

Spotlight Zoom Meeting Minutes – 20 June 2023 6-8pm

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | <p>Welcome, Apologies and Matters Arising</p> |
| <p><u>In attendance:</u> Spotlight members: Kirsten De Keyser (KDK) - Chair Derek Sheppard (DS) -Vice-Chair Nickie Fonda (NF) Christian Leonard (CL) Lia Voutourides (LV) Shane Addicoat (SA) Kiki Onyesoh (KO) Zahraa Kadri (ZK)</p> <p>Origin Staff: Funso Akande (FA) - Resident Engagement Officer Cherish Hill (CH) - Resident Engagement Officer Carla Wood (CW) – Resident and Community Engagement Manager Elena Boyle (EB) – Head of Customer Experience Carl Mercer (CM) – Rent and Service Charge Manager</p> <p>Apologies: Sammy McNeil – Spotlight member Pam Bhamra - Director of Resident Services Brian Wrigglesworth – Spotlight member</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.</p> <p>KDK suggested that the Spotlight Terms of Reference (TOR) is to be ratified as a priority in this meeting as it has been dragging on. EB – For speed, let’s concentrate on the parts of the TOR that have not got a green tick. All agreed. EB – First one is about the Consumer Standards. We need a clear link to our residents and Spotlight. SA – This seems still in development – let’s keep as it is and can change at a later date and so we can look at it further. We cannot operate without a set of tools we can operate with. Kirsten – this is not an origin requirement; it is an official requirement. We can’t debate as it is something we have to do. EB – This is something the regulator requires, yes. CL – Our role is for residents and to have their voice heard. We are not paid to shape and monitor etc, this is not the job of residents at this point and taking up time. Our core role is to get resident concerns seen to.</p> | |

| |
|--|
| <p>LV- If this is something that has not gone to legislation yet, then what does it mean if we add it in. Let's look at it when it becomes official.</p> <p>EB – Happy to table this for discussion around Sept-Christmas time - ACTION</p> <p>EB – One more point that has not been accepted is that the Quorum is 4 Spotlight members. EB suggested 3.</p> <p>EB – Origin will need to accept the TOR as well. Another point for discussion is where you suggested that 2 members of Spotlight are on the panel for new spotlight member interviews. EB suggested to have minimum 1 Spotlight member (in case of members being on holiday etc for example) and that Origin are to be involved in recruitment. If a decision cannot be made, then we can bring someone external in for example, Pam or I. This has never happened before but at least we have it in place if it does. This is the only other point I wanted to flag with you so if you are happy to accept then we can put this to bed.</p> <p>KDK - Spotlight can still invite residents to be interviewed. EB – Yes.</p> <p>Christian – asked for clarification.</p> <p>EB – said another member of spotlight can attend (3 members on the panel) or can change it to be 'decide at the time'.</p> <p>KDK – We could have Tpas involved?</p> <p>EB – If a decision is not able to be made then the recruitment panel can appoint a third person to be involved.</p> <p>CL – Happy that there's a representative from the Community team there.</p> <p>KDK – Agree to have 3 people on the panel to include Spotlight members and Origin staff and decide at the time (whomever is available).</p> <p>KDK asked SA opinion. SA - Asked why Origin needs to check it? Can't we just agree and check it.</p> <p>CH explained how the TOR is a joint official document and our SMG will need to see it and agree. CH checked if our newest member KA has seen the TOR. SA clarified that we are voting on the version with the points we have just discussed.</p> <p><u>VOTE</u></p> <p>KA no vote – 6 voted yes. Result is the TOR is agreed and ratified by the Spotlight panel.</p> <p>KDK – Thank you everyone.</p> |
| <p>Introduction - New Resident and Community Engagement staff</p> |
| <p>CW and FA both introduced themselves and Spotlight gave a warm welcome. Also, welcome to the newest Spotlight member Kiki.</p> |
| <p>Facebook comments feedback</p> |
| <p>Facebook comments were sent from KDK to the group and raised in the Spotlight agenda meeting. CH – I have raised the issues with the correct teams. It is difficult to follow up when we do not know the addresses or areas of these concerns. KDK– even without addresses we should still take the comments on board. CH will feedback once the relevant teams have responded – ACTION</p> |

