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Executive summary

Section overview

This section gives an overview of the survey and the headline results.

Background

North Coast Community Housing Company (NCCH) commissioned the NSW Federation of Housing Associations (the Federation) to conduct their 2014 tenant satisfaction survey. Using the Federation brings significant benefits, including an impartial and independent data collection and analysis service, access to best practice questions and entry into the Federation’s tenant satisfaction benchmarking group.

The aims of the 2014 survey are to:

- Establish tenant satisfaction with services in line with the National Regulatory System for Community Housing.
- Provide a comparison with the overall results achieved in the 2013 survey.
- Benchmark performance levels against the Federation’s tenant satisfaction benchmarking group.
- Inform future service delivery improvements.

How the survey was completed

The 2014 tenant satisfaction survey was undertaken as a postal self-completion questionnaire with an enclosed prepaid response envelope plus instruction which was sent to all 865 NCCH households.

To increase response rates NCCH offered three prizes of $100 (one per region) for tenants who completed this year’s tenant survey.

Fieldwork (when tenants are asked to complete the survey) was commenced on the 7th April and ended 10th May 2014. To increase response rates on the 3rd May a reminder SMS message was sent to tenants that had not returned their questionnaire.

The Federation received a total of 325 valid1 returned questionnaires (an additional 9 questionnaires were received but were invalid), representing an excellent overall valid response rate of 38%. This response rate is 13% above the NRSCH threshold (25%) and is a significant improvement compared to the 25% response rate achieved in 2013.

For this survey the overall margin of error is +/- 4.3 with a 95% confidence level2. This is a good level of certainty and means that when analysing the results using a base of all respondents NCCH can have a high degree of confidence that the views of respondents reflect the views of all its tenants.

1 The Federation has adopted the NRSCH definition of a valid response based on guidance in NRSCH (2014) Registration Return Guide (1.4.3: Numbers of surveys returned)
2 Please see the statistical reliability section of this report for a further information
About the respondents

More than a third (36%) respondents has been a tenant of NCCH for more than 11 years (DE01). The vast majority of respondents (75%) describe their ancestry as Australian or born in an English speaking country (20%) (DE04). Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander constituted 8% of the sample. The largest grouping for age of respondents was 60+ which accounted for 59% of respondents (DE05).

Headline results

This section gives the headline results from the 2014 survey.

The table below provides a summary of overall satisfaction with key service areas and a comparison with 2013 results, NRSCH thresholds and Federation benchmarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(HS11) Housing services</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75% OK</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>ABOVE</td>
<td>+/-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RM07) Repairs and maintenance</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75% OK</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>ABOVE</td>
<td>+/-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RM14) Property condition</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75% OK</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>ABOVE</td>
<td>+/-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CA09) Complaints</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52% BELOW</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NH21) Neighbourhood</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85% ABOVE</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CM13) Communication</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83% ABOVE</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TE01) Tenant engagement</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77% ABOVE</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The combined satisfaction rate is calculated by adding the percentages of respondents in the ‘satisfied’ and ‘very satisfied’ categories
The positive headlines for this year's tenant satisfaction survey are that NCCH comfortably exceeded all three National Regulatory System for Community Housing (NRSCH) thresholds that relate to tenant satisfaction, including overall satisfaction for housing services (86%), satisfaction with repairs and maintenance (80%) and an excellent 86% result for satisfaction with property condition. NCCH (38%) also exceeded the NRSCH response rate (25%).

NCCH’s results are above average in six out of seven key areas when compared to the Federation’s tenant satisfaction benchmarking data. NCCH results were marginally below the benchmarking club average in only one area – CA09 – “Complaints” key indicator.

However, overall, the results of the 2014 NCCH tenant satisfaction survey show a reduction in satisfaction in comparison with the 2013 survey with 5 out of 7 of the key indicators showing a drop in score and two indicators being stable. None of the key indicators showed an improvement. It should be noted that all reductions (apart from CA09 complaints) are at or within the margin of error for those indicators.

**Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the services provided by NCCH? (HS11) Result compared to the Federation benchmark**

![Graph showing satisfaction levels for services provided by NCCH with a result of 86% and a benchmark of 84%]

**Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the repairs and maintenance services that NCCH provides? (RM07) Result compared to the Federation benchmark**

![Graph showing satisfaction levels for repairs and maintenance services provided by NCCH with a result of 80% and a benchmark of 77%]
Gap analysis

Gap analysis provides valuable insight by mapping tenants’ priorities against levels of dissatisfaction. This analysis is summarised in the following chart and reveals that:

- Repairs and maintenance is the area of service seen as most important but with the largest combined dissatisfaction rating.
- Overall condition of your home is seen as the second most important aspect of service and this had mid-ranged combined dissatisfaction rating.
- The neighbourhood as a place to live and value for money had very similar levels of importance to tenants. The neighbourhood also had higher levels of dissatisfaction than value for money.
- The low levels of dissatisfaction for these key areas should be noted: with the exception of repairs and maintenance, all areas had a combined dissatisfaction rating of less than 10%.

Importance / Performance
Highest performing areas

The table below lists the top 15 areas of positive scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Score (% satisfied)</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH04. Services available in your area (e.g. schools, doctors)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>±2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS08. The location of your home</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>±2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT06. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the condition of your home when you first moved in?</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>±6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT05. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the information pack you received when you first moved into your home?</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>±6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH02. Suitability of your home to your circumstances</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>±3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS07. Value for money for the rent you pay</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>±3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH06. Size of your home</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>±3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS05. How likely or unlikely would you be to recommend NCCH to family and friends?</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>±3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH03. Safety of your home</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>±3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM13. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with communication with NCCH?</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>±3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH21. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your neighbourhood as a place to live?</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>±3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS04. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that NCCH treats you fairly?</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>±3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS11. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the services provided by NCCH?</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>±3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM14. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the condition of your home?</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>±5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM06. The ability of staff to deal with your query quickly and efficiently</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>±4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lowest performing areas

The table below lists the 15 lowest scoring areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Score (% positive)</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH20. In the last three years, would you say your neighbourhood has improved or declined?</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>±5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM11. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the quality of the planned maintenance work?</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>±34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA08. The outcome of your complaint?</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>±12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA06. How well you were kept informed about the progress of your complaint?</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>±11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA09. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you about how your complaint was dealt with?</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>±12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA07. The speed with which your complaint was dealt with?</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>±11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM09. The steps that were undertaken to minimise disruption during the planned maintenance</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>±34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM10. The contractor has left my home neat and tidy once the planned maintenance had been completed</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>±34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE03. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that tenants are able to influence NCCH’s decision-making?</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>±6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA05. The information and advice provided by staff?</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>±11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM13. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the out-of-hours emergency repairs service?</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>±10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM07. The final outcome of your query</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>±6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM08. The support I received from NCCH before and during the work</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>±30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE02. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that NCCH listens to tenants’ views and acts on them?</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>±5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM04. When you reported a repair how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the time it took NCCH to respond?</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>±5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

Section overview

Based on detailed survey analysis the following recommendations are made:

Overall results

1. NCCH exceeded all three NRSCCH thresholds. It also exceeded almost all Federation benchmarks with the exception of ‘dealing with complaints’. In addition NCCH recorded some very good levels of satisfaction for new tenants. It is therefore recommended that NCCH highlights these achievements to tenants, staff, board members and wider stakeholders.

2. The survey also highlights that NCCH has fallen just below the Federation benchmark for the ‘dealing with complaints’ indicator. Also compared to the 2013 survey, NCCH has recorded lower satisfaction levels for all the key indicators (apart from two remaining the same) – these differences though were within the margin of error. It is recommended that NCCH reflect on these results and as an organisation uses the findings to prioritise areas for service improvement. The following points provide some suggestions.

Methodology

1. In the 2014 survey, NCCH had a very good response rate (38%). This is a large improvement in the 2013 response rate of 25%. It is suggested that a similar survey and promotion methodology be adopted in future, including the use of SMS to announce the start of the fieldwork period and an SMS reminder.

2. It should be noted that only 2% of respondents were aged under 30. NCCH should consider new ways to engage younger tenants through the survey process in order to collect their views on issues for younger tenants. Techniques could include an online or smartphone survey and a targeted campaign to encourage younger people to have their say.
Complaints and appeals

1. Complaints and appeals had the lowest levels of satisfaction in NCCH’s 2014 survey (in common with other surveys completed by the Federation). Out of the top five items with the highest proportion of dissatisfied residents, three related to dealing with complaints. In addition, this service area also recorded the largest drops in satisfaction when compared to 2013. Therefore it is recommended that NCCH undertakes further internal research to understand the reasons for this. Is this due to dissatisfaction with the outcome of a complaint or dissatisfaction with the complaints process?

2. There is a significant minority of respondents that were unaware of how to complain to NCCH and in particular how to appeal a decision made by NCCH. Therefore it is recommended that NCCH undertakes further initiatives to increase tenants’ awareness of these areas (and perhaps even staff awareness). This might include articles in the tenant newsletter, workshops and details on the website.

