

You are invited to attend

LB Southwark Resident Involvement Review Panel – Meeting One

Objective of meeting: Panel meets to decide its order of business and methods of working (including review of Kaizen report)

AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Introductions
3. Jargon busting (Paper 1)
4. Chair of the Resident Involvement Review Panel role (Paper 2)
5. Background to the Review (Papers 3 and 3a)
6. Legal and Regulatory Framework (Paper 4)
7. Panel Objectives (Paper 5)
8. Code of Conduct and Team Ethos (Paper 6)
9. Operation of Panel
 - a. Member Portal
 - b. How to receive information (Paper 7)
 - c. Sounding Board (Paper 8)
 - d. Meetings (Paper 9)
10. Next Steps

Item 2 – LB Southwark Resident Involvement Review Panel – Meeting One

Objective of meeting: Panel meets to decide its order of business and methods of working (including review of Kaizen report)

Firstly a big welcome! The Resident Involvement Review Panel will be considering a lot of important issues over the next few weeks and I'm looking forward to working with you all. This briefing is meant to give Panel Members an overview of issues being discussed this evening. There are papers attached for the meeting for further reading. I have used hyperlinks in case Panel members wish to find out more information but these are optional and not compulsory!

Tonight is our first meeting and I'm aware that if we are to do any meaningful work with each other then we need to get to know each other. So our first task is to pair up with the person next to you and get to know their name, why they are here and what is their one wish for the Panel.

In convening this Panel I'm also aware that jargon and acronyms might get used which are both new and off-putting to Panel members. We've provided a jargon buster (Paper 1) but it will be helpful if Panel Members could flag up when language is used that they are unfamiliar with. Papers do use terms like tenants, Home Owner and resident. Tenants rent from the Council and Home Owners own their homes but have a leasehold with services provided by the Council for a service charge.

I'll then explain a bit more about my role (Paper 2) as Independent Chair and how I'll work with and support the Panel in its work.

Then we will spend some time understanding why the Council has convened the Panel including a summary of the current engagement structure, the Kaizen Review and the Council's response (Paper 3). The current structure and funding are increasingly out of kilter with how residents want to be involved and what they want funded. The growth of digital technology, the way people live their lives and our diverse communities put a premium on new and different ways of engagement.

Other Councils have made, and are making, similar changes as these structures increasingly atrophy and become less relevant. I do understand the frustration of those currently involved with a structure that doesn't work well. However the Panel will want to focus on what is needed going forward.

We will also explore some of the wider regulatory context for social housing (Paper 4). Having considered the background and context for the Panel's work I'd like to consider and agree objectives for the Panel (Paper 5) including expanding on a couple of those proposed by the Council.

Given that we will need to work well with each other I'd like to work with Panel Members on behaviours including what we expect from each other. Southwark Council has a Code of Conduct (Paper 6) but I'm also keen to emphasise team working.

Our first decision tonight will be to consider how the Panel should operate. There are a further six meetings proposed as well as use of an on-line portal. There will be a demonstration of the portal at the meeting.

I'd like to explore with the Panel the mix of papers, presentations, research, visits and experiences within and without Southwark (Paper 7). I'll also touch on the Sounding Board (Paper 8) that is made up of all who expressed an interest in joining the Panel.

Finally I will want to agree the dates, times and topics for the remaining meetings (Paper 9).

There will be a Quality Review of this process by the Housing Quality Network to reflect on lessons learned, including seeking your feedback.

Phil Morgan
20th August 2018

Item 3 – Jargon busting (Paper 1)

Item 4 (Paper 2) – Chair of LB Southwark’s Residents Involvement Review Co-design Panel

Description of Services to be provided:

- To lead the Co-design panel and provide expertise in modern methods of resident involvement in urban, local authority settings
- To chair the Resident Involvement Review Co-design Panel composed of residents, council officers and members
- To plan agendas for each meeting and determine what reports, performance data, and other information are required for the Panel and seek to ensure that the council produces these for consideration
- To support Panel members to discuss the issues identified in the terms of reference in an efficient and professional manner
- To direct and facilitate the Panel to develop its response to the review based on the evidence provided and Panel members’ experiences of living in council homes and borough
- To oversee the content and use of the panel members portal
- To analyse documents and interpret information and data
- To lead on evidence gathering
- To write an interim and final reports with recommendations on behalf of the panel
- *To ensure compliance with the agreed Code of Conduct*
- *To seek consensus within the panel*
- Any other duties that become necessary to complete the task of evidence gathering and chairing the panel

Item 5 (Paper 3) – Summary of the current engagement structure, the Kaizen Review and the Council's response

Background

Currently there is a [structure in place](#) with [Tenants and Residents Associations](#) (TRAs) selecting members of [Area Housing Forums](#), which in turn elect members of the [Tenants Council](#) and [Homeowners Council](#) (who also have directly elected reps). In addition there is a [MySouthwark Homeowners Board](#).

