

Please note compliance with Scottish Housing Regulator's Standards and Freedom of Information requirements at end of these minutes

Minutes of the Committee of Management of Blue Triangle (Glasgow) Housing Association Ltd, held at Head Office, 100 Berkeley Street, Glasgow G3 7HU on 21 January 2021. COM members attended remotely via Microsoft Teams.

1. Present

Ms A Davis (AD) (Chair), Ms C Clark (CC), Mr M Trant (MT), Ms Heather Ward (HW), Ms E Campanaro (EC), Ms R Harper (RH), Ms K Phillips (KP), Mr J Edwards (JE)

**Action
By**

2. In Attendance

Mr I Macfarlane (IM), Mr G Holmes (GH), Mr I Batt (IB), Ms D Thomson (DT), Ms K Irvine (KI) (Minutes)

3. Apologies

Mr S McIvor (SMcl) (Vice Chair), Mr D Stewart (DS)

4. Conflicts Of Interest

None

5. Minutes of the previous Committee of Management Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2020 were approved.

6. Matters Arising

MT highlighted that the Reserves Policy was not discussed at the last ARFR meeting and would like to ensure this is discussed at the next meeting.

7. Chief Executive Reports

7.1 LandAid Offer Letter & Ts&Cs

IM noted that these items had previously been approved by the COM via e-mail and the Viewpark ensuite works had commenced.

The Committee of Management:

1. Ratified the approval of the LandAid Terms and Conditions.

7.2 Glasgow Alliance - Risks & Our Response

IM spoke to his previously distributed paper summarising the history of the Glasgow Alliance and highlighted the following sections for COM attention and discussion:

- The full extent of the risks arising from the formation of The Alliance, given our absence from the partnership.
- The proactive actions we are taking in Glasgow to help mitigate these risks as far as possible.
- The risks from the SG Policy requirement to accelerate rapid rehousing across all 32 LA areas in Scotland.
- The clear need for Service Development Plans in each LA area to ensure we are offering unique and innovative whole system solutions, to protect our market position, to turn risks into opportunities, and to diversify our income streams in each LA area. The resource requirements to drive this critical activity at the pace required must be considered.

IM highlighted our risks as follows and noted that as a Legacy Provider who is not part of The Alliance, our scope to influence redesign and decommissioning decisions in Glasgow is clearly limited. All we can do is build strategic relationships, seek to influence thinking and decision-making, and evidence the quality of our services and the strong transition outcomes we achieve for the people we support.

In Glasgow, as in other LA areas, there will be a default towards support in the community as the first option, with only the most complex service users being supported in accommodation units (this reducing to 1% in Glasgow).

As such, our referrals and lengths of stay, which drive occupancy and our income streams, are under pressure. In addition, the requirement to invest to maintain suitable accommodation and protect our services is an increasing cost driver. This is true in each of the 9 LA areas where we currently operate.

He advised that it is essential we operate strategically, at a whole system level in all LA areas, protecting the continuation of services we already deliver, whilst bringing innovative service models to open up new opportunities and new income sources at a whole system level. We must be operating at the right level, we must be having the right conversations, and this needs to happen now. IM explained that this includes having clearly differentiated service propositions for Young People services, distinct from Adult services.

IM noted that the practical implication in each LA will differ and that our strategic positioning with stakeholders will drive the risk for our services. What is clear is that our parallel approach to driving Service Excellence to demonstrate our impactful and specialist service provision, whilst driving Service Development to open up new service opportunities is essential

IM reported that in order to mitigate these risks in Glasgow, we are leveraging the relationship networks of our CEO to rapidly:

- Engage with the Glasgow Alliance Leadership Team to build relationships, ensuring we are best positioned to influence their thinking and plans. Discussions to date have been very positive.
- Engage with the Head of Adult Social Work (Homelessness & Criminal Justice) in Glasgow, who is the Council's representative on the Alliance Leadership Team. He welcomes our proactive and strategic approach, he wants us to be linked into The Alliance, and he wants our input into shaping whole system solutions for the city. Indeed, he is making introductions to all the strategic stakeholders across the city, including the Head of Children & Families Services, and has arranged a meeting with the key homelessness Commissioners in Glasgow on 18 January. This meeting is vital to securing clarity on the position regarding our Children & Families commissioned services, and therefore the extent of our financial risk.
- Engage with Heads of Service responsible for intensive Young People services, including those in secure care, engaged with youth justice, held in HMYOI Polmont, and recent care leavers assessed as having complex support needs. We have been invited to help shape a Transformation Programme for YP Services in Glasgow, with the objective of releasing funds from expensive but ineffective intensive support services (c£11,000 per week per young person), to invest in innovative service models that we would help shape. The potential to extend the scope of our existing contracts to facilitate this has already been muted.
- Engage with a range of whole system stakeholders across the city, including in Community Justice Glasgow, Glasgow Alcohol & Drug Partnership, Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership, and HMP Barlinnie/HMP Low Moss, the aim being to identify common challenges, to promote whole system solutions, and to identify funding sources outside of homelessness.
- In addition, the Project Manager in our Somerset Place service is providing time to help shape Young People service ideas that we will formalise as Go To Market Service Propositions.

In addition, to mitigate the national risk IM explained that in each LA area, it is essential we build strategic relationships not just in homelessness services, but also at the right level across the whole system. This is fundamental to increasing our focus on Service Development in every LA area, which is vital to achieving our strategic objectives.

- We need to prepare Service Development Plan (SDP) for each of the 9 LA areas where we operate, based on our understanding of not just their RRTP priorities, but their whole system strategies and plans.

- We need to prepare Points of View and Service Propositions that demonstrate our understanding of their challenges, offer unique insights, and propose innovative solutions.
- We need to develop Go To Market Campaigns in each LA area to deliver our SDP, targeting the right stakeholders, rapidly building credibility, opening up new service opportunities, and providing the basis to target funding from LA sources, from SG sources, or from Grant Funding sources.

IM reiterated that it is essential the full implications of the RRTP policy is understood, not only in Glasgow, but nationally. The COM should recognise the work that is ongoing in Glasgow and the proposed focus on developing SDPs as part of a targeted Go To Market campaigns in each LA where we operate or want to operate. Discussion on the resource requirements in this regard will be required.

IM noted that The Laser COM on 18 February will be dedicated to further considering this paper, its implications, and the actions we need to take but advised he was happy to take questions or comments as time allowed.

RH noted that there are also opportunities and advised that she had considered the alliance contract in the course of her professional life and it allows for the alliance to bring in specialist providers where required so on a purely contractual basis we could still be able provide our services.

JE also highlighted the possibility to join the Alliance at a later date if they decided that they wanted us to; JE also asked what the worst case loss scenario was.

EC advised that the association needed to reflect on what value we can offer and provide a system that makes it easy for commissioners (alliance or otherwise) to adopt.

DT asked how we plan to maintain strategic relationships.

KP asked what financial and human resources are required to drive forward the service development aspect.

GH noted that GFS would be considered a high cost floating support services and he felt that that service was probably at greater risk than our fixed building city centre services. He also noted that any future contract award in Glasgow would also likely see management overheads based on 7.5%, which is also a risk to us.

IM noted that yes, it is possible that one outcome is that the alliance agree they require our services and there is no impact on us, however all risks at all levels must be noted.

IM addressed RH's comment and agreed that while the contractual scope is there to potentially retain our services, the alliance does contain direct competitors that could slot in and provide our service.

IM responded to DT and advised that while the social care landscape in

Glasgow is quite complex, it is essential that develop a repeatable service proposition that can be tailored locally and encompasses a whole-system approach to provide solutions to commissioners. IM noted that he had already had conversations with the Care Inspectorate regarding new services and different registrations and the key to maintaining the relationships was communication.

IM responded to KP's question about resources and noted that while resources will absolutely be required for service development, we needed to look at what roles we already have that may have a service development area and see what other capacity we need and where we potentially need to back fill. IM noted that his preference would be to use the talent that is already within the organisation.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the report
2. Agreed to dedicate the next Laser COM to discussion around the situation of Glasgow Alliance Tendering.

