Make, buy… or share?

Sharing services

Collins
Corporate Solutions

September 2014

Sharon Collins, HouseMark Associate

Contents

Thank you

We would particularly like to thank all those who contributed to this paper for their time, interest and insight into shared service collaborations:

Nigel Ireland, Barcud Shared Services

Mia Clay, DCH and West Devon Homes

Brendan Ryan, East Kent Housing

John Morrison and **Lisa Mason**, Wakefield and District Housing

Gareth Lewis, Watford Community Housing Trust

Thanks also to our Project Team: **Ross Fraser**, **Samantha McGrady**, **Wendy Small** and **Georgina Pickerill** at HouseMark.

Finally, **thanks goes to you** for taking time to read and reflect on this thought leadership paper and for joining our conversation, visit www.housemark.co.uk and read our blog or tweet #CollaborateDebate

Make, buy… or share?

Introduction

The model of social housing is changing. The continuing challenges of austerity and reform require the housing sector to find new solutions to increasingly complex problems if it is to continue to drive cost savings, efficiencies and better sweat *all* assets, to lever more for less resource.

This paper suggests that the shape of the social housing sector appears illogical and argues the need to rethink how we generate greater social value if we are to deliver on value for money by working more collaboratively – putting aside our guilty pleasure of existing boundaries and service delivery models.

It provides thought leadership through illustration of ‘early adopters’ and research upon which to begin a conversation with sector leaders, to enable the next generation of regional collaborative service delivery models, utilising the tax efficiencies of cost sharing groups, as a key enabler of transformational change.

So I invite you to join ‘the conversation’ and be part of co-creating new collaborative solutions, to build business and service resilience and ultimately free up capacity to boost the supply of affordable housing.

Join the conversation by using the hashtag #CollaborateDebate on Twitter

Sharon Collins
September 2014

The model of social housing that has existed for the last 25 years is changing. The operating environment is characterised by uncertainty and challenge. Thriving, or at the very least, surviving this 'new state of normal' is already requiring social housing organisations to find new solutions to increasingly complex problems, and in turn, develop a more commercial approach to running social businesses.

We're beginning to see the start of this through business diversification, for-profit entrants, the purchase of commercial businesses to generate surpluses - all signalling the evolution of the next generation of service delivery models.

Strategic choice

The publication of the CIH's paper 'Going to Market'[1] in March 2013 provided a timely think piece from which to begin a conversation in the sector, around the consideration of alternative delivery models as viable strategic options in driving efficiency and effectiveness to protect potentially vulnerable front line services to residents. Outsourcing and shared service delivery models, which can leverage greater value and wider social gain, do indeed provide real and credible delivery opportunities.

However, they are very different beasts. Whilst the principle of outsourcing (coupled with the more recent trend of insourcing) is more commonly understood across the sector, relatively little is known about the strengths and weaknesses of a collaborative, shared service approach as a route to achieving competitive advantage and securing business resilience.

The state of shared services in social housing

Original research pieces by HACT[2] and the Northern Housing Consortium[3] both found that the key driver of appetite for shared provision centred around value for money, efficiency, and driving delivery of high quality effective service. And yet, with the exception of a small number of examples – such as East Kent Housing, Northern Shared Services[4], Barcud Shared Services[5], DCH and West Devon Homes[6] and the Watford and Thrive apprenticeship shared service[7] - shared service activity within the housing industry is generally underdeveloped[8], being predominantly led by non-asset holding local authorities discharging their statutory housing duties (including revenue and benefits) via geographically bounded shared arrangements with neighbouring local authorities[9].

