a private company ▪ Energy performance certificates, external consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planned maintenance ▪ Contractors for WHQS works, voids, asbestos, small firm for small jobs, e.g. garden path



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialists, some WHQS work, 3-year SLA for street lighting with the council 		
--	--	--	--

Outsourcing of services in the past two years

Table Eleven – Outsourced services, formerly in-house		
	Management	Unions
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stores (one LA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stores (one LA)
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stores (one CM)

Plans to outsource services next year

Table Twelve – Plans to outsource services, next year – range of responses		
	Management	Unions
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No There is talk of sharing services with other LAs Stores will be tendered next year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No No
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Yes, Telecare and out-of-hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Telecare
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No

Knowledge by service users of the services that they should be receiving, how they are being delivered and the benefits of these

Table Thirteen – Service user knowledge of services			
	Management	Union	Tenant
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Newsletters. From Oct. new tenant portal to report repairs, access rent balance, make complaints, offer compliments. Free phone. Community radio, council community newsletter. Facebook, twitter, social media. Maximise use of libraries and schools – IT systems, info on welfare reform etc. ▪ Magazine and contact centre. Tenant pack when sign up. Hubs in communities, health centre etc. Lots of ways. ▪ Annual tenants and residents reporting. Service standards set. Tenants Handbook for new resident. Being revised for existing residents with their input, facebook, twitter. ▪ Tenants Fed and conferences. Housing updates. Quarterly housing news – advertise changes, e.g. extended hours service, now 8-6 rather than 8-4pm. Update on performance. Tenants Handbook, repair times etc., tenants' rights, contact, support and advice, HB, Council Tax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Web, leaflets, in reception. Repair responsibilities and timescale on the web. Through tenant participation. WHQS work – residents advised of process, timescales, works to be carried out ▪ Newsletters; residents' association meetings with surveyors present, tenant liaison group meetings and discussions, surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tenants Handbook being updated ▪ Tenants Handbook when signed up as new tenant; Council on Facebook, named contact with the council ▪ Residents got Choices Offer Document, through the Federation. Twice yearly conferences; discussion e.g. on voids. Trying to encourage younger people and people from areas where not in the Federation. Training for mystery shoppers
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, delivery outcomes, KPIs. Tenants on the board, Participation group - monitor 12 instances of service delivery a day; Postal survey. Via Neighbourhood patch officers, chief executive and directors' visits to tenants. Resident information pack on start of tenancy. 24-hours call centre. Tenant inspectors, mystery shoppers, Disability groups (e.g. resulted in improved facilities for charging mobility scooters), maintenance advisory group ▪ Offer Document promises. Quarterly newsletters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Don't know for certain. Handbooks, regular magazines, web access ▪ Survey, booklets on services in offices, on websites, newsletters to tenants, all bases covered ▪ Newsletters. Service pack when tenants sign up. For a new scheme, held meeting with residents ahead of them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pack when move in. Quarterly magazine. Organisation-wide and local amenities information. Website. Housing officers will provide information. Database of involved residents. More local meetings at different times. Various ways to communicate ▪ Quarterly newsletters and available in large print,

	<p>KPIs. Annual report to residents – Comms Group look at content and editorial. Various engagement methods. All board meetings open to public (non-confidential items). Trying to build loyalty to the organisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Customer service standards – most tenants will know what these are. We have a Have Your Say Group. There is one page in the annual report on key indicators. The board gets monthly reporting ▪ Tenant survey every two years; tenants handbook rewritten. Operating and financial reviews in the annual accounts, verbal and powerpoint presentation to AGM. Summarised in tenants' newsletter 	<p>moving in; talked about finance and other support, service delivery, and for tenants to meet each other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Everything is publicised, tenants and leaseholders handbook. Website, contacts – out of hours for repairs etc. 	<p>website. Panel information is disseminated. Service user guides on sign-up; different one for sheltered schemes. Open meetings, also via contact with the office. Training courses on engagement - two per year. Lots of community involvement from easy DIY, well-being, to governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised from the start what services are available, rent and service charge costs. Estate assistant updates noticeboard. Service charge consultation/survey. Quarterly magazine. Rent statement sent at same time. ▪ Initial tenancy agreement; TEG grant for Forum to assist with involvement. Website, twitter. Previously magazine, not supplied for 8 months, now electronic
<p>CM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involved tenants – regular conversation. Tenant and leaseholder handbook and leaflets. Phone conversations (because of literacy problems), and go out to residents ▪ Tenants – able to get involved/engaged. Landlord services team/assistants encouraged to be out there. Tenancy support, inclusion well-advertised. Quarterly magazine. A tenant is a member of the Tenants Advisory Panel. A tenant actively involved pre-ballot now works for the organisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tenants' magazine. Tenants know that services will match those provided by the LA as a minimum, some improved (e.g. garden maintenance) ▪ Magazine, covers finances, works programmes; website, also information in offices and on the walls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Newsletter, lots of information, also on website and in meetings (these have included external agencies – e.g. credit union) ▪ Newsletters, tenants handbook – tenants decided design. Every two months letter from neighbourhood manager, what's happening,