Repairs and maintenance

3. Repairs and maintenance is the single most important driver of overall tenant satisfaction so it is important to get this service right. Repairs and maintenance was the issue with the biggest gap when tenant priorities were mapped against combined dissatisfaction.

4. Overall the repairs and maintenance section contains some very positive results, in particular a high level of overall satisfaction with repairs and maintenance (RM11) at 80% and the condition of home at 86%. Despite these good results there are areas that NCCH could improve upon. Satisfaction with repairs and maintenance dropped by 3% between 2013 and 2014. There may be a specific issue with planned maintenance programs, as the lowest levels of satisfaction were for planned maintenance including the quality of the planned maintenance work and the behaviour of contractors. It is therefore recommended that NCCH investigates the reasons for respondents’ dissatisfaction and in particular, whether this is indicative of all planned maintenance works carried out in the past twelve months (as the planned maintenance sample was very small, and has a very wide margin of error due to only eight respondents having had planned maintenance in the past year).

5. When overall satisfaction with the repairs and maintenance service (RM07) was analysed by region there were some statistically significant variations. Grafton respondents were significantly more likely to be satisfied (93%) than Tweed Heads (91%). Conversely, respondents from Lismore (68%) were significantly less likely to be satisfied than respondents from Grafton and Tweed Heads. It is recommended that NCCH explores the reasons for these differences.

6. In the comments section repairs and maintenance was the area of service that received the highest number of negative comments. It is recommended that NCCH study this in detail at a program and regional level using the comments toolkit supplied with this report.
Housing services

1. There were some very high levels of combined satisfaction for the different aspects of housing services, including the value for money. Despite these good results there are areas that NCCH could improve upon. For example a sizable minority of respondents (23%) were unsure or did not understand how their rent is calculated. This is a common issue in the sector in NSW and nationally and rent calculations can be complex. However, it is recommended that NCCH considers if there are additional methods (e.g. workshops, newsletters, and information on their website or summary documents) it could produce to assist more tenants to understand how their rent is calculated.

Neighbourhood

1. There were good to very good levels of combined satisfaction for different aspects of neighbourhood. The main issue that appeared in the comments related to anti-social behaviour and neighbour disputes. These issues can be difficult to deal with and it is recommended that NCCH considers providing further information on the rights and responsibilities of tenants, what NCCH can and cannot do as a landlord plus information on Community Justice Centres and the local police. NCCH might also consider staff training on these issues and also training related to clients with complex needs.

Tenant engagement

1. Respondents were more satisfied with the lower levels of engagement. It can be difficult and time consuming for both tenants and the organisation to move towards higher levels of tenant engagement. With long term commitments and resourcing for community engagement initiatives these indicators should increase.

2. When satisfaction with tenant involvement was analysed by region there were some statistically significant variations. Tweed Heads respondents were significantly more likely to be satisfied than respondents from Grafton (78%) and Lismore (71%). It is recommended that NCCH explores the reasons for these differences and consider the best engagement structures to meet the needs of these tenants.

3. The following four issues/activities had the greatest level of interest from respondents. It is recommended that NCCH builds them into their tenant engagement strategy: repairs and maintenance, activities for older people, social activities and combating anti-social behaviour and nuisance.

4. Respondents were most interested in postal surveys, contributing to tenant newsletters, tenant council and local forums as the most useful forms of involvement. It is recommended that NCCH incorporates these approaches in their tenant engagement strategies.
Regional differences: Lismore

One clear feature of the 2014 survey is the significantly lower levels of satisfaction amongst tenants living in the Lismore region. The table below compares the differences between satisfaction in the Lismore region to the average satisfaction amongst all respondents for six key indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>All areas</th>
<th>Grafton</th>
<th>Tweed Heads</th>
<th>Lismore</th>
<th>Lismore +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS 11. Housing services</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfied</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>±4%</td>
<td>±8%</td>
<td>±3%</td>
<td>±7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 07 Repairs and maintenance</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfied</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>±5%</td>
<td>±8%</td>
<td>±7%</td>
<td>±9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 14 property condition</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfied</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>±5%</td>
<td>±13%</td>
<td>±4%</td>
<td>±9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH21 Neighbourhood</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfied</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>±4%</td>
<td>±7%</td>
<td>±4%</td>
<td>±7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM13. Communication</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfied</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>±4%</td>
<td>±8%</td>
<td>±3%</td>
<td>±7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE01 tenant involvement</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfied</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>±5%</td>
<td>±11%</td>
<td>±5%</td>
<td>±8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that NCCH conduct further investigations into the reasons why there are such clear differences in satisfaction in the Lismore region, including further work through the Tenant Council group with a special focus on Lismore.
Introduction

This report provides the findings of the independent tenant satisfaction survey conducted by the NSW Federation of Housing Associations (the Federation) on behalf of North Coast Community Housing Company (NCCH) in 2014.

The Federation is the industry peak body for mainstream community housing providers in NSW. Our independence, combined with our knowledge of the industry and our knowledge of and commitment to tenant engagement means we deliver an impartial and in-depth analysis of the information provided to us by tenants. The Federation has developed its tenant satisfaction survey to include a range of good practices. The Federation also manages one of the most comprehensive tenant satisfaction benchmarking service in Australia.

The Federation thank everyone who participated in this important survey.

Methodology

The core questions used in this survey were developed following an extensive year-long consultation with the NSW community housing industry, including tenants. The core questions and survey methodology also drew upon UK best practice contained in House Mark’s STAR tenant satisfaction survey. The Federation ensured that the final questionnaire and survey methodology complied with the requirements of the new National Regulatory System for Community Housing (NRSCH).

The questionnaire contained the following nine sections:

1. Demographic profiling information.
2. Housing services.
3. Complaints and appeals.
4. Recent tenants.
5. Repairs and maintenance.
7. Communications.
8. Tenant engagement.
9. Tenant priorities and comments.
The majority of questions were structured using a balanced five point Likert scale, with response options ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied.

A census approach was used and all 862 households managed by NCCH were invited to participate.

Fieldwork (when tenants are asked to complete the survey) was commenced on the 7th April and ended 10th May 2014. To increase response rates on the 3rd May a reminder SMS message was sent to tenants that had not returned their questionnaire.

To increase response rates NCCH offered three prizes of $100 (one per region) for tenants who completed this year’s tenant survey.

The Federation received a total of 325 valid\(^5\) returned questionnaires (an additional 9 questionnaires were received but were invalid), representing an excellent overall valid response rate of 38%. This response rate is 13% above the NRSCH threshold (25%).

The distribution of questionnaire returns is illustrated in the time series graph displayed over the page.

All returned valid questionnaires were scanned using specialist data capture and research software (SNAP). All data and qualitative comments were carefully validated to ensure accuracy.

In the report where we have presented a ‘combined satisfaction’ rate this is calculated by adding the percentages of respondents in the ‘satisfied’ and ‘very satisfied’ categories. Reference to a ‘combined dissatisfaction’ rate is calculated by adding the percentages of respondents in the ‘dissatisfied’ and ‘very dissatisfied’ categories.

Please note that percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**The Federation’s tenant satisfaction benchmarking group**

The Federation’s tenant satisfaction benchmarking group is an expanding reference group of nine CHPs. There are currently eight sets of 2014 data from NSW based CHPs and one set of data from a CHP based in WA. The CHPs in the benchmarking group are generally larger organisations with six tier one CHPs and 3 tier two CHPs included. The Federation’s benchmarking tool allows comparisons by tier.

The data shown in the benchmarking comparison points is based on the most recent six monthly update of data, dating from November 2013.

\(^5\) The Federation has adopted the NRSCH definition of a valid response based on guidance in NRSCH (2014) *Registration Return Guide* (1.4.3: Numbers of surveys returned)
## Response rates by area and program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Not valid-Partial</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Not valid-Blank</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headlease</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of responses received by date
Statistical reliability

The margin of error is the range of accuracy for a question. The confidence level tells you how sure we are of this result. For this survey the margin of error is +/- 4.3 with a 95% confidence level.

To explain what a margin of error of +/- 4.3 means, if 50% of respondents pick ‘yes’ to a yes/no question, then we can be 95% certain that if the question had been asked to all tenants then 45.7% (50 – 4.3) and 54.3% (50 + 4.3) would have picked that answer (assuming a representative sample completed the survey).

This means that when analysing the results using a base of all respondents then NCCH can have a high degree of confidence that the views of respondents reflect the views of all its tenants.

For each of the main areas of services delivered by NCCH an overall satisfaction table is supplied in this report. Within these tables at a 95% confidence level the margin of error for all respondents plus each region and program sub-group is given for combined satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Given the smaller sample sizes in each of these sub-groups there can be a wide margin of error. When there is a statistically significant difference between the levels of combined satisfaction by program or region for each of the main areas of services delivered by NCCH then this will be included within this report.
Section 1: Demographics

Section overview

The demographic section serves two purposes. Firstly, it provides information about the backgrounds of the people who responded to the survey. Secondly, it enables cross-tabulation of other survey results by each of the variables in this section. Some key cross-tabulations (namely by program and geographic area) are presented in this report. There is also the possibility to conduct further cross-tabulations should the need arise in future.