---

[1] CIH Going to Market 2013 - http://bit.ly/1wa9x6r

[2] HACT – Collaborate 2: Sustaining diversity through clustering (2010)

[3] Northern Housing Consortium in association with CustomerPlus – 'Shared Services in Social Housing'

[4] Wakefield District Housing and Together Housing Group repairs collaboration

[5] A four way shared internal audit service between Bron Afon, Merthyr Valleys Homes, NPT Homes and V2C

[6] http://bit.ly/1r7eHvD

[7] http://bit.ly/1psxEHN

[8] HouseMark benchmarking data; CBI – Improving homes, Improving lives (2012)

[9] LGA 2014 www.local.gov.uk - examples include Northamptonshire/Cambridgeshire LGSS; Preston and Lancaster Revenue and Benefits shared service etc

It is difficult, therefore, for the sector to understand the benefits sharing brings, without understanding a little more about what shared services are, and perhaps just as importantly, what they are not.

Unlike outsourcing or mergers, operational control and ownership of shared service ventures are retained and shared across the partnership. Partners retain their independent identities and can typically have equitable stakes in the shared business and in decision making, whilst benefiting from pooled resources, surpluses and efficiencies gained.

A key enabler has been the 20% VAT savings introduced by the Finance Act 2012 for Cost Sharing Group exemptions[10].

The exemption applies when two or more organisations join together on a co-operative basis to form a separate, independent entity or a cost sharing group (CSG), to supply themselves with certain services at cost and exempt from VAT. The exemption applies to 'directly necessary' supplies of certain qualifying services that are made by the representative member of the CSG to other members of the CSG.

Shared service arrangements can therefore provide effective solutions for the delivery of both back office and front line service provision.

Because let's be honest, if we were organising how best to deliver social housing provision and starting with a blank sheet of paper, we wouldn't come up with anything close to the existing arrangements.

The **East Kent Housing** experience is particularly interesting. Four district councils of Shepway, Thanet, Canterbury and Dover (comprising a range of political party controls) formed a 'super ALMO (Arm's Length Management Organisation)' in April 2011 to deliver housing management and associated services. With an annual turnover of approximately £9m, their first year's performance outturn in 2011/12 adds significant weight to the success of this form of collaboration, with savings of £702k against a target of £232k.

And two years later the partnership continues to generate annual operating savings of around £200-300K per year with more to come. Performance improvements are typified by rent arrears which have reduced by £500k during the current climate of recession and reform, relet times down from 30 days to 21 days, and satisfaction ratings up 4% (to 98%) over the life of the partnership.

"The set-up investment was in the region of £450k plus staff time and legal fees shared between the four authorities. We achieved some initial, easy early wins in terms of economies of scale of bringing four into one, and now continue with an ambitious savings programme of £750K over the next three years, plus an additional 15% efficiency target per annum.

"Our increased scale has enabled us to make substantial procurement savings – a £1m saving on gas, £100K on kitchens and bathrooms achieved so far but with significant potential for further savings in the future - although aligning the procurement of four different councils has occasionally been problematic. Our plans to move to a common IT platform will allow further operational efficiencies.

[10] The introduction of a new Group 16 to Schedule 9 of the VAT Act 1994. More info: http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/briefs/vat/brief2312.htm

"Whilst there have been a number of constraints around the pace of change, there is no doubt that there are further opportunities for us to reduce costs, while improving and extending the services that we provide to our tenants." Brendan Ryan, Chief Executive, East Kent Housing.

Barcud Shared Services is a shared internal audit service based in South Wales. It was created in 2012 by Bron Afon Community Housing, Merthyr Valleys Homes, NPT Homes and Valleys to Coast Housing to provide a more tailored, cost effective and value-adding Internal Audit service than they had previously received. They share a Head of Internal Audit and Internal Audit Officer who work closely with each organisation, enabling them not only to save money, but to learn from each other and share good practice. The service is hosted by Valleys to Coast Housing, based in Bridgend, with costs split between the partners. It is overseen by a consortium committee to ensure its scrutinising role is not compromised. Robust quality controls in line with international standards are in place to ensure a lean, cost-effective service that remains impartial and independent.

In April 2013**, Wakefield and District Housing** joined forces with **Together Housing Group** to launch **Northern Shared Services (NSS)** – the housing sector's first major repairs cost sharing group.

