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Scrutiny Panel
Catalyst Communities HA interim report was assessed by the TPAS Scrutiny Panel on 5th September 2011. The Scrutiny Panel agreed with the interim assessment and made no changes to the overall assessed units. CCHA have been awarded the TPAS Kitemark in Resident Involvement until September 2014. Comments and recommendations from the scrutiny Panel can be seen at the end of this report.

Overview
TPAS Consultancy was commissioned by Catalyst Communities Housing Association in April 2008 to assess the quality of the Resident Involvement (RI) arrangements of the organisation. The initial commission included the assessment of both Fortunegate and Kensington Housing Trust (the other operating companies within the Catalyst Housing Group).

An initial desk top review of theme one, however, indicated that across the group, there was a significant amount of work required to achieve the expected standards, and in July 2008, the decision was taken to withdraw from the process and to develop internal action plans to work towards re-submitting evidence at a later date.

TPAS were invited back to recommence the process of assessment in early 2010, focusing on the CCHA area of the business. Throughout the time that TPAS have been working with CCHA, the organisation/group have been through a significant period of change. Additionally, between initial checks in 2010, a further process of action planning and the early part of 2011 when the fuller assessment was commenced, the requirements of the quality framework changed significantly, all of which contributed to delays in reaching the current stage of reporting.

The Landlord Accreditation was carried out by Richard Tomkinson – Senior Associate Consultant.
Background

CCHA provides more than 12,500 mixed tenure homes across London and the Thames Valley to Oxford and Reading, and is the largest member of the Catalyst Housing Group.

The full group structure can be seen below. CCHA incorporates a number of subsidiaries, including Vintage Care, which manages Acton Care Centre – caring for up to 125 people with advanced illnesses and dementia and Brent Community Homes which works in partnership with the Fremantle Trust to provide residential care for around 350 older people in Barnet. Additionally, CCHA incorporates Catalyst Gateway, a charitable trust formed in 2010 to bring together the groups community development activities.
CCHA have been working to a group-wide strategy since 2009 which includes three key ambitions for the group (which more recently are referred to as ‘strategic pillars’). These are:

- A dramatic improvement in the way that the customer shapes our products and services
- Substantial growth by developing new homes and by enlarging the group
- Greater profitability so that we are less reliant on scarcer public subsidy.

Operationally, these strategic pillars have been further developed since the overall strategy was first published. In the 2010/11 CCHA Operational plan, services should focus on delivery of outcomes by ‘CHG strategic pillar’:

- **Customers** - improving the way services are delivered, meeting their needs more effectively confirmed through increased customer satisfaction.
- **Profitability** - improving the vfm - efficiency and effectiveness - of services as well as increasing income opportunities will achieve the profitability target for 2012
- **Growth** - achieving successful handovers of new builds, stock transfers and other acquisitions reinforces CHG reputation and enables us to bid for future development opportunities to achieve this goal.

**Area of Operation:**

The specific area of operation can be seen below.
CCHA have a concentration of stock (circa 8000+ units) within Ealing, Oxford and Reading – key areas of operation for Ealing Family Housing Association (the operating name by which CCHA were formerly known).

**Corporate Governance**

CCHA is governed by a Board of Management consisting of 12 members, 1/3 of which are residents and 2/3 independents. At the time of assessment, the Board had a number of vacancies and was operating with 8 members of which 2 were residents (25%). No plans are in place to recruit to vacancies since the organisation is in the middle of an extensive group restructure, which will see the housing associations in the Group join together (October 2011) to become a single company – Catalyst Housing.

The restructure, has been progressed in close consultation with residents, who have also had extensive opportunities to influence the new governance arrangements for the new structure.

Once the restructure is completed, there will be a single Registered Provider Board and 4 Local Boards (two of which will be in CCHA’s current area of operation). Local Boards will comprise 50% resident...
membership and the overall Group Board will have a resident member.

The Group Residents Federation appointed this member through a selection process which incorporated application and interview. TPAS provided independent advice/support to GRF members during the process and observed all interviews. GRF members were wholly responsible for the decision to appoint.

**Customer profiles available**
The table below details customer profiles currently available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key area</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Customer profiles available</strong> (% data collected for tenant one and tenant two on tenancy agreement)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>No Data%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or Belief</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>CCHA’s Overall Customer Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>24.4%-BME, 28.2%-White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M-62.7%, F-37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>No data %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual,</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Other,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0% Lesbian,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, Bisexual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5% Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion or Belief</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2% Non-Christian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7% No religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TPAS Reality Checking Programme

The reality checks involved a series of one to one interviews (in person and on the telephone) with Board Members, Staff, involved tenants and uninvolved tenants. Focus groups were undertaken, with staff, involved tenants and uninvolved tenants.

Staff/Board Members Interviewed included:
- Managing Director (CCHA)
- Managing Director (Fortunegate) – Lead Strategic Responsibility RI
- Head of Asset Management
- Head of Community Investment
- Human Resources Manager
- Governance manager
- Performance Improvement Officer
- Communications
- Resident Involvement Manager
- Resident Involvement Officer
- Chair

Active tenants interviewed included tenant board members. A number of interviewees incorporated several roles. Activities which they sought to represent through the interview process included:

- Board Membership
- Group-wide Forum
- Resident Scrutiny
- Local & Service Based Forums
- TARA’s
- Block Representative

Involved residents who formed part of the focus group further represented:

- Youth Forum
- Older Tenants Forum
- ‘Successful Futures’
- General Consultations
We observed Resident Involvement activities including:

- Board Meeting
- Resident Board Member Recruitment/Selection Interviews
- Group Restructure consultation meeting
- Neighbourhood meeting to consider Group restructure and local offers
- London residents Forum
- Complaints Policy Review
- Leaseholder association meeting
- Residents Group (Dee Park Regeneration)

The contents of this report have been agreed with CCHA and were presented for scrutiny 5th September 2011. The scrutiny panel agreed with the overall assessment and the individual module assessments, and have awarded Catalyst Communities Housing Association the TPAS Kitemark from September 2011 – September 2014.

The extent of changes undergone during the process of assessment, coupled with the impending group restructure means that CCHA can expect further significant change over the next 12 months. Whilst the value of accreditation and the recommendations contained within this report (once implemented) will be extremely beneficial to CCHA as the group restructure is implemented. It is recommended that TPAS re-visit Catalyst Housing (light-touch) 12 months after the restructure in October to assess the effectiveness with which existing good practice across the Group, and many of the planned changes (e.g. resident Conference in September to develop key action plan and priorities) is enshrined in the new approach, with a view to achieving full accreditation for the new company (Catalyst Housing).

Richard Tomkinson has been in frequent contact with Michael Simms, Resident Involvement Manager throughout the assessment and there have been several progress meetings to ensure stringent quality standards were achieved.

TPAS Consultancy would like to thank all of the tenants and residents at CCHA (and the wider Group) who took part in the reality checking
process and a large number of staff and Board members, without their support the assessment could not have been undertaken so thoroughly. Particular thanks must go to Michael Simms and Katerina Getsevich for their time and energy in supporting the process. We hope they think their efforts have been worth it.

TPAS would advise that final recommendations should be implemented within a timeframe which ensures evidence can be provided upon (light-touch) re-assessment (circa October 2012) – ideally within the first 6 months of the new Group structure. This will both ensure that minor weaknesses in existing arrangements are addressed and that aspects of the accreditation which have been approved based on planned implementation within the new group approach, are able to be fully confirmed.

Each recommendation is highlighted within this report.

A completed matrix, showing the detailed assessment of each stage of the landlord accreditation process is provided by TPAS Consultancy as an appendix to this report.
**THEME 1: Strategic Commitment to Involvement & Empowerment**

Unit 1.1: The landlord has clear aims for its approach to resident involvement & empowerment and these aims are influenced by resident’s priorities and aspirations

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord’s key document relating to resident involvement &amp; empowerment (Involvement Strategy and or TP Compact) has a clear link to the Business Strategy and Corporate aims of the landlord.</td>
<td>1.1 YES: RI Strategy makes clear links with corporate vision, values and missions statement and describes how RI will contribute to achieving these. Section 2 of RI Strategy is entitled ‘Principles and Corporate Objectives and quotes the organisational goal: ‘a dramatic improvement in the way that the customer shapes our products and services’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Yes: Our Strategy’ highlights that Catalyst will be customer driven and lists the RI Strategy as a key supporting strategy. Operational plan which flows from Business Plan and Group Strategy and RI is one of 7 priority areas. RI strategy, section 4, pages 2 &amp; 3 detail the approach to developing a central strategic role for the Company Residents Federation (CRF, the replacement for the Group residents Federation – GRF) including ‘co-ordinating the corporate scrutiny programme’ and that ‘service and policy review programmes will be aligned with the programme of scrutiny’.</td>
<td>1.3 Yes: RI strategy and action plan clearly present the core aims and principles of involvement, including</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a full explanation of each of the 10 key objectives. These are:

- To develop the central strategic role of the Residents’ Federation using a programme of scrutiny

- To support Local Boards in developing specific local involvement arrangements to scrutinise, audit and service test, performance, policy, and service delivery against local offers.

- To widen involvement by increasing the numbers and diversity of residents involved.

- To involve residents at a deeper level of engagement and to develop more involved and empowered residents at this ‘deeper’ level.

- To create a single database of involved residents to enable greater knowledge and monitoring of involvement.

- To embed involvement and positive customer engagement within the organisational culture by working with relevant managers and staff (including contractors) to foster an “engagement culture”.

- To use a range of methods to involve residents according to their needs and aspirations using formal and informal techniques and creating
accessible involvement opportunities for all (technology, location etc - removing geographical barriers).

- To develop a programme of tailored training to develop residents’ capacity for their scrutiny role and a system of coaching and mentoring to sustain and embed residents’ learning.
- To ensure residents receive good quality information about issues relating to their scrutiny role.
- To recognise and reward commitment of residents making an active contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The landlord’s involvement &amp; empowerment priorities and methods are influenced by residents and that this influence is reflected in the main strategy document relating to resident involvement. <em>(New standard since first submission)</em></th>
<th>2.1 Yes: Clear commitment in strategy to exchange information with residents to ensure they can influence RI approach.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.2 Clear statement within the strategy that it has been developed with input from residents, utilising existing residents meetings and a core group of GRF members comprising 12 residents – clear in RI Panel minutes (predecessor of GRF) 07.04.09 that when CCHA first began organising strategic delivery of RI on a groupwide basis, this was discussed with residents and agreement was sought and reached, with residents feeling ‘it was easier to understand the relevance of this document’.
| 2.3 Yes: Commitment within the strategy for levels of RI in monitoring of service reviews and clear project based evidence that this happens e.g. steering committees and Older Tenants Forum. New strategy contains a section on monitoring and measures (section 6), along with clear plans for area based impact assessment, collation into a single overall assessment and plans for scrutiny by the CRF. Overall strategy has been reviewed twice since TPAS’s first involvement and methods of involvement are reviewed each time utilising an RI questionnaire for activity planning and requesting additional comments. Good number of responses (from 47 involved residents) and clear evidence that views have been taken into account in planning future delivery e.g. 23 residents highlighted they would like to be involved in leading focus groups/meetings and training was provided. |
| 2.4 YES: Action plan presents clear standards, priorities and targets. Evidence that action plan was developed with the Group Residents Forum and previous Resident Involvement Panels (evidence provided includes minutes of these groups year on year dating back to 2007). New strategy developed during |
assessment period through review incorporating meetings with staff, local offer resident meetings, GRF, residents attending info. sessions on local boards (verified through interviews with both staff and residents) and previous customer feedback through STATUS. Currently working to actions carried over from previous strategy and minutes confirm that residents supported this approach. Resident conference in September 2011 will be utilised to further develop the action plan/operational plan – which will continue to link to the ‘strategic pillars’ of the overall corporate plan (Strategy), particularly: ‘Customers - improving the way services are delivered, meeting their needs more effectively confirmed through increased customer satisfaction’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. There is a clear Corporate commitment to involving a broad diversity of residents.</th>
<th>3.1 Yes: Clear commitment contained in RI. Strategy through key objective 3 (above) Action plan shows clear commitment to involving young people and ‘those not usually involved’. Youth forum developed during course of assessment and clear examples of good practice (Prison visits for young females). Clear commitment to responding to the diversity of communities and actions as above. Clear RI priority in draft diversity strategy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Yes: Clear evidence of collection of profiling data across 6 diversity strands (gender identity not explicit – evidence of attempts to collect, but no data currently available), and commitment to broaden diversity of involvement. Strategy includes clear commitment to a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
range of service users including those in supported housing. New strategy contains clear commitment to widen involvement by increasing the numbers and diversity of those involved utilizing profiling information to ensure involvement reflects the wider residents profile (page 3). Commitment to undertake Equality Impact assessments on the strategy and its implementation – evidence that equalities impacts are considered as part of activity-based impact assessment – plans to expand this approach and to gain expressions of interest for more detailed involvement by residents at conference September 2011.

3.3 Yes: Reality checking showed strong evidence e.g. Hillingdon developed partnering arrangements around resident scrutiny which developed sub-projects around training different groups. CCHA delivered good practice through ‘Look ahead’ – training in Mystery shopping for vulnerable tenants and those in supported housing. Developing a database of communication needs of involved/interested residents and have software applications allowing written communications in large font/production of audio files. Developing approach to involving those with low literacy levels.

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS
CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment and strongly recommend that when collecting customer profiling data, any refusals to answer are recorded within the overall statistics.

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:
- Youth Forum: Prison Trips – 9 young women aged 14-17, all known to the Police as serious and frequent offenders. Programme of prison visits challenged stereotypes, assumptions, perceptions, self-worth and the effect/impact of crime. All still involved to some degree in positive diversionary activities.
- Hillingdon Local Offer Pilot – Developed specific training course aimed at involving vulnerable/supported residents in Mystery Shopping activities.

Comment/Recommendation: CCHA recognise that there is more work to do on understanding the profile of their customer base and have begun to work towards a clear understanding. There was suggestion that the profile was nearly there – at 90% and that information continued to be collected at each interaction. Unfortunately, the documentary evidence provided does not support this.