There is a [housing strategy](#) in place, running until 2043.

The Council pays for this structure by setting aside a portion of the rent collected by tenants (£13.78/year) and Home Owners (£10/year). These in turn provide income for the [Tenants Fund](#) and [Home Owners Fund](#). The Tenant and Homeowner Fund have working groups (Tenant Fund Management Committee and Homeowner Fund Management Committee) that make recommendations on how the funds are allocated. There is also a [Home Owners Council Strategy](#).

The Tenants Fund for this year is £515,776 plus a further £105,139 from reserves. This is allocated to the Southwark Group of Tenant Organisations (SGTO) (£232,748), as grants to TRAs (£178,160) and towards two dedicated training officers in the Council's Tenant and Homeowner Involvement Team.

The Home Owners Fund for this year is £152,440 with a further contribution from reserves (which are £402,273) making a total of £189,900. Each year the Home Owners Fund makes a contribution of £45,000 to the Tenants Fund. The rest of the funding £144,900 is allocated for the independent Home Owners Information Centre.

This structure has been in place for many years although there have been changes to the way in which housing services are delivered and how residents now say they want to be involved. There are obvious gaps where there is no TRA, or where a TRA is ineffective resulting in over 80% of tenants being disenfranchised. There are estimates that only 0.5% of the resident population are involved in this structure.

The Council remains committed to resident engagement and have a manifesto commitment to find ways to get more tenants and residents involved on their estates and to work with them to find new ways to engage. This builds on the [Fairer Future promises](#) by the Council.

More widely the Council consults on all major decisions, with over 100 consultations each year. These use a range of different methods including public meetings, focus groups, on-line surveys and mail-outs. There is also a Council [Consultation Hub](#).

Kaizen Review

The Council commissioned an [independent review](#) (the Kaizen Review) of the housing engagement structure. This review included a large-scale outreach programme, on-line survey, focus groups and stakeholder interviews. Over 1,000 tenants and homeowners were engaged. We have also attached an Executive Summary (Paper 3a).

The Kaizen Review identified a number of weaknesses in the current approach:

The failure to engage diverse residents¹ reflecting the make up of the Borough

- The need to involve young people
- The need to engage digitally
- The need to tie in with other community groups

Lack of awareness of structures

- 35% of respondents unaware of their local TRA
- 57% were unaware of Area Housing Forums, Tenants Council and Homeowners Council

¹ There are currently no records of the diversity of those currently involved

- 19.7% feel they are informed by involvement structures

Lack of awareness of funding and outcomes

- 64% had no awareness of the Tenants Fund
- An inability to demonstrate Value for Money for the £637K/year spent from the Tenant Fund
- Low satisfaction about housing services
- Lack of accountability of current structures

Different priorities

- Preference for funding to be directed to estate based/local community projects (and not TRAs where the funding is currently focused – supported by only 10%)
- Support for TRAs improving local area and representing views to the Council

Communication

- That meetings of the Tenant Council and Homeowner Council are informational rather than discussing strategy
- The delays in cascading issues up and down the engagement structure
- That the Council were poor at communicating with tenants

Sustainability

- The pressures put on active residents faced with at least 30 meetings per year attending TRA, Area Housing Forum and Tenant or Homeowner Council plus any working groups
- A breakdown in trust within the current structure between the Council and involved residents
- 54% of residents interested in finding out more about being involved

The report stated that there is a need to provide an overall vision of what engagement means for the Council and its residents. It is worth noting that overall satisfaction with the housing service is low. Over half of respondents want to get involved and were clear that contributing to their local community was the main driver rather than incentives.