Response rate

The NRSCH sets standards which outlines if a returned tenant survey is counted as valid. The NRSCH states that if a returned survey does not include a response to the overall satisfaction question it should not be counted as a valid response.

Using this definition the Federation received a total of 325 valid returned surveys, giving a good overall response rate of 38% which is 13% above the NRSCH threshold (25%). This is also a significant increase on the 2013 response rate which was 25%.

The chart below shows the proportion of responses by different regions – this is in red (i.e. the percentage of total responses which are from a particular region). It also shows the individual response rate for each region – this is in grey. This demonstrates that both Tweed Heads (45%) and Grafton (41%) had even higher response rates that the average of all regions. While Lismore had a lower response rate, at 32% this is still a good result.

Response rate by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of all responses received</th>
<th>Response rate per region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graph below shows that most responses overall were from tenants living in capital properties (81% of the total responses received). Only 18% of tenants living in supported properties responded.

**Response rate by program**

![Response rate by program chart]

**Length of tenure**

Tenants were asked how long they had been a tenant of NCCH (DE01). Just over a third (36%) of respondents has been a NCCH tenant for 11 years or more. 29% of respondents have been a NCCH tenant for 3 to 5 years. Only 6% had been a tenant for less than a year.
The chart below looks at how those who have been tenants for different amounts of time rate the key factors. The general trend is that the newer tenants are more positive than the older tenants. This is true for almost all core indicators except condition of home (RM14) and value for money (HS07).

**Satisfaction by length of tenancy**
Language

An overwhelming 98% said that English is the main language spoken in their home (DE02). Only seven respondents mentioned a language other than English (DE03). These included Spanish (2), and Hindustani, Fijian, Dinka, Serbian and sign language (1 each).

DE02. Is English the main language spoken in your home?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (307)

Ancestry

Three quarters of respondents (75%) were of Australian ancestry, and further 20% were born in English speaking country. Only 4% of respondents said they were born in non-English speaking country. 8% were Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (DE04).
DE04. What is your ancestry?

- Australian: 75%
- Born in English speaking Country: 20%
- Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander: 8%
- Born in non English speaking Country: 4%

Base: All respondents (309)

Satisfaction by ancestry

Residents who were Australian or from English speaking country were generally more positive about neighbourhood, condition of home and repairs and maintenance.

Those who described themselves as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander were more positive about tenant involvement and tenants’ rights neighbourhood but less positive about condition of home, neighbourhood and repairs and maintenance.
Age

Tenants were asked their age (DE05); only 2% of respondents were aged under 30, 40% were aged 30-59 and 59% were aged 60 or over.

DE05. How old are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (310)
As the chart below shows, older residents tended to be more positive about many of the key factors. Tenants in the 30 – 59 age brackets tended to be less satisfied across a range of the most important areas of satisfaction. While the 20-29 age bracket were most satisfied with most service areas except for repairs and maintenance it must be noted that this is based on only 2% of the respondents who answered this question.

**Satisfaction by age**

![Satisfaction by age chart]

- NH21. Neighbourhood
- RM14. Condition of home
- RM07. Repairs and maintenance
- CM13. Communication
- NH07. Value for money
- HS03. Rights as a tenant upheld
- TE02. Listens to and acts on views

- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60-69
- 70-79
- 80+
Receipt of Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA)

93% of respondents said their household currently receive Commonwealth Rent Assistance (DE06).

DE06. Does your household currently receive Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) paid either to you or NCCHC?

Yes 93%
No 7%

Base: All respondents (251)
Section 2: Housing Services

Section overview

Housing services are the core business of every community housing provider. This section contains the key indicator of overall satisfaction with housing services. It also examines various aspects of the housing management service, including tenants’ rights, whether tenants believe NCCH treats them fairly, rent calculations and value for money, and whether tenants would recommend NCCH to friends and family.

Results overview

Overall, respondents reported very good or excellent levels of satisfaction with NCCH’s housing services. Although some questions saw a slight decline when compared to 2013, these differences were mostly within the margin of error.

For the key headline indicator, 86% said that they were very or fairly satisfied with the services provided by NCCH (HS11). This is above the NRSCH threshold (75%), a little less than the rating attained in 2013 and 2% above below the Federation benchmark.

When this question (HS11) was analysed by program and region there were some statistically significant variations by region only. By region, Lismore respondents had a significantly lower satisfaction level (76%) than Grafton (89%) and Tweed Heads (98%). It is suggested that NCCH undertake some follow up work with Lismore tenants to identify the causes of their dissatisfaction and seek ways of resolving their issues.

**HS11. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the services provided by NCCH?**

**Result compared to the Federation benchmark**

Other very positive ratings include:

- 96% combined satisfaction rating for the location of your home (HS08)
- 91% combined satisfaction rating for the value for money for the rent you pay (HS07).
- 90% respondents said it is very likely or fairly likely that they would recommend NCCH to family and friends (HS05).
- 86% respondents were satisfied that NCCH is treating tenants fairly (HS04).
- 83% were satisfied that their rights as a tenant are upheld by NCCH (HS03).
Tenants’ rights and satisfaction with being treated fairly

A very good percentage of respondents (79%) reported knowing their rights and responsibilities as tenants, 21% did not know or were unsure (HS01).

This is a slight increase compared to 2013 (77%)

HS01. Do you know what your rights and responsibilities are as a tenant of NCCHC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (311)

Similarly, a good percentage of respondents (76%) reported that NCCH has explained their rights and responsibilities to them (HS02).

This is a slight increase compared to 2013 (75%)
Respondents reported a very good level of satisfaction when asked if they considered that NCCH upheld their rights as a tenant (HS03). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 83%, combined dissatisfaction of 7% and 10% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

This is a slight decrease compared to 2013 (86%).

HS03. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that your rights as a tenant are upheld by NCCHC?

- Very satisfied: 58%
- Fairly satisfied: 25%
- Neither: 10%
- Fairly dissatisfied: 3%
- Very dissatisfied: 4%

Base: All respondents (308)
Respondents reported a very good level of satisfaction when asked if they considered that NCCH treats them fairly (HS04). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 86%, 7% combined dissatisfaction and 7% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

This is a decrease compared to 2013 (93%).

**HS04. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that NCCHC treats you fairly?**

- Very satisfied: 59%
- Fairly satisfied: 28%
- Neither: 7%
- Fairly dissatisfied: 4%
- Very dissatisfied: 3%

*Base: All respondents (309)*

**Likelihood of recommending NCCH**

A very high percentage of respondents (90%) reported that they are very likely or fairly likely to recommend NCCH to family and friends. Only 3% said it is fairly unlikely or very unlikely that they would do so.

This is an increase compared to 2013 (87%).
Rent and value for money

A very good percentage (77%) of respondents understood how their rent is calculated (HS06). This is a very good result as the process of rent calculations was found to be confusing to tenants. Still, a significant minority did not know or were unsure (23%).

This is an increase compared to 2013 when 75% reported understanding how their rent was calculated.

HS06. Do you understand how your rent is calculated?

- Yes: 77%
- No: 6%
- Unsure: 17%

Base: All respondents (306)
Respondents reported an excellent level of satisfaction when asked if they considered their rent to be value for money (HS07). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 91%, 5% combined dissatisfaction and 4% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

This is the same result compared to 2013 (91%).

**Satisfaction with the location of home**

Respondents reported an excellent level of satisfaction with the location of their home (HS08). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 96%, 2% combined dissatisfaction and 3% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

This is an increase compared to 2013 (94%).

HS07~HS08. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HS08. The location of your home (294)</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Fairly satisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HS07. Value for money for the rent you pay (309)</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Fairly satisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents

**Receiving rent statements**

The majority of respondents (64%) indicated they would like to receive their rent statements quarterly.

The preference for quarterly statements has increased since 2013 (56%).
HS09. How often would you like to receive your rent statement?

- Monthly: 22%
- Quarterly: 64%
- Yearly: 15%

Base: All respondents (302)

Inspections

70% of respondents reported having a property inspection within the previous 6 months; 26% within the last year; 3% between one and two years ago. One respondent (0.3%) reported having an inspection within the last five years, and one (0.3%) reported never having an inspection (HS03).

HS10. When was the last time you had a property inspection?

- Less than 6 months ago: 70%
- Less than 12 months ago: 26%
- Less than 2 years ago: 3%
- Less than 5 years ago: 0.3%
- I have never had one: 0.3%

Base: All respondents (311)
Overall satisfaction with housing services

Overall, there was an excellent level of satisfaction with NCCH’s housing services (HS11). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 86%, 6% combined dissatisfaction and 8% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

This is above the NRSCH threshold (75%) and just above the Federation benchmark (84%). There has been a slight decrease in this indicator since 2013, however this is within the margin of error of +/-4%.

This is a decrease compared to 2013 (88%).

When overall satisfaction with housing services (HS11) was analysed by program and region there were some statistically significant variations by region only. By region, Lismore respondents had a significantly lower satisfaction level (76%) than Tweed Heads (98%) and Grafton (89%). It is suggested that NCCH undertake some follow up work with Lismore tenants to identify the causes of their dissatisfaction and seek ways of resolving their issues. There were no statistically significant differences by program.