- Once achieved, CCHA should work with involved residents to identify key areas of under-representation and a clear ‘need to reach’ strategy.
- Record any refusals to provide profiling information within the overall statistics.
THEME 1: Strategic Commitment to Involvement & Empowerment

Unit 1.2: The landlords approach to resident involvement & empowerment has clearly identified outcomes that are assessed in collaboration with residents

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord produces an action plan for its resident involvement.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Clear action plan and evidence of review on an annual basis (minutes of RI Panels and GRF show involvement dating back to 2007. Clear links in new strategy with overall organisational strategy through the ‘Customer’ strategic pillar detailed above and through section 2, ‘Principals and Corporate Objectives’. Action/operational plan carried over from previous approach with conference in September to develop further with residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Yes: Strong interview and focus group evidence from a variety of staff and residents that tasks are related to the ‘strategic pillars’ of the organisation and that this approach is understood. Operational plans are managed at Board level by exception (when things are not working) – progress is traffic-lighted and details are not requested unless failures are identified. RI is one of 7 strands across the organisations approach to operational performance management. Interview evidence confirms a close link and understanding from residents that whilst the strategic pillars of ‘Growth’ and ‘Profitability’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are not their particular priorities, they drive the investment in the ‘Customer’ pillar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Resident involvement action plan is communicated to residents and subject to resident negotiation.</th>
<th>2.1 Yes: Clear links between action plans, impact assessments and clear resident influence through London Residents Forum (LRF)/GRF (and its predecessors). Board report provides evidence of resident influence on action plan RI Panel minutes (12.11.08) show clear evidence that residents are involved in setting and delivering against priorities, along with clear role in monitoring and scrutiny. Clear plan (known across various aspects of the organization and by residents, as confirmed in interviews) that further development is planed through the resident conference to be held in September.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. An Impact Assessment and Action plan is monitored by a resident led group and tasks have measurable performance outcomes, have processes for monitoring progress and have identified impacts at completion. <em>(i.e. Tasks are based on SMART targets)</em></td>
<td>3 Yes: RI Impact assessment previously developed with GRF. GRF clearly the key monitoring group and members have clear areas of specialism/responsibility e.g.: Local Standards <em>(All)</em> Developing the GRF website <em>(Terrence &amp; Richard)</em> Newsletter <em>(Janet)</em> Widening Resident Involvement &amp; Representation/Diversity <em>(All)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training Programme *(Robert / John / Janet)*
Understanding the business do’s & don’ts: possibly through Catalyst’s new staff induction *(All)*
Conferences *(John/ Michael)*
Scrutiny *(Abdou/ Michael)*
Sharing our good practice *(All)*
Providing feedback on the GRF/ Annual report *(All)*
Carry out GRF’s own independent residents survey *(All)*
Young adults involvement *(Katerina, CCHA RI Officer & Michelle, FCH RI Officer)*
Nominate new CHG resident Board Member *(Janet)*
GRF Budget *(Michael / John)*

(as detailed in GRF minutes March 2010).

3.1. Performance reports are received from both RI and wider areas and progress is monitored. This will be more detailed moving forward through the single company approach though interview evidence suggests that performance monitoring has struggled to gain follow through at GRF – scope for development of neighbourhood involvement plans flowing from overall approach. CRF (GRF) are keen to develop a clear residents business plan, and should be supported in doing so.

4. Action plan tasks apply basic cost/benefit assessment.

4.1 Yes: Impact review makes a value for money judgement, but this is not supported by evidence of inputs though it is clear that inputs are considered at project proposal stage (see OTF below). Certain tasks are discussed at LRF e.g. annual maintenance grant and it
was generally acknowledged by residents that staff try to engage them in this type of activity but that interest has been limited to date. Residents have asked for the information to be simplified for the audience. Documentary evidence includes financial breakdown of costs per event for Older Tenant Forum activities, which is prepared and signed off jointly by the Treasurer (resident) and a Community Regen. Advisor (staff), along with a clear project proposal detailing the anticipated costs and record of actual spend.

4.2 Yes: As above, though no costs benefit analysis has been submitted as evidence an intranet search shows a number of examples including training programme evaluations which considers numbers of participants against cost of course. Some strong examples of value for money being achieved at task level e.g. Trained residents as trainers (keeping costs down) and plans to consider devolving grant funding for training to LRF will be considered in light of the cost/benefit to the organisation. Most cost/benefit analysis is currently undertaken by the RI manager though there are plans for team members (frontline officers) to do this in future – this will require training for both staff and residents. Residents appear keen to be engaged in VFM activities around residents communications, and should be encouraged to be more involved.

Preliminary Assessment: PASS
Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted – plans have begun to progress all the points below, beginning with a scrutiny of VFM. There is also a training course advertised on our new training programme for participatory budgeting.

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:
- Providing ‘Train the Trainer’ training for residents to deliver training to other residents.

Comment/Recommendation: CCHA have struggled to engage residents effectively in this area, but are clearly trying – and involved residents are beginning to see the benefits of the approach. There needs to be a more systematic approach to outcomes thinking and value for money/cost benefit assessments.

- Training should be provided to both residents and staff in this area, and a clear approach to on-going monitoring needs to be developed.

- CRF (GRF) should be supported in developing a clear resident business plan.

- Resident involvement in VFM/Communications should be enhanced (possible VFM review/Scrutiny).
**THEME 1: Strategic Commitment to Involvement & Empowerment**

Unit 1.3: The landlord is clear about the scope of its approach to resident involvement & empowerment

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Residents and staff understand the scope of involvement &amp; empowerment, and expectations are 'managed.'</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: There is clear evidence within the strategy, RI statement and an extensive ‘guide to involvement’ that the range of involvement opportunities is clearly explained to residents, along with a commitment to set boundaries/limits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Models within the new strategy clearly demonstrate the extent of influence locally and centrally and provide clear detail of how the range of different methods link through a ‘current fit between involvement and single company structure’ chart. A further model details information and report flows between involvement methods, scrutiny and the local and group boards.

ii. CCHA is an organisation which seeks to set no formal limits on the scope of influence of involvement and strong relationships between involved residents and staff at all levels were evident – with both staff and residents confident that any issues could be resolved through direct
communication.

iii. RI Statement details each involvement activity and a pictorial code (clocks) of the time commitment required – from 30 minutes to on-going involvement, with a clear statement that anyone engaging in activity which ‘takes 2-3 hours every couple of months can decide to stop taking part at anytime’

iv. Skills and knowledge is a slightly weak area but this is addressed in the guide to involvement to some extent, through detailing a number of specific roles (pages 9 & 10), and through highlighting ‘Whether you are just starting out or are an established group, you may need to increase the available skills in your group through training’, and associated courses on page 19.

v. The guide to involvement, has sections on money matters (section 6) detailing grants and financial support, training (section 8) and sources of support (section 9), along with clear signposting of useful contacts (appendix b). There is also a clear commitment within the new strategy; ‘Increased involvement activity requires a budgetary approach based on the requirement for more intensive training and support’.

1.2 Yes: There was widespread
### Evidence through reality checks of understanding the range of involvement methods and their scope

Additionally, there was clear evidence of ‘learning through doing’, and a sense that the informal nature of this approach works for lots of residents and that by ‘outlining skills required at the outset, you put people off’. The informal approach is however supported by initial training e.g. block reps and formal terms of reference/constitutions – Involved Residents are utilised to outline the benefits when seeking to recruit new residents/develop new opportunities and this certainly contributed to high levels of interest in the new local board opportunity. The development of local boards with clear terms of reference and budgetary responsibility will further enhance this area of understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. There is a statement of the role of residents in the governance of the organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Yes: Involvement questionnaire includes Board membership as an option and clearly details the role and time requirement. The new strategy contains a clear section relating to local boards and their role in developing specific local involvement arrangements to ‘scrutinise, audit and service test, performance, policy, and service delivery against local offers’. Group restructure review consultations and information sessions clearly outlined the role of residents in the formal governance of the organisation and provided ample written support information, and TPAS observed the selection process which was wholly led/delivered by residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted – Leanne Baxter, Head of Catalyst Gateway attended the 4th July CRF meeting and is meeting with the RI Manager to draft proposed format for providing information to the CRF

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- Involving experienced residents in the promotion of involvement and involvement activities.
- Training session for Block Representatives – and then delivery by experienced block representatives in recruiting new tenants.

Comment/Recommendation: Throughout CCHA there is strong evidence of a really trusting and positive relationship between involved tenants and staff at all levels. When residents need additional advice, information and support, it is forthcoming. The approach to peer support and training is yielding success and the relaxed but supportive approach is unlike any other I have seen – in that it appears to work for this organisation.

There is a small chance that this approach creates a difficulty in recruiting more residents in large numbers, but the evidence suggests that this is addressed if it arises.

- Some concern was raised around the funding, governance and decision-making of Catalyst Gateway, and it will be important to provide clear and transparent supporting information to the GRF (and wider residents) about this area of the business in the near future.
### THEME 1: Strategic Commitment to Involvement & Empowerment

Unit 1.4: The landlord routinely reviews the impact and costs of its resident involvement activities in collaboration with residents

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord routinely records its resident involvement costs.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Budget submitted is very basic, but Board report shows budget and actual spend is recorded and monitored. Additional information includes the ‘Get Learning’ training evaluations and OTF project proposal/evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The landlord undertakes an impact assessment of RI activities annually which involves residents who are able to influence the conclusions and subsequent actions.</td>
<td>2.1 Yes: Impact review shows that CCHA regularly assess the impact of RI and discusses with GRF. Plans to extend more widely and consider at annual conference (September 11) and develop broader approach to evaluation of involvement. '17 ways ' document details 17 ways that CCHA residents have helped improve services with examples ranging from the introduction of a new resident liaison officer role, to the development of a new repairs handbook and RI Statements (3 years worth submitted) include details of previous years achievements. E.g. ‘Environmental Watchers (Reading) 175 residents who had previously expressed an interest in environmental issues were contacted and as a result, residents in Slough and Reading have attended estate walkabouts/inspections with Neighbourhood Managers. Volunteers are continuing to come forward and as a result are now involved on an ongoing basis'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Yes: ‘What residents want’ surveys assess what CCHA do, what residents think and whether any more could be done differently – this approach evolved and utilised in local offer neighbourhood consultations. Block reps have annual process where their position is opened up to volunteers – which includes details of achievements etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>The landlord has a set of indicators which have been negotiated with residents that measure the impact of RI activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Yes: Clear links throughout the organisation from overall strategy through operational plans and impact review which links to priority outcomes within the action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Yes: Clear evidence of assessing outcomes against objectives through impact review, which includes judgements in relation to unexpected/added value impacts and some examples against this e.g. 26 residents deciding they want to achieve more than one accredited qualification through training. Also evidence of equality impact considerations and actions/outcomes e.g. for a focus group with employment and training service users, measuring the diversity of the project demonstrated that 80% of participants were from BME backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Yes: Evidence of quantitative and qualitative indicators, developed with tenants through TSA local standards in Hillingdon, but unclear across other areas. Service standards do contain a range of service promises, which are considered (in parts) through the impact assessment, which details SMART outcomes. Operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
plan contains key actions (to be developed further at resident conference) and a dashboard assessment of progress is used. Strong evidence of clear understanding at all levels (both staff and residents) of the outcomes and impact achieved by RI and examples offered include those which 'add value' e.g. work placement week provided for 15 residents at CCHA following training course. '17 ways' document details added value examples such as the development of a youth programme through Page Road involvement.

| 4. The landlord seeks external funding and resources to support resident involvement activities. | 4.1 Yes: Extensive range of external funding bids including ESF for get learning (delivering training and employment for 50 individuals), People millions bid for Windmill park CC (refurbishment of community centre and purchase of media equipment to develop a young persons diversion project reducing ASB and gang related crime and increase participation), capital growth fund for community garden, Southall Day Centre securing £176,000 from London Councils for Health & Social Care projects, TEP funding for Local offer pilot etc. | 4.2 Yes: Clear example of GRF working with CCHA to develop resource centre – considered by board 02.09, with acknowledgement and support for a bid to the Community development trust (predecessor of Community Gateway) along with example of supporting a local |
residents association to achieve the necessary funding to establish a chess club. Some concerns raised by residents about transparency of funding of/through Catalyst Gateway.

4.3 Yes: Strong evidence (documented via focus groups and interviews) that the support outlined above is welcomed and appreciated. Board minutes include a key involved resident asking that it be ‘formally noted that the GRF are really pleased with the work that Michael Simms was doing’ (in support of their attempts to secure/develop a resource centre.

5. The landlord considers outsourcing its resident involvement projects and services.

5.1 Yes: Outsource a number of activities e.g. training (TPAS, HACT (The Housing Action Charity), community investment activities through Gateway, and utilise the experience of external specialist providers where their experience is significantly more than CCHA’s. Some consideration of the future role of community and social enterprises. No formal consideration of wholesale outsourcing though evidence of KPMG review of RI shows clear internal/external audit approach.

Preliminary Assessment: Partial

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted - work continues to develop exiting current measures. Recent examples include work on developing
measures with residents on monitoring local offers and the new customer charter

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment and feel that ’17 ways’ is an example of good practise.

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practice:
- CCHA seeks and achieves high levels of external funding to support a range of RI outcomes and deliver wider community benefit.
- 17 ways

Comment/Recommendation: The slight weakness here is in having a robust set of quantitative and qualitative indicators which measure the impact. Plans are in place to develop this area of work at the September residents' conference.

- Develop a clear set of quantitative and qualitative indicators/measures which demonstrate the full extent of impact of resident involvement at CCHA.
THEME 1: Strategic Commitment to Involvement & Empowerment

Unit 1.5: The landlord is positive about the principles of tenant management

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord promotes good quality, resident friendly information about Tenant Management and supports those residents that wish to investigate it.</td>
<td>• <em>No new evidence provided following previous assessment.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The landlord sees Tenant management as part of a continuum.</td>
<td>• <em>As above</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>(Alternatively)</em> there is an agreed rationale for not undertaking tenant management activities.</td>
<td>3.1 Partial: Although no documentary evidence was submitted against this module of the assessment, interview and focus group evidence was supplied which suggests the organisation is stronger in this area than it first seemed. CCHA work within an area of operation incorporating 3 local authorities which have TMO’s (some poor examples, some good) – and involved residents are aware of this form of management, with one involved resident indicating that she had undertaken some individual research and discussed with members. Mill farm residents discussed tenant management options pre transfer, and some examples were offered of referring residents directly to the DCLG/TPAS website. Whilst there was an acknowledgement from senior staff that very little has been done in this area and the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organisation had not gone as far as discussing potential for wholesale management with residents, there were examples of discussing management of aspects of service e.g. cleaning – (Acton) where residents deliver the service in return for a reduction in service charge and local agreements around grounds maintenance etc. The staff focus group also highlighted that there is a commitment to develop a neighbourhood management organisation within the successful Dee Park regeneration bid, along with a previous TMO at Blackbird Leys (68-69) households. Additionally, there was an example of establishing a tenant management committee which lasted for 2 years, achieved its aims and then faltered.

| 4. The key resident involvement strategy provides information on Right to Manage Options or Resident Management. | • As above |

Preliminary Assessment: Standard not met

Interim Assessment: PARTIAL

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PARTIAL

Comment/Recommendation: Whilst it is clear that within the ‘strategic pillar’ of growth/profitability, this area is not deemed a priority, I did not get the sense that the organisation would avoid discussing with/informing residents about tenant management, if residents deemed it of interest.
## THEME 2: Opportunities to Involve & Influence

### Unit 2.1: The landlord employs a broad and accessible range of involvement opportunities

**Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The landlord employs a broad range of opportunities for resident involvement and influence. | Yes: There is a good range of both formal and informal techniques employed and evidence of how these methods influence services and decision-making. 3 x RI statements show the range of methods and each RI Strategy details, the current list of examples include:  
  - The Resident Involvement Panel  
  - Resident forums, groups and associations  
  - Online internet forum  
  - Estate surgeries  
  - Satisfaction surveys  
  - Focus groups  
  - Telephone surveys  
  - Communications Panel  
  - Resident Consultation Group  
  - Estate Walkabouts and Inspections  
  - Conferences and one off events  
  - Service Specific  
  - Improvement Panels  
  - Resident Inspectors - |
- Mystery Shopping
- Residents’ Groups
- Central Residents Scrutiny Group – Group Residents Federation
- Local Board Membership

The list is not exhaustive but gives examples of the ways in which residents can be involved. For example, residents are firmly involved in complaints panels and there are informal roles for Chairs of key groups such as the LRF, OTF and CRF in addressing informal complaints by liaising between residents and service managers.