The aim of the partnership is to:

- generate VFM efficiencies through economies of scale
- reduce the cost per property of property maintenance services
- create market opportunity for growth and expansion of core services across the North of England
- provide a platform which strengthens service resilience by increasing market share whilst minimising the risks associated with commercial diversification and growth
- enable partners to maximise skills and core competencies of their talented workforce creating career opportunities, greater job security and motivation.

Through incremental growth, NSS now provides responsive repairs (and in some areas gas servicing) to 10,400 homes in Sheffield, Wakefield and parts of Yorkshire. The five-year partnership has not only improved customer service, but also generated efficiency savings for both landlords. Headline results in year one include:

- completed 8,500 responsive repairs
- repaired and maintained 210 void properties
- completed 1400 gas services
- reduced property maintenance overheads per property in 2013 by 8.5% from £69.82 to £63.87
- increased its operational footprint from 350 to 1630 square miles
- generated £1.5m addition revenue – returning a contribution of £150k towards the trading surplus.

Year two plans include:

- continued expansion as a result of increasing market interest from other organisations wanting to join the cost sharing group
- revenue target in excess of £4.5m, generating added value of some £1.25m for reinvestment across the partnership – with the potential to increase this still further across Yorkshire and Humberside
- property services will increase by 30% to nearly 42,000 homes creating a substantial foothold in a number of new markets
- an increased operational footprint to 5000 square miles
- creation of 27 new multi-trade posts.

DCH (previously Devon and Cornwall Housing) and **West Devon Homes** are working together in a shared-services partnership that is acheiving dramatic value-for-money savings and improvements for customers, while delivering ongoing savings of at least £436,000 over the next five years.

The shared arrangement allows West Devon Homes to gain the support and expertise of the largest regional social housing provider, enabling operational improvements to be rapidly delivered, while DCH increases the geographic density of its operations, improving customer services to DCH residents in the partnership area.

The arrangement recognises that smaller organisations need access to quality and scale, and larger organisations need to generate efficiencies, use their resources effectively, and manage geographical spread.

The partnership is based on two core principles: the improvement of quality and standards for all customers, and delivering value for money and efficiency. Benefits have already been realised in combined customer services, and the reinvestment of savings back into local services, including an increased focus on resident involvement across the 3,000 jointly managed homes.

In April 2013 we saw the emergence of **'Jobs at home – Three Rivers and Watford'** a social enterprise providing jobs for out of work tenants created through collaboration between Watford **Community Housing Trust** and **Thrive Homes**. The enterprise was initiated with the support of the Housing Leadership Foundation. Initially focused on providing a redecorations service in some of the 9,000 homes owned by the two landlords, the scope has expanded over the last year to include aids and adaptations, a handyperson service and support for Watford's own in-house repairs team.

"We knew that there was opportunity to use our collective buying power to generate greater social value and build critical mass" said Gareth Lewis, Director of Operations, Watford Community Housing Trust. *"We joined forces with Thrive Homes to take advantage of Cost Saving Group VAT exemptions, whilst transforming the way we delivered services through lean process redesign, targeting job creation for unemployed tenants.*

"Whilst productivity took time to build, we supported tenants who had previously been unskilled, long term unemployed or partially employed on zero hours contracts, to develop and hone their skills and reorientate their approach to work with personalised support.

"Our collaborative success has also attracted B3Living to join the venture in April 2014 extending the scope of services to include grounds maintenance and clearance.

"The model has been so successful – in creating jobs and savings of around 30% savings against previous spend - that it has now been replicated with creation last year of Jobs at Home South East – a partnership between Croydon Churches and Amicus Horizon, again established with the support of the Housing Leadership Foundation" Gareth concluded.

Pros and cons of sharing

As the above examples suggest, there are clear benefits to sharing.

