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**Resident Scrutiny Meeting – Complaints**   
**Thursday 13 May 4pm 2021 via Zoom**

**Minutes**

**In Attendance:**

**Scrutiny Members:**

Kala Jenkins (KJ), Shane Addicoat (SA), Faisal Ahmed (FA), Lia Voutourides (LV), Ruth Samuels (RS), Samara Richards (SR), Kim Thornton (KT),

**Origin Staff/External:**

Cherish Hill (CH) - Resident Engagement Coordinator, Carol Williams (CW) - Director of Operations, Tosin Adewumi (TA) – Community Development Manager, Michael Guest (MG)– Scrutiny Independent Mentor, Ed Newman (EN)- Customer Resolution Manager

**Apologies:**

Sammy McNeil– Scrutiny member

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1 Welcome – TA** | Actions |
| TA welcomed everyone to the meeting.  All present agreed to the recording of the meeting so we can share this to members who have said they are going to be late or have given apologies for non-attendance. Will be taking a picture (screenshot of meeting) to share online for the Origin website to update residents the start of scrutiny on complaints for transparency. Anyone who does not want their picture taken please turn video off.  Recording started. | CH to send over the recording link to the group once uploaded.  Actioned 20/05/21 |
| **2 Apologies and Introductions**  CH Apologies: Sammy has given apologies she had a hospital appointment she could not move. Belinda can no longer be involved with Scrutiny due to other commitments. Faisal, Lia and Samara may be running late.  Everyone introduced themselves. |  |
| **3 Structure, Roles and Responsibilities – TA**  TA presented a visual representation of Origins Scrutiny process and went through the stages step by step. TA also went through the roles and responsibilities of Scrutiny members, the independent mentor and Origin staff.  JM – Which two areas are you referring to? TA – Explained that there were 2 areas for Scrutiny review agreed last year. The first one was the Parking Policy, and this has been completed and is going to the Customer Services Committee imminently and the second is Complaints. |  |
| **4 Context & Complaints Review Scope – CW & EN** |  |
| CW thanked all new Scrutiny members for their time and for being part of the Scrutiny Task and Finish Group.  CW would like to be part of the process and occasionally attend the Scrutiny meetings. Working together is important and helps CW understand the group recommendations before they are presented at the Customer Services Committee. In the previous Scrutiny review I met with the group and went through all the recommendations. I see reviewing complaints as a great opportunity to improve. It is vital to get this service right for our residents. We are seeing an increase in our complaint’s figures. For us it is more important getting the complaint resolved rather than hitting the response deadline sometimes. At the moment after a period of 3 days the complaint moves onto the next stage. This could be something to consider discussing. We always try to learn from complaints, for example, how we communicate in letters. We always follow advise from the Housing Ombudsman on how we deal with complaints, but resident input is essential. The Customer Services Committee (CSC) are excited about this review. You all are working together with Michael will help improve our services.  EN spoke about his team and their role within the business. EN - I work with 2 Complaints Officers and we facilitate and administrate the complaints process. We ensure service areas are keeping on top of their complaints. We also provide any information required to the Housing Ombudsman. The team provide reports weekly and monthly giving an overview of complaints.  CW – The Customer Resolution team used to investigate the complaints and resolve them, so the organisation has tried it both ways. |  |
| **5 Q and A on the Scope of the review and data information provided.**  KT – It would be useful to see the Complaints policy before it was changed recently so we can see the process before. Not sure if it is too early to review Complaints when the policy has changed, we will not see the difference until say 6 months’ time.  CW – We had low customer satisfaction last year and I still feel it is worthwhile reviewing complaints to improve customer satisfaction and has the process proved better recently. Now staff are expected to have a conversation with the resident initially and be good to see if this has made a difference.  FA – Would like to investigate the cause of the complaints in the first place and what powers do you have to support us or is this tokenism.  CW – This is not tokenism, and we want to work with the group to review what is important to you and trust does need to be built. With the parking review I was able to meet with the group and support most of their recommendations. This is our way to build bridges and move forwards.  MG – This is good way of working and being transparent right from the start. We now need to discuss the scope and timescales as this needs to go to the CSC meeting who meet 4 times per year.  CW – yes, they do but they can hold additional meetings if needed but not in August.  MG – ok and after the scoping I recommend a meeting altogether which I call a round table approach. I also encourage that all recommendations are achievable, we stand by the recommendations and are evidenced based. Not every conclusion needs a recommendation.  FA – Do we have access to information.  CW – Yes if it does not include any identifying information.  MG – Need to be mindful of GDPR.  KT – Need to have the evidence for the recommendation.  Tosin Thanked CW and EN and handed over to MG.  LV entered the meeting. CW thanked everyone for their time today. |  |
| 6) Independent Mentor – MG |  |
| MG – Would like to discuss lead or chair for the group, to agree the scope of the project and agree timescale and timetable.  FA- How independent are you. Are you overseen by a governing body? Could you be biased in any way.  MG – I am an honest broker and will support you in negotiations. I will facilitate your work, and this is your work, you will own this, and I will be with you all the way. This is for the best outcome possible.  FA – The group may be led in a certain direction.  MG – I am flexible and if there are any concerns you can raise it with me or Tosin and Carol.  LV – Where are TPAS? We worked with TPAS before and it worked well. I think Sam from TPAs chaired the group well.  TA – TPAS were not able to support this scrutiny.  FA – I disagree and think we should have a resident chair to lead the group.  KT – I think Michael could be chair.  FA – We could have a resident chair that is not part of the group, a resident, I could ask one of my neighbours. Someone that would stay impartial. I have a resident in mind.  JM – The chair should be a resident that is already part of the Scrutiny Group.  SA – Don’t think we have time to find an external lead now. Would like to move on to looking at the scope and what we are looking into.  FA – What Carol said is that we will have free rein of information. I nominate Lia as she has done it before and has experience.  SA – I am also on the Spotlight Committee and might be an idea for someone else who is not on Spotlight to be the lead. But we need to see what we are looking at before we ask for information.  MG – Need to keep this informal and call them a lead not a chair.  CH – Maybe leave it for now and see if a natural lead comes out in the next meeting.  SR– I agree and let’s leave it for now and see if we need a lead/chair in the next meeting maybe.  MG – We have a nomination for Lia to be led by Faisal.  KJ – Focussing too much on the lead and we don’t even know what we are doing.  Group agreed WhatsApp to be set up so this can be discussed outside the meeting.  MG – Following suggestion made, a role light description for the lead/chair can be developed and shared with group to understand what it involves.  MG – let’s look at what we are going to investigate. What’s in and what’s out on complaints. Come up with a short list and gather evidence on.  A group discussion was had around the scope and what individual members would like to investigate.  MG summarised the scope so far from the discussion:   * Look at the profile of complainants * Look at what the status of residents’ complaints are * Look at how residents can make a complaint.   Group agreed to meet fortnightly and the next meeting to be 27th May 4-6pm. MG encouraged the group to make their own notes and actions going forwards as this will help take ownership of your role within the group. | Group to send Scope ideas to CH and MG before Tuesday.  MG to circulate the scope ideas after the meeting.  MG/Origin to agree and share a short role description for a lead  Scrutiny group to decide approach to taking notes and circulating (who & when) |
| Recording stopped and meeting finished 6:15pm |  |