

HA 'top performer' PI thresholds in 2006/07 and top performer HAs

In earlier years, this series of HQN briefing notes has included a 'top performer' analysis based on five measures: rent collected; current tenant rent arrears at year end; vacant and available stock; relet time; and urgent repairs completed in target. Each HA has received a score from zero to five, where (for each of the above five measures) a point has been awarded for exceeding a threshold level calculated to identify the top quartile performers. The analysis has then identified those HAs having the best scores.

This note also includes a 'top performer' analysis, but a revision is forced by the revision to the set of PIs in 2006/07, and this, of course, means that the top performer results in this note are not directly comparable with those in earlier notes.

Only three of the previously used measures (listed above) are still available: the two for rent collected and urgent repairs are not. The analysis for this note replaces the urgent repairs item by the equivalent for routine repairs, bringing the total so far to four measures. Now, it is highly desirable to bring the number of measures back up to five, because (a) it is very much easier for HAs to score three out of four than four out of five, (b) more measures means a more balanced view, and (c) reducing to four means a bigger discontinuity with the previous analyses. However, there is not a clear choice, and not even an unquestionably good choice, for the fifth measure.

The 'tenants' satisfaction overall' PI could be an appealing choice, were it an up-to-date measure, but (as mentioned in section 3) where the results are available in the data set, over 60% of the HAs had the same result in 2006/07 as in the previous year, and 30% had the same for the latest three years, indicating infrequent updating of the satisfaction PIs.

It would not be good to have the set of five measures include two that are closely related, eg, two measures concerning relet time or vacant dwellings. However, after excluding all measures similar to the four so far chosen, there are very few left to choose from, let alone to consider against any aims that might underlie the design of the top performers scoring method.⁵

From the limited options available, the choice made for this note is the proportion of HAs' stock falling short of the Decent Homes standard (DHS).

Table 1, below, shows the 'top performer' thresholds for the listed indicators in different 'peer groups'. Obviously, for the percentage of routine repairs completed within the target time, higher results are better, so the top performers are those with values at or above the threshold, whereas for the other four indicators, lower results are better, and the top performers are those with values at or below the threshold.

⁵ For instance, if the aim was to reflect, as far as possible, the HAs' performance in the latest year, a good choice would be a measure that would respond relatively quickly to changes made by HAs — though a consequence of choosing all measures that way would be the failure ever to reflect the benefits achieved by long-sustained efforts in any areas where it necessarily took years rather than months to achieve improvements (relative to others in the same peer group).

Table1 – HA ‘top performer’ PI thresholds in 2006/07

	LSVT		Non-LSVT			
	250+	5000+	250-4999 dwellings			
	dwell-ings	dwell-ings	London	South	Central	North
Current tenant rent arrears at year end for GN, 2006/07	2.53%	4.97%	5.20%	4.24%	4.63%	3.95%
Vacant and available stock (GN), 2006/07	0.32%	0.51%	0.49%	0.35%	0.35%	0.52%
GN re-let time inc major repairs (owned stock), 2006/07	20.9	28.3	27.6	21.1	21.4	26.5
Routine repairs completed in target, 2006/07	97.6%	96.0%	97.1%	96.5%	97.4%	97.8%
Stock falling Decent Homes standard, 2006/07	4.84%	4.05%	3.29%	0.90%	0.13%	0.58%

Table 2, below, lists the 15 HAs rated as a ‘top performer’ in at least four of the five indicators set out in table 1, in relation to the thresholds for their own ‘peer group’: four of these HAs had the highest possible score of five. Four of them were also listed in the comparable table based on the 2005/06 PIs, with Bromford Carinthia having been a ‘consistent top performer’ every year since 1999/00.

