Impact measures
Explanatory notes
March-April 2020
Overview

The data for these impact measures has been collated from submissions sent to the Centre for Excellence in Community Investment by social housing organisations up to 13 June. It covers the first six weeks of the social housing sector’s response to the Covid-19 pandemic, during March - April 2020.

In total, we had contributions from 41 social housing organisations from across the UK. The stock sizes of those contributing ranged from 400 to 125,000 homes.

As well as asking for number of homes and staff, we asked organisations to answer nine questions in total. The highest number of responses we had to one question was 40, the lowest was 27.

For most of these responses, the mean and the median are quite different, which indicates that a couple of organisations affect the mean disproportionately.

For each question, we provided guidance about the type of information we were requiring. Inevitably, different organisations used their own definitions when responding to some questions. For example, there is no standardised definition of vulnerability used across the social housing sector, so the numbers of vulnerable residents has been provided according to the definition of the individual organisation concerned. As long as each reporting organisation doesn’t change its definitions, the data trends we collate month-on-month will be valid.

One of the reasons for not applying a standardised definition to, for example, vulnerability, is that we wanted to reduce the burden on colleagues of providing the figures during a time of crisis. Another issue is that a standardised definition doesn’t exist - perhaps that is a conversation we need to be having as a sector.

To submit your data and evidence the impact we’ve made, www.ceci.org.uk/measures
Homes and staff

Homes
Total number of homes: 697,801
Number of responses: 41
Mean number of homes: 17,020
Median number of homes: 6,416
High: 125,000
Low: 400

Eight reporting organisations did not specify their number of homes, so we have used annual reports and web sites to identify the approximate number of homes for them.

Staff
Total reported: 24,683
Number of responses: 35
Mean number of staff: 705.23
Median number of staff: 303.50
High: 3,527
Low: 15

Eight reporting organisations did not specify their staff numbers, so we have used annual reports to identify these numbers. For six organisations, it was not possible to identify their staff numbers.
Welfare calls

Total calls made: 250,302
Number of responses: 40
Mean: 6,258
Median: 2,804
High: 50,350
Low: 317

We asked for the number of welfare calls made during March and April.

We didn’t stipulate a definition of a welfare call, so each reporting organisation has provided data according to their own definition.

With 40 responses, this category had the highest number of reporting organisations.

Vulnerable residents

Total identified: 121,656
Number of responses: 37
Mean: 3,288
Median: 1,705
High: 22,300
Low: 32
Homes per vulnerable resident 5.74

We asked for the number of residents identified as vulnerable during March and April.

As with the welfare calls, we didn’t stipulate a definition of vulnerability, so each reporting organisation has provided data according to their own definition of vulnerable resident.
Needing support

Mean % needing support: 26.2%
Number of responses: 30
Median: 17%
High: 75%
Low: 2.5%

We asked for the percentage of residents needing any form of support, including direct financial support, support with food, mental and physical wellbeing, advice or guidance, requests for further welfare calls and any other support.

With only 30 organisations reporting on this figure, there is a huge disparity between the highest and lowest responses. This highlights the need for more standardisation in reporting data across the sector.

Advice & guidance

Total people supported: 37,552
Number of responses: 35
Mean: 1,073
Median: 299
High: 8,579
Low: 1
Homes per advice & guidance 18.58

We asked for the number of people supported with advice and guidance during March and April.

We invited reporting organisations to include all advice and guidance sessions (including debt advice, mental and physical wellbeing, etc). The range of responses suggests that organisations gave us some, but not all, of these figures.

To submit your data and evidence the impact we’ve made, www.ceci.org.uk/measures
Food interventions

Total food interventions:  7,556
Number of responses:      34
Mean:                      222
Median:                    103
High:                      1,510
Low:                       0
Homes per food intervention: 92.35

We asked for the number of food interventions made in March and April.

We had numerous responses from organisations saying they had not included any indirect support they had provided around food. So if they referred a resident on to a local community hub or mutual aid group where they subsequently received a food parcel, this would not be included. Similarly, providing food vouchers or the means to buy food was not included.

Repeat food interventions

Mean % of households with > 1 food intervention:  27%
Number of responses:    27
Median:                  12%
High:                    96%
Low:                     0%

We asked for the percentage of households receiving food interventions more than once.

There were a low number of organisations who reported against this metric. The disparity between the median and the mean can be explained by the 96% statistic, which suggests it is an outlier.
Direct financial support

Total direct financial support: £108,545
Number of responses: 30
Mean: £3,618
Median: £960
High: £23,059
Low: £0

We asked for the amount distributed through direct financial support in March and April.

Although we asked for financial support linked with hardship funds, rent relief funds and fuel vouchers, the lack of a clear definition might have affected this figure. It does not include indirect financial support. In addition, there were only 30 responses to this question.

Risk of arrears

Total people at risk: 15,620
Number of responses: 27
Mean: 578
Median: 181
High: 5,313
Low: 3
Homes per person at risk of arrears: 44.67

We asked for the number of people identified as being at risk of arrears in March and April.

This figure might appear low at the moment, masked by residents who are on furlough or for whom the financial impact of Covid-19 has not yet hit. There was also a low count in terms of organisational responses to this number. We might expect this figure to increase as the number of unemployed residents grows.
Staff deployment

Total staff deployed: 1,950
Number of responses: 34
Mean: 57
Median: 36
High: 260
Low: 0
Redeployed staff as % of total staff: 8%

We asked for the number of staff deployed to community response roles in March and April.

There have been a range of responses to this question. Some have taken this as number of staff redeployed - those who were moved into community response roles - while others have taken it as the total number of staff in community response roles, including existing community investment staff.

Submit your data

Submission dates:
- May data: 18 June
- June data: 18 July
- July data: 18 August
- August data: 18 September
- September data: 18 October
- October data: 18 November

For further information about the impact measures or about this release, please contact:
info@ceci.org.uk
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