Interview evidence demonstrates a high degree of understanding of involved tenants in the range of opportunities and how these are used to influence. Focus groups demonstrate that though uninvolved residents are less aware of some methods they could list some including training, residents groups, youth panel and local estate meetings, website feedback forms and events such as the local offer consultations and fundays.

Residents are regularly involved in assessing the methods of involvement through the GRF and RI Activity questionnaires and ‘what tenants want’ identifies those that wish to engage in specific activities/with different service areas – this constitutes a database of 600 residents, 250 of which were involved in the recent local offer consultations.

2. The landlord works with residents to

2.1 In addition to the above activity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decide which involvement opportunity to employ.</th>
<th>questionnaires, there is an example of an involvement method being established in response to resident suggestion (facebook), and the resident involvement questionnaire shows work has been undertaken with residents to establish preference for involvement methods. Annual Impact Review is activity based and considers value for money judgements. Strong evidence of Local Offer Pilot establishing how residents want to be involved. Interview evidence confirmed the above and that discussions take place at both the GRF and LRF following an initial panel convened for this purpose. Residents were keen to highlight (at interviews) that the menu of options is driven by residents not wanting meetings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The landlord and residents continuously review the impact, range of involvement, modify and adapt arrangements as appropriate.</td>
<td>3.1 Yes: The impact assessment and GRF minutes show evidence of continual monitoring and scope for change. Whilst GRF members highlighted that they were less forthcoming in this area, the RI Activity questionnaire and ‘What Tenants Want’ database demonstrate that significantly more numbers of involved residents are engaged in this process. 3.2 Impact assessment shows equalities impact and issues of under-representation are considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Assessment: PASS**

**Interim Assessment: PASS**
CCHA Comments: Accepted – will be reviewing the effectiveness of how we currently use Facebook. Our Communications Team have already set up a Twitter account to communicate with residents as well, will run pilot as suggested in recommendations below.

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:
- CCHA’s use of modern technologies in increasing the numbers and diversity of involved residents (particularly social media).

Comment/Recommendation: There is potential to extend the use of Facebook (and to use Twitter) to provide additional opportunities for customer insight, feedback and service.

- **Pilot the use of Twitter as a means for customers to provide feedback of both good and bad service. (Offer Company response within 1 hour of post during contact centre opening hours)**.
## THEME 2: Opportunities to Involve & Influence

### Unit 2.2: The landlord provides easily accessible information that is prepared in collaboration with residents

#### Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff are well informed regarding the provision of information about the landlord’s policies and service standards.</td>
<td>1.1 All reality checks highlighted a high level of awareness from staff regarding where to find information about policies and service standards e.g. website, intranet, reception areas, leaflet cupboard (South-East), and by asking staff directly. Frontline staff were generally confident about discussing with/advising residents though there appeared to be a degree of inconsistency in approach. Staff who had limited contact with tenants generally knew who to refer tenants onto if they were not confident in advising themselves. There was a wide variety of ways for residents to access information for themselves and good awareness from residents (including those who attended the uninvolved focus group) about how to do that e.g. website, information stands (receptions), through staff door-knocking, surveys, leaflets etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The landlord ‘signposts’ other sources of support and advice.</td>
<td>2.1 ‘Borrowing money’ leaflet signposts other services (e.g. credit unions and sources of advice e.g. credit action and consumer credit council, ‘Claiming compensation’ leaflet signposts CAB &amp; Shelter. Other leaflets detailed signpost other sources of support. Staff interviews, focus group and observational evidence of sign-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
posting a wide variety of services/agencies for wider community benefit and engaging effectively with other organizations to do so e.g. community centres, local groups, parish newsletters, PCSO’s etc. Local offer consultation observation demonstrated neighbourhood office clearly working in partnership with 3rd sector orgs. Sign-posts to green volunteer training, life savers, free English language lessons, mental health service, sports centre, children’s service, parent and toddler group, LA services, parent support etc

| 3. The landlord ensures that residents have timely access to information to allow them to be involved. | 3.1 Yes: There was strong interview and observational evidence of provision of information (including minutes and agenda) two weeks prior to meetings. There was, however some evidence of a lack of attention to detail when inviting residents to additional involvement activities (principally the reality checks for this assessment) and this needs to be addressed. Restructure observation demonstrated information had been provided in advance and there was a commitment to provide support documentation; ‘Changing for the Better’ in Braille, tape or explained in own language (x14). Leaseholder Association observation confirmed invites and agenda had been forwarded in advance and notices placed on block notice boards. 3.2 All information provided has a named staff member to contact and there was evidence through interviews and involved residents focus group that there is a good |
Residents generally felt very confident in getting a response to their enquiries.

| 4. Information is provided in accessible formats. | 4.1 Yes: Clear statement committing to availability in different languages (including Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Gujarati, Hindi, Polish, Punjabi, Somali, Portuguese and Spanish), large print, Braille, CD etc with a clear contact number and minicom number for requests to be received.  

4.2 YES: Interview evidence supports and there was strong awareness of the availability e.g. translation services through language line, audio provision, partnership working with local authorities to identify 'most common spoken languages‘ etc, and some residents stated that they had successfully used these services. RI team are developing an on-going database of communication needs and involvement preferences which currently has in excess of 600 households on it. |

Preliminary Assessment: PASS  
Interim Assessment: PASS  
CCHA Comments: Accepted  
Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment and feel that the database of involvement preferences is an example of good practice  
Final Assessment: PASS
Examples of Good Practise:

- On-going database of involvement preferences.

Comment/Recommendation: There is potential to improve attention to detail in this area and to ensure consistency of approach by staff members advising/promoting involvement opportunities.

- Include clear service standards relating to the provision of information in the work being undertaken to develop quantitative and qualitative indicators/measures
- Develop a clear support pack for frontline staff to discuss/promote involvement opportunities when face to face with residents
### THEME 2: Opportunities to Involve & Influence

Unit 2.3: The landlord provides core 'resident focussed' information

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. There is a regular resident newsletter that is subject to resident influence. | 1.1 Yes: Four copies of Housing Matters per year. Editorial Panel (changing to Customer Communications Panel) has opportunity to review previous issue and suggest content and contribute articles for next edition.  

1.2 Yes: Newsletters seen (in excess of 2 years worth) demonstrate good mix of corporate and community based info. and residents in interview highlighted that they found the newsletters interesting, but did wonder if CCHA could balance the ‘good news’ stories with occasional articles about what is not working so well.  

1.3 Yes: Interviews showed that residents editorial panel are involved in looking at the previous edition and providing thoughts/ideas for future editions, and previous minutes (submitted at first stage assessment, Summer 2008) shows residents contributing articles. Concerned to note there were no plans to afford the Customer Communications Panel the ability to sign-off the contents of the newsletter. This was deemed not to be viable under single company structure, though there are sector examples of this happening in larger organisations. |
Though CRF produce a twice yearly newsletter sent to all residents, and retain full editorial control. Local newsletters are also developed by neighbourhood managers and Blackbird Leys (Oxford) has a resident/volunteer run and produced newspaper, which is a very good example. There was a high degree of recognition by residents of the newsletters presented to them (Housing Matters, GRF) and 50% in the focus group of involved residents were aware that they could contribute articles. Additionally, residents do sign-off service based leaflets through the Customer Communications Panel, and some literature (e.g. RI Statement, Annual Report contains the GRF logo, with plans to develop a new kitemark for resident approval under single company structure. Annual report is ‘written in partnership between CCHA and the GRF’ (front page) contains an introduction by GRF Chair.

| 2. There is a comprehensive website detailing involvement that is subject to resident influence. | 2.1 Yes: Website has clear and informative section on involvement, including an up to date events calendar and a range of relevant documents e.g. strategy, model constitution, statement, E&D policy and recognition requirements for RA’s. The site is extremely attractive and very easy to navigate. This was confirmed by residents through interviews and focus groups, though suggestions were made for increased functionality e.g. access to accounts for balances and to make payments. |
| 2.2 | Yes: The site is clearly updated regularly as evidenced by the innovative and up to date events calendar (NB: events not replicated on the Catalyst Gateway website). There is clear information about group members and scope for residents to make enquiries about their specific landlord. |
| 2.3 | Yes: Website was recently renewed and residents were involved in testing the changes which were made. Communications Officer highlighted this as a future role for the Customer Communications Panel with some scope to develop/sign-off content. |
| 2.4 | Yes: There are links to other organisations and service providers (e.g. Action care Centre, Southall Day Centre), and details of opening times and locations for local CAB’s etc. There is a direct email contact to the GRF and a link to a website – although this link is not currently live due to the restructure arrangements. |

| 3.1 | Yes: Home facts is a comprehensive residents handbook providing a range of core information, including sections on:  
- Welcome to your new home  
- Contacting us  
- About us  
- Moving in  
- Rent and service charges  
- Paying your rent  
- Emergencies and safety  
- Your household  
- Our commitment to you  
- Complaints |

| 3. | There is a comprehensive and accessible tenants’ handbook that has been subject to resident influence. |
| 4. ‘Core’ policies are easy to obtain. | 4.1 Yes: Handbooks confirm (as above), Website confirms (‘residents’ is a top line tab and leads to information broken into sections including: information on service standards, tenant publications, etc.) Interviews and focus groups confirm that residents find the site easy to navigate and accessible, reception area observation confirms a wide range of leaflets are available.  

4.2 Yes: Most policies/procedures/service leaflets are available in full in text only or to download in PDF format from the website, and staff and resident focus groups confirmed that these are easily accessed and supplied if requested. |
Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment and recommend that the terms of reference of the customer communications panel be amended to include joint sign-off (of newsletter content) between the panel and senior management.

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- Blackbird Leys – Resident/Volunteer run Newspaper.
- The website events calendar.

Comment/Recommendation: There is room for improvement in the relationship between customer communications and resident involvement. The reality checks gave rise to a slight sense of mistrust in that residents were offered opportunities to influence content, but not empowered to sign-off.

- **Empower the customer communications panel to sign-off customer communications including newsletters and website content.**
- **Develop a ‘residents kitemark’ to show where publications have been subject to resident influence/consultation and have been approved by customers for plain language.**
- **Ensure events calendar is replicated on Catalyst Gateway Website – and that this (and the Gateway Website generally) is kept up to date.**
- **Amend Customer Communications Panel terms of reference to include joint sign-off of newsletter content**
THEME 2: Opportunities to Involve & Influence

Unit 2.4: The landlord provides a range of opportunities for residents to exercise meaningful influence over its strategic direction

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord employs a range of both 'informal' and 'formal' methods for residents to be involved in and influence the strategic direction of the organisation.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: The strategy contains a clear commitment to involving residents in the strategic direction of the organisation and interview supports this – Catalysts approach to engaging residents in the group restructure has been honest and transparent and is the best I have seen, and the recent development of the 'Customer Experience' Strategy is set to drive forward CCHA’s customer focus and utilise profiling information across the 7 diversity strands. Specific examples include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong> Driving Forward – a programme of events delivered through an open top bus providing services and consultations partly relating to strategic direction and partly focusing on local services and initiatives such as knife crime, gardening competition etc.</td>
<td><strong>•</strong> Business Improvement Team located booths within community centres to interview residents and get detail on their aspirations and priorities and help shape the business plan (interview evidence from MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong> Mystery Shopping fed into the development of the Customer Engagement Strategy</td>
<td><strong>•</strong> Formal scrutiny review of Repairs fed into the operational plan (evidence provided by interview with RI Manager and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
confirmed through document review of Scrutiny Report)

- Consultation planner shows informal methods including Mill Road Funday and Catalysts Got Talent

1.2 Yes: Lots of documentary and interview evidence has been provided including those detailed above, in addition interview evidence provided by Head of Asset Management that 2 residents were involved in each re-tendering panel (total of 7 panel members for each panel) for 6 key contracts – all residents were trained and supported (this was confirmed through resident interviews). Future plans include an ‘RI Strategic Alliance Group’, which will provide regular opportunities for tenants to engage in contract and performance management and share examples of good practise across different contract/service areas. Documentary evidence submitted includes a new ‘Policy Development framework’ which considers and evaluates ‘what customers say’ at the first stage and seeks customers views, feedback and to establish their priorities, followed by affording sign-off to ‘appropriate resident scrutiny group/central scrutiny group (CRF)’ prior to formal approval at Board or Local Board. CCHA’s involvement in the Hillingdon local offer pilot provides further evidence.

1.3 Yes: There is evidence that CCHA tries to ensure that all their structures are accessible in relation to the diverse needs of its
communities. Out of pocket expenses, child care and carers costs are met and a number of initiatives have been designed specifically to engage with younger residents (Youth Forum, Catalysts Got Talent etc.). Local Offer evidence submitted demonstrates the collection of profiling information collected for involved residents in relation to age, religion, disability, gender and specific communication needs. The RI Manager provided interview evidence that profiling information that had been collected across the company is was used to decide where the best venues were for the Group Structure Review meetings and what support was needed. The model constitution for residents associations and key forums all contain sections on equality and diversity as follows:

_Catalyst Housing Group serves a community of many cultures and beliefs._

_Catalyst believes that all eligible people must have equality of opportunity for involvement. There must be no unfair discrimination on the basis of age, disability, gender, marital status, sexual orientation, religion or belief, race, colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin or community background, employment status, gender, identity (transgender), caring responsibility._

There is a strong equality and diversity policy and all staff are provided with details at induction and required to undertake specific training.
2. There is demonstrable resident influence over landlord strategic aims.

2.1 Yes: The MD acknowledged that there were different approaches across the group with two orgs. undertaking resident conferences for this purpose. CCHA residents had wanted a more ‘outward looking approach’ which encompassed new residents. Driving Forward, What Tenants Want and the Business Improvement Booths all provide this. The Group restructure consultation involved local estate meetings, paper consultations, focus groups, training and recourse to the GRF and LRF and the groupwide resident conference in Sept 2011, will provide further opportunities to shape future direction and local boards provide further opportunities for strategic influence.

2.2 Yes: RI Manager, Resident Board members, MD, Performance Improvement Officer and MD with strategic lead for RI all confirmed with plenty of supporting evidence to support (as above). New policy framework demonstrates clear documentary evidence of residents role in future development and sign-off in all policy and procedures, and the programme of reviews detailed within it are strongly linked to resident priorities/feedback.

