1.0 Purpose

1.1. This report provides an update of key areas of work in the service outwith the areas covered in the Performance Report or the Business Plan. The performance report will be presented to the next meeting of this committee.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1. It is recommended that the Committee

2.1.1. accepts the recommendations made by the Clackmannanshire Scrutiny Panel (paragraph 4.3);

2.1.2. and notes the remainder of the report, commenting and challenging as appropriate.

3.0 Tenant Satisfaction Survey 2016

3.1. During May and June of 2016 an independent survey of tenants’ attitudes was carried out. The summary report of the findings has been distributed to all members, and a member briefing was held on 7th September. A similar presentation was also made to the Tenants’ and Residents’ Federation.

3.2. The Scottish Social Housing Charter created an obligation for landlords to regularly undertake surveys of their tenants and submit the results to the Scottish Housing Regulator (SHR).

3.3. Ipsos MORI guidance prepared on behalf of the SHR recommends that the survey is carried out by post, telephone or face-to-face interviews. In conjunction with partners Stirling Council, Forth and Rural Stirling Housing Associations it was decided that face to face surveys would provide the most robust results. This method of survey:

- Maximises response rates
- Is inclusive, as interviewers can ensure that, for example, elderly or disabled people can fully participate in the process.
- Facilitates a high quality of survey output as the interviewer builds a rapport with the participant.

3.4. A total of 901 interviews were completed. This provides data accurate to $+2.97\%$ (sampling error) based upon a 50\% estimate at the 95\% confidence level. This means that if we were to repeat the survey again then we could be 95\% confident that the result we would have would be $+ \text{ or } -2.97\%$ of the result generated in this survey.

The coverage of the tenant population was such so that weighting of survey data was not required. As can be seen from table 1 below, interviews were well spread across each settlement in proportion to the housing stock. The profile of interviews also had good coverage of all other factors, varying by no more than 3 percentage points in terms of apartment and dwelling size. Table 1: sample by settlement

3.5. Table 2 below shows the results for the key charter indicators, with significantly improved performance in a number of areas when compared to the 2013 survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>no of tenants</th>
<th>% of tenants</th>
<th>no of interviews</th>
<th>% of interviews</th>
<th>difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alloa</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alva</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannan</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalsnaughton</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonside</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishcross</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestmill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenochil Village</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menstrie</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muckhart</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauchie</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillicoultry</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullibody</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4734</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Scottish Housing Regulator Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Taking everything into account, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall service provided by Clackmannanshire Council as your landlord?</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 How good or poor do you feel Clackmannanshire Council is at keeping you informed about their services and decisions?</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with opportunities given to you to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 below shows the comparisons with the other landlords carried out as part of this joint procurement, as well as the overall Scottish average for all social landlords, and the local authority only average. It can be seen that the Council is performing well above the Scottish averages in all areas other than repairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scottish Housing Regulator Indicators – Tenant Satisfaction Survey 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Percentage tenants satisfied with overall service provided by landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Percentage tenants who feel landlord is good at keeping them informed about services and decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Percentage tenants satisfied with opportunities given to them to participate in landlords decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Percentage tenants satisfied with quality of home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – Percentage tenants satisfied with repairs service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 – Percentage tenants satisfied with management of neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 – % tenants who feel rent for their property represents good value for money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Areas of Good Performance**

3.6. In general it can be said the results are pleasing, showing high levels of improving satisfaction in most areas. The following areas of good performance can be noted.

3.6.1. It is especially pleasing that satisfaction with the overall service has risen to 94%; improving on an already high rating from the last survey.
The Scottish Housing Regulator report on the social housing charter for 2015-16\(^1\) showed that at 90.9% Clackmannanshire tenants were the most satisfied of any local authority in Scotland.

3.6.2. There was also a very significant (13%) increase in the percentage of tenants that felt the rent represents good value for money, increasing to 93%. This perhaps reflects the ongoing substantial investment that has been made in the housing stock, in line with the business plan commitments agreed with the Tenants’ and Residents’ Federation in 2013.

3.6.3. The proportion of tenants who rated the newsletter very or fairly good at keeping them informed has increased from 87% in 2013 to 96%.

3.6.4. 92% of tenants were satisfied that the Council keeps tenants well informed.

3.6.5. Tenants also had a good opinion on the range of opportunities available to them to participate in their landlord’s services and decisions (89%).

3.6.6. In terms of listening and acting upon tenants views, 92% of respondents said they were very or fairly satisfied. The results have significantly increased since the 2013 survey, increasing from 72%.