When analysing a question by a particular sub-group such as region or program there may be a small number of respondents in each of these groups which means there can be a wide margin of error (MOE). At a 95% confidence level the margin of error for each region and program sub-group is given in the tables below and we would recommend interpreting the results of smaller subgroups with caution. The results in the region and program tables are ranked by score (highest to lowest).
HS11. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the services provided by NCCHC? by Program

Base: All respondents

HS11. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the services provided by NCCHC? by Region

Base: All respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Score (ranked)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+/-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>+/-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headlease</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+/-11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Score (ranked)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>+/-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>+/-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>+/-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written comments on housing services (including NCCH generally)

A record of all the written comments supplied by respondents is included in the Excel Comments Toolkit supplied with this report.

Including general comments about NCCH, the majority of comments were positive. The main negative comments related to rents, transfers and customer service.

All comments by negative, neutral or positive and by service area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service area</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCCH generally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCH services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing services-rent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing services-staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing services- transfers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Complaints and appeals

Section overview

Community housing tenants have the right to appeal certain decisions made by community housing landlords. In order to ensure that tenants’ rights are upheld, and that procedural fairness and natural justice is maintained, it is essential that the appeal process is clear, fair, effective and well publicised.

It is also important that a tenant can complain effectively if they feel that an aspect of the service is not operating properly. Complaints play an important role in highlighting problems in service delivery – if a community housing organisation does not know about problems in the service delivery it can never address the issue to ensure that the service is working well. The National Community Housing Standards recommend best practice standards relation to both complaints and appeals6.

Results overview

The results for complaints and appeals show the lowest levels of satisfaction in the NCCH’s 2014 tenant satisfaction survey. This is a feature of all the other tenant satisfaction surveys undertaken by the Federation. This could be due to respondent dissatisfaction with the outcome of a complaint or due to how complaints are dealt with.

While 71% of respondents reported that they knew how to make a complaint to NCCH (CA02), just under a half of respondents (49%) were either unsure of or did not know how to appeal a decision made by NCCH (CA01).

In total 76 respondents (24%) reported making a complaint to NCCH in the past 12 months (CA03). These respondents reported a low level of combined satisfaction (51%) with “overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you about how your complaint was dealt with” (CA09). This is a large decline compared to 2013 (63%) but within the +/-12% margin of error. This is just below the Federation benchmark (52%).

When overall satisfaction with how complaints are dealt with (CA09) was analysed by program and region there were some slight variations in the levels of combined satisfaction, statistically significant only by region.

NCCH’s results indicate that, in addition to the overall low levels of satisfaction with complaints, respondents were most dissatisfied with how well they were kept informed about the progress of their complaint (49% combined satisfaction), the final outcome of a complaint (49% combined satisfaction) and the speed of dealing with a complaint (52% combined satisfaction).

---

6 Section 3.6, National Community Housing Standards Manual third edition
How to appeal a decision

Just over a half of respondents (51%) knew how to appeal a decision. A large minority (49%) did not know or were unsure how to appeal a decision made by NCCH (CA01).

This is an increase compared to 2013 when 47% knew how to appeal.

CA01. Do you know how to appeal a decision made by NCCHC?

- Yes: 51%
- No: 21%
- Unsure: 29%

Base: All respondents (306)

How to make a complaint

71% of respondents reported that they knew how to make a complaint to NCCH (CA02). This still leaves a significant minority of respondents (29%) that were either unsure of or did not know how to make a complaint.

This is a decrease compared to 2013 when 73% reported that they knew how to make a complaint to NCCH.
Satisfaction with the complaints service

In total 76 respondents (24%) reported making a complaint to NCCH in the past 12 months (CA03). This compares to 30% of respondents who said that they had made a complaint in last year’s survey.

CA03. Have you made a complaint to NCCH in the last 12 months?

- Yes: 76% (24%)
- No: 76% (76%)

Base: All respondents (311)
The respondents who had made a complaint were asked about their experience of making a complaint to NCCH (CA4 to CA9) – the graphs and tables for these questions are over the page. The results are discussed below:

- Respondents reported a low level of satisfaction with “overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you about how your complaint was dealt with” (CA09). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 51%, 38% combined dissatisfaction and 12% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. This is a large decline compared to 2013 (63%) but within the +/-12% margin of error. This is just below the Federation benchmark (52%).
- All but one of the aspects (ease of making complaint) of NCCH’s complaints service had quite significant declines in satisfaction compared to 2013 (however it is necessary to keep in mind the low base size and resulting wide margin of error).
- 83% of respondents reported that they were satisfied with how easy it was to make a complaint (CA04).
- 70% said they were satisfied with the information and advice provided by staff (CA05).
- Across all Federation tenant surveys complaints and appeals have the lowest levels of satisfaction (as with this survey). NCCH’s results indicate that respondents are most dissatisfied with being kept informed, the speed of dealing with a complaint and the final outcome.
### CA04~CA09. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the following aspects of NCCHC’s complaints service?

- **CA04. How easy it was to make your complaint?**
  - [Very satisfied](#): 49
  - [Fairly satisfied](#): 33
  - [Neither](#): 5
  - [Fairly dissatisfied](#): 8
  - [Very dissatisfied](#): 4

- **CA05. The information and advice provided by staff?**
  - [Very satisfied](#): 38
  - [Fairly satisfied](#): 32
  - [Neither](#): 10
  - [Fairly dissatisfied](#): 10
  - [Very dissatisfied](#): 11

- **CA07. The speed with which your complaint was dealt with?**
  - [Very satisfied](#): 34
  - [Fairly satisfied](#): 18
  - [Neither](#): 10
  - [Fairly dissatisfied](#): 14
  - [Very dissatisfied](#): 25

- **CA09. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you about how your complaint was dealt with?**
  - [Very satisfied](#): 33
  - [Fairly satisfied](#): 17
  - [Neither](#): 12
  - [Fairly dissatisfied](#): 17
  - [Very dissatisfied](#): 20

- **CA06. How well you were kept informed about the progress of your complaint?**
  - [Very satisfied](#): 30
  - [Fairly satisfied](#): 19
  - [Neither](#): 16
  - [Fairly dissatisfied](#): 14
  - [Very dissatisfied](#): 21

- **CA08. The outcome of your complaint?**
  - [Very satisfied](#): 37
  - [Fairly satisfied](#): 12
  - [Neither](#): 12
  - [Fairly dissatisfied](#): 16
  - [Very dissatisfied](#): 24

*Base: All respondents who have made a complaint to NCCHC in the last 12 months*
Overall satisfaction with complaint handling

When overall satisfaction with complaints (CA09) was analysed by program and region there were some statistically significant variations by region only. Tweed Heads respondents had a significantly higher satisfaction level (80%) than Lismore (41%). There were no statistically significant differences by program.

Due to the very low base sizes and wide margins of error comparing the results for subgroups should be interpreted with caution.

When analysing a question by a particular sub-group such as region or program there may be a small number of respondents in each of these groups which means there can be a wide margin of error (MOE). At a 95% confidence level the margin of error for each region and program sub-group is given in the tables below and we would recommend interpreting the results of smaller subgroups with caution. The results in the region and program tables are ranked by score (highest to lowest).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Satisfaction (ranked)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>+/-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headlease</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+/-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Satisfaction (ranked)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+/-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+/-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+/-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CA09. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you about how your complaint was dealt with? by Region

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels by region.]

Very satisfied | Fairly satisfied | Neither | Fairly dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied
---|---|---|---|---
Grafton (10) | 30 | 20 | 20 | 30 | 0%
Lismore (44) | 27 | 20 | 11 | 16 | 20%
Tweed Heads (15) | 13 | 7 | 60 | 20 | 100%

Base: All respondents who made a complaint in the last 12 months

CA09. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you about how your complaint was dealt with? by Program

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels by program.]

Very satisfied | Fairly satisfied | Neither | Fairly dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied
---|---|---|---|---
Capital (59) | 20 | 17 | 8 | 22 | 0%
Headlease (9) | 22 | 22 | 22 | 33 | 100%
Supported (1) | 34 | 33 | 100 | 0 | 0%

Base: All respondents who made a complaint in the last 12 months
Section 4: Recent tenants

Section overview

This section provides information on respondents’ views on what it was like to become a NCCH tenant.

Results overview

The results in this section are very positive with very high combined satisfaction ratings.

This section also had the question with the highest level of satisfaction reported in the survey (95%) – satisfaction with information tenants received when they first moved into their home (RT05) and importantly, satisfaction with the condition of home when they moved in (RT06) at 95%.

The experience of becoming a tenant

In total, 17% of all respondents were housed by NCCH in the last twelve months. These 53 respondents were asked about their experience of becoming a tenant in this survey (RT01 – RT06).

RT01. Were you housed by NCCHC in the last 12 months?

Yes 24%
No 76%

Base: All respondents (220)

Waiting time to be housed

49% of newly housed respondents said they waited less than 1 year to be housed. 26% of respondents waited more than 6 years to be housed. The waiting times are broadly comparable with the waiting times reported in 2013.
RT02. How long did you wait to be housed?