7.3 Transformation Programme Update

IM briefly summarised his paper and highlighted the following points:

- The BTHA Transformation Programme was scoped following engagement with all staff to understand our internal requirements for change and following an assessment of our operating context to understand our external drivers for change.
- The COM approved the Programme scope and a Phase 1 (to end March 2021) budget on 26 November 2020.
- We will deliver our Transformation Programme via six Work Streams: Digital, People, Property, Communications, Performance, and Development.
- Mobilisation workshops with each Work Stream were held in November and December 2020, and our Laser COM Meeting on 17 December and Vision & Innovation Committee Meeting on 3 December 2020 were focused on our Transformation Programme.
- We are sourcing an appropriate IT Solution to help us deliver and report on our Transformation Programme progress, risks, issues, and decisions. This procurement will be completed over the next 6 weeks.
- We are holding weekly Transformation Programme Meetings every Monday (10.00-11.30) to capture updates from each Work Stream, including risks or issues to be closed or decisions required.
- The on-going Covid restrictions and the stricter rules in place since 26 December 2020 will impact on some of the Transformation Programme activities. We continue to operate remotely, using MS

Teams to ensure we can drive forward change activities. However, some small and socially distanced face-to-face workshops and planned engagement activities with Projects have been deferred.

- We are therefore operating with added agility and flexibility, using the Transformation Programme Meeting to ensure everyone is on the same page regarding programme wide activities and dependencies. The fluid situation means we have adopted a weekly forward view of activities within a wider Phase 1 Outcome Framework. We are therefore not managing any detailed Programme Plan during this period.
- The following Work Stream updates summarise delivery progress and highlight any risks/issues, procurement status, and expenditure headlines the COM should be aware of.
- Dashboard reports per Work Stream will be provided into future COM Meetings.

JE asked if there is anything within the Transformation plan that may need to be prioritised due to the Glasgow issue previously discussed.

IM advised that while most activities currently being tracked in the Transformation Plan are under the “service excellence” umbrella, it is evident that the “Service Development” stream will need to be prioritised and resourced as a priority to focus on the development of repeatable service propositions.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the report.

7.4 Tenders, Contracts & Service Development Opportunities

IM briefly spoke to his paper and highlighted the following:

- We have established a Development Workstream as part of our Transformation Programme.
- We are developing an Opportunity Pipeline as an input to our Transformation Programme Team Meeting (Mondays 10.00-11.30). We will share this with the COM from our March meeting as a standard input. This will include information on Commissioning (LA Department or other public body) or Buying Sources (RSLs or other Direct Purchase from our Go To Market activities) and the Contract Value (known or estimated).
- We are preparing a single repository of the Programme and Executive level Risks, Issues, Decisions, Contract Position, New Service Opportunities, and Funding Bids. This will initially be in MS Excel, until we migrate onto an appropriate IT solution.
- We are preparing a role description to recruit a Service Development Manager/Head of Service Development – we are currently scoping this role and reviewing the seniority of this position given our need to

drive new opportunities for growth (and consolidation) in an increasingly dynamic operating context.

IM noted the myriad of contract extensions agreed due to Covid-19 delaying tendering exercises, he noted that this has bought us some time to make progress on service propositions and the Transformation Plan. IM noted that many of these extensions would still become tenders, which we need to prepare for by having strategic discussions with commissioners at an early stage and developing repeatable service propositions.

KP asked how quickly a decision would need to be made on Service Development resources.

IM advised that this was an upmost priority and a decision will be required in the near future.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the report

8. **Finance Update**

GH spoke to his report and highlighted the key areas and provided a verbal update on the December accounts as follows:

The accounts to 31 December 2020 show a small deficit for the month.

Voids

The voids figures over the last month or so have seen an increase from the levels of earlier in the year, with the figure for the month of December at 6.11%, which is above budgeted levels.