3.6.7. 97% of respondents were very or fairly satisfied with how the service deals with enquiries. Since 2013 satisfaction has increased by 14 percentage points from 83%.

3.6.8. In terms of contacting the Council, all aspects of customer care have seen an increase in satisfaction since the 2013 survey. The largest increase in satisfaction can be seen in terms of getting a hold of the right person which has risen by 16 percentage points.

3.6.9. The proportion of respondents aware of the complaints procedure has increased significantly since the 2013 survey, from 49% to 80%.

3.6.10. Just under 9 in 10 respondents (89%) who moved into a new property in the last 12 months were very or fairly satisfied with the allocations process.

3.6.11. In terms of the repairs service, satisfaction was very high in terms of the being told when workers would call (97%), the attitude of workers (97%), being able to make an appointment (96%) and keeping dirt and mess to a minimum (96%).

3.6.12. The proportion of tenants who were very or fairly satisfied with the planned or cyclical maintenance carried out by their landlord has increased significantly since the 2013 survey, from 72% to 92%.

3.6.13. In terms of major works, satisfaction was very high in terms of being told when workers would call (98%), the attitude of the workers (98%) and the major works overall (97%).

3.6.14. 97% of people were satisfied with the maintenance of open spaces in the neighbourhood; 94% satisfied with the maintenance of common areas; and 90% being satisfied with the overall management of the neighbourhood.

Areas for consideration

3.7. As well as noting the improved areas, it is intended to use the survey results as a focus for continual improvement. The following areas will be discussed further with residents, and addressed through the business planning process.

3.7.1. Consideration needs to be given to the best ways to reach tenants. Only 30% of respondents, who said they had internet access, had accessed the Council’s website. Awareness of paying rent via Clacksweb was low, with only two thirds of respondents with internet access being aware of this (66%).

3.7.2. Whilst it is accepted that not everyone will wish to participate it is felt that the figure for awareness of how people can get involved in the decision making processes (75%) could be improved.

3.7.3. There needs to be a check on how we deal with complaints, where satisfaction has fallen since 2013.

3.7.4. Satisfaction with the out of hours service decreased from 92% in 2013 to 82% in 2016. The service changed provider in the last year, so changes since then will require investigation.

3.7.5. The top three neighbourhood issues which were perceived as being the biggest concern for residents in their neighbourhood were dog fouling or dog mess (25% stating major or minor problem), car parking (20%) and rubbish or litter (19%). Just over 3 in 4 tenants (77%) said they feel very or fairly safe in their neighbourhood after dark.

3.7.6. We will also review the way anti-social behaviour complaints are dealt with as satisfaction has decreased significantly from 49% in 2013 to 27%

3.7.7. It is also clear that we need to raise awareness the impact of Welfare Reform and universal credit, with awareness levels decreasing since the last survey and less than half of respondents (43%) aware that once they transfer to Universal Credit they are responsible for paying their rent directly to Clackmannanshire Council.

3.8. Members are asked to note survey results.

4.0 Report from the Clackmannanshire Scrutiny Panel.

4.1. The first report from the Clackmannanshire Scrutiny Panel is attached as appendix 1. This panel was set up in accordance with the expectations set
out in the Social Housing Charter. It is an independent panel comprised of service users, set up to examine aspects of the service provided in a through, honest and constructive manner. All panel members have been trained and assessed as part of a national programme “Stepping up to Scrutiny” commissioned by the Scottish Government.

4.2. The Panel is free to choose its own topics for scrutiny. The report is entirely the work of the Panel, and has not been edited in any way by officers.

4.3. The Panel should be congratulated for its work. The report makes four recommendations which are welcomed by officers. These can be found in full in the appendix, and are summarised as follows:

4.3.1. Develop a process that encourages staff, tenants and service users to share ideas and good practice to improve the ASB service and show how these views will be reflected.

4.3.2. Set targets and timescales influenced by service users, based on their experiences and direct input.

4.3.3. Ensure service users are supported throughout the process with all appropriate agencies involved including looking at any requirements before the case closes through to the service users satisfaction.

4.3.4. Review the ASB policy and procedures to reflect service users’ views.

4.4. Members are invited to accept the recommendations made in the report. An action plan can then be agreed with the Panel to address the recommendations.

5.0 Scottish Welfare Fund

5.1. Members may be aware of a recent press report which commented on Scottish Government statistics on the payments of community care and crisis grants for the first quarter of 2016. Both have a target for initial processing times of applications. The community care grant target is 15 days. The national average for applications processed in the given time frame is 92%, whereas the Clacks average was shown as 76%, the fourth lowest.