Change was proposed under three main headings:

1. Reviewing current approach
2. Reconfigure engagement structures
3. Introduce more modern and up to date involvement mechanisms

Boycott

Panel members should note that both the Tenants Council (who were offered a seat on the Panel) and Southwark Group of Tenant Organisations have boycotted the Review. Whilst accepting that the current arrangements are ineffective they believe that the review is about silencing voices, that they are not being engaged or consulted about the review, are critical of the Kaizen Review and believe the current arrangements are best practice and represent value for money.

Item 5 (Paper 3 a) Council's response

The Council considered a [report on the Review](#) and decided to set up the Resident Involvement Review Panel to ensure contributions from residents, stakeholders and officers. The Panel is due to finish its work and report by mid-November.

The Council has also set out some core principles for engagement including:

- A clear vision for change
- Establishing structures to implement that clear vision
- Wider range of ways for residents to be involved, including the use of digital methods
- Ensure all residents are heard, including younger people
- Empowering to make an impact on decision making

- Transparent on consultation results and outcomes
- Promotes service improvement and improved resident satisfaction

The Council wishes to take forward the proposal for change through a collaborative process involving:

- Residents (five tenants and two leaseholders have been appointed along with two reserves).
- Council (who have three officers on the Panel),
- Stakeholders (who have four places on the Panel – of which three are being taken up by the Homeowners Council, the Youth Council and MySouthwark Homeowners Board²)

The resident members reflect the diversity of the resident population of Southwark. John McCormack, who has just joined the Council as Head of the Tenant and Homeowner Involvement Team, will also be attending and on hand to offer advice to the Panel. It is possible that the Lead Councillor and Director of Communities will attend meetings from time-to-time.

² Fiona Buist, who is representing MySouthwark Homeowners Board, is a Council employee but attending on behalf of the Board

Executive Summary

Project aims and methodology

- Southwark Council commissioned Kaizen and Social Engine to carry out a review of tenant and homeowner engagement with the aim of providing evidence to support improvements to the current structures and ways of working.
- The review focused on five key questions:
 1. How aware and satisfied are Tenants and Homeowners and Council/other stakeholders with the current system and structures?
 2. How does the Southwark Council approach compare to other housing providers? What examples of good practice could Southwark Council learn from?
 3. Do the current systems and structures provide good value for money? Can cost savings and efficiencies be made which could save money and not compromise engagement (or even improve engagement)?
 4. How can tenant and homeowner engagement be improved to reflect the way people live today and that deliver improved outcomes in Southwark?
 5. What might effective engagement look like in 5 years' time – how best to define an active and involved tenant/homeowner?
- The review sought to capture the views of a wide range of stakeholders – including groups and individuals actively involved with the current engagement structures, such as TRAs, Area Housing Forums and the Homeowners and Tenants Councils – as well as a cross section of tenants and homeowners who have little current involvement.
- A large scale outreach programme across the Borough, coupled with an online survey, focus groups and stakeholder interviews were used to engage over 1,000 local tenants and homeowners. The review also incorporated the opinions of Council officers and Councillors and gathered evidence and experience from a range of other housing providers – both local authorities and housing associations as well as an assessment of other research on tenant engagement. Secondary analysis of a range of data held by Southwark Council was also undertaken to provide further evidence to inform the review.
- The project was carried out between March and July 2017.

Key Findings

The review findings have been organised under the project's five research questions.

1. How aware and satisfied are Tenants and Homeowners and Council/other stakeholders with the current system and structures?

- Awareness with the current formal engagement structures is low with the majority of people outside the Council stating they do not feel particularly well informed.
- 1 in 3 respondents to the survey said they know nothing at all about their TRA and over half said they know nothing at all about Area Housing Forums and Tenants and Homeowners Councils. As a result of these low levels of awareness, most people felt they did not know whether or not these structures were effective, however of those who felt they did know, the majority did not feel they did this very well.
- Respondents aged 65 or over were three times more likely to say they felt very well informed about opportunities to have their say than young people (aged 25 or below).