- Less than 1 year: 49%
- Between 1 to 2 years: 16%
- 3 to 5 years: 9%
- 6 to 10 years: 12%
- More than 10 years: 14%

Base: All respondents who were housed by NCCHC in the last 12 months (43)

**Time given to accept the property**

A majority of respondents (63%) said they were given three or more days to decide whether to accept the property. Almost a quarter (21%) said they were given one day.

RT03. How much time were you given to decide whether to accept the property you now live in?

- 1 day: 21%
- 2 days: 16%
- 3 or more days: 63%

Base: All respondents who were housed by NCCHC in the last 12 months (43)
Information pack

79% of newly housed respondents said they received an information pack from NCCH when they first moved into their home, the remaining 21% said they didn’t or were unsure whether they received an information pack (RT04).

This is an improvement compared to 2013 when 76% said that they received an information pack when moving in.

RT04. Did you receive an information pack from NCCHC when you first moved into your home?

- Yes: 79%
- No: 4%
- Unsure: 17%

Base: All respondents who were housed by NCCHC in the last 12 months (48)

Respondents reported an excellent level of satisfaction with the information they received when they first moved into their home (RT05). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 95%, with no one dissatisfied and 5% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

This is an improvement compared to 2013 when a combined total of 89% were satisfied with the information provided when moving in.
Condition of home

Respondents reported an excellent level of satisfaction with the condition of their property when they first moved in (RT06). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 96% and 5% combined dissatisfaction.

This is a large improvement compared to 2013 when a combined total of 80% were satisfied with the condition of their home when they moved in.
RT06. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the condition of your home when you first moved in?

- Very satisfied: 75%
- Fairly satisfied: 20%
- Neither
- Fairly dissatisfied: 5%
- Very dissatisfied

Base: All respondents who were housed by NCCHC in the last 12 months (40)
Section 5: Repairs and maintenance

Section overview

Community housing tenants have a right to live in well-maintained properties. International research suggests that repairs and maintenance is the single most important driver of overall tenant satisfaction\(^7\).

Results overview

The importance of repairs and maintenance is apparent from the gap analysis (see Section 9 below on tenant priorities and gap analysis). This demonstrates that this area of service is the most important to tenants but also has the largest combined dissatisfaction rating (excluding satisfaction with the complaints service).

There was a very good level of overall combined satisfaction (80%) with the repairs and maintenance service (RM07) and the score is above the Federation’s benchmark figure of 77%. However, this is a decrease compared to 2013 when 83% reported that they were satisfied with the repairs and maintenance service, the difference though is within the +/-5% margin of error.

RM07. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the repairs and maintenance services that NCCH provides? Result compared to the Federation benchmark

When overall satisfaction with the repairs and maintenance service (RM07) was analysed by region there were some statistically significant variations. By region, respondents from Lismore were less likely to be satisfied (68%) than respondents from Grafton (93%) and Tweed Heads (91%) and this difference was statistically significant. There were no statistically significant differences between NCCH’s programs.

Certain aspects of the repairs and maintenance services achieved very good levels of satisfaction. For example 86% were satisfied with the condition of their home (RM14). Also 80% of respondents were satisfied with the time it took NCCH to respond after a repair was reported (RM04). 84% of respondents were also satisfied that NCCH’s staff were knowledgeable and skilled in dealing with repairs and maintenance matters (RM06).

\(^7\) Hood and Smedley (2009) How to develop and monitor local performance measures House Mark
The lowest level of satisfaction was with the quality of planned maintenance work (RM11) which scored only 38% combined satisfaction; however, this variable also had a very high margin on error (+/-34%).

**Reporting a repair in the preceding 12 months**

In total, 238 respondents (79%) reported a repair in the preceding 12 months (RM01). These respondents were asked about their overall satisfaction with the repairs and maintenance service.

**RM01. Have you reported a repair to NCCHC in the last 12 months?**

- Yes: 79%
- No: 21%

Base: All respondents (303)

- The most frequent way of requesting a repair (RM02) by respondents was by contacting NCCH’s housing team (68%).
Awareness of repairs response times

Just over half (54%) of respondents said they are aware of repair response times, 25% were unaware of response repair times and 20% were unsure (RM03).

This is a decrease compared to 2013 when a combined total of 60% were aware of repair response times.
Satisfaction with last repair

Respondents were asked specific questions about various aspects of their last repair in the preceding 12 months (RM04 – RM06). Respondents gave some very good levels of combined satisfaction to these questions. In particular respondents were very satisfied with the staff being knowledgeable and skilled in dealing with repairs and maintenance matters (RM06).

- A very good combined satisfaction rating of 80% for the time it took NCCH to respond (RM04).
  
  This is a decrease compared to 2013 when a combined total of 82% were satisfied.

- A very good combined satisfaction rating of 81% for “the quality of repairs carried at your home” (RM05).
  
  This is a decrease compared to 2013 when a combined total of 83% were satisfied.

- A very good combined satisfaction rating of 84% for the knowledge and skills of the staff in dealing with repairs and maintenance (RM06).
  
  This is a slight decrease compared to 2012 when a combined total of 85% were satisfied.
RM04~RM07. In relation to your last repair, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Fairly satisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM06. When you reported a repair how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the knowledge and skills of the staff in dealing with those matters? (220)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM05. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the quality of the repairs carried out at your home? (222)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM07. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the repairs and maintenance services that NHC provides? (223)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM04. When you reported a repair how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the time it took NCCHC to respond? (230)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents who have reported a repair to NCCHC in the last 12 months
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When you reported a repair how satisfied how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the time it took NCCH to respond (RM04)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the quality of the repairs carried out at your home? (RM05)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The knowledge and skills of the staff in dealing with those matters (RM06)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the repairs and maintenance services that NCCH provides (RM07)?</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Satisfaction with planned maintenance**

The survey was specifically targeted at tenants who have had a planned maintenance completed in the 12 months prior to the survey. There were 23 tenants who have had this maintenance done, and out of these 23, 8 tenants in total responded to the questions on planned maintenance. They were from Lismore and Tweed Heads regions. The low response rate also means that a large margin of error was recorded (between +/-30% and +/-34%) so the results should be interpreted with caution. The questions on planned maintenance were asked for the first time in 2014 so the comparison with 2013 is not possible.

- There was a good level of combined satisfaction (75%) with the support received from NCCH before and after the work, with the margin of error of +/-30%. (RM08)
- Below average satisfaction with the steps undertaken to minimise disruption during the planned maintenance, with only 63% of combined satisfaction (and margin of error of +/-34%) (RM09).
- Similarly, the satisfaction with the behaviour of contractors was also low: RM10 the contractor has left my home neat and tidy one the planned maintenance had been completed”, with 63% combined satisfaction. Again, the margin of error was high (+/-34%) as only 8 tenants responded to this question.
- Finally, the overall quality of planned maintenance work (RM11) also scored a very low result of only 38%. 3 respondents (out of 8) were fairly or very dissatisfied with the overall quality of the planned maintenance they received.
Satisfaction with the out of hours emergency repairs service

In total, 72 respondents have used the out-of-hours emergency repairs service (RM12). These respondents were asked about their satisfaction with this service.

RM12. Have you used NCCHC’s out-of-hours emergency repairs service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents who have reported a repair to NCCHC in the last 12 months (223)
Respondents reported a satisfactory level of satisfaction with the out-of-hours emergency repairs service (RM13). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 72%, 10% combined dissatisfaction and 18% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. However there were only 72 respondents to this question. The difference in satisfaction should be treated with caution due to the small sample of sizes of respondents that have used this service.

This is a slight decrease compared to 2013 when a combined total of 73% were aware of out-of-hours emergency repairs services.

**RM13. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the out-of-hours emergency repairs service?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly satisfied</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly dissatisfied</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents who have used NCCHC's out-of-hours emergency repairs service (72)

**Overall satisfaction with the condition of your home**

Respondents reported a very high level of satisfaction with the condition of their property (RM14). There was a combined satisfaction rating of 86%, 9% combined dissatisfaction and 4% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Once again, this should be seen in the context of the NRSCH threshold for this indicator (75%).

This is a slight improvement compared to 2013 when a combined total of 84% were satisfied.
When overall satisfaction with the condition of home (RM14) was analysed by region and program there were some slight variations in the levels of combined satisfaction. By program Supported had the highest level of combined satisfaction (90%) and by region Tweed Heads had the highest level of satisfaction (97%).

RM14. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the condition of your home? by Program

Base: All respondents who have reported a repair in the last 12 months (180)
Taking the margin of error into account there were no statistically significant difference between the levels of combined satisfaction by program. By region however, there were some notable and statistically significant differences. Respondents from Tweed Heads (97% combined satisfaction) were more likely to be satisfied with the condition of their home than respondents from Grafton (83%) and Lismore (78%).

