

Innovation Report Suggestions – Issues raised at HMCSC 4.9.12

Minutes of Meeting on 4.9.2012	Information/Clarification	Link to Action Plan Objective
<p>(15.4) Suggestion 1 (adopting a revised code of conduct). Mr Melson questioned the need for a revised code of conduct as there was already one in place. Mr Kent said that different groups had different codes of conduct and it was important that everyone used the same one. The Chair referred to page 10 of appendix one (page 23 in the agenda), and noted that 87% of the residents who commented on that issue were in favour of a change.</p>	<p>There has always been a code of conduct but tenant feedback was that it was out of date and needed to be implemented consistently throughout the resident involvement framework.</p> <p>The existing code of conduct and examples of good practise in other Local authorities/ housing providers have fed into the draft Code of Conduct</p>	<p>Objective 14</p>
<p>(15.5) Suggestion 2 (reassessing the need for a Tenant Compact Monitoring Group (TCMG)). Councillor Mears asked why it was necessary to reassess the need for the TCMG, and asked for clarification of what would be different with Service Improvement Group. She also commented that many of the working groups she had set up should have been closed down by now but they were still running. The Committee were advised that there had been recognition that the TCMG were not doing what was in their terms of reference and that the TCMG had acknowledged that they had found certain issues hard to deal with. Mr Kent stated that he had not attended the last few meetings of the TCMG because there were so many arguments within the group and there was concern that if they couldn't agree amongst themselves they wouldn't be able to help others. Mr Murtagh agreed and said that the TCMG had behaved appalling over the last two years.</p>	<p>The request to review the Tenant Compact Monitoring Compact Group has come from tenant representatives and members of TCMG.</p> <p>The new Resident Involvement Framework establishes groups based on the TSA regulatory themes: Service Area Specific groups Service Improvement Groups for Home, Tenancy, Neighbourhood & Community;</p> <p>2 service wide groups for Involvement and Empowerment Business and Value for money</p> <p>Objective 3 focuses on reviewing TCMG and establishing the new IEG. Part of this will be to look at the roles and remits of both groups to see if they should amalgamate or not</p> <p>All working groups will be reviewed under objective 2. It is anticipated that some groups will end whilst others will continue. Aiming to standardize the framework for groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of reference • Membership (60/40) • Key aims and Objectives • Identify key priorities for a set period • Simple Action Plan – live document that is reviewed regularly to identify progress/lack of movement; identify gaps or upcoming events 	<p>Objective 3</p> <p>Objective 3</p> <p>Objective 2</p>

Innovation Report Suggestions – Issues raised at HMCSC 4.9.12

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standing Agenda • Review of achievements/celebration of success <p>This information will feed into the annual Impact and VFM Assessment process.</p> <p>The review process will be supported by the Resident Involvement Team.</p>	
<p>(15.6) The Committee considered Suggestion 3 (Tenant and Resident Associations). Councillor Farrow noted that all communities and estates were different and would need individual help. The Committee were advised that appropriate help and support would be offered to all Tenant and Resident Associations (TRA). Mr Cohen was concerned that some areas had no representatives and wondered who would be involved in the TRA. The Chair reassured the Committee that the intention was to have representatives on all TRA. Councillor Mears noted that the report stated that 62% of residents were satisfied with housing generally and that their views were listened to and acted on, and was concerned that they may therefore feel that was no need to be involved.</p>	<p>Individualised support offer to all TRA's.</p> <p>Encourage new TRA's in areas where there aren't current associations or look at amalgamation with others</p> <p>Support all TRA's to have representation</p>	<p>Objective 5</p>
<p>(15.7) The Committee considered Suggestion 4 (CRB checks). Councillor Farrow asked for clarification on when a CRB check would be needed and how it would be operated. Councillor Mears also asked in what circumstances it would be needed and was concerned over funding as she did not think a HRA should pay for it. The Committee were advised that the suggestion had come from residents. Some of the groups had discussed the possibility of holding homework or sports clubs etc. The council would offer support where necessary. Mr Murtagh suggested that there would a number of ways to generate additional funding such as coffee mornings, and the council would not be expected to fund it all. Mr Melson asked what would happen if someone failed a CRB check and did not think it should be the responsibility of residents.</p>	<p>CRB Checks.....Guidance can be sought on an individual basis about the requirements for CRB checks. TRA's would need to fund the application from their grants.</p>	