- The lack of awareness appears to be matched by generally lower levels of satisfaction with the housing service overall. Compared to other London Boroughs, Southwark tenants and homeowners were generally less satisfied with housing service provision.
- Despite many within the Council vociferously advocating the importance of engagement, it is clear that trust has broken down between the Council and many of those involved in formal engagement structures. This distrust has undermined effective collaboration and risks further disengagement if it is not addressed.
- In some situations engagement and consultation was described as merely ‘ticking boxes’ with limited expectations from Council and participants about the ability to influence decisions, and the breadth of opinions considered.
- The review has uncovered the absence of a clear and consistent vision and definition of what engagement means. This is resulting in different approaches and a lack of coherence across the Council at an operational level. As a result expectations of tenants are unmet and council officers feel equally frustrated by the responses of tenants to their engagement processes.
- The Council and the many highly engaged tenants have invested considerably in the current strategic engagement structures, however many expressed the view that the Council are not currently making strategic use of them. The Homeowners and Tenants Councils sit at the pinnacle of the current engagement structure, however we have found that they are being overly used for information sharing, with much more limited strategic input or collaborative working.
- We have observed a lack of accountability within the current formal engagement structures and a specific gap exists in the oversight of the effectiveness of the overall system – beyond the Council’s own scrutiny and oversight mechanisms.
- Meetings have become the default method of strategic engagement with tenants, particularly through formal structures. Whilst well run and effective meetings are an important part of engagement, the current arrangements have become too reliant on them at the expense of other ways of working.
- Despite many examples of good relations between individual Council staff and tenant reps, the approach taken by the Council to communicating with tenants more generally was often found to be of a poor quality, lacking clarity, inaccessible and overly complicated.
- Unsurprisingly, we found that there is no single platform or channel which can effectively communicate with and engage every tenant. Letters and emails were the most popular communication methods and face-to-face and phone were also popular responses. Website, text message, meetings and social media were not favoured; however young people were significantly more positive about digital communications than older people (particularly over 65s).
- Respondents were clear in their views on what the role of their TRA should be, with two thirds saying they thought it should be to improve the local area and half saying the TRA should be representing tenant views about services to the Council.
- Almost two-thirds of survey respondents said they knew nothing at all about the Tenants Fund and Homeowners Fund.
- Respondents expressed a preference for spending to be allocated to activity which directly and demonstrably benefited their communities: improvements to the area, social and community events and support for local projects. Indeed, increasing the emphasis on local and community benefit may well be a significant motivator for encouraging engagement.

- These preferences appear to be somewhat disconnected with the current allocation of funds, which places considerable emphasis on training and support for residents and TRAs, with much less emphasis on funding local improvements, community events and local projects.
- A review of Tenant and Homeowner Funds monitoring reports suggests an over-emphasis on outputs, internal controls and financial management rather than delivering outcomes and opportunities that benefit local communities.
- A number of people felt that their voices were not heard and that the formal engagement structures were not as inclusive as they might be. Whilst the contribution of those who did participate in these structures was widely acknowledge and appreciated, there was a general feeling that they relied on a representative model at the expense of wider participation. Young people are particularly likely to feel less represented in the current engagement structures. The review found that the majority of young people felt that their views were not heard and that they did not matter to the Council.

2. How does the Southwark Council approach compare to other housing providers? What examples of good practice could Southwark Council learn from?

- Our Rapid Evidence Assessment found that the evidence-base relating to effective tenant engagement is extremely weak with very little high quality studies or research. Although there is a great deal of published information, it is generally very limited - largely consisting of single case studies and anecdotal evidence.
- We identified six design features which underpin strong tenant and homeowner engagement. These are:
 1. They are focused on enabling and capacity building
 2. They place citizens at the centre of their approach
 3. They adopt a tailored approach to different audiences
 4. They are proactive in their approach
 5. They make decisions on the basis of available evidence
 6. They integrate the use of technology where it can improve outcomes
- A number of key learning points emerged from peer research with other housing providers:
 1. Having a clear strategy and values which underpin the engagement approach
 2. A tailored approach to engagement
 3. Strong leadership within the Council and the community

3. Do the current systems and structures provide good value for money? Can cost savings and efficiencies be made which could save money and not compromise engagement (or even improve engagement)?

- Southwark spends a considerable amount of money on supporting tenant engagement and the Tenants Fund and the Homeowners Fund have a combined budget of over £600,000 a year. Although there is considerable scrutiny of this money from a financial management perspective, relatively little attention is given to specifying the impact it is intended to have or measuring the difference it makes.
- A greater emphasis on outcomes – rather than outputs – would improve the ability to determine whether funds were delivering improvements that represented value for money.
- Better coordination of engagement activity across Council departments and services – based on a common vision of engagement – will help to ensure messages and approaches are consistent. Coordinating engagement and communications across the Council will require dedicated resources

to manage the process effectively but is likely to produce savings and efficiencies elsewhere in the system.