RM14. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the condition of your home? by Region

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels by region.](chart.png)

Base: All respondents who have reported a repair in the last 12 months
Overall satisfaction with the repairs and maintenance service

The levels of satisfaction with the individual aspects of the repairs and maintenance service were very good and this was also reflected in the overall satisfaction with repairs and maintenance (RM07) which was somewhat lower than last year but still very good and certainly above the NRSCH benchmark of 75%. There was a combined satisfaction rating of 80%, 14% combined dissatisfaction and 6% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

This is a decrease compared to 2013 when a combined total of 83% were satisfied.

When overall satisfaction with the repairs and maintenance service (RM07) was analysed by region and program there were some slight variations in the levels of combined satisfaction. By program Supported had the highest level of combined satisfaction (85%) and by region Grafton had the highest (93%). When analysing a question by a particular sub-group such as region or program there may be a small number of respondents in each of these groups which means there can be a wide margin of error (MOE). At a 95% confidence level the margin of error for each region and program sub-group is given in the tables below and we would recommend interpreting the results of smaller subgroups with caution. The results in the region and program tables are ranked by score.

Taking into account these differences there were some statistically significant variations. By region, Grafton respondents were significantly more likely to be satisfied (93%) than Tweed Heads (91%). Conversely, respondents from Lismore (68%) were significantly less likely to be satisfied than respondents from Grafton and Tweed heads. There were no statistically significant differences between NCCH’s programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Satisfaction (ranked)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+/-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>+/-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headlease</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+/-18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Satisfaction (ranked)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+/-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>+/-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>+/-9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RM07. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the repairs and maintenance services that NCCHC provides? by Program

Base: All respondents who have reported a repair in the last 12 months

RM07. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the repairs and maintenance services that NCCHC provides? by Region

Base: All respondents who have reported a repair in the last 12 months
Written comments on repairs and maintenance

A record of all the written comments supplied by respondents is included in the Excel Comments Toolkit supplied with this report.

Apart from two positive comments about repairs and maintenance most comments were negative or neutral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service area</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repairs-time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs-modifications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs-condition of property</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs-quality of home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs-cost/tenant responsibilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs-quality of repairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs-inspections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs-modifications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6: Neighbourhood

Section overview

This section provides information on tenants' views about their local neighbourhood. This information can be used to identify if there are any emerging neighbourhood issues in any of the communities NCCH works within and to determine if additional partnerships are needed in particular localities.

Results overview

Overall respondents were positive about their neighbourhoods.

Respondents reported excellent levels of combined satisfaction with specific aspects of their home and the neighbourhood in which it is based (NH01 – NH03); ranging from 89% to 96%. Although most of the aspects registered a decrease in satisfaction, the decreases were slight.

Reflecting these high levels of satisfaction with the individual aspects of neighbourhood, there was also a very good level of overall combined satisfaction with neighbourhood (87%) (NH21). This was one of the best performing service areas.

Taking the margin of error into account there were statistically significant differences between the levels of combined overall satisfaction with neighbourhood by program. Headlease had statistically significant higher levels of overall combined satisfaction with neighbourhood than Capital and Supported. By region, Tweed Heads had statistically significant higher levels of overall combined satisfaction with neighbourhood than Grafton.

Respondents were asked their perceptions about their neighbourhood improving or declining in the last three years (NH20). The majority felt it had remained the same (57%). 27% felt their neighbourhood had improved and 16% felt it had declined. When this question was analysed by region and program there were some slight variations in the levels of combined satisfaction, statistically significant only in the case of regional comparison. Respondents from Tweed Heads were more likely to say that their neighbourhood has improved (34%) than respondents from Grafton (17%).
Satisfaction with home and neighbourhood

Respondents were asked specific questions about their home and the neighbourhood in which it is based (NH02 – NH06). In addition, respondents were also asked whether they experienced any negative events since they have been tenants of NCCH.

As the table and chart below illustrates, overall, respondents reported very high levels of combined satisfaction to the questions related to the aspects of their home (NH02-NH06), with the satisfaction levels ranging from 83% to 96%.

However, when asked about specific negative events, the majority of respondents indicated that they experienced verbal abuse (64). It should be noted that only 85 respondents in total answered this question, comprising 27% of the total sample.

Again as the table below illustrates, when compared to 2013, most of the aspects registered a decrease in satisfaction in 2014, but this decreases were slight and within the margin of error:

NH01. Have you or a member of your household experienced any of the following while you have been a tenant of NCCHC?

- Verbal abuse: 64%
- Relationship breakdown: 33%
- Discrimination: 28%
- Domestic Violence: 27%
- Racism: 16%
- Financial abuse: 14%

Base: All respondents (85)
Respondents reported some very high levels of combined satisfaction to these questions:

- An excellent combined satisfaction rating of 96% for the “services available in your area (e.g. schools, doctors)” (NH04).
  
  This is a slight decrease compared to 2013 when a combined total of 97% were satisfied.

- An excellent combined satisfaction rating of 92% for the “suitability of you home to your circumstances” (NH02).
  
  This is a slight decrease compared to 2013 when a combined total of 92% were satisfied.

- An excellent combined satisfaction rating of 90% for the “size of your home” (NH06).
  
  This is the same result as 2013.

- A excellent combined satisfaction rating of 89% for the “safety of your home” (NH03).
  
  This is a slight decrease compared to 2012 when a combined total of 91% were satisfied.

- A very good combined satisfaction rating of 83% for the “transport available in your area (NH05).”
This is a slight decrease compared to 2013 when a combined total of 84% were satisfied.

Neighbourhood problems

Respondents were also asked if their neighbourhood had any problems with a range of issues (NH067 – NH19). For each possible issue the large majority of respondents reported there were no problems in their neighbourhood. Despite this there were still some issues that a significant minority of respondents reported as a problem. The following three issues had the largest combined percentage of respondents reporting them as either a major or minor problem:

- The issue with the largest combined percentage for either a major or minor problem was “noisy neighbours” (NHO9). This had a combined total of 39%.
  
  This is a slight improvement compared to 2013 when a combined total of 41% reported this as either a major or minor problem.

- The issue with the second largest combined percentage for either a major or minor problem was “car parking” (NHO7). This had a combined total of 31%.

  This is a slight worsening compared to 2013 when a combined total of 30% reported this as either a major or minor problem.

- The issue with the third largest combined percentage for either a major or minor problem was “drunk or rowdy behaviour” (NH14). This had a combined total of 29%.

  This is a slight worsening compared to 2013 when a combined total of 27% reported this as either a major or minor problem.
Respondents were asked their perceptions about their neighbourhood improving or declining in the last three years (NH20). The majority felt it had remained the same (57%). 27% felt their neighbourhood had improved and 16% felt it had declined.

- This is a slight decrease compared to 2012 when a combined total of 12% considered that there had been a decline.
NH20. In the last three years, would you say your neighbourhood has improved or declined?

- Greatly improved: 14%
- Slightly improved: 14%
- Stayed the same: 57%
- Slightly declined: 10%
- Greatly declined: 6%

Base: All respondents (281)

Graph NH20 below shows that regions reported very good levels of improvement in their neighbourhoods. For example, 34% of respondents in Tweed Heads region said the neighbourhood had greatly or slightly improved and 26% of respondents in Lismore said the neighbourhood had greatly or slightly improved.

NH20. In the last three years, would you say your neighbourhood has improved or declined? by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Greatly improved</th>
<th>Slightly improved</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Slightly declined</th>
<th>Greatly declined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grafton (54)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore (132)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads (93)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents
Overall satisfaction with neighbourhood

Reflecting the high levels of satisfaction with the individual aspects of neighbourhood, there was also a very good level of overall combined satisfaction (87%) with neighbourhood (NH21).

This is the same result as in 2013.

NH21. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your neighbourhood as a place to live?

Very satisfied 58%
Fairly satisfied 29%
Neither 6%
Fairly dissatisfied 4%
Very dissatisfied 3%

Base: All respondents (293)

When combined overall satisfaction with neighbourhood (NH21) was analysed by region and program there were some slight variations in the levels of combined satisfaction. By region Tweed Heads had the highest level of combined satisfaction (96%) and by program Headlease had the highest (100%).

When analysing a question by a particular sub-group such as region or program there may be a small number of respondents in each of these groups which means there can be a wide margin of error (MOE). At a 95% confidence level the margin of error for each region and program sub-group is given in the tables below and we would recommend interpreting the results of smaller subgroups with caution. The results in the region and program tables are ranked by score (highest to lowest).

Taking this margin of error into account there were some statistically significant differences between the levels of combined satisfaction by program. Headlease had statistically significant higher levels of overall combined satisfaction with neighbourhood than Capital and Supported. By region, Tweed Heads had statistically significant higher levels of overall combined satisfaction with neighbourhood than Grafton.
### Program Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>+/-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headlease</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+/-0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+/-16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NH21. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your neighbourhood as a place to live? by Program**

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels by Program](chart.png)

**Base: All respondents**

### Region Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Fairly satisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NH21. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your neighbourhood as a place to live? by Region**

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels by Region](chart.png)

**Base: All respondents**
Written comments on neighbourhood

A record of all the written comments supplied by respondents is included in the Excel Comments Toolkit supplied with this report.