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Huge raft of ways to communicate. Annual report, newsletters in various formats. Patch-based every two months. Local what's said and done. Weekly local community radio. Use social media. Tenant handbooks, leaflets, tenant agreed standards. Scrutiny, communications group. 900 tenants are shareholders. Looking again at the offer – what's in it for tenants to be a shareholder? 28 members at the AGM, 700 tenants came to funday when AGM was held		who's who, estate walkabouts etc. Website, good communications
--	--	--	--



Financial sustainability

The business planning cycle and who decides what you spend

LA	30-year Housing Revenue Account business plan; yearly business plan process, officers propose budget and plan which goes to scrutiny, then cabinet which approves plans and expenditure for forthcoming year. Sent to Welsh Government. Planning period starts autumn/Nov/Dec through to financial year end, with regular monitoring.
HA	Similar process and timescale to above; 30-year model produced, more detailed yearly and five-year plans. Officers prepare and boards approve, to Welsh Government in July, also sent to funders.
CM	Similar process and timescale to above; 30-year model produced, more detailed yearly and five-year plans. Officers prepare and boards approve, to Welsh Government in July, also sent to funders.

Controls to stop assets being transferred (asset lock)

Table Fifteen – Controls to stop assets being transferred			
	Management	Unions	Tenants
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statute and due process ▪ Don't know ▪ Council has asset management strategy ▪ If looking to dispose or demolish, criteria would be there – own governance and then Welsh Government? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not aware of asset lock, or of any assets being transferred ▪ Don't really know, assume a Cabinet decision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Don't know, difficult ▪ Don't know ▪ Don't know
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would need WG Section 9 consent to sell properties except exempted classes. Ring fencing of social housing, etc., in the Rules ▪ WG general consents for grant funded, supported activities ▪ Would need WG Section 9 consent to sell properties ▪ Would need WG Section 9 consent to sell properties (s133 consent for stock transfers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Don't know ▪ Keeps an eye on assets. Have had enquiries about land but there is no intention to transfer assets ▪ Don't know, governed by charitable status ▪ Has disposed of some properties in need of regeneration and demolished some – with agreement of Welsh Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board would have to say ▪ Controls in the Rules, rule G20. Also, WG, can't sell assets until after fifth anniversary ▪ Financial controls, refinancing. Imagine that it is looked at in depth to make sure that assets don't get transferred ▪ Cost floor for new properties (limits statutory RTB/RTA)
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-profit making, Rules, Charity Law. S9, security for lenders ▪ S9 consent for disposals ▪ Pledged to funders. Section 9 consents. No changes (mergers/subsidiaries) allowed until year six – Transfer agreement term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safeguards in accounting processes, finances audited ▪ Security for loans. Have in-house solicitor to advise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thinks external WG scrutiny ▪ Don't know



Employee terms and conditions

How salaries are set

Table Sixteen – Salary schemes	
LA	All have NJC terms and conditions
HA	All have their own reward schemes, a mixture of spot salaries and some progression in bands. Salaries are benchmarked against the market. Two stock transfer organisations previously had NJC terms and conditions
CM	All have NJC terms and conditions. Two use NJC for all staff; one uses NJC for existing staff and their own scheme for new staff