- Local people do not live their lives within the confines of specific Council Directorates or service delivery silos. Adopting a broader focus on local outcomes – including but not limited to housing – would enhance coordination across services and departments that reflect the lives of residents and enable stronger and more meaningful collaborative working.
- There was some evidence of duplication in the formal engagement structures, which contributes to increased cost and reduced engagement due to the large volume of meetings volunteers need to attend. In particular the separation of tenants and homeowners seemed counter-productive as there was little evidence of significant differences in views between the two groups on most issues and the peer review brought out how other providers combine tenants and homeowners in strategic bodies to good effect.
- Whilst our findings are based on a limited set of data, we found that on key measures – satisfaction with housing service overall and satisfaction that the provider listens and acts on tenant views – Southwark’s tenants are less satisfied than average compared with other housing providers.
- From the limited benchmarking data we have been able to gather we found a very weak negative relationship between the amounts spent on engagement and how satisfied tenants and leaseholders are. Organisations that spend more on engagement actually yield slightly lower overall satisfaction rates in the limited data we had available to analyse. This suggests it is not purely how much that is spent, but how the investment in tenant engagement is used which is more important. Further exploring these findings with data from all London Boroughs and a consistent methodology would help determine whether the negative correlation the benchmarking identified is consistent across all authorities.

4. How can tenant and homeowner engagement be improved to reflect the way people live today and that deliver improved outcomes in Southwark?

- The review uncovered numerous ideas and suggestions for how tenant and homeowner engagement could be improved. The following are key themes that could be usefully considered:
 - Co-design a Council-wide vision for engagement
 - Managing expectations to be clear and consistent in articulating its aspirations
 - Recognising the strong connection between engagement and satisfaction
 - Understanding motivations and barriers to engagement
 - Rebuild trust and demonstrate a commitment to improvement
 - Respond to the desire for greater transparency
 - Develop more effective use of digital tools
 - Involve Southwark Young Advisors and the Southwark Youth Council in actively engaging and representing the views of young people
 - Review the approach and provision of training and support for tenants and TRAs
 - Develop greater insight into the role the Council has in people’s lives and the ways in which Council activities can influence attitudes towards it.

5. What might effective engagement look like in 5 years’ time – how best to define an active and involved tenant/homeowner?

- Applying the learning from this review to the design of new structures and approaches to tenant engagement will take time and effort on all sides. It will also require a period of transition with the Council and tenants collaborating to co-design a new approach to engagement.

- The Council needs to be a participant in this process – not simply a leader or convenor – which suggests it would be very beneficial to seek independent facilitation to support and facilitate the co-design process.
- The Council should consider how it can build the six characteristics identified through our Rapid Evidence Assessment in to its revised approach. In particular consideration should be given to:
 - Introducing a range of opportunities which enable people to participate in different ways from bite-sized, lighter touch, one-way opportunities through to deeper and more meaningful two-way engagement which relates to not just housing but a range of local public services.
 - How the new engagement approach can be used to kick-start and/or further develop the pre-conditions for civic engagement more widely.
 - How a map of touchpoints could be developed to identify and act upon all the opportunities to develop a relationship with tenants and leaseholders and respond effectively first time.
 - Using technology and social media to have a credible and meaningful, two-way conversation (not just to broadcast official messages).
 - How to shape the engagement offer so that it meets the needs of particular groups including leaseholders, younger people, and people for whom English is a second language
 - Developing a robust approach to evaluation to ensure the new approach to engagement is delivering the outcomes that are intended.

Recommendations

- We have organised our recommendations into three distinct, but related, areas: the approach to engagement, the structures for engagement and the methods of engagement.

Approach to engagement

- A co-design process is established which enables a ‘community conversation’ to develop a collaborative approach to engagement. This new collaborative approach should:
 - Include a clear definition of what engagement means for Southwark which can be consistently applied across the Council.
 - Bring a greater focus on outcomes, not just outputs with a robust approach to evaluating engagement.
 - Embed transparency and openness, including sharing data sets with strategic bodies.
 - Ensure consultation allows sufficient time for tenants to contribute to decision-making.
 - Begin the process of rebuilding trust between tenants, homeowners and the Council.
 - Embed accountability more firmly into engagement structures.
 - Adopt an asset based approach that values under-used community assets.
 - Create and values different ways for residents to engage.
 - Actively engage young people by working with Southwark Young Advisors and the Southwark Youth Council
 - Better communicate information about the Tenants and Homeowners Funds and align spending with local priorities.
 - Reflect the importance of strong leadership within the Council and the community to deliver effective engagement.

