



Challenge for Change

Outcomes and recommendations



	What is the C4C Judgement?	What evidence do we have to support that judgement?	What impact is this having on customers?	What is our recommendation?
1	Engagement is difficult <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even harder with underrepresented groups such as young people 	Low attendance at meetings and with involvement generally – particularly young people	Customers are not being proportionately and fairly represented	R5 -Go to where people are – young people/ single Mums R9 - Tell Job Centres to encourage people to get involved R10 - Use tenants that are involved to promote benefits
2	There is general apathy towards involvement and volunteering	As above – and surveys of non-involved tenants / TARAs. Many groups are populated by the same volunteers	Widespread involvement is not happening and there is a feeling that the “same old faces” are always involved. This can lead to a sense that there is a form of “closed shop” where all potential views are not heard. It can also lead to a lack of fresh ideas and different perspectives are not obtained.	R10 - Use tenants that are involved to promote benefits R11 - Recruit to specific things not general R13 - Campaign to tell people benefits of getting involved R14 -Use more “event driven” recruitment in “special” locations R18 - Use a wide variety of methods to recruit volunteers and involve tenants in the process
3	Specialist activity has less of a problem with recruitment	VAS interviews showed vacancies filled easily when subject of volunteering made clear. Also “it’s Your Shout” showed targeted work is more effective	Disproportionate involvement / under involvement if subject area not made clear	R11 - Recruit to specific things not general and promote the fact that volunteers can pick and choose how much involvement they would like R6 - Email adverts re recruitment activity R16 - Offer flexible involvement – home based / not dependent on attending meetings

	What is the C4C Judgement?	What evidence do we have to support that judgement?	What impact is this having on customers?	What is our recommendation?
4	People don't understand what Community Engagement actually means	C4C members themselves e.g. IA/TG. Tenant survey. TARA survey.	Potential involvement lost	R1 - Promote TARA's at New Tenancy Visit – how many people get referred on and what do TARA's do with them? R7 - Use social media to feed back on action taken R15 – Revamp the communication strategy and explain/define/promote what Community Engagement actually is and possibly rename as something more meaningful
5	Communication methods are not clear enough in explaining what involvement entails	All communications not understood well enough.	Potential involvement lost	R7 - Use social media to feed back on action taken ask new tenants to use Facebook R15 - Revamp the communication strategy R20 - Make the website more attractive with less text / more visuals and provide appropriate links to relevant external organisations
6	The variety of people involved is limited and does not broadly reflect the customer profile	A number of people attend multiple groups and new initiatives tend to attract those already involved, There is no evidence of a regular influx of new recruits. Where there have been new recruits e.g. It's Your shout and C4C, retention has been an issue	Potential involvement lost. Due to the limited number of people involved, many in multiple groups, the same views are repeatedly expressed. This means the service does not obtain views of a wide range of people	R5 - Go to where people are – young people/ single Mums R9 - Tell Job Centres to encourage people to get involved R13 - campaign to tell people benefits of getting involved R14 - Use more “event driven” recruitment in “special” locations R26 Promote types of involvement that do not involve attending meetings and research what people are actually interested in

	What is the C4C Judgement?	What evidence do we have to support that judgement?	What impact is this having on customers?	What is our recommendation?
7	The impact of involvement is not made clear to those getting involved	Recruitment materials do make clear what personal gains may be achieved through volunteer involvement. Information provided is not direct enough.	Potential involvement lost. A greater variety of involved people is missed. Skills are not developed and opportunities to do so are not taken.	R27 Use case studies to publicise the impact of involvement more widely and provide regular updates
8	Communications not effective – social media is under used	Small numbers of Facebook followers. Little response to articles in The Bridge and In Touch. Get Involved pages not in “top ten” of webpage hits	Disproportionate and not future proof as there are significantly more old people involved than other age groups	R8 - Monthly campaigns using social media on specialist topics R17 Useblogs/videoclips.vox pops -Webchats on live topics -Use Sheffield Forum -Balanced use of Facebook i.e. not all about evictions
9	The benefits of involvement are not made clear to individuals	Tenant survey – misunderstanding of the virtues of involvement. Not promoted by any managers interviewed	Potential involvement lost and “personal improvement” opportunity missed. Lack of effort to build social capital and personal skills	R9 - Ask Job Centres to encourage people to get involved
10	The “getting involved” section of the website is not inviting / warm / welcoming enough, or easy to navigate	VAS did not think it was clear or user friendly (mobile version). C4C comparison with other local providers websites	Wider access is impacted affecting potential involvement	R28 Navigation on the website needs to be made easier – especially the mobile platform. Links should be easier to find R19 - Integrate the Council Housing Service within the main Council website

	What is the C4C Judgement?	What evidence do we have to support that judgement?	What impact is this having on customers?	What is our recommendation?
11	There is a lack of understanding within the service of the role of TLOs and also by tenants and TARAs. The role could be more “community” driven	Area Managers meeting. TARA survey - understanding of TLOs role and meeting with TLOs	TLO role not fully realised – possibly losing wider involvement with tenants beyond the scope of TARAs	R12 - Clearer role for TLOs – role in the community and for this to be communicated. R21 - Consider renaming TLO to Tenant and Community Liaison Officer - TCLO
12	TARAs do not operate consistently	Not all TARAs are able to offer the same range of activities to levy payers and not all are proactive in engaging with members given their resources	Potential involvement lost and not all levy payers receive the same information about activities and opportunities for involvement	R1 - Promote TARA's at New Tenancy Visit – how many people get referred on and what do TARA's do with them? R2 - Consistent staff numbers committed to CE and TARA support. R22 - The new recognition policy should be reasonably and consistently applied and enforced where appropriate R23 - A minimum TARA communication standard should be applied across all areas e.g. at least one newsletter a year R24 - TARAs should be encouraged to share good practice R25 - Provide information to levy payers about how the levy is used

Other recommendations

- R3 Staff competent to give training to tenants
- R4 Time taken up during meetings by people who monopolise them - manage them



This document can be supplied in alternative formats, please contact:
Sheffield City Council • Council Housing Service
Tel: 0114 293 0000 or 205 3333
www.sheffield.gov.uk/councilhousing

This document is printed on paper from a sustainable source