

Craigavon Grants Office Customer Survey

March 2010

Northern Ireland
Housing Executive

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
1.0 Background to the Survey	3
2.0 Research Methodology and Sample	3
3.0 The Questionnaire	3
4.0 Fieldwork	4
5.0 Comparison between 2010 and 2007 findings	4
Commentary and Analysis	5
1.0 Respondent Profile and Grant Type	5
2.0 Contact with Grants Office	6
3.0 Completing Grant Forms	9
4.0 Payments, Contractors and Length of Time to Process Grant application	10
5.0 Communication from the Grants Office	11
6.0 Internet Access	14
7.0 Further Comments	14
Appendix 1: Tabular Report - Craigavon Grants Customer Survey	15
Appendix 2: Comparison between 2010 and 2007 Grant Surveys	27
1.0 Satisfaction with Inspection Stage	27
2.0 Satisfaction with telephoning the Grants Office.	27
3.0 Satisfaction with visiting the Grants Office	28
4.0 Satisfaction with letters received	28
5.0 Grants Forms	29
6.0 Satisfaction with Payment Stage	30
7.0 Satisfaction with builder	30
8.0 Satisfaction with grants process overall	31

Introduction

1.0 Background to the Survey

As part of the Customer Satisfaction Survey Programme agreed with Design and Property Services, the Research Unit conducted a telephone survey of people living in the Craigavon Grants Office area who had applied for and received a grant from the Housing Executive to repair, renovate or adapt their home. A previous study was conducted in 2007; comparisons with the earlier study, where possible, are included in this report.

The aims of the survey were:

- to evaluate grant applicants' perceptions of the grant process
- to assess whether applicants thought they had a say in the services they had received
- to identify the priorities of applicants
- to measure overall satisfaction with the service
- to evaluate grant applicants' views on electronic delivery of services
- to identify any shortcomings in the service and improvements required as perceived by the applicants

In addition, the survey was carried out in support of the Craigavon Grants Office's Customers Service Excellence Standard.

The Research Unit consulted with Design and Property Services on the aims of the survey, questionnaire design, survey methodology and sample frame.

2.0 Research Methodology and Sample

It was agreed that the sample frame should include grant applicants in the Craigavon Grants Office catchment area whose application had been completed during the 12 months from January to December 2009. This was agreed as an appropriate cut-off point, bearing in mind resource constraints and the length of time grant customers could be expected to remember details of the application process. The Housing Executive's computerised Grants Management System identified a total of 486 grant applicants to be included in the sample frame.

The agreed methodology was a telephone survey. The sample frame included applicants who had received Home Repair Assistance Grants, Disabled Facilities Grants, Renovation Grants and Replacement Grants.

3.0 The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed to assess satisfaction levels with all stages of the grant application process. As the process varies somewhat for Home Repair Assistance Grants, the questionnaire design took account of these differences.

4.0 Fieldwork

It was agreed that a quota of 100 achieved interviews would be sufficient for analysis. Research Unit staff carried out the interviews by telephone over approximately 20 days during February 2010.

From an eligible population of 486 households, the Research Unit selected two stratified random samples of 100, proportionate to each grant type. Once the first sample was exhausted, the second sample was used to ensure the target of 100 interviews was achieved. Sample and response information is in Table A.

Table A: Sample and Response Information

Grant Type	Sample Frame	Sample	Achieved Interviews
Home Repair	232	94	47
Disabled Facilities	184	76	38
Renovation	52	22	11
Replacement	18	8	4
TOTAL	486	200	100

As a consequence of setting a target of 100 achieved interviews, the Research Unit did not contact some applicants in the sample. To make allowances for this fact, the survey data were weighted and grossed to provide findings that would be considered representative of the eligible population of Craigavon grant applicants (Table B).

Table B: Effects of Weighting

Grant Type	Achieved Interviews	Grossed by weight of	Sample Frame
Home Repair	47	4.94	232
Disabled Facilities	38	4.84	184
Renovation	11	4.73	52
Replacement	4	4.50	18
TOTAL	100	-	486

It should be noted that the application of weights to the data sometimes has the effect of creating tables where column figures do not equal the total. This is due to the rounding process associated with weighting but has negligible effect on reporting.