Whilst one of the central drivers has always been to reduce costs and make work processes more efficient, the benefits and driving forces to share have moved away from a pure cost focus to increasingly achieving greater added value. Demonstrable benefits therefore also include:

- increased service resilience, particularly in a climate where budgets are being squeezed, and back office services downsized
- professionalisation of the service which is shared; ie back office, allowing a 'front line' focus on core services to improve the quality of outcomes for residents
- added value through increased productivity and capability
- opportunities to upgrade technology as a shared investment
- shared risk
- improved management information to inform investment and delivery decisions, a spin-off of which is improved transparency in local communication
- surplus and efficiency savings are retained and reinvested for social purpose (as opposed to shareholder gain which would be the outcome of outsourcing to the private sector)
- greater transparency and scrutiny of services by residents across the partnership
- enables greater resource flexibility, levering greater value for money
- provides opportunities to explore the synergies of cultural dynamics outside formal group structures generating more shared service ideas/opportunities for the future.

But for some, it's not all plain sailing. There have been well publicised 'howlers' within the media – not least of which is highlighted by the 2012 National Audit Office report[11] detailing the failure by some central government departments to engage with the Government's shared service agenda which, despite significant cost and effort, failed to realise planned benefits.

Because shared service arrangements are based on a climate of trust between parties, there can be a number of pitfalls and risks to navigate. These include:

- lack of understanding, awareness, and difficulty in finding a suitable partner
- lack of strategic appetite
- leadership and cultural issues such as fears over loss of autonomy, power, lack of buy-in and visible commitment and transparency between parties etc
- system and process interface issues and lack of inter-operability
- inertia and poor project management escalating start up investment costs; and

[11] National Audit Office - Efficiency & reform in government corporate functions through shared service centres 2012

- poor communication between parties.

But despite these potential risks, there continues to be a number of driving forces and opportunities to be gained from greater collaboration.

Forward focus on collaborative advantage

There is a sustained drive by Government to tip the balance in favour of greater collaboration. The CIH report[12] rightly highlights that VAT exemption introduced in autumn 2012 for Cost Sharing Groups (previously VAT charges were cited by the sector as a real barrier[13] to sharing) has provided a driver for change, with Ministers providing further incentivised local authority collaboration via a £410m Transformational Challenge Award fund[14] following the success of the Troubled Families Programme[15], which demonstrates how services can be improved by building them around what people want and need, not how agencies want to organise themselves.

The fund was originally inspired by the success of the West London Tri-Borough initiative[16] which is on track to deliver £43m efficiency savings by 2015/16 – exceeding the original estimate of £40m. The three councils are sharing £300 million of services, cutting management costs in these areas by half. Savings made from this alliance have helped keep respective council tax charges amongst the lowest in the country. The shared provision comprises:

- Hammersmith and Fulham London Borough Council and Kensington and Chelsea London Borough Council share a single chief executive[17];
- Children's services, libraries and adult social care are combined across all three boroughs;
- A number of corporate overheads are combined, including ICT and HR;
- There are combined facilities management and managed services contracts;
- Environment and leisure services are combined across the two boroughs of H&F and RBKC, including leisure, highways, and transport; and
- Work is currently underway to further combine corporate services across the three councils.

It will be interesting to understand the Homes and Community Agency's (HCA) view over time in challenging the absolute and comparative effectiveness and efficiency of existing service delivery models. Although it is currently silent on dictating terms of organisational form, business models, allocation of resources or operating structures, it does have a very clear stance around leverage and maximising the return on investment across *all* assets. The sector will be unable to hide behind regression analysis[18] findings to explain away significant cost variances forever.