2.3 Yes: GRF and LRF shows strong evidence of wider influence (beyond Board), and resident members confirmed at interview and focus group that they pro-actively engage in presenting and promoting involvement opportunities to uninvolved residents. Clear evidence of and
corporate commitment to being customer driven. e.g. local boards provide 50% resident membership (confirmed through Group restructure meeting observation). Communications Officer, Performance Improvement Officer and MD all confirmed that there was an extensive resident lead in establishing the ‘values and behaviours’ of ‘Catalyst people’, producing a corporate slogan and desk calendar.

2.4 Ample evidence as described above.

| 3. Core departmental strategies refer to the role of Resident Involvement in their planned service reviews and changes. | 3.1 Yes: There is good evidence of consultation in relation to stock rationalisation (potential service/management changes). Previous RI action plan showed evidence of RI in services e.g.. Asset Management, Hsg. Man/Customer services etc. Overall operational plan shows significant resident involvement and influence, customer satisfaction. And profiling throughout. Departmental plan provides clear mapping of involvement in service changes/review. New policy review framework provides clear and transparent direction for residents to influence at onset and sign-off. Local boards afford ultimate decision-making responsibility. 250 tenants (from the database of 600) engaged in local offer consultations and priority setting (evidenced through RI Officer interview and estate meeting observation). |
### 3.2 Yes: Policy review framework provides clear programme and step by step approach with clear involvement of tenants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. The views of residents in local neighbourhoods are sought, and that they can influence strategic policy. Old requirement</th>
<th>4.1 The driving forward campaign is strong evidence and demonstrates a clear understanding of the priorities for improvement across those estates involved. Annual report to tenants affords residents feedback across all TSA standards. Interview and focus group evidence that GRF and LRF act as a conduit between neighbourhood and individual views and the Board.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Yes: Mystery shopping (for example) forms part of the GRF’s formal scrutiny role, and it is clear that GRF consider evidence from wider sources than their own membership prior to making recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Assessment:** PASS  
**Interim Assessment:** PASS  
**CCHA Comments:** Accepted  
**Scrutiny Panel Comment:** Agree with assessment  
**Final Assessment:** PASS  

**Examples of Good Practise:**  
- RI in group restructure  
- RI in procurement
Comment/Recommendation: This is clearly an area of strength for CCHA and indeed across the Group. The groupwide conference in September is seen as an opportunity to ensure that as the Group moves to single company status, ‘the baby is not thrown out with the bath water’, and this commendable.

- See through plans to develop RI in the ‘Strategic Alliance Group’, incorporating residents involved in selection panels.
- Consider wider promotion of training/involvement opportunities in procurement and contract monitoring.
- Consider potential to roll-out the above to incorporate day to day repairs.
**THEME 2: Opportunities to Involve & Influence**

Unit 2.5: The landlord offers a range of opportunities for residents to exercise meaningful influence over local services

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord uses resident intelligence to make local operational decisions.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Documentary evidence of consultation and development work around local offers including profiling, communication needs and service area preferences. Some progress across 7 diversity strands and clear commitments contained in operational plans to increase data capture where required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are a good range of opportunities for residents to influence local service provision.</td>
<td>2.1 Yes: Range of opportunities for residents to influence local service provision (including block reps, RA’s, resident Inspection, estate meetings, mystery shopping etc.) and wider policies with customer feedback an integral part of all service/policy review. Staff focus group showed awareness of local forums/ra’s to which all tenants are invited (South-East) and a strong emphasis is placed on ‘What are your priorities?’ Observation and interview evidence of residents influencing at local and organisational level including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | • Local offer service priorities and standards  
|  | • Group restructure consultations and information sessions  
|  | • Leaseholder Association directing programme of improvements to their blocks.  
<p>|  | • Block rep undertaking door |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. The landlord and residents have agreed setting out formal local offers of service delivery as a means to improve local accountability.</th>
<th>3.1 Yes: Strong evidence through local offer pilot, standards consultation project plan and observation of local offer meetings. Staff focus group showed that staff and residents in the South East have concerns about how to address ‘local’ in the region. Staff stated they were trying to develop local estate agreements where possible and a ‘local offer group’ will meet quarterly to monitor progress. Local Offer consultations delivered by neighbourhood housing managers and incorporating staff from around the organisation e.g. resident involvement, business improvement, senior management team and involved residents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Yes: MD detailed very specific local offers are being developed for Sheltered housing Schemes. Involvement in the ‘Thriving Communities’ Programme in Reading; a community development programme where CCHA are ‘supporting the development of close working arrangements between the Community residents Action Group and the Dee Park Residents association’ and aiming to ‘maintain high levels of resident involvement in the physical and social renewal of the Dee Park Estate’. Other examples include</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
working with the Older Tenants Forum and Young Adults Forum.

3.3 Clear consideration of local in terms of geography and services – less so in terms of communities of interest, but clear consideration of leaseholders and sheltered/supported in consultations. Both residents and staff highlighted that the South-East is not local, so staff are working with residents to develop local estate agreements where possible. MD stated that groups of residents were asked ‘what is local’ in the summer of 2010, and then asked to identify their 3 key services. Lessons from the Hillingdon Pilot provided ideas which were CCHA tested with their own residents.

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted – staff briefings were carried out with neighbourhood management staff during their team meetings and specifically with smaller groups prior to the GSR consultations. A de-brief was also held in order to gather any learning prior to the next consultation being carried out.

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment and recommend that CCHA continue to be aware of the need to collect high levels of customer profiling information in order to inform local operational decisions. Additionally, the panel felt
that utilising the lessons of the Hillingdon Local offer Pilot and testing with CCHA residents was an example of good practise.

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- Local Offer consultations delivered by neighbourhood housing managers and incorporating staff from around the organisation e.g. resident involvement, business improvement, senior management team and involved residents.
- Utilisation of lessons from local offer pilot for testing with CCHA residents.

Comment/Recommendation: CCHA engaged effectively as a key contributing partner within the Hillingdon local offer Pilot, and utilised much of that experience to develop their approach. Local offer info./consultation sessions were delivered within neighbourhoods and utilised staff from a variety of service areas. Whilst this highlights good practise, it should be noted that observations of these activities indicated a degree of inconsistency of approach. Whilst TPAS would not discourage this approach in the future, it is important that staff briefings/training/dry-runs are developed to ensure consistency of message/approach.

- Provide staff training/briefings/dry-runs when utilising staff from around the organization for neighbourhood consultation activity.
- Consider including the development of ‘local involvement plans’ within the South-east local agreements.
- Continue to be aware of the need to collect high percentage levels of customer profiling information in order to informal local operational decision making.
### Theme 2: Opportunities to Involve & Influence

#### Unit 2.6: The landlord understands and responds to the diverse needs of residents

**Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear consideration has been given to using techniques that increase diversity in resident involvement.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Evidence submitted for young persons consultation/community work with young people (summer in da city) and of an older tenants culture exchange day though no equality/diversity monitoring appears to have been conducted. Interview evidence shows good practise in working with young people with activities including go-karting trips etc. – young adults forum members stated that this was ‘aimed at encouraging young people to meet with those from other areas, not just sticking to their own’. Broad acknowledgement from youth forum members that they would ‘not have gone to a meeting’ and that they only go ‘because it has been set up differently’. RI officer highlighted attendance at sheltered schemes to promote block representatives and residents associations. Mystery shopping training for vulnerable/supported residents was cited by a number of staff. MD (with strategic lead for RI) stated that lots of work has been undertaken around understanding the needs of young people and how they want to be engaged and that this has prompted lots of work around developing the use of new technologies (e.g. social networking such as facebook).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Venues and transport/mobility needs of residents are considered, and cabs/expense provided as appropriate to accessible venues. RI Manager stated that profiling information was used to determine best/most suitable venues for group restructure consultation meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The landlord understands which groups are under-represented and seeks to find out why these groups are under-represented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Yes: The strategy talks of a customer database and commits to a range of measures around equality and diversity and discusses the needs of different &quot;types&quot; of tenants though no targets appear to be set. The new strategy has a key objective (3) ‘to widen involvement by increasing the numbers and diversity of residents involved’, along with a separate section (8) on Equality &amp; Diversity, which contains the commitment ‘We will monitor the profile of those involved and ensure it is reflective of the profile of Catalyst Housing as a whole. We will undertake Equality Impact Assessments as this strategy is implemented – including one of the strategy itself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Yes: The customer experience strategy has progressed work on resident profiling across 7 diversity strands and this insight will influence service planning and delivery. Within this strategy, there is a commitment to develop ‘individual pledges’ with residents, ‘These will be similar to the personal support plan created for supported housing residents in conveying rights and responsibilities. By making such pledges, we will understand what is really important to them, and not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
what we think is important. A number of programmed tasks have been developed aimed at increasing involvement of young people and conducting telephone conferences in different languages and linking with advocates/support agencies. RI Manager gave examples of discussions with some community leaders, gaining support in engaging with customers. Staff have attended a BME day care centre for input/feedback.

### 2.3 Yes: There is evidence that CHG collect profiling information across 6 diversity strands in consultations and involvement (examples include the 2008 STATUS survey by MRUK Research and the Local Offer Consultation survey, customer database form, database of involvement in community regen.). MD confirmed that gender identity question is being asked but there is currently very little data in this area. Performance Improvement Officer confirmed that there are plans to utilise the 9 characteristics of the equalities act, going forward.

### 3. The landlord is taking action to ensure that under-represented groups can access resident involvement and modify existing methods to be easily accessible.

#### 3.1 Yes: Clear actions as described above coupled with the on-going monitoring of the profile of those involved, as described in the new strategy (section 8). New methods adopted e.g. facebook, twitter pilot, youth forum etc. Young Adults Forum members confirmed they ‘would not have attended’ if it been arranged as a meeting.

#### 3.2 Yes: The new Customer Experience Management Strategy ‘sets out the mechanisms by which we
will systematically align the Group’s focus and resources on improving customer experience in pursuit of becoming the housing provider that all of our customers would personally recommend. It details our vision and how a step-change in customer experience will be planned, delivered, and measured. Step 2 is ‘Customer Insight – Understanding who our customers are’. Section 5.2 expands as follows:

‘Customer insight is key in delivering truly customer focused services, so ultimately allowing us to improve customer satisfaction and happiness levels. It also allows us to help achieve efficiencies by identifying the most cost effective methods of delivering services. Knowledge about customers’ needs, characteristics, preferences and behaviours will be based on analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, so allowing for specific insights being used to inform service delivery to groups of customers with shared characteristics.’

4. The landlord will work with ‘need to reach’ groups to determine the best methods of achieving involvement.

4.1 Yes: Involvement Questionnaire shows resident suggestions of other activities to broaden diversity e.g. afro-Caribbean group, male group etc. The RI manager gave examples of where previous consultations in Hillingdon showed low involvement from elderly residents leading them to target specific households and sheltered schemes – this resulted in good participation of elderly residents (and is supported by the involved residents summary document,
which shows participation of between 5 and 8 residents over the age of 65 out of total involvement of between 14 and 31 residents (spread over 4 general meetings). Current RI Statement (2011-12) has a section within the ‘good news’ feedback from last year which details a range of successful examples of ‘working to involve hard to reach groups’ including cultural events, youth events, and inter0generational events.

| 5. There is a clear response to discrimination including core standards of behaviour for staff, individual residents and TRAs. | 5.1 Yes: There is a strong commitment in the model constitutions for RA’s and this is consistent across all wider representative groups (e.g. Fed. LRF etc.) and an expectation to sign-up to an "acceptable" standard within the recognition criteria. There is a core equality and diversity policy accessible thorough the resident involvement pages of the website and training is available to RA’s, committees and staff. There was acknowledgement (from both staff and residents through interviews) that it can be difficult to challenge discriminatory or prejudicial behaviour in meetings, but all stated that they had a ‘commitment to educate those who display poor behaviour’. |

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted – one of the ways we are seeking to address is for each RI Officer to develop specific involvement methods targeted at under-represented groups.
Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment and recommend equality and diversity monitoring information be collected at each involvement activity. Additionally, the panel recommend that targets be set in relation to involving under-represented groups.

Final Assessment: PASS

Comment/Recommendation: CCHA have recognised that more systemic work is required in this area and are taking the necessary steps. Examples of good practise and recommendations are detailed elsewhere in this report.

- Ensure equality and diversity monitoring information is collected at each involvement activity
- Set annual targets in relation too involving under-represented groups.
### THEME 3: Use of Resident Intelligence

Unit 3.1: The landlord has systems in place to capture meaningful intelligence from residents

**Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord is committed to undertake a regular (at least once every two years) survey of all its residents.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Status methodology used for survey 2008 (conducted by MRUK Research), within guidelines for error margin/confidence interval with an error margin of +/- 3% and at the 95% confidence limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Yes: Satisfaction that views have been taken into account was included and this was recorded at 50% when those which are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied were excluded and 58% when they are included. 31% overall were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Yes: Action plan is produced and implemented. Resident Board member confirmed that a staff member wrote a report which is considered by Board – this led to changes including changes to opening hours, housing manager visits and the introduction of targets and monitoring in relation to call backs by the right person within timescale. Other examples include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Satisfaction surveys undertaken within Asset Management, themes and trends collated by Resident Liaison Officers (both in house and contractors) who are empowered to discuss with heads of service and implement changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Board has considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
patterns/trends in repairs surveys and developed actions for improvement.
- Newsletters have included questionnaires about communication needs/preferences, resulting in initial piloting of twitter page by Communications Panel.

| 2. The landlord has a range of methods to capture intelligence from residents. | 2.1 Yes: Survey map shows evidence of regular customer research utilising a range of methodology (telephone/postal/mystery shopping) across a range of service areas including:  
- Complaints*  
- ASB  
- Repairs (planned and responsive)  
- New build quality etc.  
  
  Interview evidence from staff at all levels confirmed the use of The way forward, business improvement booths etc.  
  
  * Complaints procedure recently reviewed with residents – though again, there were inconsistencies in the consultation process between different offices. Residents involved in complaints panels and some creativity in dealing with complaints at stage 3 e.g. panel went to complainants home to see what was happening before making decision – changed the panels decision and great response from complainant. Robust approach to complaints in planned improvements where RLO’s are used to minimise complaints and address issues at source – only 4-5 complaints in this area of Asset Management during the past 12 months, and plans to adopt this approach going forward in day to day repairs.  
  
  2.2 Yes: STATUS 2008 was diversity |
proofed in line with guidance at the
time and is appropriately balanced,
reporting demographic profiling
and geography by borough and
management office (London &
Oxford). Satisfaction surveys in
2011 conducted in general needs
and Leasehold. Performance
Improvement Officer confirmed
that the recent Customer
Experience Management Strategy
includes profiling across 7 E&D
strands. The results are statistically
reliable as described in 1.1 above.

| 3. The landlord has an active approach
to sampling residents’ views and has
internal systems in place to apply
captured information to inform effective
decision-making. | 3.1 Yes: 2011 satisfaction survey looks
at differences in levels of
satisfaction over time and at each
of the individual operating
companies within the group.