Formal Engagement Structures

- Taking steps to improve the formal engagement structures by addressing duplication and inefficiency in the current structures by:
 - Merge the Homeowners Council and the Tenants Councils.
 - Merge the Area Housing Forums with the existing Community Councils.
 - Establish a new scrutiny or oversight group for housing involving Council (members and officers), tenants, homeowners and other stakeholders.
 - Establishing a new 'Ideas and Innovation group' with a remit to develop new initiatives as a mechanism for collaboration and creative approaches to be developed.
 - Increased use of co-design groups involving council officers, members, tenants and leaseholders to look at specific issues.
 - Using strategic groups more strategically.

Engagement Methods

- Develop a broad range of communication and engagement methods that are multi-channel and tailored to different audiences and types of engagement by:
 - Personalising communications and tailoring messages to specific audiences to encourage engagement.
 - Address the over-reliance on meetings by providing quicker and more flexible ways of participating
 - Make more effective use of Digital Tools based on enabling two-way engagement rather than being just another broadcast channel.
 - Identify and address poor engagement and communication practice through staff training and support.

Item 6 (Paper 4) – Legal and Regulatory Framework

Legal

The Housing Act (1985) required Councils and Housing Associations in England and Wales to inform and consult secure tenants (individually rather than collectively) on specific matters relating to the management of their homes. In particular, Section 104 of the Act required Landlords give all tenants a written explanation of their conditions of tenancy, statutory rights, the Landlord's repairing obligations and the arrangements for consultation. Section 105 of the Act placed a duty on Councils to consult tenants on any changes in housing management.

Regulation

All social housing, and tenants, is covered by a Regulator – the [Regulator for Social Housing](#). The Regulator carries out its role through a [series of standards](#) that all social landlords are expected to meet. These standards are split into 'economic' (governance, finance, rent and VFM) and 'consumer' standards (including involvement, Decent Homes, ASB, repairs and maintenance). Councils, and their tenants, are affected primarily through the consumer standards that are not actively regulated.

The Housing Act and regulatory standards are not prescriptive about how involvement should be carried out.

Safeguards

There are three safeguards:

- The ability to make complaints through landlord's complaints processes and then to the Housing Ombudsman
- Tenant Scrutiny Panels
- The regulator could intervene if there was "serious detriment"

Regulatory Notices

The Regulator issues Regulatory Notices if a consumer standard has been breached. To date there have been 30 Regulatory Notices issued. Of these 17 relate solely to Gas Safety (and another jointly), 4 to Fire Safety, 2 to Repairs and one each for tenant safety, Decent Homes, Housing Tenancy and Tenancy Rights. Two of these were issued to Local Authorities.

Green Paper into Social Housing

As part of the Government wider response to the Grenfell Tower it has published a [Social Housing Green Paper](#), preceded by a number of meetings with tenants by the then Minister of State for Housing and Planning Alok Sharma. The Hackett Report has also highlighted the importance of [involving tenants and leaseholders](#) and ensuring that tenant voice is heard.

Key issues raised in the Green Paper include:

- A pilot on sharing information with residents on safety,
- Improving access and times for resolving complaints,
- Supporting tenants to understand how their landlord's performance compares to others,
- Expectations that landlords will involve and engage their residents
- That the Regulator will become more active on consumer issues

Implications

Changes could affect Local Authorities, who currently receive little attention from the Regulator, to ensure they are compliant on issues such as tenant involvement, tenant scrutiny and tenant and Home Owner safety.

Item 7 (Paper 5) – Panel Objectives

Although not prescriptive the Council would like the Panel to consider the following:

1. Panel meets to decide its order of business and methods of working (including review of Kaizen report)
2. Panel discusses and develops a vision of how the involvement structure should look and work
3. Panel considers role of TRAs and Area Housing Forums
4. Panel considers role of Tenant Council and Homeowner Council
5. Panel considers use and management of Tenant and Homeowner funds
6. Panel considers management of TRA halls
7. Panel reviews Chair's draft report and produces final report and recommendations

I would also like the Panel to consider expanding item 3 to include engagement at a community level, and to expand item 4 to include engagement on wider issues such as housing strategy and policies, service standards and accountability to tenants and Home Owners.