Table 2 – HAs with multiple ‘top performer’ ratings in 2006/07

HA name	HA type	Region of HQ	Peer group	General needs dwellings	No of top performer ratings (max=5)	‘Top performer’ in 2006/07
Beth Johnson	NonLSVT	Central	>=5000 stock (non LSVT)	6532	5	
Bromford Carinthia	NonLSVT	Central	>=5000 stock (non LSVT)	8078	5	Yes
Railway and Benefit Fund	NonLSVT	North	North	424	5	
Waterloo	NonLSVT	Central	Central	2978	5	
Broadacres	LSVT	North	LSVT	2814	4	
<u>Cherwell Housing Trust</u>	NonLSVT	London	London	1313	4	
Cottsway	LSVT	South	LSVT	3355	4	Yes
Huntingdonshire Housing Partnership	LSVT	Central	LSVT	5405	4	
Jephson Homes	NonLSVT	Central	>=5000 stock (non LSVT)	6285	4	
South Sunderland Housing Company	LSVT	North	LSVT	5771	4	
The Exeter Housing Society	NonLSVT	South	South	1026	4	
The Swaythling Housing Society	NonLSVT	South	South	4753	4	
The Wrekin Housing Trust	LSVT	Central	LSVT	9527	4	Yes
Warrington	NonLSVT	North	North	880	4	Yes
Washington Housing Company	LSVT	North	LSVT	6108	4	

Although 376 HAs were eligible to be counted in table 2, only 299 had values recorded against them for all five of the indicators behind the table. For instance, one HA had three top performer points but also had a missing value amongst the other two indicators, while another with three points had both its remaining indicator values missing; also, one of the HAs with four points had a missing value. So perhaps if all their indicator values had been recorded, one or more of them might have scored enough to appear in the table or to have a score of five instead of four.

If (hypothetically) being a top performer in one or more of the five indicators meant no more likelihood of being a top performer in another, a score of four or five would on average appear in about 1.3% of the 376 HAs, ie, in about five HAs. The fact that there are as many as 15 in table 2 possibly points to a propensity for HAs to perform well against one of these indicators if they perform well against others of them.

How robust is the analysis of top performers?

This being the first use of the revised set of measures, a test was made to show the effect of replacing 'routine repairs completed in target' by 'tenants satisfied with repairs and maintenance'. Six HAs left table 2 (because their scores fell below four), and five others entered, giving a net reduction to 14 HAs in the list. The nine in both versions of table 2 included the four that had been in last year's table 2. One of those in both versions changed its score from four to five, and another changed from five to four. Important points are that there was little change in the number of HAs; the overlap between the tables was two-thirds of the HAs; and the number scoring five was the same in both.

Had there been a considerable difference in the numbers in the tables or the proportion with a score of five, it might have been possible to argue (on statistical grounds) in favour of a specific choice between the percentage of repairs completed in target and the satisfaction with repairs and maintenance. However, in view of the similarity, deciding between the two measures would be more subjective, so long as the satisfaction PI would be measured every year (unlike the other two satisfaction PIs discussed in section 3); with infrequent updating of the satisfaction result, there would be a strong preference for using the repairs completed in target.

HQN is grateful for the Housing Corporation's helpful comments provided on an initial draft of this analysis.

Appendix A – detailed comparisons: median PI scores by peer group, 2002/03-2006/07