| | |
|----------|---|
| | <p>LV – Repairs is a real issue and so is communal doors and ASB.</p> <p>CL – ASB is an issue across many of our estates.</p> <p>EB – The way we manage ASB needs improvement, and this has already been identified and work is being done internally. This would be a good Scrutiny review.</p> <p>CH – Neighbourhoods is writing a paper for Spotlight which will include how the team manage ASB, their renewed ASB policy and their recent improvement plans.</p> |
| 4 | KPI data pack questions |
| | <p>KDK – Spinning in the language in the feedback seems disingenuous. It is brilliant we are getting these KPI's, but the approach needs to be more genuine and more accepting. Staff comments on the KPI's seem in denial.</p> <p>LV – Perplexed by the figures and some do not have targets. The numbers seem low and we do not receive all of them. What is LCRA and LCHO? Also, some data starts late – what are the number of tenancies so we can gauge the satisfaction?</p> <p>EB –in terms of the 23/24 targets; if we were performing at the lower quartile, it would be unwise to set a top target for next year but ultimately that is our aim. LCHO (Low-Cost Home Ownership) and LCRA (Low Cost Rental) divide is the Tenant Satisfaction Metrics and is new. Acting on your views, the last financial year we tracked this by overall satisfaction, and you do not see further data until later as now we have split this by tenure. From September used external company, we have tested. Number of tenants. We use a company called Qwest and they suggest a sample size number and a good range of people.</p> <p>EB – Bring more data around this next time so we can see this comparator (how many tenancies we are asking and how many responses)- ACTION</p> <p>LV – This explanation should be included in the data and also the size of sample will be constantly changing.</p> <p>Elena – when we buy more properties, there is a working group where we calculate how many more staff we need – there is a formula for that and include that in our thinking.</p> <p>SA – Some of the numbers look quite dire, can we compare our performance with other housing associations? Be good to get a comparison once or twice a year so we can see how we are performing. It will help us evaluate the KPI's better. Vacant</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>properties – re let times; can we have these metrics? Transfers/mutual exchange – is there some stats on this as well?</p> <p>Elena – Yes, I can get back to you on this and provide what information we have on this that is of value. Carla the new manager is going to look at how we show these KPI's on the website.</p> <p>Elena to email Shane on what she finds out to see if it is helpful for spotlight and go from there. ACTION.</p> <p>EB - Housemark track overall satisfaction on Housing Associations. Satisfaction had dopped around 12% across the board.</p> <p>CL – If an internal transfer is possible, the advice is to go to the Local Authority. We should look to support our residents first before going to the local authority as a priority.</p> <p>EB – This is something we are looking at and Pam and Tina are doing a piece of work on this.</p> <p>CL - Moving this over to Pam reassures me.</p> <p>NF – Nothing further to comment and happy with the conversation already had.</p> |
| 5 | <p>Service Charge Scrutiny update</p> <p>CM Introduced himself to DS who attended the meeting after the initial introductions.</p> <p>EB – We moved to a Task and Finish Scrutiny method for this review and worked in a fast paced way and Tpas independently facilitated this. There were a number of meetings and significant amount of data was reviewed. Staff were interviewed and then a set of recommendations were written. These were shared with Carl and Finance and then to the Customer Services Committee in May however we needed to add some more timescales around the recommendations first so now the recommendations will be put forward to the CSC in July.</p> <p>CM – 28 out of 30 recommendations were agreed. all but 2 were not approved. Once response has gone to the committee we will work with scrutiny to re design the rent statements and implement the agreed recommendations. We will provide a quarterly update on our progress to Spotlight.</p> <p>KDK – when will spotlight have the report? EB – it will be sent by the end of June before the CSC.</p> |

