PURPOSE:

To provide the Committee with the preliminary results of the 2012 Tenant Survey.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Committee receives this report for information and for consideration in the development of the 2013 – 2015 Community Management Plan.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Toronto Community Housing has done tenant surveys in 2004, 2006 and 2008. Tenant surveys help Toronto Community Housing measure tenant satisfaction in general and across a number of areas.

The objective of this survey was to assess tenant satisfaction with Toronto Community Housing’s performance in key service categories including:

- Repairs and Maintenance
- Emergency repairs
- Call Centre
- Community Safety
- Value for money
- Condition of buildings and units
- Communication

By assessing and understanding performance in these areas, the survey sought to determine which of these is most strongly driving overall satisfaction, whether it be for the positive or negative, and thereby provide TCHC with actionable information on the most effective area in which to allocate resources moving forward.

At a broad level, the survey results will be used to inform current strategies, future plans and corporate-wide initiatives.

The results will be presented at the Committee meeting by Ipsos Reid, the consultants who undertook the survey for Toronto Community Housing.
Methodology

Sample size and composition:

- Representative and random sample of 1108 TCHC head of household tenants. Note: tenants living in single family homes were excluded from the survey sample.
- The data has been weighted by region, gender and age to ensure the final sample reflects the actual TCHC head of household database.
- Of the 1108 interviews conducted, 97 were completed with residents preferring to complete the survey in one of the following languages.
  - Mandarin
  - Cantonese
  - Somali
  - Russian
  - Spanish

Method: = Telephone
Fielding dates: = January 16 to February 20 2012.
Margin of error: +/-3.0%, 19 times out of twenty on overall sample.

Communications:

Toronto Community Housing is committed to building public confidence through greater public transparency. One way we will do this is by shining a bright light on all areas of the organization’s performance. That includes how we do well in some areas, and how we need to improve in other areas.

The Tenant Survey is an important public accountability tool, featuring clear and statistically-verifiable metrics about tenant perceptions about what’s working well and where things need to get better.

Toronto Community Housing will share the tenant survey results widely, with the Shareholder, elected officials (including the newly-formed housing working group led by Councillor Bailao), tenants, stakeholders, staff, media and the public, using multiple communication channels and languages.

Sharing information in this way will ensure that all interested parties understand tenant perceptions of Toronto Community Housing’s performance. That will help make sure the views of tenants are brought to bear when opinions about Toronto Community Housing are formed and decisions about the organization are made.
IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS:

The tenant survey results are valid within the margin of error cited above at an organizational level. It is possible to drill down somewhat with a reasonable margin of error but the results cannot be used to determine satisfaction at an operating unit or building level.

Undertaking the survey to determine the areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction implicitly sets up a promise that Toronto Community Housing will take action based on the results. It is necessary for us to take these results into consideration as we develop our strategic plan and work plans.

“Len Koroneos”

________________________________________
Len Koroneos
Chief Executive Officer (Interim)

Attachment: 1: Toronto Community Housing Tenant Survey 2012 – PowerPoint Presentation by Ipsos Reid
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Objectives

The objective of this survey was to assess tenant satisfaction with Toronto Community Housing’s performance in key service categories such as:

- Repairs and Maintenance
- Emergency repairs
- Call Centre
- Community Safety
- Value for money
- Condition of buildings and units
- Communication

By assessing and understanding performance in these areas, the survey sought to determine which of these is most strongly driving overall satisfaction, whether it be for the positive or negative, and thereby provide TCHC with actionable information on the most effective area in which to allocate resources moving forward.

At a broad level, the survey results will be used to inform current strategies, future plans and corporate-wide initiatives.
Methodology

Sample size and composition:

- Representative and random sample of 1108 TCHC head of household tenants. Note: tenants living in single family homes were excluded from the survey sample.
- The data has been weighted by region, gender and age to ensure the final sample reflects the actual TCHC head of household database.
- Of the 1108 interviews conducted, 97 were completed with residents preferring to complete the survey in one of the following languages.
  - Mandarin
  - Cantonese
  - Somali
  - Russian
  - Spanish

Method: = Telephone

Fielding dates: = January 16 to February 20 2012.