3.2 There are a broad range of both
formal and informal market
research techniques used (and
described above and throughout),
“17 ways” document, details a
range of methods used and
resultant changes in services. |

| 4. The landlord interprets differences in
satisfaction levels in different
communities. | 4.1 Yes: Interview evidence (Board
Members) support MD’s view that
performance is managed by
exception and that when trends of
complaints and/or dissatisfaction
are identified, they are escalated
for Board consideration, then
differences in levels across groups
are considered and the customer
experience strategy does consider
the experience of customers
across the 7 diversity strands. MD
also confirmed that ‘satisfaction
testing’ has been conducted in
relation to ASB, Complaints and
Repairs, through a targeted
consultation with those who have
expressed dissatisfaction used to |
influence the tender process for new contractors (repairs).

Preliminary Assessment: PARTIAL

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment but noted disappointment at the low levels of satisfaction in respect of ‘views being taken into account’

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- Creative approach to considering stage 3 complaint.
- RLO’s in contract delivery (both in-house and per contractor)

Comment/Recommendation: The approach to balancing the capture of resident intelligence could be improved, along with some clear examples of targeting particular research into areas of dissatisfaction amongst different groups and communities. The Customer Experience Strategy should support customer segmentation and deliver improvements in services and satisfaction of specific groups.

- Utilise initial research through the Customer Experience Strategy to deliver service improvements for specific, targeted groups/communities.
### THEME 3: Use of resident Intelligence

Unit 3.2: The landlord has a clear view of its resident profile

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord can profile its residents.</td>
<td><strong>1.1 Partial:</strong> Resident database shows significant work is still required to achieve a level of 90% across 7 diversity strands. Interviews suggested collection of information currently at 90% (MD) with a continued emphasis on collection at each interaction, though desk top evidence was unable to support. Customer information and vulnerability form confirms that information is being gathered through sign-up and annual tenancy verification (at the rate of 20% of stock per year, see below). E&amp;D Corporate action plan includes a target (8) ‘to develop a policy on gender re-assignment’ by October 2011, and targets requiring the utilisation of profiling information (across all 7 strands) in order that Local Boards can use the information to ‘tailor service provision’. Additionally, target 9 is ‘To produce a single data form for capturing resident household data looking at all Protected Characteristics as they relate to customers’, by November 2011, with data collection commencing January 2012 and input into an integrated housing system by June 2012. This will result in collection across all 9 characteristics of the Equalities Act 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Yes: The information provided is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69
less than 2 years old. Very little information regarding gender identity, although the question is asked. Annual tenancy verification (audit) is at 20% (20% of all households are visited for tenancy audit process each year), so the methodology is there to improve the data collection across all strands.

1.3 Yes: Profile of registered service users of Southall Day Centre is good and at 100%. MD advised through interview that profiling data has been used to plan around heating breakdown (enhanced service, provision of heaters for elderly) – used to plan number of heaters required. Also influenced caretaker support (gritting strategy)

2. The landlord sets its market research programme with resident influence.  

2.1 Yes: Residents commented that they had scope to influence content of surveys and areas of research. Block rep. influenced and undertook local survey of 100 households. RI Manager confirmed that all surveys are signed-off by the CRF and where time allows, local forums. RI Manager and Resident Board Member confirmed that ‘Boards will not pass documents until they are certain that residents have had prior input’.

3. The landlord has investigated opportunities of using residents as interviewers in market research surveys.  

3.1 Yes: Annual report states that the GRF helped design and carry out some of the surveying work as part of the local offer pilot. Driving forward used resident interviewers – given some basic training in questioning techniques – strong sense that residents opened up more to other residents. Block reps involved in door-to-door surveying when decisions are required on local services.
Preliminary Assessment: PARTIAL

Interim Assessment: PARTIAL

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PARTIAL

Examples of Good Practise:

- Driving forward, local neighbourhood consultations, providing scope to scope to visit residents who wouldn’t traditionally get involved.
- Use of trained resident interviewers in Driving Forward/Local consultations

Comment/Recommendation: If CCHA are able to demonstrate customer profiling at 90%, this unit will be raised to ‘PASS’.

- Consider rolling out the basic training to support more residents as interviewers for market research and local consultations
**THEME 3: Use of resident Intelligence**

Unit 3.3: The landlord uses both profiling and customer intelligence to influence its approach to Resident Involvement

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord applies customer intelligence and profiling information to prioritise its approach and the allocation of resources for resident involvement.</td>
<td>1.1 No: Whilst some interview evidence was forthcoming (enhanced heating provision, gritting strategy, planning of venues for local offers etc.), there is no documentary evidence which supports the systematic use of profiling information. However, both the customer experience management strategy and the groupwide residents conference in September aim to address this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. There is a clear link between profiling data and the landlords approach to resident involvement and priorities for action. | 2.1 No: This is currently unproven, since the documentary evidence is not there to support, though will be considered in the planning sessions at Resident Conference, Sept. 11.  
  • One example of using profiling information (religion) to target consultation through Southall day centre along with previously mentioned examples in relation to planning locations/venues. |
| 3. **(Alternatively)** where the landlord does not undertake resident led surveying there is a clear rationale for this choice. | |

Preliminary Assessment: STANDARD NOT MET

Interim Assessment: STANDARD NOT MET
CCHA Comments: Accepted – with the expansion of the resident involvement team, an officer with specialist skills has been successfully recruited to be the Resident Involvement (Research) Officer in order to help address this particular area of weakness.

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: STANDARD NOT MET

Comment/Recommendation: CCHA’s approach in this area is clearly developing and the plans to improve the collection and use of profiling information in planning and prioritising in a number of service areas are well developed, but as yet, unproven.
THEME 4: Accountability & Performance

Unit 4.1: The landlord involves residents in setting standards, performance indicators and targets and widely reports on its performance

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The landlord has service standards, set in negotiation with residents. | 1.1 Yes: Website provides link to broad range of information across range of services/policies with information leaflets which can be downloaded for each service including. Service standards focus on:  
  * Customer Service  
  * Maintaining your home and  
  * Maintaining and investing in our housing  
And there is a comprehensive service standards publication containing standards in relation to:  
  * Customer service  
  * Complaints  
  * Maintaining your home  
  * Your neighbourhood  
  * Tenancy management (rent and service charges)  
  * Empty properties and moving home  
  * Home ownership  
  * Resident involvement and community development  
Page 4 of the service standards commits to:  

‘measuring our performance against key measurable service standards  
* carrying out ‘mystery shopping’"
through Quality Housing Standard (QHS), who monitor the services we provide (see the glossary at the back of this leaflet)

• after you have had a service from us, asking you how well we met our standards and commitments, and
• monitoring the feedback you give us.’

1.2 Clear evidence of setting standards with residents through local offer work, identify (3) key priority areas for offers. Policy Review framework provides clear future role for residents as described previously. Policy consultation document (produced as a special edition magazine with supporting questionnaire) clearly shows how residents have previously been consulted on developing the standards. (Standards covered by the document include: RI Strategy, Rent Arrears, Former tenant arrears and Aids and adaptations. The survey map shows regular surveying across the range of services described earlier in 3.1 (2.1). Interview evidence including a block representative who engaged in the local offer consultation and was provided with written feedback, and examples offered by other residents including complaints policy review and repairs contract specifications (Chair of LRF).

2. The landlord has in place effective processes that enable residents to negotiate both organisation wide and local performance indicators and targets.

2.1 Yes: Local offer work supports. In future, Local Boards will monitor delivery and on-going effectiveness of local offers and consider standards and performance across national framework. The Customer Experience Management Strategy
(page 6) states: ‘A critical component of the CEM Strategy is how all of our customers continuously feedback to us, both on how well we are doing, but also on how our services ought to change. This connects our services, processes and people to what our customers tell us and how they rate us.

We aim to have the voice of the customer at the heart of their business activities, by using a range of digital engagement techniques, allowing customers to give us information in a way and at a time that is convenient to them. This will be especially important to our leasehold customers.’

2.2 Yes: Broad range of both formal and informal methods include:

- Focus Groups
- Meet and Greets
- Local meetings
- Information Sessions
- Estate Walkabouts
- Fundays/The Way Forward
- Surveys
- GRF/LRF
- Mystery Shopping
- Improvement Panels

3. The landlord employs a process for comparing its performance with its peers.

3.1 Yes: Strong evidence of benchmarking between operating companies (CCH, KHT, FortuneGate), including resident satisfaction, preferred methods of communication, preferred services for improvement of quality of life. Plans resident Face 2 Face benchmarking may grow into benchmarking performance, but is currently an ideas sharing forum. This group is resident led and includes residents from Genesis,
Notting Hill, Kensington Housing Trust and CCHA. CCHA remain part of the Hillingdon local offer Group, and continue to compare performance. Members of RI champions (RI Manager confirmed). Also part of IRIS (Independent Resident Inspectors Scheme) with a range of landlords in Berks (Reading Borough Council, Woking etc.) TPAS provided the training, inspections are conducted by peers. Interview evidence demonstrates benchmarking activities through Housemark and G15 (asset management in development), and clear understanding of upper quartile performance in some areas e.g. resident satisfaction with planned improvements.

3.2 Yes: Resident Face 2 Face benchmarking group is resident led. LRF/GRF do look at national standards and LRF Chair confirmed that role in recent scrutiny of customer care and complaints, which was recently raised as an area to improve – this was a key driver for the recent procedure review.

4. The landlord feeds back its performance to the resident population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1 Yes: 1st Annual report under standards framework produced on time with a broad range of performance information across all standard. The report is available in full to download from the website (as are all local offers).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2 Yes: Annual report front page states ‘Produced in partnership by CCHA and the Group Residents’ Federation’. The ‘Welcome’ section is written by the GRF Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
(resident), and each section is introduced by an involved resident (other than Governance and financial viability, which is introduced by the MD).

4.3 Yes: Clear range of scrutiny options and redress throughout annual report (e.g. mystery shopping, complaints, performance monitoring).

4.4 Yes: Benchmarking information is limited with one reference to being in top 25% of RSL’s in July 2008, post-inspection. Previous annual reports include comparisons for rent charges across a number of providers and neighbourhood breakdowns in relation to 10 key work areas including: customer care, estate management, participation and repairs. CCHA’s current report sits on the website along with those from Fortungate and KHT, providing the clear opportunity for comparisons.

4.5 Yes: Performance information provided to GRF for scrutiny. Scrutiny panel is established and clear evidence of service based review (responsive repairs) and clear recommendations to Board. Performance information is present throughout editions of Housing Matters and the local offer survey showed that 71% of residents wanted a summary of the annual report (provided through Housing Matters) with a full copy available on request – this can be provided by completing the freepost return slip in housing matters or downloading from the website.

4.6 Yes: As described above and
confirmed in resident interviews that performance information is scrutinised at the GRF, LRF and the Board. Future performance scrutiny will take place at Local Board which have 50% resident membership. LRF have developed an 'items for discussion sheet' allowing the Chair to raise issues directly with relevant managers and resolve more quickly and informally – there was good awareness amongst involved residents from other involvement activities of this process. LRF Chair confirmed that the members had asked for information to be presented differently and it was.

| 5. The landlord feeds back on deteriorating services and celebrates service success (all households or neighbourhood based). | 5.1 Yes: Grounds for change article shows acknowledgement of poor performance being clearly communicated and clear action (replacement of contractors) taken. Observations and interviews provide strong evidence that CCHA are comfortable on feedback when things are not working well (MD spoke about the need to do more for the 29% of residents who are dissatisfied. Acknowledged that leaseholders and shared owners are less happy. local offer consultation,) and some evidence from staff and residents regarding newsletter articles highlight areas of concern and what is being done to address though there was a clear sense that this needs to be more balanced.  
5.2 Yes: Newsletters contain information about where CCHA are performing well e.g. July 2011 contains articles relating to Dee |
Park Regen and signposting the recent SNAP satisfaction survey results will be in the next edition. Spring 2011 contains an extensive ‘Your words, our actions’ on page 3. General sense (through resident interviews) of too much communication – highlighted that one person could receive 4-5 newsletters in a single period (Housing Matters, GRF Newsletter, Estate/Local newsletter, etc). Strong on reporting/action on recent receivership of key contractor – interim arrangements and process for procurement to be communicated through newsletter and individual letter to all residents affected. Scrutiny function affords local tenant trigger.

Preliminary Assessment: PARTIAL

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted – about to embark on a new partnership with Notting Hill HA and other RSLs to capitalise on joint scrutiny training and sharing of good practice, provided by TPAS. Also, carrying out similar, but lower key, exercises with Barnet Homes and partners.

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- Strong and inclusive approach to developing local offers
- IRIS – partnership approach to resident inspection
- ‘Items for discussion sheet’ for informal resolution of issues through the LRF Chair
Comment/Recommendation:

- *CCHA need to develop a more systematic approach to benchmarking and involve residents in this process.*
- *Consideration should be given to the volume of customer facing literature produced as part of the VFM considerations of the Customer Communications Panel (recommended elsewhere in this report)*
### THEME 4: Accountability & Performance

Unit 4.2: The landlord has robust processes to ensure its accountability to residents for services

**Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Landlord has processes by which residents can hold the landlord accountable for local (neighbourhood or area) performance.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: there is a clear process for scrutiny incorporating key stages of scoping, desk top review, action plan (signed off by GRF), onsite reality checks, meeting to formulate report/recommendations, GRF sign-off and report to board. Triggers for scrutiny need to be clarified and widely publicised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Yes: Having already completed scrutiny reviews of repairs and customer care, the process and arrangements were well understood by staff and residents alike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Yes: Clear evidence of training provided to residents through scrutiny work plan and through TPAS training for IRIS (Independent Resident Inspectors Scheme). RI statement 2011-12 commits to developing ‘a further programme of tailored training to develop residents capacity for their scrutiny role’ and to ‘ensure residents receive good quality information about issues relating to their scrutiny role.’ (Page 8), along with a commitment to ‘develop a new scrutiny procedure with the CRF which shows how it will work with and support the work of the Local Boards as well as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

other residents and resident representatives.’

1.4 Yes: RI Statement states that Catalyst will:

- ‘develop local arrangements for scrutiny, linked to the overall scrutiny led by the CRF and develop local arrangements for audit, service testing, performance monitoring, policy development, and service delivery against local offers’

1.5 Yes: Two scrutiny reviews completed (repairs, customer care) and clear documentary evidence includes a reports to Board with findings and recommendations to improve. Along with documentary evidence of organisational response/outcomes e.g. (taken from IRIS Customer Care Scrutiny Review:

- IRIS Recommendation: When there is a team meeting and the Switchboard is closed, something should be put in place to cover this, rather than leave all messages to go to Voicemail until lunchtime. Perhaps it can be re-routed to another service area.