Particularly high void levels were experienced in Sauchiehall Street (10.05%), Holland Street (7.32%), Viewpark (11.06%), Clydebank (10.60%), Solas (11.29%), Renfrew (9.50%), Alexandria (8.80%) and East Kilbride (17.34%).

Reasons for voids largely relate to a lack of referrals from local authorities and to a lesser extent repairs and Covid-19 related delays in using rooms after a service user leaves (72 hour rule in some local authorities).

GH reported that January has seen voids rise further with 8.11% in the week ending 3 January 2021 and 8.66% for the week ending 10 January 2021, equating to just under £20,000 in cash terms.

Sums outstanding

After a very healthy level of receipts in December, the month ended with a very low level of debtors, of approximately £250,000.

Cash Flow

GH noted that this remains good, with a strong start to January 2021, although with the low level of opening debtors, this will likely slow down as the month continues.

External audit

GH advised that the interim audit had been completed remotely the previous week, and a report is awaited.

Internal audit

GH noted that the final internal audit assignment completed by end of calendar year, and report currently awaited.

Previous report on Policies and Procedures discussed at ARFR.

Plans for tender of internal audit being progressed.

Annual Budget and Rent Setting

GH reported that the annual budget setting process continues, with consultation with project managers completed.

At this time, Unison have advised they are not in a position to table their pay demand, so the budget includes a best estimate of likely increase.

In terms of increases to accommodation charges for Housing Benefit purposes, with low levels of inflation, any meaningful uplift over and above RPI of 0.9% is not expected.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the report

9. Operations Update

IB spoke to his paper and a reduced set of KPI's and advised that he only had one update, that all 9 local authorities has now been in touch with service managers with a full plan for the roll out of the Covid-19 vaccine to front line staff.

IB advised that he is constantly in awe of how fantastic the frontline staff are coping although he noted that a bit of fatigue can be seen setting in now with the current lockdown.

IM noted that he agreed and that the tone of messaging from the Scottish Government felt "harsher" this time and that staff and service users are all struggling with no visitors and he advised that he was still chasing up the promised £500 payment for social care staff and would report back once he had any update.

HW noted that staff burnout is out with our control when there is nowhere for anyone to go, as much as making sure leave is taken is a priority, it is not as restful as it would be under normal circumstances. She also noted that only 1 Covid-19 outbreak in the year is testimony to the staff and wished to thank them on behalf of the board.

KP suggested asking the staff what we could do to help them cope and AD asked for thoughts on a survey.

IM advised that IB and the area managers are checking with their services constantly on a very human level and IM sends out a "temperature" check

weekly, inviting responses.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the report

10. Subcommittee Reports

10.1 Quality and Performance

HW provided an update on the Q&P meeting from 12 January 2021.

She highlighted the significant COVID-19 cluster outbreak at our Holland Street project, which has resulted in 2 service users and 3 staff members test positive, with 6 other staff members and 3 other service users, currently self-isolating despite all 6 staff members having tested negative. She noted that DS has organized a deep clean as part of ensuring all risks are minimised and additional PPE has been delivered to the project.

HW advised that the issue of notice periods for senior staff had been raised at the meeting and it was highlighted that the current notice period for all staff (except the CEO) is 1 month. The subcommittee felt that this left the association vulnerable should several senior staff leave at the same time and that a notice period of 3 months would be preferable.

HW also noted that a list of outstanding policies to be reviewed was circulated with the COM papers.

There was significant discussion around at what level a 3 month notice period should be required and the various pros and cons as well as the process required to amend any terms and conditions.

MT suggested that any proposed changes should be brought back to the Q&P subcommittee for consideration as a next step.

AD noted that the policies and procedures needed to be looked at as a whole in terms of what is required and noted it will require a few months to get the Q&P policies up to date at a rate of 2 or 3 a meeting.

MT noted that he would like to see policies as a policy statement, separate from a procedure, as he feels our policies are too meaty.

IM noted that policy activity was likely to be brought in-house and simplified with the use of model documents where possible.

