

Summary of approach - Tenant Satisfaction Measures 2025

a	Summary of achieved sample size (number of responses)	We surveyed 18,602 residents, including those in low-cost rented accommodation (LCRA) and low-cost home ownership (LCHO) homes. We received 5,198 responses from our LCRA homes and 375 from our LCHO homes.
b	Timing of the survey	Our Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSM) survey was conducted over a two-week period from 15 September to 26 September 2025. This defined window allowed for multiple contact attempts at various times and days, including weekends, ensuring residents had several opportunities to participate where initial engagement was unsuccessful. This approach is consistent year on year for PA Housing, with the same two key survey weeks used annually. Maintaining this fixed period supports comparability of results over time and provides a reliable basis for tracking changes in resident satisfaction.
c	Collection Methods	The primary method of data collection followed the TSM summary of approach principles, with a strong emphasis on direct, face-to-face engagement. Colleagues systematically visited every property within the survey area, knocking on residents' front doors and conducting surveys on the doorstep where residents were willing to participate. In total, 18,602 homes were visited, and due to initial unsuccessful contact attempts, a programme of repeat visits resulted in a total of 30,537 door knocks. This approach supported inclusivity and maximised response rates by providing residents with an immediate and accessible opportunity to engage. It also ensured that residents with disabilities or vulnerabilities were able to participate in a way that suited their needs. In addition, 148 residents chose to complete their survey via internet at their request, recognising and reflecting our tailored and responsive approach to supporting those with additional needs. Where initial contact was not successful, a structured programme of follow-up visits was undertaken. These repeat door knocks ensured that residents who were unavailable at the first

		attempt were given further opportunities to take part. In cases where residents indicated a willingness to participate but were time-constrained during the initial visit, appointments were arranged for a more convenient time. Responses were primarily captured using a mobile application installed on colleagues' phones. This digital approach proved to be efficient and reliable across the majority of locations, enabling real-time data capture and reducing the need for subsequent data entry. While a small number of areas experienced poor Wi-Fi connectivity, this did not significantly impact the overall process. In such instances, paper copies of the survey were used as a contingency, with responses later uploaded to the system. The mobile devices, supported by battery backup packs, consistently maintained sufficient charge throughout each working day, ensuring uninterrupted delivery. As the project introduced new, internally provided technology, a pilot phase was implemented to test and refine the approach. This pilot took place over a one-week period commencing 18–22 August and covered a small, representative area. The aim was to assess usability, connectivity, and overall operational effectiveness before full rollout.
d	Sample Method	A 'Census' approach, where all households were invited to participate in the survey, was adopted. Colleagues from across the business were split into 65 Neighbourhood patches, which reflected our housing management model. Each neighbourhood team was led by a Neighbourhood Co-ordinator (NC) supported by volunteers from across the business, with approximately 143 colleagues taking part in the exercise.
e	Summary of the assessment of representativeness of the sample	We adopted a 100% census approach to our collection

f	Weighting applied	No weighting has been applied.
g	The role of any named external contractor(s) in collecting, generating, or validating the reported perception measures	None – the entire process was managed and delivered in-house
h	The number of tenant households within the relevant population that have not been included in the sample frame due to exceptional circumstances, with a broad rationale for their removal	None of our homes were omitted due to exceptional circumstances;
i	Reasons for any failure to meet the required sample size requirements	Not applicable. The sample size requirements were met.
j	Type and amount of any incentives offered to tenants to encourage completion	There were no incentives offered.
k	Any other methodological issues likely to have a material impact on the TSMs being reported	None.