

Derry Grants Office Customer Survey

May 2010

Table of contents

Table of contents	2
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
Telephoning the Grants Office within the previous 12 months	7
Visiting the Grants Office within the previous 12 months	8
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	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 Derry 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; and
- 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 Derry Grants Office's Customer 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 Derry Grants Office catchment area whose application had been completed during the 12 months from February 2009 to January 2010. 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 675 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 April 2010.

From an eligible population of 675 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
Disabled Facilities	298	88	44
Renovation	193	58	29
Home Repair	169	50	25
Replacement	15	4	2
TOTAL	675	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 Derry grant applicants (Table B).

Table B: Effects of Weighting

Grant Type	Achieved Interviews	Grossed by weight of	Sample Frame
Disabled Facilities	44	6.77	298
Renovation	29	6.65	193
Home Repair	25	6.76	169
Replacement	2	7.50	15
TOTAL	100	-	675

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 there is 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

More than half (55%) of respondents were aged 65 or older; 24% were between 55 and 64, 9% were between 45 and 54 and smaller proportions (5% in each case) were aged 25- 34 and 35- 44. The remaining 2% of respondents refused to state their age (Figure 1, Table 1.1).



1.2 Ethnicity of respondents

The vast majority (98%) of respondents described their ethnicity as white; 2% 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 8% described their nationality as 'Other' including Northern Irish. The remaining 2% refused to state their nationality (Table 1.3).

1.4 Household Religion

More than half (54%) of respondents described their household religion as Catholic, 34% described their religion as Protestant and 6% as mixed religion. The remaining 6% of respondents refused to state the religion of their household (Table 1.4).

1.5 Grant Type

More than two-fifths (44%) of respondents had received a disabled facilities grant, 29% had received a renovation grant, 25% had received a home repair assistance grant and 2% had received a replacement grant (Table 1.5).

2.0 Contact with Grants Office

2.1 Involvement in process

Most respondents (80%) said they had been involved in every stage of the grants process; 20% had been involved in some of the stages (Table 2.1).

2.2 Access to grants service

Most respondents (95%) said they had found the grants service easy to access. Reasons stated by the 5% of respondents who had found the service difficult to access included 'very confusing' and 'could have been explained better' (Table 2.2).

2.3 Grants officer's identification

More than four-fifths (82%) of respondents said the grants officer had given his / her name; 15% could not remember and 3% said the grants officer had not provided identification (Table 2.3).

2.4 Preliminary inspection appointment

The vast majority (92%) 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 (98%) said the appointment had been kept (Tables 2.3 and 2.4).

2.5 Explanation of 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 3, Table 2.6).

2.6 Availability of grant


More than two-thirds (69%) of respondents said the grants officer had explained whether he / she thought the grant would be available (Figure 3, Table 2.6).

2.7 Grant type

Almost three-quarters (74%) of respondents said the grants officer had advised them on the type of grant they could receive and 84% said he/she had explained the next steps in the grant application process (Figure 2, Table 2.6).

2.8 Overall satisfaction with Preliminary inspection stage

The majority of respondents (94%) were very satisfied / satisfied with the preliminary inspection stage of the process; 4% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 2% were dissatisfied (Table 2.7).



Telephoning the Grants Office within the previous 12 months

2.9 Use of telephone

More than one-third (36%) of respondents had telephoned the grants office during the previous 12 months while awaiting approval of their grant application. Of these respondents, 72% had been told the name of the person dealing with their call; 22% were unsure if they had been given a name and 6% said they had not been told the name of the person dealing with their call (Tables 2.8 and 2.9).

2.10 Staff telephone manner


All respondents (100%) who had telephoned the grants office had found the staff polite, knowledgeable and they had not felt hurried or rushed by staff dealing with their query (Table 2.10).

2.11 Ability to deal with call

Of the respondents who had telephoned the grants office (36% of all respondents), 89% 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 3, Table 2.11).

2.12 Overall satisfaction with Telephone service

Almost all respondents (97%) who had telephoned the grants office were very satisfied / satisfied with the overall service they had received; 3% were dissatisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction included: process was confusing (Table 2.12).