5.2. The Crisis Grant target is two days, and the national average is 97%. The figures indicated that at 77% Clacks had the poorest performance in the country.

5.3. The Chair of the Scrutiny committee asked for a report on this performance.

5.4. In the response to the press enquiry we acknowledged that steps had already been taken to meet targets, as would be shown in the latest statistics.

5.5. It is likely some staffing issues affected service performance at that time. However, having now spent some considerable time examining the data returned to the Scottish Government used to produce the national statistics it appears that the returns contained errors. As such the figures cannot be

---

considered an accurate reflection of the position. The issue has been brought to the attention of the software provider and to the Scottish Government.

5.6. It appears that the return showed the date of case closure, and not the date of decision. These dates can be significantly different. For example, where goods are supplied the case will only be closed when all invoices have been received, processed and authorised for payment.

5.7. The 19 cases that had been identified as exceeding the 15 day community care grant target were examined. In every case the actual decision time was well under this target. 15 cases were dealt with the same day, two cases took one day, one case was dealt with in two days, and one took nine days.

5.8. A sample of crisis grants revealed a similar pattern.

5.9. There were also no recorded customer complaints of the time it took to award one of these grants. This seems to support the finding that the data returned to the Scottish Government was incorrect.

5.10. It should also be noted that the software used for SWF has some limitations, and the Scottish Government also asks for very detailed information. A relatively small amount of funding is made available by the Scottish Government to support this work. At the time, the staffing complement was 2.5 people, with one of those staff members unfortunately on long term sickness absence. In a larger team more data verification may have been possible. However, staff are focussed on the delivery of the service.

5.11. Work is ongoing with the software provider to ensure that the above issue is rectified and officers are now able to mark a case as resolved without having to wait for the budget to be reconciled. This should allow for accurate reporting in the future.

5.12. Staffing levels have also been temporarily increased pending further review of the operation of the SWF function.

6.0 Sustainability Implications

6.1. The Clackmannanshire Housing Strategy is subject to a full Environmental Impact Assessment which will incorporate its principle priorities and actions.

7.0 Resource Implications

7.1. Financial Details

The full financial implications of recommendations are set out in the report. This includes a reference to full life cycle costs where appropriate. Yes √

Finance has been consulted and has agreed the financial implications as set out in the report. Yes √

7.2. Staffing

There are no additional staffing implications associated with this report.
8.0 Exempt Reports

8.1. Is this report exempt?

Yes [ ] (please detail the reasons for exemption below)  No [ √ ]

9.0 Declarations

The recommendations contained within this report support or implement our Corporate Priorities and Council Policies.

(1) Our Priorities (Please double click on the check box ☑)
- The area has a positive image and attracts people and businesses [ ☑ ]
- Our communities are more cohesive and inclusive [ ☑ ]
- People are better skilled, trained and ready for learning and employment [ ]
- Our communities are safer [ ☑ ]
- Vulnerable people and families are supported [ ☑ ]
- Substance misuse and its effects are reduced [ ]
- Health is improving and health inequalities are reducing [ ]
- The environment is protected and enhanced for all [ ☑ ]
- The Council is effective, efficient and recognised for excellence [ ☑ ]

(2) Council Policies (Please detail)

10.0 Equalities Impact

10.1. Have you undertaken the required equalities impact assessment to ensure that no groups are adversely affected by the recommendations? Yes [ ]  No [ √ ]

11.0 Legality

11.1. It has been confirmed that in adopting the recommendations contained in this report, the Council is acting within its legal powers. Yes [ √ ]

12.0 Appendices

12.1. Please list any appendices attached to this report. If there are no appendices, please state "none".

Appendix 1 – Scrutiny Panel Report

Have you used other documents to compile your report  No [ √ ]
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Following the publication of the Scottish Social Housing Charter and guidance from the Scottish Housing Regulator, Clackmannanshire Council Housing & Community Safety Service set up a Scrutiny Panel in response to the opportunity to encourage tenants to examine the services provided by Clackmannanshire Council Housing & Community Safety Service to report their evidence based findings to Clackmannanshire Council Scrutiny Committee in a thorough, honest and constructive manner.

The Scrutiny Panel is totally independent of any other organisation. We are able to choose our own topics for scrutiny and we report directly to Clackmannanshire Council Scrutiny Committee. We have formal Terms of Reference and a Code of Conduct.

In early 2015, tenants on the Scrutiny Panel underwent formal scrutiny training through the ‘Stepping Up to Scrutiny’ training and learning programme. CIH Scotland in partnership with HouseMark Scotland were commissioned by the Scottish Government to deliver this national training programme. Only tenants who have undertaken formal scrutiny training will be directly involved in the scrutiny of any aspect of landlord service.