| | |
|----------|---|
| | <p>CM– Improving and adding more information on the rent statements was the main bulk of the recommendations put forward. Only 4 recommendations were partially agreed due to requirement to investigate further.</p> <p>CM– Key improvements were to improve the supporting information on the website to be improved and the statements. Transparency on the statements itself, personalising a lot more so that the information applies to the reader and therefore clearer and less jargon filled.</p> <p>EB - Overall the Scrutiny group was really successful and Sam from Tpas commented this was one of the more successful reviews she has facilitated.</p> <p>KDK – We need to keep learning on these good works, and this is really encouraging to hear.</p> <p>EB – Every quarter spotlight will receive the progress on the implementation and this is really important. From the Scrutiny group a number of members now want to get more involved in our resident involvement. We will continue working with them.</p> <p>NF - My building wants to see draft statements to comment on as we have an energetic group here at Stokes Court.</p> <p>EB – Some of the recommendations will take longer to implement. These will be sent to Spotlight by the end of June.</p> <p>KDK would like the Climate Group Update next as it always gets left out as we run out of time.</p> <p>LV would prefer to talk about the next Scrutiny Topic.</p> |
| 6 | Topics for next Scrutiny review |
| | <p>LV – In additions to looking into communications. Repairs and complaints were going to be looked at last year, so this still needs looking at. Also overseeing the delivery of services as things are not being done. Sometimes this is down to the monitoring of the contractors.</p> <p>KDK – Also manage ASB and manage communal areas.</p> <p>DS – New repairs contract only just started so not sure how useful a scrutiny review would be. Need to leave for at least 12 months.</p> <p>LV - don't want to wait another 12 months – it is the same contractor and not happy to for it to continue for the next 12 months.</p> <p>DS – The new contract will not be implemented yet until later in the year.</p> <p>SA – The last review was positive I think because it was so focussed. Can we select some small things and one larger thing to look at. Want to keep this positivity going.</p> |

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>Maybe look at the complaints resolution/process and then a larger one on communication policy for example.</p> <p>EB -Tpas are good at managing the scope and keeping it manageable. Shall we ask Sam to come along to a session to narrow down these ideas and put a plan in place and the specific questions?</p> <p>ACTION - Sam to come to a meeting with spotlight and help plan the next Scrutiny review/s. KDK agreed (before September Spotlight meeting).</p> <p>CL – Chris Wait would be very happy to answer the questions in relation to the Gilmartins and Origin new contract – ACTION.</p> <p>NF – Getting diagnostics right first time as a Scrutiny review is my suggestion – for example it took 9 weeks to repair the door system in my building. Also, fire alarms in the building will not switch off, what is the managing system for these new alarms. ACTION for CH to raise this internally.</p> |
| 7 | Communications Improvement Plan |
| | |
| 8 | Climate Change Update |
| | <p>NF – The Roundtable discussion was successful – nearly 20 staff members attended. We spoke about what is Sustainability and what are we doing. All these different initiatives are happening across the business. There was no communication about any of it before we met. Sam from Tpas was very good and made the most of the 90 minutes. The most important take from that meeting is improving communication and working together.</p> <p>KDK – Communications have just sent out a workshop invite about this as well.</p> <p>Spotlight agreed that having Tpas facilitate was really helpful to help focus us.</p> |
| 9 | AOB |
| | <p>DS - Ask for Chris Wait to attend the next meeting. Have raised before about the internal/external security. Derek to email Elena about this so Elena can send to the right person and Pam for oversight.</p> <p>LV – Thank Carl for coming along.</p> <p>Elena to offer staff to come along and observe spotlight meetings going forward as Spotlight agreed that attending is useful to all staff– ACTION.</p> <p>CL – The roundtable session meeting felt like we have kicked something going. I feel like we are moving in the right direction.</p> <p>Meeting ended 6:05pm.</p> |