Item 8 (Paper 6) – Code of Conduct and Team Ethos

To ensure that meetings are conducted in the spirit in which all opinions can be heard, the following Code of Conduct will apply to all Panel members and meetings:

1. Prepare for each meeting by reading the required papers.
2. Attend on time, and notify the Chair if you can't attend, or have any problems with participation.
3. Work collectively and seek consensus/agreement.
4. Speak through the Chair, ensuring that you wait until you have been asked to make your contribution.
5. All members have a responsibility to conduct themselves in a way that does not cause offence to others or limits in any way their ability to participate in a meeting.
6. The above includes racist, sexist or other derogatory remarks or actions, behaviour that intimidates people who are speaking or wish to speak, and preventing people from expressing their views by interrupting them or talking whilst they are speaking.
7. The Panel Chair will point out to anyone who breaches this Code of Conduct that unacceptable behaviour will not be tolerated.
8. If unacceptable behaviour persists, a motion will be put to the meeting to suspend the person from meetings of the Panel.
9. Future participation by such persons will be dependent on a written commitment, sent to the Chair that such behaviour will not be repeated.
10. Further breaches of the Code of Conduct by such persons will result in their right to attend meetings being withdrawn.
11. Keep discussions confidential and do not distribute papers unless authorised to do so by the Chair.

Item 9b (Paper 7) – How to receive information

Inevitably for a first meeting there has been a reliance on papers drawn up in advance. However it is for the Panel to decide how they want to receive information going forward.

Papers to the Panel

This can be paper based – case studies and reports from the Council and other landlords working with their tenants and Home Owners. If the Chairs briefing is helpful I can continue that.

Presentations to the Panel

This can include inviting people to attend the Panel and provide their experiences. This can include Southwark tenants, Home Owners, staff and councillors. Experiences can also be sought from outside of Southwark.

Panel research

Panel members could undertake their own research as agreed with the Panel. In addition both John McCormack and I can provide examples of how other landlords engage and work with their tenants and Home Owners.

Visits

Panel members can visit other areas to see how they operate (although this would need to take account of availability of Panel members)

Council staff

Alongside the Sounding Board (Paper 8) and views sought directly from Area Housing Forums and TRAs it would also be useful to gain the input of staff as a stakeholder in the Panel's work. As with the Sounding Board this will be collated by John McCormack and shared with the Panel.

Area Housing Forums and TRAs

Area Housing Forums and TRAs have been invited to share views and evidence. This will be collated and shared with the Panel for meeting 3.

Item 9c (Paper 8) – Sounding Board

Nearly 100 residents (including tenants, Home Owners and residents) applied to join the Panel. Most of these were unsuccessful in that application but we were keen to ensure they had a voice during the work of the Panel.

Therefore we have invited the unsuccessful applicants to join a Sounding Board. This allows the Panel to seek views of others when considering its objectives. This could be before a discussion, or on issues or views following a discussion.

Our current thinking is to provide a short summary of Panel discussions to the Sounding Board after each meeting along with both closed (Yes/No) and open questions (What do you think?). John McCormack will collate responses and feed these back to the Panel both through the portal and for the final meeting of the Panel.

Item 9d (Paper 9) – Proposed Dates, Times and Topics

There is a requirement for the Panel to complete its work by mid-November. The proposed dates for the meetings would be fortnightly except at the end when we will meet weekly. The final meeting will be to discuss and agree a report based on the reports from each of the previous meetings.

For the first meeting we have identified a time between 6pm and 8.30pm. We can discuss the start time and length of the meeting.

For the first meeting we have identified this venue and will check whether this is suitable for future meetings with the Panel.

The topics are based on the Council's proposed topics. However the Panel is considering these in Paper 5.

Meetings

Meeting 1 - 23rd August: Panel meets to decide its order of business and methods of working (including review of Kaizen report)

Meeting 2 – 13th September: Panel discusses and develops a vision of how the involvement structure should look and work

Meeting 3 – 27th September: Panel considers role of TRAs and Area Housing Forums

Meeting 4 – 11th October: Panel considers role of Tenant Council and Homeowner Council

Meeting 5 – 25th October: Panel considers use and management of Tenant and Homeowner funds

Meeting 6 – 1st November: Panel considers management of TRA halls

Meeting 7 – 8th November: Panel reviews Chair's draft report and produces final report and recommendations