The majority of comments were negative and no positive comments were received. Despite this it must be remembered that overall respondents had very good levels of combined satisfaction for their neighbourhood.

All comments by negative, neutral or positive and by service area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service area</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood-anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour issues/disputes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood-area/amenities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood-bins/recycling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 7: Communication

Section overview

This section of the survey asked tenants about their experience of communicating with NCCH.

Results overview

There were good to very good levels of combined satisfaction for the different aspect of communication.

2014 highlights include the following:

- A very good percentage (80%) reported that it was easy to get hold of the right person (CM04) – up from 77% in 2013.
- A very good combined satisfaction rating for “the ability of staff to deal with your query quickly and efficiently” (CM06) at 85% – up from 84% in 2013.
- A good combined satisfaction rating with “the final outcome of your query” (CM07) at 75% – down from 80% in 2013.
- A very good combined satisfaction rating with “the way NCCH provides you with information” (CM09) at 84% - but a decrease of 6% since in 2013.

Overall, there was an excellent combined satisfaction rating with communication at 87%. This figure is also well above the Federation benchmark (83%) (CM13). When this question was analysed by region and program there were some statistically significant variations in the levels of combined satisfaction by region.

Finally it is interesting to note that 48% of respondents state they have access to the internet (CM10). With CHPs and other agencies increasingly providing information and services on-line NCHCC might want to consider how they can further develop this.
Communication with NCCH during the preceding 12 months

In total, 295 respondents made contact with NCCH in the preceding 12 months (CM01).

CM01. Have you made contact with NCCHC in the last 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (295)

These respondents were then asked about their experience of communicating with NCHCC.

Main reason for contact

Respondents that had made contact with NCCH in the preceding 12 months were asked their reason for this contact (CM02). The top three reasons were as follows:

- About repairs and maintenance, 158 respondents (68%)
- About rent, 43 respondents (18%)
- About neighbourhood issues, 25 respondents (11%).
**CM02. What was the reason that you last contacted NCCHC?**

- Repairs and maintenance: 68%
- Rent: 18%
- Neighbourhood issues: 11%
- Tenancy transfer: 4%
- Communal garden area: 1%
- Other: 16%

Base: All respondents who have made contact with NCCHC in the last 12 months (234)

- The most common method for contact with NCCH by far was by phone (75%).

**CM03. How did you last contact NCCHC?**

- By phone: 75%
- In person: 25%
- By letter: 2%
- By email: 3%
- Home visit: 5%
- Other: 3%

Base: All respondents who have made contact with NCCHC in the last 12 months (239)
• The majority of respondents (80%) found it easy to get hold of the right person.

**CM04. How easy or difficult was it to get hold of the right person?**

- Easy: 80%
- Difficult: 9%
- Neither: 11%

Base: All respondents who have made contact with NCCHC in the last 12 months (240)

• The great majority of respondents (85%) found that their inquiry was answered within a reasonable time.

**CM05. Was your enquiry answered within a reasonable time?**

- Yes: 85%
- No: 8%
- Unsure: 8%

Base: All respondents who have made contact with NCCHC in the last 12 months (238)
There was an excellent combined satisfaction rating for “the ability of staff to deal with your query quickly and efficiently” (CM06) at 85%.

This is a slight improvement compared to 2012 when a combined total of 84% were satisfied.

There was a somewhat lower satisfaction rating with “the final outcome of your query” (CM07) at 75%.

This is a decline compared to 2012 when a combined total of 80% were satisfied.

CM06–CM07. When you contacted NCCHC, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the following?

- **CM06.** The ability of staff to deal with your query quickly and efficiently (234)
  - Very satisfied: 65
  - Fairly satisfied: 20
  - Neither: 6
  - Fairly dissatisfied: 6
  - Very dissatisfied: 3

- **CM07.** The final outcome of your query (221)
  - Very satisfied: 57
  - Fairly satisfied: 18
  - Neither: 7
  - Fairly dissatisfied: 9
  - Very dissatisfied: 10

Base: All respondents who have made contact with NCCHC in the last 12 months

The majority of respondents found NCHCC’s staff helpful (84%)

This is a slight improvement compared to 2013 when 83% of respondents found NCCH’s staff helpful.
CM08. Did you find NCCHC’s staff helpful or unhelpful?

- Helpful: 84%
- Unhelpful: 5%
- Neither helpful nor unhelpful: 11%

Base: All respondents who have made contact with NCCHC in the last 12 months (237)

Provision of information

There was a very good combined satisfaction rating with “the way NCCH provides you with information” (CM09) at 84%.

This is a decline compared to 2013 when 90% said they were satisfied with the way NCCH provides them with information.

CM09. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way NCCHC provides you with information?

- Very satisfied: 60%
- Fairly satisfied: 24%
- Neither: 8%
- Fairly dissatisfied: 5%
- Very dissatisfied: 3%

Base: All respondents (239)
Access to the internet

48% of respondents state they have access to the internet (CM10).

This is an increase compared to 2013 when 43% said they had access to the internet.

CM10. Do you have access to the internet?

Yes 48%
No 52%

Base: All respondents (296)

Access to email

45% of respondents state they have access to email (CM11).

This is an increase compared to 2013 when 39% said they had access to email.
Awareness of the NCCH’s website

- Just over half of respondents (57%) knew that NCCH has a website.
  - This is an improvement compared to 2013 when 51% said they did not know that NCCH has a website.

CM12. Did you know that NCCHC has a website?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (290)
Overall satisfaction with communications

All respondents were asked about their overall combined satisfaction with communications (CM13).

Reflecting the good levels of satisfaction with the individual aspects of communications there was also a very high level of overall combined satisfaction at 87%, 6% combined dissatisfaction and 7% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

This is the same score as that achieved for 2013.

When combined overall satisfaction with communications (CM13) was analysed by region and program there were some slight variations in the levels of combined satisfaction. By region, Tweed Heads had statistically significant higher levels of satisfaction (98%) Grafton (89%) and Lismore (78%). There were no statistically significant differences in satisfaction between different programs.

When analysing a question by a particular sub-group such as region or program there may be a small number of respondents in each of these groups which means there can be a wide margin of error (MOE). At a 95% confidence level the margin of error for each region and program sub-group is given in the tables below and we would recommend interpreting the results of smaller subgroups with caution. The results in the region and program tables are ranked by score (highest to lowest).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Satisfaction (ranked)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+/-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>+/-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headlease</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+/-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Satisfaction (ranked)</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>+/-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+/-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>+/-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CM13. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with communication with NCCHC? by Program

- **Capital (236)**: Green = Very satisfied, Yellow = Neither, Red = Very dissatisfied
- **Headlease (41)**: Green = Very satisfied, Yellow = Neither, Red = Very dissatisfied
- **Supported (16)**: Green = Very satisfied, Yellow = Neither, Red = Very dissatisfied

Base: All respondents
Written comments on communication

A record of all the written comments supplied by respondents is included in the Excel Comments Toolkit supplied with this report.

There were only three written comments related to this area, two negative and one positive. The positive comment focused on an instance when the respondent perceived that staff had communicated well with tenants. Negative comments focused on instances when respondents perceived that staff had been rude, not returned calls or properly dealt with issues:
Section 8: Tenant engagement

Section overview

Questions in the tenant engagement section are designed to measure tenants’ satisfaction with the degree of engagement they have with NCCH.

Results overview

Compared to 2013 (81%) there was a slight decrease in overall satisfaction for 2014 (80%) but this decrease is within the +/-5% margin of error for this question. NCCH’s overall satisfaction for 2014 also scored above the Federation benchmark of 77%.

Respondents were more satisfied with the lower level of engagement – starting from involving tenants (TE01) (80%), through to higher levels of involvement (whether NCCH listens to tenants’ views and acts on them - TE02) (76%) and finally whether tenants feel satisfied or dissatisfied that they can have the highest level of involvement – being able to influence NCCH’s decision making (TE03) (64%). All three elements recorded a slight decline compared to 2013.

When “how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way NCCH involves tenants” (TE01) was analysed by region there were some statistically significant variations. Tweed Heads respondents were significantly more likely to be satisfied (92%) than Grafton (78%) and Lismore (71%). There were no statistically significant differences by program.

TE01~TE03. In relation to tenant engagement, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TE01. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way NCCH involves tenants? (281)</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE02. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that NCCH listens to tenants’ views and acts on them? (280)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE03. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that tenants are able to influence NCCH’s decision-making? (276)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents
Satisfaction with different levels of tenant engagement

Respondents were asked specific questions about satisfaction with tenant engagement (TE01 – TE03). These questions ask for respondents’ satisfaction with different levels of engagement, starting from involving tenants (TE01), through to higher levels of involvement (whether NCCH listens to tenants’ views and acts on them - TE02) and finally whether tenants feel satisfied or dissatisfied that they can have the highest level of involvement – being able to influence NCCH’s decision making (TE03). When using the ‘ladder of participation’ concept it is important to realise that different rungs of the ladder are not necessarily superior.