MT noted that there was a difference between COM, Q&P and ARFR minutes and no consistency in the use of initials vs. designation, it was agreed that initials will be used and HW will discuss with Linda McFarlane, Admin support for the Q&P subcommittee.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the report

10.2 Audit, Risk, Finance and Resources

GH provided a brief update on behalf of SMcl and highlighted the following points:

- GH confirmed he was awaiting the engrossed extension of the lease to come through to be signed but that Glasgow City Council were paying the increased rental amount.
- GH explained that the processes are now being tidied off and will soon be ready to roll out.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the report

10.3 Vision and Innovation

IM spoke to the notes from the meeting on 3 December 2020 and noted that the items carried forward from the last COM meeting had been discussed and noted. He advised that the next meeting of the Vision and Innovation subcommittee was scheduled for 1 July 2021

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the report

11. Other Updates

11.1 Property Working Group

IM spoke to the minutes of the Property Working group held on 9 December 2020 and advised that the need to develop a portfolio view of our property (leased and owned) and within the context of a Service Development Plan (SDP) per Local Authority area was discussed. IM advised that one of our 6 Work Streams is focused on Property as we recognise it requires to be managed at a strategic portfolio level.

IM highlighted that if we lose a contract and are left with an owned building with a HAG position, we need to have scenario planned for this outcome – at least as far as possible. This must include other uses for the property, aligned to the LAs strategic service outcomes where funding from non-homelessness commissioned sources is possible.

IM explained that we understand the internal requirements for change in terms of property improvements that are required, including investment in en-suite facilities and the creation of psychologically informed environments. However, he also noted that there are external drivers for property investments that must be recognised such as the SG Suitable

Accommodation Guidelines. As such, some investments must be considered mandatory if we are to continue to receive referrals from commissioners.

IM advised that DS is seeking quotes for a feasibility study on Chalmers Court, as the building is not suitable accommodation according to the Suitable Accommodation Order.

JE noted an amendment to the minutes where he is noted as saying “you can only use recycled HAG on social housing new builds”, what this should say is that you can only use recycled HAG on housing stock that is coming into use as social housing for the first time.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the update

11.2 JNC Update

GH provided a verbal update on the JNC meeting held on 16 December 2002.

He highlighted the change to the probationary period for new staff from 3 months to 6 months, which had now been communicated and changed in the terms and conditions going forward.

GH advised that as there had not been a JNC meeting for an extended period, the 2021 market supplements had been previously agreed in principle and were ratified at the meeting.

GH noted that absence management figures were still persistently high and DT was working with Unison to bring these down to below budgeted figures.

GH also highlighted that Unison were currently recruiting for a Unison member to sit on the Job Evaluation committee but that interest has been low.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the update

11.3 Health and Safety

Update will be provided at next meeting as DS at Viewpark for commencement of the en-suite works.

11.4 Laser COM

IM spoke to the notes of the Laser COM meeting held on 17 December 2020 where the Communications and Learning and Development work streams presented.

IM highlighted that after our initial engagement with the 3 branding and web

agencies that we had approached to tender, and the subsequent questions via the procurement portal from the agencies, it has become clear that the brand strategy and web are likely to be two separate pieces of work.

IM noted that the original approval circa £18k is unlikely to cover both pieces of work, but stressed how vital the brand positioning piece of work is before we move onto web.

Once the tenders are received, and the scoring group has assessed them, IM will bring a business case to the COM for budget approval.

The Committee of Management:

1. Accepted the update

12. Policies for Approval

12.1 Policies approved by sub-committee

None

12.2 Policies not approved by sub-committee

None

13. Any Other Competent Business

None

12. Date of Next Meetings

Laser COM dates

18 February 2021

Next COM

25 March 2021

Vision and Innovation

1 July 2021

Signed: Anna Davis

Dated: 25 March 2021

The COM minutes may be required to be posted on our external website to comply with Scottish Housing Regulator guidance and Freedom of Information legislation.

Should we be asked for information in relation to this meeting. Text will be redacted and the reason for redaction noted below.

Page	Section	Reason