---

[12] CIH Going to Market 2013 - http://bit.ly/1wa9x6r

[13] Northern Housing Consortium in association with CustomerPlus – 'Shared Services in Social Housing'

[14] Announced in April 2014 funding rewards local authorities that redesign services around the needs of local people and cut long-term costs. More information here; http://bit.ly/1rObKq2

[15] DCLG and DWP introduced separate programmes to support so-called 'troubled families' in 2012, respectively aiming to 'turn around' 120,000 families and move 22% of those associated with the programme into employment by March 2015

[16] A Tri-borough initiative comprising Westminster City Council, Hammersmith and Fulham London Borough Council and Kensington and Chelsea London Borough Council

[17] LGA analysis identifies that at May 2014 there are already 40 local councils sharing a Chief Executive - http://www.local.gov.uk/shared-services-map

[18] HCA – Understanding Unit costs of Housing Providers – regression analysis 2012

It could be argued therefore that it will be increasingly difficult to justify in the short to medium term strategic options which don't at least explore whether collaborative advantage would provide a step change in organisational capacity and capability.

Learning from the public sector

Looking outside the immediate social housing market, shared provision is commonplace, and embraces a multitude of quasi 'public' provision spanning central/local government, police, fire, ambulance, NHS, Higher and Further Education sectors as well as the wider commercial market.

Analysis of shared activity at a local authority level demonstrates significant uptake, with at least 337 councils engaged in 383 shared arrangements generating an estimated £357m efficiency savings[19]- up £86m on 2013 delivery - and this trend is set to continue. Research by Ipsos Mori[20] (2011) found that 98% of senior local government executives surveyed said the future must include greater collaboration. 94% had plans to share further front line services including 33% intending to share housing services provision. Although Local Authority shared provision across all services was estimated by respondents to generate efficiency savings of up to 15%, return of this scale does not come without effort. Respondents recognised that whilst sharing is hard to deliver, 84% agreed that the long term rewards far outweighed short term challenges.

Sharing provision within the public sector is strong because there are a larger number of organisations in close proximity to each other, the economy is tough, they are all carrying out the same or very similar processes, delivering services to similar social groups and all facing similar problems. Is this really very different from housing associations?

The CIH reaffirms through its own research[21], supported by regression analysis by the HCA[22] as well as HouseMark data,[23] that most variances in costs between housing associations are unexplained, suggesting significant scope for savings both in back office/transactional services and front line provision – all areas where local government in general has already had reasonable success.

With over 2,000 housing associations/groups operational in the UK,[24] can associations operating shoulder–to-shoulder within regions really argue the case for the most effective use of resource when their neighbouring housing provider has similar core values, strategic intent and shared ambition to do its very best for local communities? Indeed, shared service vehicles may be a way of achieving more joined up approaches to social housing delivery without having to tackle difficult issues around ownership/ stock swaps.

Taken within the context of the new operating environment with all its challenges and difficulties, the shape of the housing association sector appears illogical, unable to sustain current

[19] Local Government Association 2014 – http://bit.ly/1qqQgNo

[20] Ipsos Mori – Browne Jacobson Shared Services Survey of Local Authorities 2011

[21] CIH – Does Size Matter – or does culture drive VFM 2011

[22] HCA – Understanding Unit costs of Housing Providers – regression analysis 2012

[23] HouseMark – Overheads Detailed Overheads 2012

[24] www.housingnet.co.uk

operating models, structures and traditional service boundaries for the long term, and thus jeopardising the purpose of the sector.

We need a paradigm shift in thinking about the core purpose of a housing organisation as a thriving community business.

For example:

Traditional thinking would define a landlords' core purpose in terms of process – ie collecting the rent, carrying out repairs, managing neighbourhoods etc. Organisations with this mindset and business culture may perhaps find it difficult to be persuaded of the benefits sharing can bring.

On the other hand, organisations who define their purpose in terms of the outcomes that they are trying to deliver or facilitate – ie improve life chances, build vibrant communities, provide decent places to live, ensure customers are appropriately supported, are likely to be more open to new thinking about how these might be delivered.

We must be innovative … but are we ready?

Despite the apparent illogicality, market intelligence suggests our current response as a sector has been to continue to deploy tried and tested approaches, including outsourcing/insourcing and merger and acquisition (M&A) strategies, to achieve economies of scale, despite evidence suggesting this approach doesn't necessarily deliver the efficiency gains required or indeed guarantee improvement[25].