5.0 Comparison between 2010 and 2007 findings

The survey methodology and sampling methods remained consistent to allow for comparison with a previous survey carried out in 2007. The Research Unit and Design and Property Services have amended and extended the questionnaire in some areas since the last survey, so data from 2007 are not available for comparison of some questions.


Comparison of findings between the 2010 and the 2007 surveys is presented in Appendix 2.

Commentary and Analysis

1.0 Respondent Profile and Grant Type

1.1 Age of respondents

Almost half (47%) of respondents were aged 65 or older; 21% were between 55 and 64, 17% were between 45 and 54 and 10% were between 35 and 44. Smaller proportions (1% in each case) were aged between 25 and 34 and 16 and 24; 3% of respondents refused to state their age (Figure 1.1, Table 1.1).



1.2 Ethnicity of respondents

The vast majority (97%) of respondents described their ethnicity as white; 3% refused to state their ethnic origin (Table 1.2).

1.3 Nationality of respondents

Almost two-thirds (63%) of respondents described their nationality as British; 34% were Irish and the remaining 3% refused to state their nationality (Table 1.3).

1.4 Household Religion

Half (50%) of respondents described their household religion as Catholic, 38% described their religion as Protestant, 4% as other/none and 1% as mixed. The remaining 7% of respondents refused to state the religion of their household (Table 1.4).

1.5 Grant Type

Almost half (47%) of respondents had received a home repair assistance grant, 38% had received a disabled facilities grant, 11% had received a renovation grant and 4% had received a replacement grant (Table 1.5).

2.0 Contact with Grants Office

2.1 Involvement in process

Most respondents (90%) said they had been involved in every stage of the grants process; 10% had been involved in some of the stages (Table 2.1).

2.2 Access to the grants service

Most respondents (96%) said they had found the grants service easy to access. Reasons stated by the 4% of respondents who had found the service difficult to access included lack of information and administration problems (Table 2.2).

2.3 Staff identification

Almost nine-tenths (88%) of respondents said the grants officer had given his/her name (Table 2.3).

2.4 Appointment for Preliminary Inspection

The vast majority (93%) of respondents said the grants officer had made an appointment for a preliminary inspection. Of those respondents who said an appointment had been made, almost all (99%) said the appointment had been kept (Tables 2.3 and 2.4).

2.5 Explanation of grants process

Respondents were asked a series of questions to establish if the grants officer had explained the grants process to them. The majority of respondents (87%) said the grants officer had explained what the inspection stage entailed (Figure 2.1, Table 2.6).

2.6 Availability of grant


Three-quarters (75%) of respondents said the grants officer had explained whether he / she thought the grant would be available (Figure 2.1, Table 2.6).

2.7 Type of grant

More than three-quarters (76%) of respondents said the grants officer had advised them on the type of grant they could receive and 83% said he/she had explained the next steps in the grant application process (Figure 2.1, Table 2.6).

2.8 Overall satisfaction with Preliminary Inspection stage

Almost all respondents (98%) were very satisfied / satisfied with the preliminary inspection stage of the process; 2% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Table 2.7).



Telephoning the Grants Office within the previous 12 months

2.9 Use of telephone service


More than two-fifths (42%) of respondents had telephoned the grants office during the previous 12 months while awaiting approval of their grant application. Of these respondents, 62% had been told the name of the person dealing with their call; 22% were unsure if they had been given a name and 17% said they had not been told the name of the person dealing with their call (Tables 2.8 and 2.9).

2.10 Staff manner

The majority of respondents who had telephoned the grants office had found the staff polite (93%), knowledgeable (93%) and 86% of respondents said they had not felt hurried or rushed by staff dealing with their query (Table 2.10).

2.11 Ability to deal with telephone queries

Of the respondents who had telephoned the grants office (42% of all respondents), 81% said the person who took the call had been able to deal with their query. Smaller proportions of respondents said they had to speak to more than one member of staff before their query was answered (Figure 2.2, Table 2.11).



2.12 Overall satisfaction with telephone service

The majority (85%) of respondents who had telephoned the grants office were very satisfied / satisfied with the overall service they had received; 7% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 7% were dissatisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction included: query was not resolved and only given vague answers (Table 2.12).