Visiting the Grants Office within the previous 12 months

2.13 Visiting the grants office

A small proportion (16%) of respondents had visited the grants office within the previous 12 months. Reasons included: to submit documents (75%), make a general enquiry (25%) and complete a test of resources interview (13%) (Tables 2.13 and 2.14).

2.14 Attendance at counter

More than half (56%) of those respondents who had visited the grants office (16% of all respondents) said counter staff had attended to them straight away; a further 32% said counter staff had attended to them within five minutes. Most respondents who had an appointment to see a particular member of staff (84%) said they had spoken to that member of staff within five minutes (Tables 2.15 - 2.18).

2.15 Staff identification

All respondents who had visited the grants office (16% of all respondents) said the person who dealt with their query had provided identification and that staff attending to them had been polite and knowledgeable; in addition, all respondents (100%) who had visited the office had not felt hurried or rushed by staff (Tables 2.19 and 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

All (100%) of respondents who had visited the grants office were very satisfied / satisfied with confidentiality in the grants office (Table 2.22).

2.18 Leaflets and posters

Of the 16% of all respondents who had visited the grants office, almost two-fifths (38%) had read the leaflets and posters on display in the office; all (100%) of these respondents had found the information useful and 68% had found it up-to-date (Table 2.23 and 2.24).

2.19 Access

Of those who had visited the grants office, 13% said they had a physical disability which made access to the building difficult for them. Respondents did not make any suggestions for improvement to the service when visiting the grants office (Table 2.25).

2.20 Overall satisfaction with 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 (88%) felt the preliminary form had been easy to complete; 7% had found it difficult to complete and 5% could not remember. Reasons why respondents had found the form difficult to complete included: complicated, confusing and required assistance with form (Figure 4, Table 3.1).

3.2 Schedule of Works

Similarly, a high proportion (89%) of respondents felt the Schedule of Works package had been clear; 7% could not remember and 4% felt the package had not been clear. Reasons included: found terminology difficult to understand (Figure 4, Table 3.2).


3.3 Test of Resources Form

Three-fifths (60%) of respondents had completed a Test of Resources form. Of these respondents, 80% had found the form clear; 13% could not remember and 7% felt it had been difficult to complete. Reasons included: complicated, confusing and required assistance. (NB home repair assistance grant applicants are not required to complete the Test of Resources form.) (Figure 4, Table 3.3)

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

3.4 Approval of Grant Form

Most respondents (89%) said the Approval of Grant form had been clear; 9% could not remember and 3% felt the form had not been clear. Reasons included: complicated and poorly explained (Figure 3, Table 3.4).



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

4.1 Payment stage


The majority (88%) of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the payment stage of the grants process, 3% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 9% were dissatisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction included: payment took too long (Figure 5, Table 4.1).

4.2 Builder

Similarly a high proportion (93%) of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the builder who had carried out the work, 3% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 4% were dissatisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction included: poor workmanship and builder was unreliable (Figure 4, Table 4.2).

4.3 Time to process grant

Almost three-quarters (74%) of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the length of time it had taken to process their grant application; 3% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 23% were dissatisfied (Figure 4, Table 4.3).



5.0 Communication from the Grants Office

5.1 Others involved in the grants process

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 Reasons others were involved in grants 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
- applicant's individual needs and requirements

All respondents (100%) said a builder had been involved in the grant process; fewer respondents said their occupational therapist (56%), architect (47%), Building Control (44%), Planning Office (41%) and Fold/Gable (32%) 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	675	100	-	-	675	100
Occupational Therapist	379	56	296	44	675	100
Architect	319	47	356	53	675	100
Building Control	298	44	377	56	675	100
Planning Office	278	41	397	59	675	100
Fold/Gable	217	32	458	68	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

5.3 Contact with builder

The majority (86%) of all respondents felt that the grants office had worked well with the builder; 10% 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: lack of communication and delay on payment (Figure 5.2, Table 5.1).