This is the Scrutiny Panels first Full Report as part of the ‘Stepping Up to Scrutiny’ training and learning programme

We would like to thank everyone who has taken part in the scrutiny process. From the office staff who supported us, the member of staff who was interviewed and also to the tenants who gave of their time.

I would like to thank the members of the Scrutiny Panel for collating and preparing this report.

Melvin Wilson

Scrutiny Panel Chair
1. Background

Welcome to the first full report of the Clackmannanshire Scrutiny Panel. The Scrutiny Panel consists of a group of volunteer Tenants from across Clackmannanshire, who are working together to improve the services supplied by Clackmannanshire Housing & Community Safety Service. Members of the Scrutiny team involved in the Scrutiny of the Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) procedures were Melvin Wilson, Bridget Buchan, May Barker and Margaret Garbutt (Scribe).

2. Scope

We identified from the Tenant Satisfaction Survey 2013, Annual Return on the Charter (ARC) 2015 and the Report to Tenants 2015, that there were three areas that had highlighted themselves to the panel members, these included, Voids, Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) and Debt, former tenants arrears.

As a consequence of this the panel decided to take a more detailed look at the Anti-social Behaviour ASB procedures to review performance and the information provided to service users, including possible improvements to the current service provided.

Our scrutiny concentrated on the high level information/performance of the Anti-social Behaviour service provided. Our findings on these form the basis of the report noting what worked well and recommendations to assist with improvements to the service.

3. Aims

The Scrutiny Panel asked three key questions about the Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) service provided by Clackmannanshire Housing & Community Safety Service.

• How well is the ASB procedures are being implemented?
• Does the service meet the Estate management, anti-social behaviour, neighbour nuisance and tenancy disputes outcome/ standard of the Scottish Social Housing Charter?
• How does the customer satisfaction level compare with the final outcome/standard?

In order to answer these questions the Scrutiny Panel

• Asked for some paper based Information prior to the scrutiny exercise.
• Took account of Clackmannanshire Annual Return on the Charter (ARC)
• Wrote and tested two scenarios against the Anti-social Behaviour procedures
• Interviewed a Tenancy management officer who deals with ASB
You will find more details about who we spoke to, what kind of checks we carried out and what documents we reviewed in section 7– Sources of Evidence.

4. Our Findings

(1) Landlord Performance

It was positive to learn through the "Tenants report" 2015 that the percentage of cases resolved within the locally agreed target had risen from 74.6% in 13/14 to 82.1% in 14/15. However the overall satisfaction of the service user was not reflective of the performance with only a limited number of service users responding to the customer satisfaction survey following the case closure highlighting that they were dissatisfied with the case outcome.

Strengths / Positive Practice

- Staff is knowledgeable and have plenty of good ideas to contribute to possible interim measures or solutions to the ASB cases that they manage.

- Suite of letters used to for sending information to service users was very good, covering the different aspects/sections within each case without being confrontational.

Weaknesses and or Issues which emerged:

- Limited number of service users responding to customer satisfaction survey following the case being closed.

- No mechanism for or indication of how the ASB service has used service users’ feedback to influence or change the service.

(2) Panels experience of the Anti-social Behaviour Service

The panel reviewed the anti-social behaviour service from a customer point of view by creating two scenarios and testing these against the ASB procedures.

Scenario One – Noise/Parties
Scenario Two – Harassment.

The Panel then invited a Tenancy management officer along to an interview were the scenarios were tested by asking the officer Alex Frith to address the scenarios against the current ASB procedures, as if the panel member was a service user getting in touch with the ASB service for the first time.
Although the staff were helpful and knowledgeable in giving information as to what action they could take within the boundaries of the ASB procedures, legislation and working in partnership other agencies. By testing the scenarios the panel found that they were surprised by how complex some of the ASB cases could be. With some cases needing to be addressed by more than one agency (MATAC)

**Strengths / Positive Practice**

- The implementation of neighbourhood officers gives a better understanding of the areas and is a single point of contact to tenants and service users.

- Staff are helpful, willing and have a strong customer focus.

- MATAC to deliver a co-ordinated approach to combat anti-social behaviour in the local community.

**Weaknesses and/or Issues which emerged:**

- Satisfaction with the overall service provided to service users was 8.3% but it also, highlighted that of the limited number of services users who answered the customer satisfaction survey 17% were not satisfied with the final outcome of the case.

- 20 week local target was agreed following the CIH online resource that provides comprehensive advice, guidance and good practice examples on housing topics in a single place. However, does not take account of the experience of service users and their feedback

- No evidence or mechanism for follow up monitoring or support being offered to service users prior the closure of the ASB case.