Innovation Report Suggestions – Issues raised at HMCSC 4.9.12

<p>(15.8) The Committee considered Suggestion 5 (training for TRA Chairs). Mr Crowhurst asked who would provide the training and who would monitor it. The Committee were advised that the training would be monitored as it was now, with feedback from those who undertook it. The training would be provided at the Resource Centre as it was now, but it was also hoped to use other venues such as City College or other Community Centres. Councillor Farrow suggested it would be useful to provide training in the evenings or weekends as well as during the day, and also that training for Secretary's and Treasurer's be provided. Mr Kent said that some residents may have difficulty with literacy and support for them would be useful. The Committee were advised that there was a range of training which it was hoped to provide, and that the council was already working with trade unions to provide to provide literacy training at the learning centre in Moulsecoomb.</p>	<p>Resident Training Offer</p> <p>Inclusion and Involvement Team will set up a database of tenant training. Evaluation and impact of training will be captured through follow up and feedback etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident training offer available to all tenants • New initiatives funded through the Interreg Learning Cities Project • Resource Centre funded to provide their core training offer • Recommended training for key TRA roles (not compulsory) • "Buddying" for new TRA members/ reps • Learning & Participation Service to support individual training needs • Inclusion team to include basic skills support • Developing the Learning offer at the Housing Centre (including Learning Champions model) <p>Flexible approach to meet the needs of tenants ie. Evenings and weekends</p>	<p>Objective 10</p>
<p>(15.9) The Committee considered Suggestion 6 (establishment of a separate body to deal with code of conduct breaches). Mr Melson said it would be important to have a balance, and not to return to the old system.</p>	<p>Joint Adjudication Panel</p>	<p>Objective 14</p>
<p>(15.10) The Committee considered Suggestions 7-13 (Tenant and Resident Associations). Councillor Mears noted there was reference to 'compulsory' training and asked who would police the training and whether anyone had spoken to the Resource Centre. The Committee were advised that the wording could be changed to 'highly recommended' or 'core training'. It was not the case that people would be forced to undertake training, but the council wanted to encourage as many people as possible to do it. The Resource Centre had been contacted. Mr Kent felt training would be very useful but it should not be compulsory. Cllr Farrow referred to suggestion 11</p>	<p>Wording amended to highly recommended</p>	<p>Objective 10</p>

Innovation Report Suggestions – Issues raised at HMCSC 4.9.12

112

<p>(keeping a list of TRA members) and said that all tenants should already be part of associations. All residents should be given equal information and not just those who were active in the association. Councillor Farrow referred to suggestion 12 and said that new associations would need assistance if officers would not be present. Mr Melson said that officers should be present unless requested not to. Councillor Peltzer Dunn referred to suggestion 9, and the further information provided on page 54, and was concerned that it was far too detailed. Councillor Peltzer Dunn suggested that there be a two year rather than an annual impact assessment for the TRAs. Councillor Robins referred to suggestion 12 and thought that it could be advantageous for the TRAs not to always have an officer present. The Committee were advised that suggestion 11 had come from residents, but could be removed. With regard to suggestion 12, if an officer were requested they could attend. Resident Associations could meet whenever they wanted and the feedback was that it would sometimes be useful not to have an officer present. As much support as possible would be provided, but it would not always be possible to have an officer available to attend all meetings. It was agreed that the Annual Impact Assessments were detailed, but it was necessary to look at the cost effectiveness and impact of resident involvement</p>	<p>Suggestion 11 - Tenant request</p> <p>All TRA's have contact lists; Information will be shared with all residents not just TRAs</p> <p>Tenant Only Meetings. This is not about withdrawing support but about enabling tenant groups. Recognition that tenants did not always want council officers present.</p> <p>There will be a tailored support offer for each TRA. Officers will attend meetings if requested but TRAs need to consider:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what do you want from that officer • who is the most appropriate officer to attend • Agenda planning before meeting - highlight issues you want to discuss so officer has time to investigate/get responses from the appropriate services/teams beforehand and bring them to the meeting • Don't wait for a meeting to raise an issue – use the reporting protocols in place • Recognition that it is not always possible for an officer to attend every meeting given the number of TRAs in the city/meeting clashes. It is possible for an officer to provide the chair with a written update if requested beforehand. <p>Annual Impact Assessments These would be light touch - KISS Keep it simple and short</p>	<p>Objective 7</p>
<p>(15.11) The Committee considered Suggestions 14-17 (Area Panels). Councillor Mears said that it appeared that Area Panels were no longer important, and asked whether the cost of running them was an issue. The Committee were reassured that Area Panels were important and their views had been taken into account. The cost of holding each Area Panel was around £1800, with each round of blue pages costing around an additional £2,000. It was important to look at the best use of money. Councillor Mears stated that Area Panels were for tenants and were paid for out of tenant rents. Housing Management was about performance and the suggestions in this report seemed to be silencing tenants. The Chair confirmed that that was not the case. The Head of</p>	<p>Revisions to Area Panels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-energise Area Panels ToR; purpose and format • Review the Blue Pages Process to make it more efficient in terms of time and cost (including looking at other reporting protocols/processes) • Ensuring residents have a strong robust method to raise issues 	<p>Objective 8</p>