5.4 Occupational Therapist

The majority (86%) of respondents who had required assistance from an Occupational Therapist felt the grants office had a good working relationship with their Occupational Therapist during the grant process; 14% were unsure (Figure 5.2, Table 5.1).

5.5 Fold / Gable

Similarly, high proportions of respondents (84%) who had received assistance from Fold / Gable felt the grants office had worked well with Fold/Gable during the grant process. The remaining 16% were unsure (Figure 5.2, Table 5.1).

5.6 Architect

More than four-fifths (81%) of respondents who had required assistance from an architect felt the grants office had worked well with them during the grant process; 15% were unsure and a smaller proportion (4%) felt they had not had a good working relationship. Reasons why respondents felt the grants office had not worked well with their architect included: architect was not suitable for disabled adaptations work and had to pay for architect (Figure 5.2, Table 5.1).

5.7 Planning Service

Almost four-fifths (78%) of respondents who had required involvement from the Planning Service felt the grants office had worked well with them. The remaining 22% were unsure (Table 5.2; Appendix Table 5.1).

5.8 Building control

More than three-quarters (77%) of respondents who had required involvement from Building Control felt the grants office had worked well with them; 20% were unsure and a smaller proportion (2%) 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: lack of communication (Figure 5.2, Table 5.1).

5.9 Annual grants newsletter

Two-fifths (40%) of respondents said they had not received a copy of the Annual Grants Newsletter; 44% were unsure and 16% said they had received a copy. Of those who said they had received the newsletter, the majority (88%) were satisfied with the latest edition and 13% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Tables 5.2 and 5.3).

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

	Numbers - %			
	Yes	No	Unsure	Total
the builder?	580 - 86%	27 - 4%	67 - 10%	675 - 100%
the occupational therapist?	325 - 86%	-	54 - 14%	379 - 100%
Fold/Gable?	183 - 84%	-	34 - 16%	216 - 100%
the architect?	258 - 81%	14 - 4%	47 - 15%	319 - 100%
the Planning Service?	217 - 78%	-	61 - 22%	278 - 100%
Building Control?	231 - 77%	7 - 2%	61 - 20%	298 - 100%

Bases: 100 (builder); 56 (OT); 47 (architect); 44 (Building Control); 41 (Planning Office); 32 (Fold/Gable).

5.10 Letters


The majority (92%) of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the letters they had received from the grants office; 4% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 4% were dissatisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction included: letters were too complicated and could be simplified (Tables 5.4).

5.11 Treatment during process

Most respondents (94%) felt they had been treated fairly and 97% 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 (93%) of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied overall with the grants process. Almost one-third (31%) 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

One-quarter (25%) of respondents had access to the internet. Of these respondents, 68% said they would be interested in accessing grants forms and documentation via the internet and 72% 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, 26% were satisfied with the service provided, 4% said the process had taken too long and 4% said the grant payment had taken too long (Table 7.1).

Appendix 1: Tabular Report - Derry Grants Customer Survey

Table 1.1: Age of Respondents

	Numbers	Percentages
25-34 years	34	5
35-44 years	34	5
45-54 years	61	9
55-64 years	162	24
65+ years	371	55
Refused	13	2
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 1.2: Ethnicity of Respondents

	Numbers	Percentages
White	661	98
Refused	13	2
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 1.3: Nationality of Respondents

	Numbers	Percentages
British	306	63
Irish	166	34
Other	54	8
Refused	13	2
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 1.4: Household Religion

	Numbers	Percentages
Catholic	364	54
Protestant	230	34
Mixed Religion (Protestant/Catholic)	41	6
Refused	40	6
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 1.5: Grant Type

	Numbers	Percentages
Disabled Facilities Grant	298	44
Renovation Grant	193	29
Home Repair Assistance Grant	169	25
Replacement Grant	15	2
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes, every stage	540	80
Yes, some of the stages	135	20
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	641	95
No	33	5
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	553	82
No	20	3
Don't know/cant remember	101	15
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	621	92
No	13	2
Don't know/cant remember	41	6
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.5: Was the appointment kept?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	607	98
No	-	-
Don't know/cant remember	14	2
TOTAL	621	100

Base: 92 (respondents who had an appointment)

Table 2.6: Did the Grants Officer explain...