- Organisations Response: New system introduced using out of hours switchboard to deal with enquiries at all times when office is closed. The out of hour’s contract started the week of the inspection and information was not available to show this. Details are being sent out to residents in the July Housing Matters Magazine. This was confirmed by
reviewing the July edition which contains details in the group restructure article on page 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Local service issues raised by residents are resolved quickly or a reasonable explanation is given.</th>
<th>2.1 Yes: Block rep, OTF Chair, Resident Board Member, LTF Chair and other involved residents all stated that if they ‘had any problems they would speak to their local housing officer’. LTF have developed an ‘items for discussion’ sheet which provides quick resolution to service based issues, and a number of involved residents knew of this process. Residents (including uninvolved) strongly support the notion that when they raise issues with their housing managers, they are resolved quickly. Resident Liaison Officers for planned improvements are empowered to address issues at source or direct access to heads of service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Yes: RLO’s collate all satisfaction responses (circ 60-70% response rate) and where trends are identified, improvements are made. Any customer feedback of 5 or less (out of 10) receives the attention of the Head of Service who contacts the customer to clarify the issues and address.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is a process that ensures that residents (collectively) can hold the landlord to account for its general performance and behaviour.</td>
<td>3.1 Yes: The RI strategy clear details the role of the GRF in having both a ‘central strategic role’ and in ‘providing a central point of co-ordination for involvement’. It adds that the GRF/CRF has the key role in addressing issues of collective concern and will co-ordinate a programme of scrutiny, working with Catalyst, other residents and staff. Interviews demonstrated the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A strong relationship between the GRF and Group Board through scrutiny function and other involvement activities. A common theme of the interviews from both staff and residents was that Catalyst is an organisation and a number of interviewees (RI Manager, Performance Improvement Officer, MD and Resident Board Member) stated very clearly that the Board ‘manages by exception’ and that customer satisfaction is a key consideration. There are a range of methods to identify collective concerns including mystery shopping, local forums, complaints and compliments, resident inspections. Example exist of scrutiny addressing the collective concerns of both tenants and leaseholders in terms of gas safety checks/boiler service – which is now being offered to leaseholders as a result of a scrutiny recommendation.

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:
• Strong organisational support for and understanding of independent inspection and scrutiny function - though triggers for scrutiny need clarifying
• Extremely responsive approach to local service/satisfaction issues and high response rates to surveying
• Head of Service ‘inquiry’ into individual cases of dissatisfaction

Comment/Recommendation: The level at which Head of Service inquiry is instigated was set by service managers. Some private sector organisations (e.g. Magnet) who undertake the same activity instigate inquiries when levels of satisfaction are below 8 out of 10.

• Consult residents regarding the level at which Head of Services inquiries should be triggered.
• Consider extending this approach across other areas of the business e.g. day to day repairs, customer contact etc.
• Develop clearer support information for scrutiny and how it works, including clarification of triggers
THEME 4: Accountability & Performance

Unit 4.3: The landlord has a clear focus on impact and efficiency

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord regularly reviews the impact of its services and involves residents in the review process.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Extensive activity based impact assessment with traffic light judgements. Strong cost/benefit analysis in respect of ‘Get Learning’. VFM considered as part of impact assessment but limited C/B analysis. Additional documentary evidence includes aids &amp; adaptations review (2009), the aims of which were to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify waste and delay within the aids and adaptations service which inhibit service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review customer satisfaction with the service and identify specific areas for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This report clearly demonstrates cost-benefit considerations (throughout and within the financial resources section) and impacts (both positive and negative) for the customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive RI in recent contract re-tendering in planned improvements (across 6 contracts), with training in VFM included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 GRF Consider RI activity impact assessment and the policy/procedure framework provides solid evidence that residents views are intrinsic to all reviews undertaken (as does</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. The landlord agrees efficiency targets with residents. | 2.1 Partial: Although no documentary evidence was submitted, the business improvement team booths and other methods of involvement (e.g. surveys etc.) contributed to the development of the operational plan, which includes actions and targets in relation to:

- Review ASB service for VFM and Customer focus (London)
- Rationalise office accommodation to deliver customer focus and VFM (Oxford)
- Review and update voids management process (Asset – all areas)

All action plans which sit behind the headline 'dashboard' contain actions to involve residents in all such reviews. |

| 3. The landlord considers joint procurement of services. | 3.1 Yes: IRIS – partnership training (with Reading Borough Council and others) to provide a 2-day training course in Resident Inspectors and Mystery Shopping (delivered by report author!) – though CCH’s trained group is small. Clear evidence of partnership working and joint initiatives through local offer pilot (described earlier). |

| 4. The results of the impact assessment are fed back to residents. | 4.1 Yes: GRF considered impact assessment and reported through summary in their newsletter, with link to full document on website. |
Resident Involvement Statements containing summary of key achievements from the previous year on website – plans to utilise a combination of traffic-lights and smiley faces in future.

| 5. The criteria used to measure impact is linked to the organisations business aims, departmental aims and its resident involvement action plan. | 5.1 Yes: Impact review has examples of community capital/cohesion, confidence building e.g. recruitment and training of 'learning champions', 50% of learners going onto employment, peer promotion of learning opportunities etc. |
| 5.2 Yes: Impact assessment sets strong quantitative and qualitative measures in parts e.g. recruit 15 learning champions and 40 residents enrolled on courses; 50% of CHG learners to remain involved, 50% of learners to go onto paid employment etc. and provides evidence through course evaluations and feedback forms and through past learners who now deliver training (LTF Chair interview evidence). |

Preliminary Assessment: PARTIAL

Interim Assessment: PARTIAL

CCHA Comments: Accepted – adverts for mystery shoppers and resident inspectors were put out to the wider resident body via newsletters and has also been recently repeated. Students (residents) on in house CIH training course have also been utilised for this.

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment and feel that the aids and adaptations report is an example of good practise. Additionally, the panel felt that unit 5.2 should be
raised to a pass – though this does not affect the overall score for this module.

Final Assessment: PARTIAL

Examples of Good Practise:

• Aids and adaptations review report

Comment/Recommendation:

• Potential to extend training for resident inspectors and mystery shoppers beyond initial group as a means of recruiting more residents.
• Mystery Shopping programme could be enhanced/further developed and run more systematically.
THEME 4: Accountability & Performance

Unit 4.4: The landlord supports resident led scrutiny

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There is a clear process for formal resident led scrutiny of performance (below Board level).</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: There is a clear resident scrutiny procedure and a GRF scrutiny protocol which sets out CRF’s role very clearly. New procedure to reflect restructure has been developed and states: The CRF’s scrutiny role also seeks to hold Catalyst accountable to residents by checking that Catalyst’s policies and procedures ensure services to residents are delivered to the highest possible standards. Report to board (responsive repairs) with clear recommendations and confirmed in RI statement. GRF minutes show Board were positive about the approach and recommendations. 1.2 Clear evidence of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• independence (through setting programme) as detailed in RI statement 2011-12, and scrutiny procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• good mix of customer demographics and geographical and operating company representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• scrutiny procedure supported by GRF and forum constitutions and terms of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• terms of reference with a requirement to be ‘open and accountable to wider tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Yes: Already strong links with Board and terms of reference have been agreed for Local Boards, which will have a clear future role in facilitating scrutiny activities, and 50% resident membership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a clear process for the wider tenant body to receive feedback on scrutiny and to trigger scrutiny where they are concerned about serious or persistent failure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.1 Yes: Procedure includes triggers for CRF members, Catalyst and Local Boards and residents section 3.3 states:  
*Residents’ feedback can also trigger scrutiny of a particular service. This feedback may have been gathered from (but is not restricted to), residents groups or individuals, residents events, questionnaires, surveys, training, formal and informal meetings. These will then be considered by the CRF committee to decide upon.*  
2.2 Yes: Satisfaction results (in respect of complaints) led to reviews of R&M and Customer services – scrutiny members are keen to |
| 3. The landlord undertakes a range of additional resident scrutiny activities. | 2.3 Yes: RI Strategy has the overall purpose of:  
To ensure Catalyst Housing has resident involvement structures and mechanisms to support effective resident scrutiny for the purpose of empowering residents, improving services and creating strong accountability within a framework of co-regulation and localism.  
And additional scrutiny activities include:  
- Block reps.  
- Mystery Shopping  
- Resident Inspection  
- Focus Groups etc. |

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted – new scrutiny program currently being discussed with CRF. Plan to re-launch at September 10th conference, recruit new residents, for mystery shopping etc, and offer relevant training.

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment but very strongly recommend that an explicit ‘information protocol’ be developed for tenant-led scrutiny.

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- The fact that resident-led scrutiny is in place, functioning and delivering recommendations for service improvement is and example of good practise
Comment/Recommendation: There was little evidence of recent training and support for residents to support them in keeping up to date with sector and regulatory changes – though this did not appear to diminish the knowledge of the pool of hard-working, dedicated involved residents. Potential exists, however, to engage more and a broader diversity of tenants in scrutiny activities.

- **Consider providing refresher training/briefings to existing scrutineers**
- **Ensure scrutiny activities are well planned and the scope of reviews include initial desk top review of all relevant written information**
- **TPAS support the view of residents that a scrutiny review of Catalyst Gateway should be undertaken**
- **Develop an explicit ‘information protocol’ for tenant-led scrutiny**
THEME 5: Community Development

Unit 5.1: The landlord’s community development work is locally led and negotiated with residents

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The landlord supports local (“bottom-up”) community led initiatives. | 1.1 Yes: Strong evidence over many years through community development and regeneration strategies, strategic frameworks community trust business plans and operational plans, with emphasis on consultation with local communities/residents. e.g. (Extract from 2008 CD strategy):

Developing a community means encouraging local people and groups to work together to make a difference to their lives and neighbourhood. We aim to:

- tackle poverty and the causes of poverty
- promote equal opportunities
- reduce crime and antisocial behaviour
- invest in communities and make them sustainable
- promote active communities
- encourage residents from different backgrounds to
- value and understand each other.

Whilst there is currently no published strategy as Catalyst Gateway (the new charitable trust which runs Catalysts community projects and provides funding for groups to do so), the website is clear that the strategic priorities for community development/investment are: |
- Employment & Training
- Family & Young People
- Health & Wellbeing and
- Regeneration

Current strategy and funding arrangements are in development, but interview evidence (Head of Community Gateway) confirmed that this will be developed through local forum members who are part of a working party. Also confirmed that all previous funding and recognition criteria were developed with residents associations/groups.

- Some concern raised through resident interviews that Gateway has resulted in some confusion around funding, requirements and decision making. Gateway website suggests funding policy is currently being updated – unclear on consultation around this.

2. The landlord develops a locally negotiated plan for community development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Extensive evidence includes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- CCT business plan requiring all funding projects to maximise involvement of CCHA residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leys Community development Initiatives (an annual 4 week programme of summer youth projects at Blackbird Leys, Oxford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dee Park regen, local survey followed by ‘neighbourhood natter’ topic groups which will be used to develop neighbourhood plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning champions &amp; E&amp;T programmes (Get Learning is recognised as an Open College Network and CIH training provider. In 2010-11:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 151 started training via get learning (23 retired, 13 employed, 115 Unemployed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
97. 97 completed a training course
75 qualifications
12 progressed to further education
2 progressed to higher education
15 progressed to work experience
10 progressed into work

Interview evidence (RI Officer, RI Manager, Head of Gateway and Staff Focus Group) confirmed Gateway staff are working jointly with RI/Housing to develop local community plans, utilising local offers as a guideline for delivery.

3. The landlords approach to community development seeks to promote community cohesion.

3.1 Clear section on promoting community cohesion and social capital within previous community development objectives in CCT business plan and community development and regeneration strategy. Clear evidence through CD leaflet, community chest requirements and partnership working.

Gateway website currently contains 16 active projects/programmes, with clear explanations of each in terms of aims e.g.

Wornington Green:

The regeneration of Wornington Green is the only way to tackle some of the long-term issues on Wornington Green and in doing so, improve residents’ quality of life. These issues include overcrowding, the poor design and layout of the existing buildings and concerns about security.

Through full regeneration we want to strengthen the great sense of community many residents already
experience. This will ensure that the new Wornington Green has been shaped by the views and aspirations of local residents, and is a place people would choose to live, both now and in the future.

We want residents to be at the heart of our regeneration proposals – before, throughout and after the regeneration has taken place.

3.2 Yes: Da Way Forward – consultations resulted in inter-generational activity including event/fun day addressing tensions across generation gap. Skills development including DIY, Cooking, Local History etc. Interview evidence (Head of Gateway) suggests that much of the impetus for activities has come from RI in local offer meetings

3.3 Yes there are examples of equalities impact assessments and diversity monitoring and all projects provide training in equality and diversity.

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment:

Examples of Good Practise: It is difficult to highlight good practise at the current time as the new organisation needs to develop its approach and identity.
Comment/Recommendation: CCHA has a rich and productive recent history in community development. Some concern was expressed that it is important that the natural progression from RI to wider CD activity is not lost as the organisation progresses to single company structure, with Gateway operating under separate charitable structure.

- **Funding priorities and requirements (for Catalyst Gateway), and a clear strategy/business plan need to be developed as a matter of priority**
- **TPAS support the view of residents that a scrutiny review of Catalyst Gateway should be undertaken**
### THEME 5: Community Development

Unit 5.2: The landlord works with partners to enable community based solutions

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord works with other agencies in order to deliver local community initiatives.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Strong partnership approach with key funding partners including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- London Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Peoples Millions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Homes &amp; Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resourcing of community sector partners includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Southall day centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Windmill Park Estate Community Centre (Big lottery provided £50,000, CCH provided £30,000 for new recording studio and IT suite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Al Noor Youth Association is a community organisation that runs a supplementary school in North Kensington, providing additional tuition in subjects such as Maths and English. They also provide recreational activities such as football. Catalyst Gateway provided £4,900 funding to support this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other partners include: RSLs, councils, police, PCT, Sure Start, specialist delivery agencies, BME specialist advise groups, credit unions, schools, colleges, CVS’s (evidenced through completed questionnaire submitted to G17 (through Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing) Community Development

1.2 Yes: CCT business plan requiring all funding projects to maximise involvement of CCHA residents and the head of Gateway provided interview evidence of:

- Gardening projects where residents and led on providing training
- The Way Forward – youth lead on youth initiatives
- Elders Forum – which develops its own activities (including a trip to Blackpool)

Along with a further example of a Jobs & Skills Network which is considering merging the PCT with Housing and Job Centre services – residents wanted to be trained to undertake scrutiny specifically of those organisations – 3 residents trained and undertook mystery shopping (collating results currently) and they are now progressing to take the Community Activists course.

Observation of Community Residents Action Group (Dee Park CRAG) confirmed resident lead in planning a local funday.

1.3 Yes: Formal partnerships are governed by clear terms of reference e.g. G15 youth practitioners forum and service level agreements (e.g. Southall Day Centre, Ealing Credit Union), and this was confirmed in interviews with RI Manager, Head of Gateway and some participants in the staff focus group.