- The highest level of satisfaction was recorded for involving tenants (TE01). In total, 80% of respondents had an overall combined satisfaction rating, with 5% combined dissatisfaction and 15% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (TE01).

  This is a slight decrease compared to 2013 when a combined total of 81% were satisfied.

- There was a combined satisfaction rating of 76% for the “how satisfied or dissatisfied are you that N listens to tenants’ views and acts on them” (TE02).

  This is a slight decrease compared to 2012 when a combined total of 79% were satisfied.

- Respondents were least satisfied with the higher level of engagement. There was a combined satisfaction rating of 64% for the “how satisfied or dissatisfied are you that tenants are able to influence NCCH’s decision-making” (TE03).

  This is a slight decrease compared to 2012 when a combined total of 69% were satisfied.

When overall satisfaction with tenant engagement at NCCH (TE01) was analysed by program and region there were some slight variations in the levels of combined satisfaction.

When analysing a question by a particular sub-group such as region or program there may be a small number of respondents in each of these groups which means there can be a wide margin of error (MOE). At a 95% confidence level the margin of error for each region and program sub-group is given in the tables below and we would recommend interpreting the results of smaller subgroups with caution. The results in the region and program tables are ranked by score (highest to lowest).

Taking this margin of error into account, Tweed Heads respondents were significantly more likely to be satisfied (92%) than Grafton (78%) and Lismore 971%). This was also the case for TE02 and TE3. There were no statistically significant differences by region. There were no statistically significant differences by program.
TE01. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way NCCHC involves tenants? by Program

Very satisfied | Fairly satisfied | Neither | Fairly dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied
---|---|---|---|---
Capital (228) | 48 | 31 | 14 | 5
Headlease (36) | 61 | 22 | 17 | 6
Supported (15) | 53 | 20 | 14 | 5

Base: All respondents

TE01. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way NCCHC involves tenants? by Region

Very satisfied | Fairly satisfied | Neither | Fairly dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied
---|---|---|---|---
Grafton (50) | 50 | 28 | 18 | 4
Lismore (132) | 35 | 36 | 20 | 2
Tweed Heads (97) | 71 | 36 | 21 | 2

Base: All respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Satisfaction (ranked)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headlease</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>+/-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>+/-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+/-22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Satisfaction (ranked)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Heads</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>+/-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+/-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>+/-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers to engagement

Tenants were asked to indicate barriers that would stop them from being involved (TE04). Tenants could make multiple selections for this question. This question is useful when planning or refining engagement strategies. The following three barriers had the largest number of mentions:

- The largest number of mentions was "location of the meetings. This was selected by 90 respondents (41% of respondents mentioned this).
- The barrier with the second largest number of mentions was "times/day of meetings”. This was selected by 66 respondents (30% of respondents mentioned this).
- The barrier with the third largest number of mentions was "transport cost”. This was selected by 53 respondents (24% of respondents mentioned this).

TE04. Are there any barriers or concerns that would stop you getting involved in tenant participation at NCCHC?

![Bar Chart]

- **Location of the meetings**: 52%
- **Times/day of meetings**: 38%
- **Transport cost**: 31%
- **Lack of interest**: 29%
- **Content of the meetings**: 10%
- **Lack of child care**: 5%
- **Format of the meetings**: 5%
- **Language barrier**: 1%

Base: All respondents (173)
Issues and activities

Tenants were asked to indicate which issues or activities interested them (TE05) – multiple selections were allowed for this question. This question is useful when planning a tenant engagement strategy as it provides information on tenants’ interests which can be used to make a tenant engagement strategy more relevant to tenants. The following four issues/activities had the largest number of mentions:

- The issue/activity with the largest number of mentions was repairs and maintenance. This was selected by 107 respondents (50% of respondents mentioned this). This reflects the importance of repairs and maintenance to tenant satisfaction.

- The issue/activity with the second largest number of mentions was activities for older people. This was selected by 75 respondents (35% of respondents mentioned this). This reflects the presence of older tenants in the sample.

- The issue/activity with the third largest number of mentions was social activities. This was selected by 64 respondents (30% of respondents mentioned this).

- The issue/activity with the fourth largest number of mentions was anti-social behaviour and nuisance. This was selected by 63 respondents (29% of respondents mentioned this).

TE05. Which issues or activities are you interested in?

Base: All respondents (206)
Useful ways to involve tenants

Tenants were asked to indicate which participation methods they find useful taking into account their personal circumstances (TE06). Tenants could make one selection for this question. This question is useful when planning a tenant engagement strategy. The following three ways of involvement were found to be the most useful:

- Completing tenant surveys – this was selected by 223 respondents. Out of these, 87% or 195 thought that surveys are very useful or useful. 28 respondents or 13% thought that surveys are not useful.
- Tenant newsletter contributions – this was selected by 181 respondents. Out of these, 72% or 130 thought that tenant newsletter contributions are very useful or useful. 65 respondents or 42% thought that a telephone call is not useful.
- Tenant Council – this was selected by 154 respondents. Out of these, 61% or 94 thought that tenant council is very useful or useful. 56 respondents or 36% thought that personal visit is not useful.

**TE06. Taking into account your personal circumstances, please say how useful the following ways to involve you would be.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>First Selection</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completing Tenant Surveys</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Newsletter Contributions</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Council</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local forums</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outings and social events</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Voice groups</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee mornings</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents
Written comments on tenant engagement

A record of all the written comments supplied by respondents is included in the Excel Comments Toolkit supplied with this report.

In total four comments were made about tenant engagement, two were coded positive, one was coded neutral and one was coded negative. The comments focused on social events, the need to listen to tenants and also ways to get more tenants involved:
Section 9: Tenant priorities and gap analysis

Section overview

This section examines the level of importance that tenants attach to different aspects of NCCH’s services and compares this with their levels of dissatisfaction for each of these services. This identifies service gaps and this information can be used by NCCH to target future service improvements.

Results overview

The gap analysis indicates that the most important areas of service to tenants that have the largest levels of combined dissatisfaction are repairs and maintenance, followed by overall condition of their home and the neighbourhood as a place to live. Value for money was also very close in the order of importance, just 1% below neighbourhood.

Tenant priorities

From the following seven service areas tenants were asked to indicate the three most important priorities to them (YP01):

- Repairs and maintenance.
- Overall condition of your home.
- Your neighbourhood as a place to live.
- Value for money for the rent you pay.
- Communications with NCCH.
- Your rights as a tenant upheld by NCCH.
- NCCH listening to tenants’ views and acting on them.

Please note that the complaints and appeals service is not included in this list. This is because not all tenants would have used this service. This means that they would not be able to comment on the importance of this service, nor would they be able to reflect on their experience of using this service.

The analysis revealed the following priorities:

- Repairs and maintenance was by far the most important priority for tenants, with 75% of respondents selecting it amongst their top three.
- Secondly, this was followed by “overall condition of your home” (49%).
- Thirdly, was “your neighbourhood as a place to live” (45%) following very closely by “value for money for the rent you pay” (44%).
- It should also be noted that out of the seven key areas, only repairs and maintenance had dissatisfaction levels above 10%
YP01. From the following list, please choose the three most important areas of service to you.

- Repairs and maintenance: 75%
- Overall condition of your home: 49%
- Your neighbourhood as a place to live: 45%
- Value for money for the rent you pay: 44%
- Communications with NCCHC: 34%
- NCCHC listening to tenants' views and acting on them: 32%
- Your rights as a tenant upheld by NCCHC: 22%

Base: All respondents (293)

**Gap analysis**

Tenants’ priorities were then mapped against information about their levels of dissatisfaction. This allows NCCH to identify service areas that are considered to be both important and where performance is seen by tenants as comparatively less satisfactory and therefore a service gap.

This map is supplied below and it charts the proportion of tenants who were dissatisfied with each area of service, against a count of importance (the cumulative frequency that service was cited as being in the top three priorities for tenants). This map demonstrates that:

- Repairs and maintenance is the area of service seen as most important but with the largest combined dissatisfaction rating.

- Overall condition of your home is seen as the second most important aspect of service and this had mid-ranged combined dissatisfaction rating.

- Lastly, the neighbourhood as a place to live and value for money had very similar levels of importance to tenants. The neighbourhood also had higher levels of dissatisfaction than value for money.
Section 10: Comments

Section overview

This section looks at the comments made by respondents (YPO2).

All comments are supplied separately in the Excel Comments Toolkit. This toolkit allows NCCH to filter and analyse in more depth all the comments received. A selection of comments has also been included in the relevant sections of this report.

In total 123 comments were supplied.

All comments by negative, neutral or positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most negative comments were about repairs and maintenance and neighbourhood.

Most positive comments were about NCCH generally and the service it provides.

The word cloud below illustrates the frequency of certain words that appeared in all the comments received. The more prominent a word the more frequently it was mentioned. A stop word list has been used to filter out words and numbers that are irrelevant to the analysis.

Reflecting the positive results achieved in the survey words like “thank”, “happy” “like” and “good” appear.

Reflecting some of the more negative themes words like “complaint”, “nothing” and “maintenance” appear.
YP02. Do you have any comments about NCCHC's services? *P...