	Numbers %			
	Yes	No	D/K	Total
what the inspection stage entailed?	587 87%	40 6%	47 7%	675 100%
whether they thought a grant would be available?	465 69%	108 16%	102 15%	675 100%
what type of grant you could receive?	500 74%	54 8%	121 18%	675 100%
the next steps in the grants process?	567 84%	47 7%	61 9%	675 100%

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 2.7: Satisfaction with the preliminary inspection stage of process

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	323	48
Satisfied	312	46
Neither	27	4
Dissatisfied	14	2
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	675	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	243	36
No	344	51
Don't know/cant remember	88	13
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	176	72
No	13	6
Don't know/cant remember	54	22
TOTAL	243	100

Base: 36 (respondents who had contacted the grants office by telephone)

Table 2.10: Did you find the staff...

	Yes		No		Unsure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
polite?	243	100	-	-	-	-
knowledgeable?	243	100	-	-	-	-
in a hurry/rushed?	-	-	243	100	-	-

Base: 36 (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	216	89
Two staff members	13	5
Three or more staff members	7	3
Don't know/can't remember	7	3
TOTAL	243	100

Base: 36 (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	148	61
Satisfied	88	36
Neither	-	-
Dissatisfied	7	3
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	243	100

Base: 36 (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	108	16
No	553	82
Don't know/can't remember	13	2
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Submitting documents	81	75
General enquiry	27	25
Test of Resources Interview	14	13

Base: 16 (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	60	56
Within 5 minutes	34	32
More than 5 minutes but less than 10 minutes	13	12
TOTAL	108	100

Base: 16 (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	41	38
No	60	56
Don't know/can't remember	7	6
TOTAL	108	100

Base: 16 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.17: Was the appointment kept?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	41	100
No	-	-
TOTAL	41	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
Within 5 minutes	35	84
More than 5 minutes but less than 10 minutes	7	16
TOTAL	41	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	108	100
No	-	-
Don't know/can't remember	-	-
TOTAL	108	100

Base: 16 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.20: Did you find the staff...

	Yes		No		Unsure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
polite?	108	100	-	-	-	-
knowledgeable?	108	100	-	-	-	-
in a hurry/rushed?	-	-	108	100	-	-

Base: 16 (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	87	81
Helpful	21	20
Neither	-	-
Unhelpful	-	-
Very unhelpful	-	-
TOTAL	108	100

Base: 16 (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	47	43
Satisfied	61	57
Neither	-	-
Dissatisfied	-	-
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	108	100

Base: 16 (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	41	38
No	67	62
TOTAL	108	100

Base: 16 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

Table 2.24: Did you find the information...

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
useful?	41	100	-	-
up-to-date?	28	68	13	32

Base: 6 (respondents who had read any of the leaflets/posters/booklets)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	14	13
No	95	88
TOTAL	101	100

Base: 16 (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	40	37
Satisfied	68	63
Neither	-	-
Dissatisfied	-	-
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	108	100

Base: 16 (respondents who had visited the grants office)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	445	88
No	40	7
Don't know/can't remember	27	5
Sub Total	512	100
Family/friend completed form	115	
Fold completed form	34	
Builder completed form	13	
TOTAL	675	

Base: 76 (respondents who completed the Preliminary Enquiry form)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	438	89
No	27	4
Don't know/can't remember	34	7
Sub Total	499	100
Family/friend dealt with document	102	
Fold/ dealt with document	40	
Builder completed form	34	
TOTAL	675	

Base: 69 (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	324	80
No	27	7
Don't know/can't remember	54	13
Sub Total	405	100
Home Repair Assistance Grants	169	
Family/friend completed form	54	
Fold completed form	34	
Builder completed form	13	
TOTAL	675	

Base: 60 (respondents who completed the Test of Resources Form)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	479	89
No	20	3
Don't know/can't remember	47	9
Sub Total	546	100
Family/friend dealt with document	82	
Builder completed form	27	
Fold completed form	20	
TOTAL	675	