Visiting the Grants Office within the previous 12 months

2.13 Visiting the grants office

More than one-fifth (21%) of respondents had visited the grants office within the previous 12 months. Reasons included: to submit documents (71%), make a general enquiry (34%) and complete a test of resources form (5%) (Tables 2.13 & 2.14).

2.14 Attention at counter

The majority (86%) of those respondents who had visited the grants office (21% of all respondents) said counter staff had attended to them within five minutes and 50% of respondents who had an appointment to see a particular member of staff said they had spoken to that member of staff within five minutes (Tables 2.15 - 2.18).

2.15 Staff identification and manner

Of the respondents who had visited the grants office (21% of all respondents), more than four-fifths (81%) said the person who dealt with their query had provided identification; 19% did not know/could not remember (Table 2.19). All respondents (100%) who had visited the grants office said staff attending to them had been polite and knowledgeable; 95% of respondents said that they had not felt hurried or rushed by staff (Tables 2.20)

2.16 Advice and service

All respondents (100%) who had visited the grants office said the advice/service they received had been very helpful/ helpful (Table 2.21).

2.17 Confidentiality

Most respondents (95%) who had visited the grants office were very satisfied / satisfied with confidentiality in the Grants Office. The remaining 5% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the confidentiality (Table 2.22)

2.18 Posters and leaflets

Of the 21% of all respondents who had visited the grants office, more than two-fifths (42%) had read the leaflets and posters on display in the office; all (100%) of these respondents said they had found the information up-to-date and 89% found it useful (Table 2.23 and 2.24).

2.19 Access to the building

Of those who visited the grants office, 43% said that they had a physical disability that made access to the building difficult for them. A small proportion (1%) of all respondents suggested the need for ramps at the front door as an improvement to the service when visiting the grants office (Table 2.25)

2.20 Overall satisfaction with the grants office

All respondents (100%) who had visited the grants office were very satisfied / satisfied with their visit (Table 2.26).

3.0 Completing Grant Forms ¹

3.1 Preliminary Form

Most respondents (92%) felt the Preliminary form had been easy to complete (Figure 3.1, Table 3.1).

3.2 Schedule of Works

Similarly, high proportions of respondents (88%) felt the Schedule of Works package had been clear (Figure 3.1, Table 3.2).


3.3 Test of Resources Form

Almost two-fifths (37%) of respondents had completed a Test of Resources form. Of these respondents, 84% had found the form clear. (NB the Test of Resources form does not require completion by home repair assistance grant applicants.) (Figure 3.1, Table 3.3)

3.4 Approval of Grant Form

Most respondents (93%) said the Approval of Grant form had been clear (Figure 3.1, Table 3.4).

¹ 29% of respondents, who stated that someone else (family member/friend or representative from Fold) had completed the grant forms on their behalf, are not included in the analysis relating to the completion of forms.



4.0 Payments, Contractors and Length of Time to Process Grant application

4.1 Payment stage


The majority (87%) of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the payment stage of the grants process, 3% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 10% were dissatisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction included: payment took too long (Figure 4.1, Table 4.1).

4.2 Builder

Similarly, a high proportion (86%) of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the builder who had carried out the work, 1% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 13% were dissatisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction included: poor workmanship and work took too long (Figure 4.1, Table 4.2).

4.3 Length of time to process grant

Almost two-thirds (63%) of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the length of time it took to process their grants application; 8% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 29% were dissatisfied with the time it took to process their application (Figure 4.1, Table 4.3).



5.0 Communication from the Grants Office

5.1 Involvement of others

Respondents were asked if anyone else had been involved in the grant process and, if so, whether they thought the Grants Office had had a good working relationship with them.

5.2 Reason for others to be involved in process

The main factors which influenced the need for involvement by others included:

- level of work required,
- building and planning legislation,
- ability of respondents to complete forms and
- applicants' individual needs and requirements.

All respondents (100%) said a builder had been involved in the grant process; fewer respondents said their occupational therapist (40%), architect (23%), Building Control (16%), Planning Office (16%) and Fold (12%) had been involved in the grant process on their behalf (Table 5.1).