			ESVA		Non-ESVA				All
			250+ dwellings	5000+ dwellings	250-4999 dwellings				
					London	South	Central	North	
Table A1	% of stock vacant and available for letting, 2002/03-2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	0.84%	1.06%	0.57%	0.71%	0.84%	1.53%	0.91%
		2003/04	0.73%	1.06%	0.75%	0.79%	0.90%	1.32%	0.83%
		2004/05	0.64%	0.84%	0.52%	0.54%	0.87%	1.06%	0.67%
		2005/06	0.51%	0.82%	0.62%	0.69%	0.77%	0.77%	0.62%
		2006/07	0.51%	0.75%	0.71%	0.51%	0.52%	0.81%	0.60%
Table A11	% of stock vacant and not available for letting, 2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2003/04	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2004/05	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2005/06	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2006/07	0.53%	1.02%	0.45%	0.49%	0.30%	0.87%	0.56%
Table A2	Average relet intervals (days), 2002/03-2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	29	38	37	28	26	40	32
		2003/04	32	38	35	28	29	47	33
		2004/05	28	36	37	27	31	41	32
		2005/06	27	35	35	25	29	31	31
		2006/07	28	34	36	24	28	33	30
Table A3	Rent collec: current tenant arrears at yr end 2004/05-2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2003/04	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2004/05	4.1%	6.1%	6.8%	4.2%	5.8%	5.3%	5.2%
		2005/06	3.7%	5.7%	6.6%	5.0%	5.6%	5.9%	4.7%
		2006/07	3.7%	6.4%	6.0%	5.0%	5.9%	5.4%	4.8%
Table A4	Routine repairs completed on time, 2002/03-2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	92.6%	94.6%	92.5%	95.0%	94.0%	97.2%	94.1%
		2003/04	92.9%	94.3%	94.0%	95.0%	95.8%	96.5%	94.2%
		2004/05	92.8%	93.6%	95.0%	93.4%	95.3%	95.9%	93.8%
		2005/06	94.2%	93.8%	95.3%	95.6%	96.2%	95.8%	95.0%
		2006/07	95.8%	95.1%	93.5%	94.3%	96.5%	96.4%	95.7%
Table A5	Tenant satisfaction with repairs & maint, 2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2003/04	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2004/05	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2005/06	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2006/07	78.0%	71.1%	70.0%	75.0%	79.0%	81.1%	77.0%
Table A6	Tenant satisfaction overall, 2002/03-2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	81.0%	75.5%	73.0%	77.0%	83.4%	88.0%	80.0%
		2003/04	81.0%	75.6%	72.0%	78.9%	83.0%	86.0%	80.2%
		2004/05	81.0%	76.2%	72.0%	82.6%	81.2%	84.2%	80.1%
		2005/06	81.0%	76.0%	71.2%	82.3%	79.6%	85.0%	80.0%
		2006/07	80.8%	76.7%	71.6%	80.0%	81.1%	85.3%	80.1%
Table A7	Tenant satisfaction with participation, 2002/03-2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	61.1%	62.3%	55.0%	62.0%	61.7%	66.0%	60.0%
		2003/04	61.0%	54.5%	57.0%	62.0%	62.2%	63.0%	61.0%
		2004/05	62.0%	52.4%	55.5%	58.0%	60.1%	64.6%	60.1%
		2005/06	62.5%	53.0%	55.9%	61.9%	58.0%	66.3%	60.0%
		2006/07	60.0%	52.7%	51.7%	62.9%	63.5%	65.5%	59.2%
Table A8	OCI actual % predicted cost, inc maj repair, 2004/05-2006/07 (means)	2003/04	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2004/05	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2005/06	96.9%	100.1%	93.7%	99.8%	103.1%	104.8%	100.3%
		2005/06	100.7%	105.1%	97.1%	99.7%	101.8%	103.2%	100.5%
		2006/07	98.7%	100.4%	93.7%	103.9%	102.6%	100.2%	100.1%
Table A9	Stock condition 2002/03-2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	29.6%	13.5%	11.5%	5.6%	2.6%	4.8%	14.0%
		2003/04	25.2%	13.4%	13.1%	11.3%	3.7%	4.5%	13.9%
		2004/05	17.7%	12.6%	11.5%	7.4%	3.7%	1.8%	11.8%
		2005/06	14.7%	11.6%	8.9%	8.1%	3.8%	2.6%	10.0%
		2006/07	11.5%	7.5%	7.5%	2.3%	2.3%	3.1%	7.5%
Table A10	Energy efficiency, of stock 2002/03-2006/07 (medians)	2002/03	58	61	59	65	63	64	60
		2003/04	60	65	62	66	66	65	62
		2004/05	65	66	67	72	69	66	66
		2005/06	67	69	69	74	70	67	68
		2006/07	67	68	70	76	71	69	68