5. **Conclusion**

Overall, we considered that the anti-social behaviour service provided to service users by housing & community safety service was in general a good service. However, there was little input from service users. whilst noting many strengths and positives in the delivery of the service, we have highlighted some of the weaknesses and issues that were identified.

Because our recommendations (Section 6 Our Recommendations) align themselves to the standards and outcomes of the Scottish Social Housing Charter, we have deliberately tried not to be prescriptive in our recommendations.

We hope however, that the Council will engage with the ASB service users to explore appropriate solutions and or methods to meet these recommendations.
6. Our Recommendations

The Scottish Social Housing Charter sets the standards and outcomes that all social landlords should aim to achieve when performing their housing activities. We will therefore report our recommendations using a framework based on the Scottish Social Housing Charter for all our scrutiny activity.

2: Communication

Social landlords manage their businesses so that: tenants and other customers find it easy to communicate with their landlord and get the information they need about their landlord, how and why it makes decisions and the services it provides. This outcome covers all aspects of landlords’ communication with tenants and other customers. It is not just about how clearly and effectively a landlord gives information to those who want it.

It also covers making it easy for tenants and other customers to make complaints and provide feedback on services, using that information to improve services and performance, and letting people know what they have done in response to complaints and feedback. It does not require landlords to provide legally protected, personal or commercial information.

Recommendation 1
Consider and develop a process that encourages staff, tenants and service users to share ideas and good practice to improve the ASB service and show how these views will be reflected.
Ensure that jargon is not used within the documentation so that service users and or customers find easy to understand.

3: Participation

Social landlords manage their businesses so that: tenants and other customers find it easy to participate in and influence their landlord’s decisions at a level they feel comfortable with.

This outcome describes what landlords should achieve by meeting their statutory duties on tenant participation. It covers how social landlords gather and take account of the views and priorities of their tenants; how they shape their services to reflect these views; and how they help tenants and other customers to become more capable of involvement.

Recommendation 2
Recommend that any target/ timescales should be influenced by ASB service users through Feedback of their experiences or by their participation in a possible focus group.
6: Estate management, anti-social behaviour, neighbour nuisance and tenancy disputes.

Social landlords working in partnership with other agencies, help to ensure that: Tenants and other customers live in well maintained neighbourhoods where they feel safe.

This outcome covers a range of actions that social landlords can take on their own and in partnership with others. It covers action to enforce tenancy conditions on estate management and neighbour nuisance, to resolve neighbour disputes, and to arrange or provide tenancy support where this is needed. It also covers the role of landlords working with others to tackle anti-social behaviour.

**Recommendation: 3**
Recommend all steps are taken to ensure service users are supported throughout the process with all appropriate agencies involved including looking at any requirements before the ASB case closes through to the service users satisfaction.

**Recommendation: 4**
Recommend that the service look at an ASB policy and a procedure that reflects the service users views either through feedback from their ASB experiences or by consultation and not solely through the use of the CIH on-line forum or officers.

7. Sources of Evidence

**Interviews and Meetings**
- Tenancy Management Officer
- Tenant Participation Co-ordinator
- 4 Review meetings

**Key Documents Reviewed**
- The Scottish Social Housing Charter
- Tenant Satisfaction Survey 2013
- ARC Submission 2014/15
- Report to Tenants 2015
- ASB Procedures
- CIH on-line practice forum
- SHR on-line comparison toolkit.
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Glossary

ARC  Annual Return on the Charter which provide the SHR with key information on a Landlords performance in achieving the outcomes and standards in the Charter.

ASB  Anti-social Behaviour - "Antisocial" means causing, or likely to cause alarm, distress.

CIH Scotland  The Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH) is the professional body for people involved in housing and communities.

ICT  Information, Communication and Technology system.

MATAC  Multi Agency Tasking And Co-ordinating - which is a multi agency group which includes, Police Scotland, The Council and Local Housing Associations who come together to deliver a co-ordinated approach to combat anti-social behaviour in the local community.

Outcome  An outcome is a result we want to happen.

Scrutiny  Examining a service in a critical way.

Scrutiny Panel Members  Scrutiny Panel Members are trained tenants who are part of the scrutiny team. They are involved in the preparation for the scrutiny, reading landlord materials as well as talking to tenants.

Service Users  Users of housing services provided by social landlords and bodies representing the interests of those users.

Stakeholder(s)  Any person or organisation who obtains a service from the landlord or is effected by the landlords actions.

Standard  A level of quality that every social landlord should achieve.