Base: 81 (respondents who dealt with the Grant Approval Document)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	148	22
Satisfied	446	66
Neither	20	3
Dissatisfied	61	9
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	675	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	398	59
Satisfied	230	34
Neither	20	3
Dissatisfied	20	3
Very dissatisfied	7	1
TOTAL	675	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	54	8
Satisfied	447	66
Neither	20	3
Dissatisfied	141	21
Very dissatisfied	13	2
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers %			
	Yes	No	Unsure	Total
the builder?	580 - 86%	27 - 4%	67 - 10%	675 - 100%
the occupational therapist?	325 - 86%	-	54 - 14%	386 - 100%
Fold/Gable?	183 - 84%	-	34 - 16%	216 - 100%
the architect?	258 - 81%	20 - 4%	47 - 15%	319 - 100%
the Planning Office?	217 - 78%	-	61 - 22%	278 - 100%
Building Control?	231 - 77%	7 - 2%	61 - 20%	298 - 100%

Bases: 100 (builder); 56 (OT); 47 (architect); 44 (Building Control); 41 (Planning Office); 32 (Fold/Gable)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	107	16
No	270	40
Don't know	297	44
TOTAL	675	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	40	38
Satisfied	54	50
Neither	13	13
Dissatisfied	-	-
Very dissatisfied	-	-
TOTAL	107	100

Base: 16 (respondents received the Annual grants Newsletter)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	208	31
Satisfied	412	61
Neither	27	4
Dissatisfied	20	3
Very dissatisfied	7	1
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	634	94
No	34	5
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	654	97
No	20	3
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Very satisfied	216	32
Satisfied	412	61
Neither	13	2
Dissatisfied	27	4
Very dissatisfied	7	1
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
No comment	466	69
Speed up process	84	12
Satisfied with service	42	6
Process should be simplified	42	6
More grants/money needed	14	2
Speed up payment stage	7	1
Other including need more grant aid and better advertisement needed	21	3
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

Table 6.1: Do you have access to the internet?

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	169	25
No	506	75
TOTAL	675	100

Base: 100 (all respondents)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	115	68
No	47	28
Don't know	7	4
TOTAL	169	100

Base: 25 (respondents who have access to the internet)

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

	Numbers	Percentages
Yes	122	72
No	47	28
TOTAL	169	100

Base: 25 (respondents who have access to the internet)

Table 7.1: Further comments about the grants process


	Numbers	Percentages
No comment	426	63
Satisfied with service	178	26
Process took too long	28	4
Payment took too long	14	2
Other including grant didn't cover total costs	28	4
TOTAL	675	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 (94% in 2010; 88% in 2007).




2.0 Satisfaction with telephoning the Grants Office.

Similar proportions of respondents were satisfied with the telephone service they had received from the Grants Office (97% in 2010; 95% in 2007).




3.0 Satisfaction with visiting the Grants Office

In 2010, all respondents were satisfied with the overall service they had received on their visit to the Grants Office; there had been a slightly lower level of satisfaction in 2007 (100% in 2010; 91% in 2007).



4.0 Satisfaction with letters received

In 2010, a slightly lower proportion of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the letters they had received (92% in 2010; 96% 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 (88%; 85% in 2007).

Schedule of Works


In 2010, a similar proportion of respondents felt that the Schedule of Works package had been clear (89%; 87% in 2007).

Test of Resources Form

In 2010, a higher proportion of respondents felt that the Test of Resources Form had been easy to complete (80%; 78% in 2007).


Approval of Grant Form

In both surveys, the same proportion of respondents felt that the Approval of Grant Form had been clear (89%; 89% 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 (88% in 2010; 84% in 2007).



7.0 Satisfaction with builder

In 2010, a higher proportion of respondents were very satisfied / satisfied with the builder who had carried out the work (93% in 2010; 88% in 2007).



8.0 Satisfaction with grants process overall

In 2010, a similar proportion of respondents said they were very satisfied/satisfied overall with the grants process (93% in 2010; 92% in 2007).