Table 5.1: Was there anyone else involved in the grants process?

	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Builder	486	100	-	-	486	100
Occupational Therapist	194	40	292	60	486	100
Architect	111	23	376	77	486	100
Building Control	77	16	409	84	486	100
Planning Office	77	16	409	84	486	100
Fold	59	12	427	88	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

5.3 Relationship with builder

The majority (85%) of all respondents felt that the Grants Office had worked well with the builder; 11% were unsure and 4% felt the Grants Office had not had a good working relationship with the builder. Reasons given by respondents who felt the grants office had not worked well with the builder included: problems over technical details and builder had to wait for payment (Table 5.2; Appendix Table 5.1).

5.4 Occupational Therapist

The majority (95%) of respondents who required assistance from an Occupational Therapist felt the grants office had a good working relationship with their Occupational Therapist during the grant process. The remaining 5% were unsure (Table 5.2; Appendix Table 5.1).

5.5 Fold

Similarly, high proportions of respondents (92%) who had received assistance from Fold felt the grants office had worked well with Fold during the grants process. The remaining 8% were unsure (Table 5.2; Appendix Table 5.1).

5.6 Architect

More than four-fifths (82%) of respondents who had required assistance from an architect felt the grants office worked well with them during the grants process; 14% were unsure and a smaller proportion (5%) felt they had not had a good working relationship. Reasons why respondents felt the grants office had not worked well with their architect included: breakdown in communication (Table 5.2; Appendix Table 5.1).

5.7 Building Control

Almost half (49%) of respondents who had required involvement from Building Control felt the grants office had worked well with them; similar proportions (44%) were unsure and a smaller proportion (6%) felt they had not worked well together during the process. Reasons why respondents felt the grants office had not worked well with Building Control included: all parties could not agree (Table 5.2; Appendix Table 5.1).

5.8 Planning Service

More than two-fifths (43%) of respondents who had required involvement from the Planning Service felt the grants office had worked well with them; more than half (51%) were unsure and a smaller proportion (6%) felt they had not worked well together during the process. Reasons why respondents felt the grants office had not worked well with the Planning Office included: all parties could not agree (Table 5.2; Appendix Table 5.1).

Table 5.2: Do you think the Grants Office worked well with ...

	Numbers %			
	Yes	No	Unsure	Total
the builder?	413 - 85%	19 - 4%	54 - 11%	486 - 100%
the occupational therapist?	184 - 95%	-	10 - 5%	194 - 100%
Fold?	54 - 92%	-	5 - 8%	59 - 100%
the architect?	91 - 82%	5 - 5%	15 - 14%	111 - 100%
Building Control?	38 - 49%	5 - 6%	34 - 44%	77 - 100%
the Planning Service?	33 - 43%	5 - 6%	39 - 51%	77 - 100%

5.9 Annual Grants Newsletter

More than three-fifths (62%) of respondents said they had not received a copy of the Annual Grants Newsletter; 26% were unsure and 12% said they had received a copy. Of those who had received the newsletter, the majority (91%) were satisfied with the latest edition and 9% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Tables 5.2 and 5.3).

5.10 Letters


The majority (93%) of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the letters they had received from the grants office; 4% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 3% were dissatisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction included: letters were too technical and never received forms (Tables 5.4).

5.11 Equality of treatment

Almost all respondents (95%) felt they had been treated fairly and equal proportions (95%) felt they had been treated sensitively throughout the grants process (Tables 5.5 and 5.7)

5.12 Overall satisfaction with the grants process

The majority (90%) of respondents were very satisfied/satisfied overall with the grants process. Almost one-third (32%) of all respondents made suggestions on what they thought would help to improve the grants process, including: speed up process and process should be simplified (Figure 6, Table 5.7 and 5.8).



6.0 Internet Access

6.1 Access to the internet

Almost one-third (31%) of respondents had access to the internet. Of these respondents, 45% said they would be interested in accessing grants forms and documentation via the internet and 48% said they would be interested in receiving information and updates about their grant application via email (Table 6.1 - 6.3).

7.0 Further Comments

7.1 Further comments

More than one-third (36%) of all respondents provided further comments about the grants process. Of these respondents, 49% were satisfied with the service provided, 17% said the process had taken too long and 9% said the grant was insufficient (Table 7.1).