Margin of error: +/-3.0%, 19 times out of twenty on overall sample.

Reporting Conventions:

- Statistically significant increases in scores compared to 2008 or within subgroups scores higher than the average are denoted with ▲
- Statistically significant decreases in scores compared to 2008 or within subgroups scores lower than the average are denoted with ▼
A majority of two-thirds of tenants (67%) say they are satisfied with the delivery of services provided by Toronto Community Housing. However, a quarter of tenants (25%) say they are dissatisfied with the service, including 12% who say they are very dissatisfied.
Overall Satisfaction by Key Variables

- Tenant satisfaction varies by administrative region, tenant age, household size and whether the tenant’s building is contract or directly managed.

% Satisfied = 67% Overall

**Region**
- Central: 58%
- East: 59%
- West: 67%
- Seniors: 81%

**Gender**
- Female: 65%
- Male: 71%

**Age**
- 18-34: 45%
- 35-58: 64%
- 59+: 76%

**Rent Type**
- RGI: 68%
- Market rent: 64%

**Household Size Number**
- Single person: 73%
- 2: 67%
- 3: 64%
- 4+: 58%

**Contract Type**
- Direct: 69%
- Contract: 51%

Base: 2012 n=1108
Q3: Taking into account all of the things you view as important, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the delivery of all of the services provided by Toronto Community Housing?
When compared with the comparator group of 14 London Boroughs, TCHC has the same overall satisfaction score (67%) as the mean of these 14 areas.

- 2012 Toronto Community Housing: 67%
- 2008 London Borough mean: 67%, median 68% (N=14)

A more in-depth look at satisfaction across a number of key service aspects reveals that TCHC scores highest on *Being respectful* (77%) and *Keeping tenants informed* (73%). As the highest rated metric, the score for being respectful when dealing with tenants is particularly promising. The highest level of dissatisfaction lies with *Keeping up with regular repairs and maintenance* (32% dissatisfied) and *Keeping your building safe and secure* (28% dissatisfied).

- **Being respectful when dealing with tenants**
  - Very Satisfied: 46%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 32%
  - Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied: 5%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 9%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%
  - Benchmark: 77%

- **Keeping tenants informed about changes that affect them**
  - Very Satisfied: 38%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 35%
  - Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied: 5%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 10%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 3%
  - Benchmark: 73%

- **Keeping up the overall condition and cleanliness of the buildings**
  - Very Satisfied: 34%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 33%
  - Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied: 5%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 12%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 15%
  - Benchmark: 67%

- **Keeping up the overall condition of your unit**
  - Very Satisfied: 35%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 32%
  - Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied: 6%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 10%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 16%
  - Benchmark: 66%

- **Keeping your building safe and secure**
  - Very Satisfied: 33%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 31%
  - Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied: 6%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 10%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 18%
  - Benchmark: 64%

- **Keeping up with regular repairs and maintenance**
  - Very Satisfied: 33%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 28%
  - Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied: 5%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 12%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 20%
  - Benchmark: 61%

- **Keeping tenant views in mind when making decisions**
  - Very Satisfied: 24%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 32%
  - Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied: 10%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 11%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 15%
  - Benchmark: 56%
On every satisfaction measure, tenants living in direct managed homes are more satisfied than those living in contract managed homes. In particular, Direct Managed considerably outperforms Contract Managed on *Keeping up the overall condition and cleanliness of the buildings* (69% vs. 51% satisfied) and the overall condition of the units (69% vs. 52% satisfied). Direct managed tenants are also more positive about repairs and maintenance than contract managed tenants (64% vs. 46% satisfied). That said, it is important to note that the demographics of tenants living in Contract Managed homes skews toward younger people who tend to be less satisfied, so the differences cannot be fully attributed to the management situation.

Base: 2012 n=1108
Q4: How would you rate your satisfaction with Toronto Community Housing on each of the following?
The results of a driver analysis show that repairs and maintenance, condition of unit and value for money are the strong drivers of tenant satisfaction. Therefore, TCHC should prioritise resourcing repairs and maintenance and efforts to improve the condition of units ahead of all else.

Efforts to improve in these areas will go farther to improving tenant satisfaction than efforts in any other area.