1.4 Yes: Strong historical evaluations in respect of Get Learning (impact assessments and project
evaluations). All funded projects evaluated as per the requirements of the funder. Gateway has representation on a number of networks/partnerships panels.

| 2. Residents and frontline staff form effective relationships with local agencies, networks and partnerships. | 2.1 Yes: Extensive evidence of successful working relationships delivering improved community services, detailed throughout Gateway website and within the RI Statement 2011-12, including:

- Amersham Road, Reading (a multi-landlord estate with community centre) – Hot Topic Events enable residents to meet their housing manager and others in the community around a theme including money, litter, youth etc.
- Get learning (outcomes detailed earlier)
- Dee Park Regeneration – working with residents to provide a new community facility and support residents to manage a £250,000 endowment for future management of the resource
- Farmers Market and Leys news (volunteer run newspaper) at Blackbird Leys

2.2 Yes: Hillingdon Housing Partnership is a sub-group of the Local Strategic Partnership. Interview evidence confirms that CCHA are members of a number of LSP’s through the Business Improvement Team. Strong partnership with LA’s in regeneration areas e.g. Reading Borough Council and observation of resident-led partnership meeting (CRAG). |
3. The landlord supports residents to engage with other stakeholders and service providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Yes: HACT training project, financial inclusion partnership with CAB, LEAP: Partnership with mental health service, Brent Business Venture (social enterprise). Strong demonstration of understanding and recording of outcomes including: increase youth involvement, increase access to accredited training, increase skills, increased partnership working with contractors, outdoor activity training (PGL), music and dram projects (deliver confidence and skills), increased aspirations/potential, diversion from crime, one such project demonstrated the need for an extended project/support for gang members – resulted in a 30% drop in criminal activity in the area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Yes: Interview evidence (Staff focus Group, RI Manager, RI Officer) confirms staff are confident in signposting local organisations. Further, observation of local estate office provided evidence of promotion of a range of local providers e.g. green volunteer training, life savers, free English language lessons, mental health service, sports centre, children’s service, parent and toddler group, LA services, parent support etc. Plus evidence of neighbourhood housing officer speaking about Future Job Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Yes: Most involved residents were very knowledgeable and knew where to access support (website, through staff, local CVS etc.) Less involved felt they could ask other members and get all they needed (one example at resident focus group of having done so and being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Young Adult (Youth) Forum members ask RI Officer and get all the information and support they need (currently being helped to submit a grant application for fun activities). Uninvolved residents felt confident in asking local officers and of getting responses.

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise: It is difficult to highlight good practise at the current time as the new organisation needs to develop its approach and identity.

Comment/Recommendation: It is clear from the vast array of evidence that CCHA and Catalyst Gateway has and will continue to work with partners to enable community based solutions. The earlier recommendations will provide residents with the necessary clarity and influence they require.
**THEME 5: Community Development**

Unit 5.3: The landlord supports residents in influencing local strategic decision making

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord seeks resident support for partnerships or new ventures.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Mill farm transfer ballot and steering group minutes support. Gateway is currently looking at budgetary requirements and overall funding, but engages local forums for projects and initiatives. Much of CCHA’s summer activity is funded through local bids; ‘Fair Share’ – young people are on the decision-making panel. Gateway Board includes 33% resident membership. Some concerns evident of the lack of consistency between the approach of Gateway and different approach being delivered in the SE (to reflect different geographical and demographic nature of the region).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The landlord offers support to resident aspirations to influence strategic decisions made by other agencies or partnerships.</td>
<td>2.1 Yes: CCHA’s work in respect of the local offer through HHP supports advocate role with other service providers. Mill Farm estate forum incorporates other service providers. RI Officer provided examples of advocating on behalf of a tagged young person to extend the time of curfew in order to allow access to a course CCHA provided. 2.2 Yes: 5 residents have been supported through funding to graduate from the school for social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Yes: Evidence both documentary (GRF minutes, Group Structure Review, Local Offer Meetings) and interview (Head of Gateway and observation of information sessions, CRAG meeting, Local offer meeting and interview process for Group Resident Board Member, conducted entirely the Chairs of the GRF and LRF), all show an organisation which is fully prepared to engage residents in a full range of decision-making. Local offer consultations are driving community development activity, 33% community Gateway resident Board Membership, 50% Local Board Membership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The landlord informs residents that it will assist resident groups to deliver their wider local aspirations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Yes: Evidence of support, partnership and strong communication through Dee Park website and Mill farm Close Microsite (contained within main CHG site) with extensive community news section. Evidence in GRF minutes and newsletter that resident led website and content is being developed and that CCHA are providing technical support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise: It is difficult to highlight good practise at the current time as the new organisation needs to develop its approach and identity.

Comment/Recommendation: It is clear from the vast array of evidence that CCHA and Catalyst Gateway supports residents in influencing local strategic decision-making.

- The earlier recommendations, coupled with the development of local community plans should provide the necessary clarity for the on-going delivery of excellent services
THEME 6: Support & Resources

Unit 6.1: The landlord is committed to supporting and resourcing resident involvement & empowerment

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord is committed to a range of support for resident involvement.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Clear commitment to training, capacity building and appropriate information. Expenses policy shows support for travel, care, incentives (vouchers), telephone, subsistence and accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Yes: Expectations are managed – clear recognition criteria, constitutions, code of conduct and policies etc., available on the website and intranet for staff to respond to enquiries. Requirements include RA’s require 20% of residents supporting, bank account, committee and constitution, which must contain all of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equal Opportunity Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear definition of the area covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular meetings including AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management of finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An annual health-check has been developed to ensure RA’s continue to comply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: The front resident involvement page on the website contains a pdf download of the policy and claim form. Strong awareness of grant process and application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Awareness of support available from RIO. Promotion of individual activities within Housing Matters includes details of support available e.g. From Spring 2011 – Customer Communications Panel article ends - Training and support will be provided to all members. We’ll also pay the travel costs of those attending the meetings.

Strong interview evidence of awareness amongst involved residents around the support available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The landlord communicates levels of support available for resident involvement to all residents.</th>
<th>2.1 Yes: Website promotes the support available and staff feel confident in either advising or directing enquiries through the RI team.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Partial: Some evidence provided in respect of publicising through newsletters on an activity/method-by-method basis (as above), and details of total grant funding is evident in each RI Statement, but no evidence of publishing RI budget annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. The landlord negotiates levels of support with its residents. | 3.1 Yes: Interview evidence confirms that levels of support are negotiated and agreed at a ‘Chairs get together’ and discussions have taken place at both LRF and OTF, evidence submitted includes LRF Minutes (October 2010) where the levels of group funding support were proposed to be increased from £3.50 per property (RA’s) to £4. The vote was tied and the Chairs casting vote meant the funding remained at £3.50. A vote to increase forum funding from £1000pa to £2000 was carried by 10 to 2. Members were also asked to provide comments on the (then) draft resident expenses policy. |
Preliminary Assessment: PARTIAL

Interim Assessment: PARTIAL

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PARTIAL

Examples of Good Practise:

- The levels of financial support are high, though requirement to prove 20% support could potentially be too onerous to encourage more RA’s.

Comment/Recommendation: Awareness of the broad range of support available is strong amongst involved residents and uninvolved residents have some knowledge of wider support e.g. training – increased more regular publicity of the budget and financial support will provide increased incentives for more residents to become involved.

- Consider reducing the level of evidence of support required to trigger RA grant, possibly link grant more to outputs and outcomes e.g. local action plan and develop support for RA’s to identify their priorities and action plan for delivery
- At least annual newsletter articles highlighting the type and levels support available and how to access them
- At least annual opportunity for residents to influence levels of support and priorities for allocation of RI budget, and newsletter article detailing the outcomes of these discussions
THEME 6: Support & Resources

Unit 6.2: Staff are aware of the role of resident involvement, have resident involvement targets, and are positive about resident involvement

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff at all levels are aware of resident involvement and are supportive of its role.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Staff at all levels demonstrated confidence in articulating the range of involvement opportunities available and supported. CCHA promotes staff involvement, providing up to 2 volunteering days per year per staff member to work on community/involvement projects. ‘Chance for change’ conference attended by all managers had a session on ‘resident stories’ which was considered the most worthwhile and successful session in the evaluation. Staff at all levels involved in Local Offer and Local Board consultation/info days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Yes: Strong sense of support for the principle of involvement at all levels, and all supportive of RI Team and recognise their contribution. Staff Focus Group (unprompted) supported the residents view that ‘informal relationships create trust and drive the more formal stuff’ with an emphasis on ‘getting people involved at different levels to provide a network of critical friends, without making it too formulaic’. MD stated that ‘all we do is about making things better for the customer’ this was supported by similar comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from staff at all levels who all had clear understanding and belief that RI plays a major role in doing that.

2. Staff performance in resident involvement is measured. Partial: All staff have ‘Individual Contribution Development Review’ (ICDR) meetings on a quarterly and annual basis which looks at individual and team targets – whilst there was no strong evidence of all staff having RI targets (though neighbourhood manager targets 2008/9 relating to RI and CD), all neighbourhood managers have something related to RI in their job profile.

3. All staff can point to positive impacts of resident involvement. 3.1 Yes: Staff at all levels were able to highlight positive benefits of RI and were clear on outcomes ranging from increased involvement in training, increased aspirations/opportunities, increased cohesion (e.g. in mixed tenure schemes), increased community support, increased satisfaction and better services.

3.2 Yes: Staff in the focus group provided a strong sense that the organisation is very much resident-led and gave local neighbourhood examples of where residents have driven improvements in local services both within CCHA and to services provided by others e.g. planning authority, refuse collection, bus company

- Slight concern regarding frontline staff being made aware of customer satisfaction survey which had been distributed.

Preliminary Assessment: Pass (subject to interview evidence)
Interim Assessment: Partial

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PARTIAL

Examples of Good Practise:

- Staff volunteering days are a strong example of good practise

Comment/Recommendation: There is obvious and strong commitment to the customer and to their involvement at all levels of CCHA, earlier recommendations will provide increased emphasis on positive impact messages though target setting and performance monitoring will ensure that the key messages of RI are truly embedded across the organisation.

  - All staff to consider their potential contribution to RI and have a clear target set and monitored through ICDR meetings.
  - All frontline/estate based staff to be provided with advance copies of literature/consultations being sent to residents to enable them to discuss/advise/promote to residents
  - Staff to be provided with an annual ‘They said, we did’ e-briefing.
### THEME 6: Support & Resources

**Unit 6.3: Staff are skilled in resident involvement**

**Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord provides basic training to staff on resident involvement.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Overview of RI included in local staff induction, though formal corporate induction focuses more keenly on customer excellence type messages. Employee induction programme requires staff to have an understanding of the current strategic review process by the end of week one and this incorporates RI requirements and the Managers checklist includes the requirement to outline key policies, of which the RI Strategy is one. 1.2 Yes: Staff briefings provide good overview as well as specialist info. on specific areas and evidence includes staff presentations on impact assessment, the accreditation framework and the development of local offers. Recently, RI strategy and Regulation have featured in management team meetings and Policy Officers have provided a ‘business partnering’ approach between op.co’s around RI (confirmed by Business Improvement Officer interview).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ongoing staff training is linked to competencies and performance.</td>
<td>2.1 Yes: ICDR meetings identify training and agrees a personal development plan. Opportunities for shadowing/job swap, job placement scheme for 2 weeks, but no current use of e-learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was a strong sense from staff that CCHA are supportive of their training requests (confirmed by Business Improvement Officer who highlighted he had been to a number of external training events whilst being on temporary contract). Strong sense that basic RI training has been through staff briefings/individual contact with/advice from RI teams.

3. The landlord ensures that training is provided to equip staff with skills appropriate to their role in delivering resident involvement activities.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Yes: As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Yes: Specific staff training has been sourced by the RI team and Customer Service training has been provided across the Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- Job swaps allowing staff to experience different perspectives and work flows.

Comment/Recommendation: Staff are positive about their ability to access training when required/wanted.

- *Incorporate a clear, unambiguous commitment to RI in the Corporate induction*
- *Consider use of e-learning/briefings for staff*
- *Provide a short-course (half-day) ‘Introduction to effective resident involvement’ course as compulsory training*
• *Develop a regular ‘staff roadshow’ to inform staff of developments/priorities in respect of RI*
THEME 6: Support & Resources

Unit 6.4: The landlord supports the development of resident skills

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord ensures that residents with very responsible roles have the required skills and knowledge to deliver their role.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: the ‘Guide to Involvement’ has a full section (3) on the roles of group members And there is an extensive course manual for block representatives, which is agreed with block reps. prior to formal acceptance of the role. CCH offer levels 1-3 accredited course in Board member skills, and the course outlines show clear learning outcomes and assessment criteria for BM’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Some training needs analysis has been completed – key objective of RIO’s (carried out at Chairs meeting) and skills and needs are assessed and supported when new involvement activities are developed (as evidenced by observation of local board information sessions and Housing Matters launch of the Customer Communications Panel – Spring 2011). There is are extensive and growing resident training programmes are in place and are currently being aligned across the Group. GRF are providing resident input/comment. Residents in both interviews and focus groups (both involved and uninvolved) confirmed widespread knowledge of training available including ICT, Train the Trainer, Chairing skills, shadowing, scrutiny, resident inspectors, mystery shopping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. The landlord provides a range of both informal and formal training. | 2.1 Yes: Extensive evidence of formal core skills and informal training as above. Get learning prospectus confirms as does Housing Matters (Spring 2009) which contains an article detailing RI short courses including:

- Committee Skills
- Board member Skills
- Energy wise, money wise

Along with accredited courses as follows:

- Level 2, Youth Work
- Level 2, Cert. in Housing
- Level 1, Budgeting and money management

2.2 GRF minutes (e.g. May 2009), demonstrate role in commenting on planned training programme and that 'Training Programme' is a clearly allocated area of specialist lead for GRF member (Minutes May 2010). |

| 3. The landlord provides training in broader community issues and/or signposts and supports residents to external sources of this training. | 3.1 Yes: Get learning prospectus confirms extensive approach and many accredited training. Wider approach to employment and training a core feature of Catalyst Gateway.

3.2 Yes: Fund a broad range of external training e.g. school for social enterprise. Head of Asset stated that Employment & Training and local labour quotas are contained within all procurement contracts (moving to 40% target over 2 years), 5 placements through apprenticeships etc. |
Uninvolved residents focus group included a resident who had completed the course at school for social enterprise but had not been involved in any other way either before or since.