Appendix 1: Tabular Report - Craigavon Grants Customer Survey

Table 1.1: Age of Respondents

	Numbers	Percentages
16-24 years	5	1
25-34 years	5	1
35-44 years	49	10
45-54 years	82	17
55-64 years	102	21
65+ years	229	47
Refused	15	3
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 1.2: Ethnicity of Respondents

	Numbers	Percentages
White	472	97
Refused	14	3
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 1.3: Nationality of Respondents

	Numbers	Percentages
British	306	63
Irish	166	34
Refused	15	3
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 1.4: Household Religion

	Numbers	Percentages
Catholic	243	50
Protestant	184	38
Other/none	20	4
Mixed Religion (Protestant/Catholic)	5	1
Refused	34	7
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 1.5: Grant Type

	Numbers	Percentages
Home Repair Assistance Grant	232	47
Disabled Facilities Grant	184	38
Renovation Grant	52	11
Replacement Grant	18	4
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.1: Was the applicant involved in every stage of the process?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes, every stage	437	90
Yes, some of the stages	49	10
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.2: Did you find the grants service easy to access?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	466	96
No	19	4
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.3: Did the Grants Officer give his or her name?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	428	88
No	19	4
Don't know/cant remember	39	8
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.4: Did the Grants Officer make an appointment for a preliminary inspection?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	452	93
No	15	3
Don't know/cant remember	19	4
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.5: Was the appointment kept?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	447	99
No	5	1
TOTAL	452	100

Base: 93 (respondents who had an appointment)

Table 2.6: Did the Grants Officer explain...

	Numbers %			
	Yes	No	D/K	Total
what the inspection stage entailed?	423 87%	34 7%	29 6%	486 100%
whether they thought a grant would be available?	364 75%	78 16%	44 9%	486 100%
what type of grant you could receive?	369 76%	68 14%	48 10%	486 100%
the next steps in the grants process?	403 83%	63 13%	19 4%	486 100%

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.7: Satisfaction with the preliminary inspection stage of process

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	209	43
Satisfied	267	55
Neither	10	2
Dissatisfied	-	-
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.8: Did you make telephone contact with the Grants Office at any time during your application?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	204	42
No	239	49
Don't know	44	9
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.9: Did the person dealing with the call give his/her name?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	126	62
No	34	17
Don't know	44	22
TOTAL	204	100

Base: 42 (respondents who had contacted the grants office by telephone)

Table 2.10: Did you find the staff...

	Yes		No		Unsure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
polite?	189	93	15	7	-	-
knowledgeable?	189	93	10	5	5	2
in a hurry/rushed?	24	12	174	86	5	2

Base: 42 (respondents who had contacted the grants office by telephone)

Table 2.11: How many members of staff did you speak to before your query was answered?

	Numbers	Percentages
One staff member	165	81
Two staff members	19	9
Three or more staff members	5	7
Don't know/can't remember	5	2
TOTAL	204	100

Base: 42 (respondents who had contacted the grants office by telephone)

Table 2.12: How satisfied/dissatisfied were you with the telephone service?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	82	40
Satisfied	92	45
Neither	15	7
Dissatisfied	5	2
Very dissatisfied	10	5
TOTAL	204	100

Base: 42 (respondents who had contacted grants office by telephone)

Table 2.13: Have you visited the Grants Office within the last 12 months?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	101	21
No	375	77
Don't know/can't remember	10	2
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.14: Reasons for visiting the Grants Office within the last 12 months

	Numbers	Percentages
Submitting documents	72	71
General enquiry	34	34
Test of Resources Interview	5	5

Base: 21 (respondents who had visited the grants office) respondents could give more than one response

Table 2.15: How long did you have to wait in the reception area before being attended to by counter staff?

	Numbers	Percentages
No waiting time	39	38
Within 5 minutes	48	48
More than 5 minutes but less than 10 minutes	15	14
TOTAL	101	100

Base: 21 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.16: Did you have an appointment to see a particular member of staff?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	29	29
No	72	71
TOTAL	101	100

Base: 21 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.17: Was the appointment kept?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	29	100
No	-	-
TOTAL	29	100

Base: 6 (respondents who had an appointment)

Table 2.18: How long did you have to wait before being attended to by that particular member of staff?