Innovation Report Suggestions – Issues raised at HMCSC 4.9.12

<p>Housing and Social Inclusion reminded the Committee that this report had come from tenant's suggestions. The whole motivation for the report was to give tenants a voice and support their involvement. Mr Melson stated that the only voice tenants had was when they had Blue Pages and that Area Panels were useful. Mr Melson asked for a breakdown of the cost of preparing this report. In response to this, additional information was circulated comparing the costs of the Innovation Group with those for running the TCMG. The committee was informed that costs considered were room hire, refreshments and travel; and totalled £339 for the IG and £1534 for TCMG. Also that when the costs were averaged out per meeting the former was £24 and the latter was £220. Mr Melson commented that he did not mean the cost of holding the meetings but the cost of preparing the actual report. It was confirmed that there would be no budget pressure from preparing this report as it was the core work of the department to bring reports to meetings</p>		
<p>(15.12) Suggestion 18 related to Tenant Scrutiny Panel and would be covered in more detail in Item 16 on the agenda.</p>	<p>TSP agreed at HMCSC</p>	<p>Objective 13</p>
<p>(15.13) The Committee considered Suggestions 19-26 (Resident involvement framework and working groups and the involvement of young people).</p> <p>Cllr Peltzer Dunn noted the reference to 'young people' and asked if that meant those under 18. It was confirmed that it referred to young tenants aged 18-30. Councillors Farrow and Peltzer Dunn both referred to suggestion 26 and suggested that the percentage earmarked should be confirmed. Mr Crowhurst said that the Estate Development Budget (EDB) was a finite budget for the whole city and there could be other ways to raise money. The Committee were advised that this suggestion had come from residents who wanted to include everyone. It was important to hear from younger people and what they wanted on their estate. Councillor Duncan said that this report had been looked at a number of times and it wasn't for</p>	<p>Sum would need to be agreed by tenants. Suggestion of bidding process/Dragons Den style presentations from young people etc</p>	<p>Objective 11</p>

Innovation Report Suggestions – Issues raised at HMCSC 4.9.12

<p>councillors to pick apart what tenants had asked for. Residents had been asked what they wanted the money spent on and they had said that they wanted to help the whole community to be engaged. Councillor Mears replied that a lot of these issues had not been looked at before. This was Housing Management and it was important to ensure that funds were not used by other council departments.</p>	<p>HRA is ring fenced and cannot be used for general fund activities. HSI see this as an opportunity to bring in match funding/added value from other budget areas in meeting shared community aims and objectives</p>	
<p>15.14 The Committee considered Suggestions 27-31 (The menu of involvement, communications and social media and the funding of resident involvement). Councillor Farrow referred to suggestion 29 and said that there were different size associations and it might be better to allocate money to an area. The Committee were advised that it was a suggestion that each application be capped at £1,000. All associations could complete an application. There would be a cut off date for submission of applications, and it would not be on a first come first served basis. Resident Involvement officers would support associations. Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked what the budget would be, and was advised it £26,250. Councillor Peltzer Dunn thought the wording suggested that there would be a limit to one application per TRA. Councillor Robins thought it was clear that there would be no limit to the number of applications any association could submit, but that any application would be limited to £1,000. Councillor Mears referred to Appendix 3 (page 67 on agenda), and said that a restructure would be costly and would be a misuse of tenants rent. If the Strategic Director was looking at a restructure, why was tenant's rents being used. The Committee were advised that Appendix 3 was not a restructure of staff, but a new way of resident involvement and there would no additional cost involved. Councillor Mears said she would like to see a breakdown of the current budget and the costings alongside the new structure in appendix 3. The Chair confirmed that it was important to know how effective and useful the TRAs were and to ensure value for money was being achieved</p>	<p>Wording changed to clarify capping limit of individual grants</p> <p>Clarified in meeting that restructure related to the proposed Resident Involvement Framework not staffing structure.</p> <p>Resident Involvement Budget included in report to December HMCSC</p> <p>Annual assessment of EDB spend</p>	<p>Objective 6</p> <p>Objective 12</p>

Innovation Report Suggestions – Issues raised at HMCSC 4.9.12

<p>(15.15) The Committee considered Suggestions 32-36 (Resident training and annual impact assessments). Councillor Farrow referred to suggestion 33 and said that it would be good to hold workshops and particularly useful if all the TRAs attended together. Mr Crowhurst referred to suggestion 36 and asked how the assessments would be done and what the cost implications would be. Councillor Jarrett said that financial issues should be for the Housing Committee and not for this meeting.</p>	<p>Annual Impact Assessments – will be light touch as previously explained.</p> <p>Costs will be met in through existing resources</p> <p>Training and support offer to all residents</p>	<p>Objective 7</p>
<p>(15.16) Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted an inconsistency with information relating to a meeting of the Tenant Scrutiny Panel on pages 72 and 105 of the report. On page 72 it says a meeting will be quorate with 6 people and on page 105 it would be 7 people. Councillor Peltzer Dunn also noted that page 72 stated that 'inquorate meetings should be noted and decisions ratified at the next quorate meeting. It was agreed that it should read that any discussion would be discussed at the next quorate meeting.</p>		
<p>(15.17)The Committee had been asked to endorse this report, and it would then be considered by the Housing Committee. However, following the comments made at this meeting it was agreed that an action plan be produced covering the issues raised. and that the report together with the aforementioned action plan come to the next meeting of the Housing Management Consultative Sub Committee.</p>		
<p>RESOLVED – That the report of the Innovation Group on Resident Involvement, together with an action plan following comments made at this meeting, be considered at the meeting of the Housing Management Consultative Sub Committee on 23 October 2012.</p>		