The driver analysis also indicates that while safety and security is critically important and should be continually monitor and improved in key geographic areas and buildings where concerns about safety and security are the highest, the current level of satisfaction with safety among the full tenant base is high enough that it is not strongly affecting their overall impression of TCHC.

Should concerns about safety rise significantly in the future however it will have a dramatic negative impact on satisfaction and overall impression of the organization.

A separate analysis on seniors (59+) shows that keeping tenants informed is a stronger relative driver for this age group. As with the overall tenant group, repairs and maintenance, condition of unit, and the condition of the building are also important drivers.
As points venture further from 0 on the vertical axis, their influence on overall satisfaction is greater – whether bearing a positive relationship (increase in one = increase in the other) or negative relationship (increase in one = decrease in the other).

**TCHC Performance (mean score)**
Tenants were asked to choose up to three areas most in need of improvement, and the results show a focus on the ‘core’ services provided by TCHC. Tenants perceive the areas most in need of improvement to be *Keeping the building safe and secure* (65% mentioned), *Keeping up with regular repairs and maintenance* (55%), and *keeping up the overall condition and cleanliness of the buildings* (47%).

**Areas Perceived To Be Most In Need of Improvement**

- **Keeping your building safe and secure**: 65%
  - 1st Mention: 30%
  - 2nd Mention: 21%
  - 3rd Mention: 14%
- **Keeping up with regular repairs and maintenance**: 55%
  - 1st Mention: 23%
  - 2nd Mention: 20%
  - 3rd Mention: 12%
- **Keeping up the overall condition and cleanliness of the buildings**: 47%
  - 1st Mention: 14%
  - 2nd Mention: 17%
  - 3rd Mention: 16%
- **Keeping up the overall condition of your unit**: 30%
  - 1st Mention: 11%
  - 2nd Mention: 10%
  - 3rd Mention: 9%
- **Keeping tenants informed about changes that affect them**: 28%
  - 1st Mention: 6%
  - 2nd Mention: 9%
  - 3rd Mention: 13%
- **Keeping tenant views in mind when making decisions**: 23%
  - 1st Mention: 6%
  - 2nd Mention: 7%
  - 3rd Mention: 10%
- **Being respectful when dealing with tenants**: 20%
  - 1st Mention: 5%
  - 2nd Mention: 5%
  - 3rd Mention: 10%

*Base: 2012 n=1108
Q5: Which of the following do you consider to be the three areas most in need of improvement?*
A majority of seven in ten tenants (69%) think that the money they spend on rent is good or very good value. As could be expected, RGI tenants (72%) are more likely than Market Rent tenants (58%) to believe they get good value for money for their rent.

**Very good value**
- 37%

**Somewhat good value**
- 33%

**Neither good nor poor value**
- 7%

**Somewhat poor value**
- 11%

**Very poor value**
- 10%

**(DK/NS)**
- 2%

% Good Value = 69%

London average 66%

Q7: Thinking about all of the services you receive from Toronto Community Housing, would you say that overall you get good value or poor value from the money you spend on rent?
The proportion of tenants who think that the overall condition and cleanliness of their building is good or very good stands at 64%, and has risen 10 percentage points since 2008. Only 15% of tenants say that the condition and cleanliness of their building is poor or very poor.

- **Very Good**: 26%
- **Good**: 38%
- **Fair**: 20%
- **Poor**: 8%
- **Very Poor**: 7%

Rebased to exclude Don’t know response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Very/Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base**: 2012 n=1108 (excluding don’t know responses to match tracking)

**Q9**: Taking everything into consideration, how would you rate the overall condition and cleanliness of your building / complex?
Key Areas of Condition and Cleanliness

- Tenant perceptions of the condition and cleanliness of their building has increased in a number of areas since 2008. Two thirds (67%) now rate the exterior condition of the buildings as very or somewhat good, compared to just 53% in 2008. The rating of common areas (up 16% since 2008) and elevators (up 9% since 2008) also show considerable improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety Systems (n=1099)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior (n=1088)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage and Recycling Area (n=1090)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot/Garage (n=799)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Areas (n=1029)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Areas (n=1029)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Room (n=943)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators (n=874)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rebased to exclude Don’t know response

Base: 2012 Bases: vary based on exclusion of don’t know or not applicable mentions <4% not shown
Q8: How would you rate the current condition and cleanliness of your building/ complex’s?
Improvements can also be seen with the overall condition of apartments when compared to previous years. In 2006, only 50% of tenants rated the condition of their apartment as very good or good, and this now stands at 65% overall.