	Numbers	Percentages
No waiting time	5	17
Within 5 minutes	10	33
More than 5 minutes but less than 10 minutes	15	50
TOTAL	29	100

Base: 6 (respondents who had an appointment)

Table 2.19: Did the person who dealt with your query give his/her name?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	82	81
No	-	-
Don't know / can't remember	19	19
TOTAL	101	100

Base: 21 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.20: Did you find the staff...

	Yes		No		Unsure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
polite?	101	100	-	-	-	-
knowledgeable?	101	100	-	-	-	-
in a hurry/rushed?	-	-	96	95	5	5

Base: 21 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.21: How helpful was the advice given by staff in relation to your query?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very helpful	54	53
Helpful	48	47
Neither	-	-
Unhelpful	-	-
Very unhelpful	-	-
TOTAL	101	100

Base: 21 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.22: How satisfied/dissatisfied were you with the confidentiality in the Grants Office?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	29	29
Satisfied	67	67
Neither	5	5
Dissatisfied	-	-
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	101	100

Base: 21 (respondents who had contacted grants office by telephone)

Table 2.23: Have you read any of the leaflets/posters/booklets on display in the office?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	43	42
No	58	58
TOTAL	101	100

Base: 21 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.24: Did you find the information...

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
useful?	38	89	5	12
up-to-date?	43	100	-	-

Base: 9 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.25: Do you have a disability which makes physical access to the Grants Office difficult for you?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	43	43
No	58	58
TOTAL	101	100

Base: 21 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.26: Overall, how satisfied were you with your visit to the Grants Office?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	49	48
Satisfied	53	52
Neither	-	-
Dissatisfied	-	-
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	101	100

Base: 21 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 3.1: Do you think the Preliminary Enquiry Form was easy to complete?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	325	92
No	19	5
Don't know/can't remember	10	3
Sub Total	354	100
Family/friend completed form	98	
Fold completed form	34	
TOTAL	486	

Base: 73 (respondents who completed the Preliminary Enquiry form)

Table 3.2: Do you think the Schedule of Works Package was clear?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	320	88
No	34	9
Don't know/can't remember	10	3
Sub Total	364	100
Family/friend dealt with document	93	
Fold/ dealt with document	29	
TOTAL	486	

Base: 75 (respondents who completed the Schedule of Works Package)

Table 3.3: Do you think the Test of Resources Form was easy to complete?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	153	84
No	5	3
Don't know/can't remember	24	13
Sub Total	182	100
Home Repair Assistance Grants	232	
Family/friend completed form	43	
Fold completed form	29	
TOTAL	486	

Base: 37 (respondents who completed the Test of Resources Form)

Table 3.4: Do you think the Grant Approval Document was clear?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	359	93
No	15	4
Don't know/can't remember	10	3
Sub Total	384	100
Family/friend dealt with document	78	
Fold completed form	24	
TOTAL	486	

Base: 79 (respondents who dealt with the Grant Approval Document)

Table 4.1: Overall, how satisfied were you with the payment stage?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	107	22
Satisfied	317	65
Neither	15	3
Dissatisfied	34	7
Very dissatisfied	14	3
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 4.2: How satisfied/dissatisfied were you with the builder who carried out the work?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	262	54
Satisfied	156	32
Neither	5	1
Dissatisfied	39	8
Very dissatisfied	24	5
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 4.3: Overall, how satisfied were you with the time it took to process your grant application?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	49	10
Satisfied	258	53
Neither	39	8
Dissatisfied	116	24
Very dissatisfied	24	5
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 5.1: Do you think the Grants Office worked well with ...