The lowest to highest pay ratio

Table Seventeen – salary ratios (lowest to highest)		
	Management	Union
LA	1:8; 1:6; 1:4; 1:5	1.5 (1 response); 1:9 (includes chief executive)
HA	1:9; 1:6; 1:7; 1:8	1:9; not known or specified (3 responses)
CM	1:7; 1:6; 1:7	Not known (2 responses)

Salaries increases last year

Table Eighteen – salary increases		
	2012/13	2013/14
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1%
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2.5% except staff on NJC terms ▪ No for staff (on NJC then), and senior staff no increase since 2008 ▪ 1.8% average increase ▪ 1.7% average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Being negotiated (1% for NJC staff) ▪ 5% average increase ▪ Not stated ▪ No increase
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No ▪ No ▪ 2% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1% (and senior staff <1% expected) ▪ Not stated ▪ 1%



Other benefits offered to staff

Table Nineteen - benefits		
All LAs	All HAs	All Community Mutuals
Management	Management	Management
Flexitime Home working Mobile working arrangements Special leave Buy/sell leave Sickness benefits Car allowances Health and well-being support	Flexitime Flexible working Buy/sell leave Sabbatical policy Salary sacrifice Sickness benefits Permanent Health Insurance (in-house) Bus passes Travel expenses Bike doctor, bike mileage Car allowance Debt advice Nursery, child-care vouchers Free tea and coffee Employee assistance health and well-being scheme Vouchers/meals (excellence zone)	Flexi-time Same hours for all Work-life balance Family friendly environment Free parking Health scheme Café Counselling Free tea and coffee Day off when first child goes to school



Unions	Unions	Unions
Flexi-time for staff Flexi-time for all – no fixed hours Crafts – fixed hours Car allowance	Flexi-time (one stated that terms are worse than with the council) Annual leave, extra leave earlier than previously. Family and emergency related leave. Buy/sell leave Good holidays Salary sacrifice, child care, bus passes, bike scheme coming in. Have permanent health care. Private health care for executive Training better. Health and safety very good Government childcare vouchers, free tea and coffee. Very modest 10-year bonus	Flexi-time, usual holidays and sick pay arrangements, health, maternity, family friendly policies, term time working etc. Benefits similar to or better than the council Extra benefits - £280k training budget. Nurse appointments, flu jabs, alternative therapies. Debt management advice

Pension arrangements

Table Twenty– pension arrangements	
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All staff members of LAs are members of a local government pension scheme (LGPS) – currently all defined benefit, final salary scheme ▪ LGPS offered to all, opt in by staff – currently all defined benefit, final salary scheme
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LGPS for LA transferred staff; SHPS (final salary, now closed); SHPS career average (open); defined contribution scheme ▪ LGPS final salary (open); SHPS final salary (1 person); defined contributions scheme ▪ SHPS, defined contribution scheme ▪ LGPS – closed; SHPS – final salary closed; SHPS career average - open
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All LGPS

Schemes in place to reduce the size of the workforce last year

Table Twenty One – workforce reduction schemes last year	
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes – retirements ▪ Yes, transformational change - voluntary severance ▪ Continuous review - efficiency savings. Early retirement, displacement pool ▪ Yes, early voluntary redundancy – arising from service reviews
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Workforce always under review ▪ Re-organised housing services. Staff offered vacancies, some took redundancies. Moved from generic to specialist roles. No deliberate policy to reduce size of workforce, resourcing to respond to the bedroom tax, universal credit ▪ No, though two people redeployed (cuts in supporting people service contract) ▪ Five back office posts went. One redundancy. New posts in welfare reform, debt advice, rent collection
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All no

Schemes in place to reduce the size of the workforce next year

Table Twenty Two – workforce reduction schemes next year	
LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes – two posts ▪ Yes, budget cuts ▪ Continuous review, 2-4% budget cuts ▪ Continuous review
HA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Workforce always under review – may be cuts if lose local authority contracts ▪ No, but if revenue falls (welfare reform) may be cuts in future years ▪ No, not unless councils cut contracts ▪ Yes, probably in 2014/15 with welfare reform coming in
CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Next year, 20 people will be redeployed (will have finished main works programme) ▪ Others no