**Q12**: Taking everything into consideration, how would you rate the overall condition of your apartment/unit?
Six in ten tenants (62%) rate the overall quality of service for non-emergency repairs as being very good or good, compared to only two in ten (19%) who would rate this as poor or very poor. Those living in seniors housing (78%) are more satisfied with the service than other regions, and RGI tenants are more satisfied (64%) than market rent tenants (46%) in this regard.
Specific Rating of Non-Emergency Repairs

- TCHC has shown improvement on specific aspects of the non-emergency repairs service. In particular, three quarters (75%) of tenants who requested repairs now say that it is easy to request repairs, compared to only 57% in 2008. Two thirds (66%) say the repairs are done properly, up 12 percentage points from 54% in 2008, and a full eight in ten (80%) say that the maintenance staff are helpful and respectful, an increase of 11% points since 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to request repairs (n=877)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The maintenance staffs clean up before the leave (n=866)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EasyTrac is an easy / helpful way to check the status of your...</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The repairs are done properly (n=870)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The repairs are done when you are told they will be done (n=875)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 2012 base numbers are in the brackets (excludes don’t knows or not applicable).
Q20: Thinking of general maintenance or repairs in your apartment or unit, do you agree or disagree that...
Overall Rating of Emergency Repairs

- The overall rating of emergency repairs has decreased recently, down seven percentage points to 55% overall saying that it is very good or good. The rating of emergency repairs is consistent across demographic groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rebased to exclude Don't know response

*Base: 2012 made an emergency request in past 12 months n=470
Q15: Taking everything into consideration, how would you rate the overall quality of service related to emergency repairs to your apartment or unit.*
Two thirds of tenants (66%) rate the overall safety of their community as good or very good, compared to 14% who believe this to be poor or very poor.

- Very Good: 31%
- Good: 35%
- Fair: 18%
- Poor: 6%
- Very Poor: 8%
- Don't know: 1%

%Very/ Good = 66%
Safety Issues in the Community

- When asked about specific safety issues, *Drunk and Rowdy Behaviour* emerges as the most prominent issue, with 29% of tenants identifying this as a very big problem or somewhat big problem in their community.

### Drunk or Rowdy Behaviour

- **Very Big Problem:** 14% (London: 16%)
- **Somewhat Big Problem:** 14% (London: -)
- **Not A Very Big Problem:** 23% (London: 20%)
- **Not A Problem At All:** 44% (London: 47%)

### Other Crimes

- **Very Big Problem:** 13% (London: 15%)
- **Somewhat Big Problem:** 12% (London: -)
- **Not A Very Big Problem:** 20% (London: 25%)
- **Not A Problem At All:** 47% (London: 49%)

### Vandalism/Graffiti to Common Areas

- **Very Big Problem:** 11% (London: 15%)
- **Somewhat Big Problem:** 14% (London: -)
- **Not A Very Big Problem:** 21% (London: 25%)
- **Not A Problem At All:** 49% (London: 52%)

### Pets and Animals

- **Very Big Problem:** 11% (London: 13%)
- **Somewhat Big Problem:** 12% (London: -)
- **Not A Very Big Problem:** 22% (London: 23%)
- **Not A Problem At All:** 52% (London: 56%)

### Disruptive Children / Teenagers

- **Very Big Problem:** 9% (London: 19%)
- **Somewhat Big Problem:** 13% (London: -)
- **Not A Very Big Problem:** 19% (London: 17%)
- **Not A Problem At All:** 51% (London: 57%)

### People Damaging Your Property

- **Very Big Problem:** 12% (London: 19%)
- **Somewhat Big Problem:** 8% (London: -)
- **Not A Very Big Problem:** 19% (London: 15%)
- **Not A Problem At All:** 57% (London: 56%)