Intelligence suggests that M&A activity would appear to have moved from being opportunistic (predominantly based on senior executive personal contacts and relationships) to having more of a strategic objective, but given the co-regulatory nature of the HCA's approach coupled with the increasing financial risk of very big, potentially unwieldy groupings too large to rescue in the event of collapse, will Boards and residents continue to be comfortable being 'swallowed up' as part of successive groupings, and eventually losing their 'local' feel and focus?

Although there are examples in the housing association sector of stock swapping and sales, and whilst no-one would argue that the sector has been reasonably successful in developing local (particularly Joint Venture) development partnerships with others, it would nevertheless appear that many associations are reticent about developing collaborative activity between 'competing' service providers, despite delivering the same services in the same neighbourhoods. What residents want is simple. They want local services, delivered by local people in jobs which support the local economy. They want to retain control of service quality and cost, and have a real say in how services are delivered.

There is a live decision for the housing sector to debate whether we continue to make or buy … or share services for the public good. The debate on whether or not we can collectively begin to better work together at a regional/sub regional basis to meet the challenges we face is indeed now centre stage.

[25] CIH – Does size matter – or does culture drive VFM 2011

Realising opportunities

The social housing sector is already comfortable and familiar with the principle of local authorities transferring stock in order to free it up to get on with its strategic role, leaving the management of homes to others in the marketplace, but when we begin to apply this principle to, say, sharing back office arrangements between neighbouring organisations to enable us to focus on our core [housing] business, we seem to go cold.

Perhaps it's because, as Donald Rumsfeld infamously said[26] sometimes we simply *"… don't know what we don't know*".

It can be argued that future advantage will go to organisations which can stimulate and support business-to-business collaboration as a lever to both secure and maximise the return across all assets of the business. But to do this, the sector not only needs to think differently about its strategic options, but also to use its collective intelligence to better understand what market conditions and opportunities exist to enable a collaborative market to flourish.

A collaborative approach is attractive within our current operating environment as it offers relatively rapid, low cost and flexible start-up opportunities to redefine service delivery arrangements – in contrast to the high cost and restrictive requirements of strategy based on M&A activity.

However, whilst there is a mass of research debating the barriers, success factors and pitfalls of collaborative practice, there's little evidence of the pre-requisite market conditions. Indeed, seminal research by Todeva and Knoke (2005)[27] provides one of less than a handful of studies which attempt to explain, amongst other traits, the motives of organisations forming collaborative partnerships.

Whilst limited, research suggests that pre-requisite **market** conditions to collaborate typically fall into four categories:

1. *There are clear cut economic drivers* – where organisations need to achieve significant cost reduction and/or efficiencies but lack the economies of scale to achieve it; usually accompanied with a drive to reduce financial risks
2. *There is clear strategic intent* – in either seeking new markets through product development, consolidation or diversification, perhaps pre-empting a move by competitors
3. *There is an organisational imperative* to improve performance and develop resource resilience, whilst protecting service standards
4. *There is a need to overcome regulatory, legal or policy barriers.*

… and if we're honest, most housing organisations can tick some if not all of the above boxes!

So let's just assume that we agree these pre-requisite market conditions all exist. What's stemming our appetite?

Are we hungry enough? Or is it simply because operating conditions are not yet tough enough?

[26] SSA, Building Trust and Vision Tool

[27] Todeva and Knoke (2005) *Strategic alliances and models of collaboration,* Management Decision Vol 43 No 1

Are operating margins looking too healthy to bother?

Do we have bigger [welfare reform] fish to fry?

Are we open to the principle of sharing … but would rather 'share mine not yours'?

Do we have the right skills and competencies or capacity to drive change?

Or is it simply that as a sector we are unable to articulate our need, nor yet fully understand the potential for a shared service solution?

As part of our new business intelligence offer, HouseMark is interested in starting a 'conversation' with our members about collaborative services. We want to enable the sector's collective intelligence and thoughts about the ideas set out in this paper, with a view to co-create new solutions, facilitated by us, to create market opportunity and appetite in this field.