	Numbers %			
	Yes	No	Unsure	Total
the builder?	413 - 85%	19 - 4%	54 - 11%	486 - 100%
the occupational therapist?	184 - 95%	-	10 - 5%	194 - 100%
the architect?	91 - 82%	5 - 5%	15 - 14%	111 - 100%
Building Control?	38 - 49%	5 - 6%	34 - 44%	77 - 100%
the Planning Office?	33 - 43%	5 - 6%	39 - 51%	77 - 100%
Fold?	54 - 92%	-	5 - 8%	59 - 100%

Bases: 100 (builder); 40 (OT); 23 (architect); 16 (Building Control/Planning Office); 12 (Fold)

Table 5.2: Did you receive a copy of the Annual Grants Newsletter?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	58	12
No	301	62
Don't know	127	26
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 5.3: How satisfied/dissatisfied were you with the latest edition of the Annual Grants Newsletter?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	5	8
Satisfied	48	83
Neither	5	9
Dissatisfied	-	-
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	58	100

Base: 12 (respondents received the Annual grants Newsletter)

Table 5.4: Overall, how satisfied/dissatisfied were you with the letters you received?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	136	28
Satisfied	315	65
Neither	20	4
Dissatisfied	15	3
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 5.5: Overall, do you think you were treated fairly throughout the grants process?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	462	95
No	24	5
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 5.6: Overall, do you think you were treated sensitively throughout the grants process?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	462	95
No	24	5
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 5.7: How satisfied/dissatisfied are you with the overall grants process?

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	126	26
Satisfied	311	64
Neither	19	4
Dissatisfied	20	4
Very dissatisfied	10	2
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 5.8: Suggestions that would help to improve the grants process

	Numbers	Percentages
No comment	331	68
Speed up process	60	12
Process should be simplified	40	8
Speed up payment stage	15	3
Work should be inspected at different stages	15	3
More advertisement / literature needed	10	2
Other including update list of qualified builders	15	3
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 6.1: Do you have access to the internet?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	150	31
No	336	69
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 6.2: Would you be interested in accessing grants / documentation forms via the internet?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	68	45
No	73	48
Don't know	10	7
TOTAL	150	100

Base: 31 (respondents who have access to the internet)

Table 6.3: Would you be interested in accessing grants / documentation forms by email?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	73	48
No	73	48
Don't know	5	3
TOTAL	150	100

Base: 31 (respondents who have access to the internet)

Table 7.1: Further comments about the grants process


	Numbers	Percentages
No comment	311	64
Satisfied with service	85	17
Process took too long	30	6
Grant was insufficient	15	3
Better advertisement/literature needed	15	3
Poor workmanship by builder	15	3
Other including too many forms	15	3
TOTAL	486	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Appendix 2: Comparison between 2010 and 2007 Grant Surveys


1.0 Satisfaction with Inspection Stage

There were high levels of satisfaction with the inspection stage in both surveys (98% in 2010; 98% in 2007).




2.0 Satisfaction with telephoning the Grants Office.

In 2010 a lower proportion of respondents who had telephoned the grants office were satisfied with the service they had received (85% in 2010; 100% in 2007).




3.0 Satisfaction with visiting the Grants Office

In 2010, a higher proportion of respondents were satisfied with the overall service they had received on their visit to the Grants Office (100% in 2010; 97% in 2007).



4.0 Satisfaction with letters received

Similar proportions of respondents were satisfied with the letters they had received from the Grants Office (93% in 2010; 94% in 2007).



5.0 Grants Forms

Preliminary Form

In 2010, a higher proportion of respondents felt that the Preliminary Enquiry Form had not been difficult to complete (92%; 80% in 2007).

Schedule of Works


In 2010, a higher proportion of respondents felt that the Schedule of Works package had been clear (88%; 82% in 2007).

Test of Resources Form

In 2010, a higher proportion of respondents felt that the Test of Resources Form had been clear (84%; 76% in 2007).


Approval of Grant Form

In 2010, a higher proportion of respondents felt that the Approval of Grant Form had been clear (93%; 82% in 2007). (The Approval of Grant form required only a signature and therefore respondents were not asked if it had been difficult to complete.)




6.0 Satisfaction with Payment Stage

In 2010, a higher proportion of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the payment stage of the grants process (87% in 2010; 82% in 2007).



7.0 Satisfaction with builder

In 2010, a lower proportion of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the builder who had carried out the work (86% in 2010; 93% in 2007).



8.0 Satisfaction with grants process overall

In 2010, a lower proportion of respondents said they were very satisfied/satisfied overall with the grants process (90% in 2010; 94% in 2007).