### Neighbour Disputes

- **Very Big Problem:** 13% (London: 20%)
- **Somewhat Big Problem:** 0% (London: -)
- **Not A Very Big Problem:** 20% (London: 56%)
- **Not A Problem At All:** 56% (London: 52%)

### Racial or other harassment

- **Very Big Problem:** 7% (London: 19%)
- **Somewhat Big Problem:** 9% (London: -)
- **Not A Very Big Problem:** 19% (London: 61%)
- **Not A Problem At All:** 61% (London: 52%)

### Index: None = 38%, 1-3 = 41%, 4-6 = 16%, 7-9 = 5%

**Base:** 2012 all respondents n=1108, London = N=22,251 Tenants in London

**Q24:** To what extent are any of the following a problem in your community?
More tenants say their community is safer than it was two years ago (33%) than those who think it has become less safe (19%). Half (48%) believe it is about the same. This is a significant change from the situation in 2008, when tenants were more likely to believe that their community was becoming less safe (28% compared with 22% saying it was safer).
One in five tenants (20%) have requested assistance from TCHC safety and security services in the past year. Younger tenants aged 18-34 are most likely to have requested this assistance (31% compared to 13% of those aged 59+).
Two thirds of tenants (68%) rate the quality of service of the TCHC call centre as very good or good, an improvement of 8 percentage points since 2008 and 18 percentage points since 2006. Rating of the TCHC call centre is broadly consistent across demographic groups.

- **Very Good**: 31%
- **Good**: 37%
- **Fair**: 17%
- **Poor**: 9%
- **Very Poor**: 6%
The call centre experience is highly rated across a number of aspects. Eight in ten (82%) say that the person who answered their call was polite and respectful, and three quarters (75%) agree that the person who answered their call was able to explain the next steps. Perception of the wait time was slightly mixed, with a quarter of callers (25%) saying that their wait time was not acceptable, compared to 66% who agreed that it was.
Community Pride and Advocacy

- On community pride, a measure that has traditionally been used as an overall metric, three quarters now say they are proud to live in their neighbourhood, up 5 percentage points from 2008. Seven in ten also agree that they have a strong sense of belonging to my community (68%), and that they would recommend Toronto Community Housing to others as a great place to live (69%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong sense of belonging to my community</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to live in my neighbourhood</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not apply/DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend Toronto Community Housing to others as a good place to live</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not apply/DK</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 2012 n=1108
Q47: Do you agree or disagree with the following?
Advocacy

- Half of Toronto Community Housing tenants would speak positively about the organization if they were asked, compared to only 7% who would say something negative. RGI tenants (49% compared to 38% market rent) and direct managed tenants (49% compared to 34% contract managed) are more positive about TCHC.

![Bar chart showing responses to the question: If you and your neighbours in your local community were asked about Toronto Community Housing, would you...?](chart)

- Speak positively about the organization: 47%
- Hope that others speak positively about the organization, but I would not speak out myself: 7%
- Be neutral - offering some positives and negatives: 32%
- Hope that others speak negatively about the organization, but I would not speak out myself: 2%
- Speak negatively about the organization: 7%
- (DK/NS): 5%

**Base:** 2012 all respondents n=1108

Q48. If you and your neighbours in your local community were asked about Toronto Community Housing, would you...?
Recall of the Media Coverage about TCH

- Only half of tenants (51%) say they have heard or read anything about Toronto Community Housing in the media or on the news. Of these tenants, two thirds believe (64%) that the coverage has been negative compared to only three in ten (29%) who say the coverage has been positive. Younger tenants (81% negative), market rent tenants (75%), and those living in Central district (73%) are the most likely to have picked up on negative news stories.
Ensuring Equal Treatment

- TCHC scores highly on ensuring equal treatment, with eight in ten tenants (81%) saying they are satisfied with efforts made to help make sure all people are equally valued and fairly treated. However, two in ten (20%) are dissatisfied with this, suggesting some room for improvement. A third of younger tenants (33%) are dissatisfied in this regard, compared to only 12% of seniors.

Base: 2012 all respondents n=1084
Q51. Overall, how satisfied are you with Toronto Community Housing’s efforts to help make sure all people are equally valued and fairly treated? Are you…

Rebased to exclude Don't know response