So let's start a conversation

We believe the opportunity is upon us for the housing sector to consider new forms of competitive advantage through collaboration – particularly shared service collaborations - to achieve resilience and maintain financial viability whilst protecting the front line and leveraging wider social gain.

We want to start a conversation with you to find out what you need as a business to support service resilience, capacity and capability whilst achieving greater VFM outcomes for residents and other stakeholders.

We are interested in creating solutions designed by the sector, for the sector – so we would like to hear from you, your thoughts on this highly topical approach.

We believe there's an increasing case for organisations to consider a more flexible modular approach to service delivery based on geography and/ or function with mixed delivery mechanisms.

For example:

- An organisation may choose to deliver all housing management services directly, develop shared services arrangements for the delivery of integrated community initiatives in different localities and contract out its repairs and maintenance activities.
- Another might deliver all services directly in some geographical areas (e.g. of high stock concentration) but be more interested in shared service arrangements for service delivery in areas where there is less stock.
- Others could establish local delivery vehicles (potentially with multiple owners) – focusing on delivering joined up housing and added value services in local areas across multiple landlords – and perhaps with some input from local authorities/ other public agencies.
- We could even see commissioning landlord models when the landlord retains ownership of the stock but delivery is enabled through shared service arrangements.

We want to find out what you think about the shape and relevance of current delivery models and are planning to start the conversation with a series of facilitated regional and national events.

The CIH is right to say that the time is ripe for the sector to be bold, to be innovative and rethink strategic options if we are to truly protect some of the most vulnerable people in society, support communities and continue to make a difference to people's lives.

We must put aside our belief that we can remain autonomous in a world where collaboration, in whatever form it takes, is critical to future success.

If you would like to join in the conversation, go to www.housemark.co.uk and read our blog. You can comment on LinkedIn or tweet #CollaborateDebate

About the author

Sharon Collins

Director, Collins Corporate Solutions Ltd

Email: sharon.collins@housemark.co.uk
Mobile: 077 404 82976

Web: www.collinscorporatesolutions.co.uk

LinkedIn: uk.linkedin.com/pub/sharon-collins32/360/626

Twitter: @collinscsl

Sharon is an accomplished housing professional with over 25 years' experience of the social housing and care sector – 15 of which are at senior executive level leading internal and external business consultancy services. Sharon is the Director of Collins Corporate Solutions Ltd, a leading-edge social housing consultancy based in the South-East.

Sharon provides associate consultancy expertise and product development services to HouseMark encompassing value for money product design and development, facilitation and delivery of bespoke consultancy projects, alongside performance improvement and regulatory reassurance products focusing on economic regulation and consumer standards.

Sharon has an extensive track record in facilitating and implementing large scale change and improvement programmes and is skilled at enabling proactive stakeholder engagement. Previous projects include facilitation of group mergers and collaborative partnerships, redesign of repairs and maintenance services, transformation of extra care provision, providing support and challenge to boards, executive teams and resident scrutiny groups for numerous bespoke projects including business planning, strategy development, regulatory reassurance, scrutiny and service redesign and implementation.

Sharon also chairs HouseMark's national Welfare Reform Impact Club which provides advice and practical support across a variety of aspects of welfare reform policy, practice and performance to over 80 social landlords. She brings out-of-sector expertise to her work from her position as Governor of the Solent NHS Trust.

Sharon holds a Masters Degree (Distinction) in Organisational Development, Change and Strategic Quality Management and is a registered Shared Service Architect and Prince 2 Practitioner.

Further information

For further information visit our website
www.housemark.co.uk or call **024 7646 0500.**

HouseMark, 4 Riley Court, Millburn Hill Road,
University of Warwick Science Park, Coventry CV4 7HP.

About HouseMark

HouseMark is the leading provider of integrated data and analysis, insightful knowledge transfer, high quality consultancy support and via Procurement for Housing, cost effective procurement services to the social housing sector.