4. The landlord monitors that its training is fairly distributed and is value for money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1 Yes: profiling information is collected and clear targets are set and form part of the evaluation process (particularly for funded courses where funding requirement e.g. ESF). Extensive learning database provides further evidence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Extensive cost-benefit analysis of ‘Get Learning’ which considers unit costs against the target number of participants including OCN costs, trainer costs, participant expenses etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted – development plans for residents has been included in all RI Staffs work plans/objectives

Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- ‘Get learning’ prospectus
- Use of residents in ‘peer to peer’ training

Comment/Recommendation: This area demonstrates significant strengths in CCHA’s approach.
- Develop a clear skills and needs assessment for RIO’s to develop learning plans for groups and individuals
- Ensure effective cost-benefit of RI skills training
THEME 6: Support & Resources

Unit 6.5: The landlord supports and celebrates resident involvement

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 'Individual' resident involvement is financially supported.</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Expenses policy shows support for travel, care, incentives (vouchers), telephone, subsistence and accommodation, and is available for download on the website. Strong awareness of support available amongst both involved and uninvolved residents who gave examples of travel (mileage and taxis), childcare, refreshments, training/confere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20% of residents are supportive of the RA is onerous, and this should be revisited. I have been able to discuss this with the RI Manager and the fact that he accepts the recommendation is evidence that CCH are prepared to recognise the different challenges and aspirations of groups.

3.2 Clear interview and observational evidence of working with GRF to establish a ‘one stop shop’ tenants resource centre, Dee Park Regen working with a residents group to develop community fundays, though RA’s need more support on priority setting, outcome thinking and action planning. RA Chair gave evidence that CCH RI Staff have tried to provide this but that it is difficult to get residents to respond to this.

4. Resident involvement is celebrated in a variety of ways.

- Yes: Plenty of examples in newsletters. Time awards – for involved residents (e.g. most volunteer time – Promoted in Housing Matters and Website), Catalyst Oscars – staff awards (team nominations with an RI dimension). E-bulletin – prison visits, articles published in resident newsletters etc. Volunteering days. Strong interview evidence from staff and residents that they are aware of the range of ways RI is celebrated and shared.

Preliminary Assessment: PASS

Interim Assessment: PASS

CCHA Comments: Accepted
Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment and recommend that expenses policy be reviewed in light of changes to national industry standard mileage rates

Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- Time awards – good example of recognising and valuing involved residents time and contribution

Comment/Recommendation: CCHA clearly recognises, supports and celebrates the time contribution of its involved residents, and RI generally.

- Revisit priority setting, outcomes thinking and action planning with key groups
- Review expenses policy in light of changes to national industry standard mileage rates
### THEME 7: Governance

Unit 7.1: The landlord has a considered approach to resident involvement in governance and decision making

Preliminary/Interim Assessment Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Expected for Accreditation</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The landlord has residents on its Board (for RSLs / ALMOS) or Scrutiny Committee (for LAs).</td>
<td>1.1 Yes: Clear process for BM recruitment and leasehold BM recruitment Process incorporates training and support. Interviewed 2 existing resident board members (one wearing the hat of an RA Chair).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Extensive evidence of consulting residents on new organisational structure including the introduction of local boards and the numbers of resident places – majority, clear commitment to 50% resident membership, 1 company board member – selection process developed and decision made by residents (observed and supported by TPAS). Scope to further develop resident members with the aspiration of appoint resident chairs to local boards (competitive process, no resident chairs currently)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The landlord has considered / reviewed a fair and democratic process for the selection / election of residents.</td>
<td>2.1 As above, extensive documentary and observation evidence includes process with 5 key steps as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Leaflet for expressions of interest from residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pre-Interview meet and greet, including info. packs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Board acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ratification</td>
<td>TPAS were able to observe a process for the recruitment of Group Board RBM with interviews conducted by and decision made by GRF members. Interview evidenced that unsuccessful resident applicants felt the process for appointing resident to company board was fair and transparent. Process for Local boards influenced by consultation – originally planned hybrid of selection/election but consultation showed preference for selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resident Board / Scrutiny members are clear about their role.</td>
<td>3.1 Yes: Those that I met are amongst the most skilled an knowledgeable that I have met in any organisation. Evidence that staff are amenable and supportive ‘every staff member I asked made time for me’ (Resident Board member).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resident Board / Scrutiny members are valued and their positive contribution can be demonstrated.</td>
<td>4.1 Yes: Without doubt. GRF asked for a meeting 18 months ago as they were concerned this was not the case – general view that now treated equally in all respects – feel confident can offer views and valued by the organisation and Board minutes show regular resident contributions and views being considered and valued. MD view was ‘They do more for us, so we owe them more’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is effective and ongoing training for Board / Scrutiny members and where appropriate supplementary training is available to resident board members.</td>
<td>5.1 Yes: All BM’s receive an induction with the relevant MD. All get handbook including role, agreement, induction day, training and capacity building prior to application (to support through process). Awayday/strategy days. Skills and needs assessment (with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is an effective and ongoing approach to succession planning, especially with reference to resident board members.</td>
<td>6.1 Yes: Talent pool for all residents who have successfully completed application/training provides basis of succession but unclear how selection happens in the event of vacancy. Chairs meeting annually discusses succession/renewal terms (interview evidence Governance Manager). Appraisals conducted. Would consider profiling info. as part of recruitment, but only in event of a tie. Monitor ethnicity, age, gender, disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Resident Board / Scrutiny members are accountable to the wider resident body.</td>
<td>7.1 Yes: Extensive evidence of local boards and GRF/LRF being accountable to the wider resident body including group structure consultation, GRF newsletter etc. Many examples of governance and restructure articles in Housing Matters, and letters (including one from MD outlining the initial discussions held at Board and signposting the impending resident consultation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Assessment: PASS**

**Interim Assessment: PASS**

**CCHA Comments:** Accepted – one of RI Manager’s objectives is to develop a training/ capacity building plan/program for resident Board members.

**Scrutiny Panel Comment: Agree with the assessment**
Final Assessment: PASS

Examples of Good Practise:

- *CHG’s approach to group restructure has been open, transparent and has fully engaged and empowered residents.*

Comment/Recommendation: CCHA can draw considerable strength from a very dedicated, hard working and talented pool of resident volunteers

- *Provide intensive support to resident members of local boards with the clear target of having at least one resident chair by the next term of office.*
## Interim Assessment Outcome Matrix

### Criteria for Accreditation

1. The landlord should achieve "YES" for at least 21 out of 27 units
2. The landlord should "no" for no more than 5 out of 27 units
3. The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 4 out of 5 units in Theme 1
4. The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 5 out of 6 units in Theme 2
5. The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 6 out of 7 units in Themes 3 / 4
6. The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 7 out of 9 units in Themes 5 / 6 / 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>ACCREDITATION Required level of pass/partial scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategic commitment to involvement &amp; empowerment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 Pass or partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Opportunities to involve &amp; influence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 Pass or partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use of resident intelligence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Pass or partial combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accountability &amp; performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 Pass or partial combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Support &amp; resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Conclusion
Catalyst Communities Housing Association has evidenced and demonstrated considerable strengths. The following points highlight particular areas that TPAS recognises as good practice.

Unit 1 – Strategic Commitment to Involvement & Empowerment

1.1 Youth Forum: Prison Trips – 9 young women aged 14-17, all known to the Police as serious and frequent offenders. Programme of prison visits challenged stereotypes, assumptions, perceptions, self-worth and the effect/impact of crime. All still involved to some degree in positive diversionary activities.

Hillingdon Local Offer Pilot – Developed specific training course aimed at involving vulnerable/supported residents in Mystery Shopping activities.

1.2 Providing ‘Train the Trainer’ training for residents to deliver training to other residents.

1.3 Involving experienced residents in the promotion of involvement and involvement activities.

Training session for Block Representatives – and then delivery by experienced block representatives in recruiting new tenants.

1.4 CCHA seeks and achieves high levels of external funding to support a range of RI outcomes and deliver wider community benefit.

17 ways.

Unit 2 – Opportunities for Involvement & Influence

2.1 CCHA’s use of modern technologies in increasing the numbers and diversity of involved residents (particularly social media)

2.2 Database of involvement preferences

2.3 Blackbird Leys – Resident/Volunteer run Newspaper and the website events calendar

2.4 RI in group restructure and procurement

2.5 Local Offer consultations delivered by neighbourhood housing managers and incorporating staff from around the organisation e.g. resident involvement, business improvement, senior management team and involved residents.
Utilisation of lessons from local offer pilot for testing with CCHA residents.

**Unit 3 – Use of Resident Intelligence**
3.1 Creative approach to considering stage 3 complaint.

RLO’s in contract delivery (both in-house and per contractor)

3.2 Driving forward, local neighbourhood consultations, providing scope to scope to visit residents who wouldn’t traditionally get involved.

Use of trained resident interviewers in Driving Forward/Local consultations

**Unit 4 – Accountability & Performance**
4.1 Strong and inclusive approach to developing local offers

IRIS – partnership approach to resident inspection

‘Items for discussion sheet’ for informal resolution of issues through the LRF Chair

4.2 Strong organisational support for and understanding of independent inspection and scrutiny function - though triggers for scrutiny need clarifying

Extremely responsive approach to local service/satisfaction issues and high response rates to surveying

Head of Service ‘inquiry’ into individual cases of dissatisfaction

4.3 Aids and adaptations review report

4.4 Resident-led scrutiny is in place, functioning and delivering recommendations for service improvement is and example of good practise

**Unit 6 – Support & Resources**
6.1 The levels of financial support are high, though requirement to prove 20% support could potentially be too onerous to encourage more RA’s

6.2 Staff volunteering days are a strong example of good practise

6.3 Job swaps allowing staff to experience different perspectives and work flows

6.4 ‘Get learning’ prospectus

Use of residents in ‘peer to peer’ training
6.5 Time awards – good example of recognising and valuing involved residents time and contribution

**Unit 7 – Governance**

7.1 CHG's approach to group restructure has been open, transparent and has fully engaged and empowered residents.
2. Recommendations
The following table provide a quick reference summary to key recommendations from TPAS at the interim stage of this assessment process. There are many suggestions and comments throughout the assessment, which provide additional detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Reference</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>● Once 90% profiling is achieved, CCHA should work with involved residents to identify key areas of under-representation and a clear ‘need to reach’ strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.2            | ● Provide training for both residents and staff in developing action plans and outcomes thinking (including cost-benefit)  
● Develop a clear approach to on-going monitoring of action plans  
● CRF (GRF) should be supported in developing a clear resident business plan.  
● Resident involvement in VFM/Communications should be enhanced (possible VFM review/Scrutiny). |
| 1.3            | ● Provide clear and transparent supporting information relating to Catalysts Gateway to CRF (and wider residents) in the near future. |
| 1.4            | ● Develop a clear set of quantitative and qualitative indicators/measures which demonstrate the full extent of impact of resident involvement at CCHA. |
| 2.1            | ● Pilot the use of twitter as a means for customers to provide feedback of both good and bad service. (Offer Company response within 1 hour of post during contact centre opening hours). – *Achieved, 600 followers to date* |
| 2.2            | ● Include clear service standards relating to the provision of information in the work being undertaken to develop quantitative and qualitative indicators/measures  
● Develop a clear support pack for frontline staff to discuss/promote involvement opportunities when face to face with residents |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Reference</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2.3**        | - Empower the customer communications panel to sign-off customer communications including newsletters and website content.  
- Develop a ‘residents kitemark’ to show where publications have been subject to resident influence/consultation and have been approved by customers for plain language.  
- Ensure events calendar is replicated on Catalyst Gateway Website – and that this (and the Gateway Website generally) is kept up to date. |
| **2.4**        | - See through plans to develop RI in the ‘Strategic Alliance Group’, incorporating residents involved in selection panels.  
- Consider wider promotion of training/involvement opportunities in procurement and contract monitoring.  
- Consider potential to roll-out the above to incorporate day to day repairs |
| **2.5**        | - Provide staff training/briefings/dry-runs when utilising staff from around the organization for neighbourhood consultation activity.  
- Consider including the development of ‘local involvement plans’ within the South-east local agreements. |
| **3.1**        | - Utilise initial research through the Customer Experience Strategy to deliver service improvements for specific, targeted groups/communities. |
| **3.2**        | - Consider rolling out the basic training to support more residents as interviewers for market research and local consultations |
| **4.1**        | - CCHA need to develop a more systematic approach to benchmarking and involve residents in this process.  
- Consideration should be given to the volume of customer facing literature produced as part of the VFM considerations of the Customer Communications Panel (recommended elsewhere in this report) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Reference</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.2            | • Consult residents regarding the level at which Head of Services inquiries should be triggered.  
• Consider extending this approach across other areas of the business e.g. day to day repairs, customer contact etc.  
• Develop clearer support information for scrutiny and how it works, including clarification of triggers |
| 4.3            | • Potential to extend training for resident inspectors and mystery shoppers beyond initial group as a means of recruiting more residents.  
• Mystery Shopping programme could be enhanced/further developed and run more systematically. |
| 4.4            | • Consider providing refresher training/briefings to existing scrutineers  
• Ensure scrutiny activities are well planned and the scope of reviews include initial desk top review of all relevant written information  
• TPAS support the view of residents that a scrutiny review of Catalyst Gateway should be undertaken |
| 5.1            | • Funding priorities and requirements (for Catalyst Gateway), and a clear strategy/business plan need to be developed as a matter of priority  
• TPAS support the view of residents that a scrutiny review of Catalyst Gateway should be undertaken |
| 6.1            | • Consider reducing the level of evidence of support required to trigger RA grant, possibly link grant more to outputs and outcomes e.g. local action plan and develop support for RA’s to identify their priorities and action plan for delivery  
• At least annual newsletter articles highlighting the type and levels support available and how to access them  
• At least annual opportunity for residents to influence levels of support and priorities for allocation of RI budget, and newsletter article detailing the outcomes of these discussions |
| 6.2            | • All staff to consider their potential contribution to RI and have a clear target set and monitored through ICDR meetings.  
• All frontline/estate based staff to be provided with advance copies of literature/consultations being sent to residents to enable them to discuss/advise/promote to residents  
• Staff to be provided with an annual ‘They said, we did’ e-briefing. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Reference</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6.3**        | • Incorporate a clear, unambiguous commitment to RI in the Corporate induction  
• Consider use of e-learning/briefings for staff  
• Provide a short-course (half-day) 'Introduction to effective resident involvement' course as compulsory training  
• Develop a regular ‘staff roadshow’ to inform staff of developments/priorities in respect of RI |
| **6.4**        | • Develop a clear skills and needs assessment for RIO’s to develop learning plans for groups and individuals  
• Ensure effective cost-benefit of RI skills training |
| **6.5**        | • Align mileage rates to HMRC approved rates and review regularly  
• Revisit priority setting, outcomes thinking and action planning with key group |
| **7.1**        | • Provide intensive support to resident members of local boards with the clear target of having at least one resident chair by the next term of office. |
3. Scrutiny Panel Comments and Recommendations
The following table provide a quick reference summary to key comments and recommendations made by the TPAS scrutiny panel at the final stage of this assessment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Reference</th>
<th>Comments/Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>When collecting customer profiling data, record any refusals to answer within the overall statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Amend customer communications panel terms of reference to include joint sign-off of newsletter content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>CCHA should continue to be aware of the need to collect high percentage levels of customer profiling information in order to inform local operational decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Equality and diversity monitoring information to be collected at each involvement activity. Targets to be set in relation to involving under-represented groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Develop an explicit ‘information protocol’ for tenant-led scrutiny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Review expenses policy in light of changes to national industry standard mileage rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>