

LANDLORD SELF-ASSESSMENT OF ACCREDITATION SCORING

UNIT SCORE AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Unit 1.1 | 0 |
| Unit 1.2 | 0 |
| Unit 1.3 | 0 |
| Unit 1.4 | 0 |
| Unit 1.5 | 0 |
| Unit 1.6 | 0 |
| Unit 1.7 | 0 |
| Unit 1.8 | 0 |
| Unit 1.9 | 0 |
| Unit 1.10 | 0 |
| Unit 1.11 | 0 |
| Unit 2.1 | 0 |
| Unit 2.2 | 0 |
| Unit 2.3 | 0 |
| Unit 3.1 | 0 |
| Unit 3.2 | 0 |
| Unit 3.3 | 0 |
| Unit 3.4 | 0 |
| Unit 3.5 | 0 |
| Unit 3.6 | 0 |
| Unit 3.7 | 0 |
| Unit 3.8 | 0 |
| Unit 4.1 | 0 |
| Unit 4.2 | 0 |
| Unit 4.3 | 0 |
| Unit 5.1 | 0 |
| Unit 6.1 | 0 |
| Unit 6.2 | 0 |
| Unit 6.3 | 0 |
| Unit 7.1 | 0 |

CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| 1 | The landlord should achieve "YES" for at least 22 (73%) units | FAIL |
| 2 | The landlord should "no" for no more than 5 units | PASS |
| 3 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 9 units in Theme 1 | FAIL |
| 4 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 8 units in Theme 2&3 | FAIL |
| 5 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 6 units in THEME 4,5&6 | FAIL |

TARGET FOR ACCREDITATION

| | |
|----|---|
| 22 | More units raised to "YES" across the entire assessment |
| 0 | More units raised from "NO" across the entire assessment |
| 9 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Theme 1 |
| 8 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Theme 2&3 |
| 6 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Themes 4,5,6&7 |

NOTES:

For any given unit if there is no assessment inserted in the unit sheet (i.e. evidence is still required or assessment has not reached that stage) the formulas which produce the assessment will continue to deliver a result. These results should be overlooked.

e.g. If no results have been input then the first criteria will count 0 "YES" assessments and return "FAIL".

RATIONALE FOR THEME BASED CRITERIA ASESMENTS

Criterion 3 relates to the strategy of the landlord and its ability to communicate its strategy to residents

Criterion 4 relates to the landlords operational control over resident involvement. It has a lower threshold due to identified challenges in 'profiling' residents, managing resident involvement projects and measuring involvement efficiency.

Criterion 5 relates to the resident involvement culture of the organisation. Although it has fewer units it is given roughly equal weight to Criterion 3 as TPAS consider culture crucial to effective delivery.

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT (DESK TOP REVIEW)

UNIT SCORE AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Unit 1.1 | 0 |
| Unit 1.2 | 0 |
| Unit 1.3 | 0 |
| Unit 1.4 | 0 |
| Unit 1.5 | 0 |
| Unit 1.6 | 0 |
| Unit 1.7 | 0 |
| Unit 1.8 | 0 |
| Unit 1.9 | 0 |
| Unit 1.10 | 0 |
| Unit 1.11 | 0 |
| Unit 2.1 | 0 |
| Unit 2.2 | 0 |
| Unit 2.3 | 0 |
| Unit 3.1 | 0 |
| Unit 3.2 | 0 |
| Unit 3.3 | 0 |
| Unit 3.4 | 0 |
| Unit 3.5 | 0 |
| Unit 3.6 | 0 |
| Unit 3.7 | 0 |
| Unit 3.8 | 0 |
| Unit 4.1 | 0 |
| Unit 4.2 | 0 |
| Unit 4.3 | 0 |
| Unit 5.1 | 0 |
| Unit 6.1 | 0 |
| Unit 6.2 | 0 |
| Unit 6.3 | 0 |
| Unit 7.1 | 0 |

CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| 1 | The landlord should achieve "YES" for at least 22 (73%) units | FAIL |
| 2 | The landlord should "no" for no more than 5 units | PASS |
| 3 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 9 units in Theme 1 | FAIL |
| 4 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 8 units in Theme 2&3 | FAIL |
| 5 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 6 units in THEME 4,5&6 | FAIL |

TARGET FOR ACCREDITATION

| | |
|----|---|
| 22 | More units raised to "YES" across the entire assessment |
| 0 | More units raised from "NO" across the entire assessment |
| 9 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Theme 1 |
| 8 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Theme 2&3 |
| 6 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Themes 4,5,6&7 |

NOTES:

For any given unit if there is no assessment inserted in the unit sheet (i.e. evidence is still required or assessment has not reached that stage) the formulas which produce the assessment will continue to deliver a result. These results should be overlooked.

e.g. If no results have been input then the first criteria will count 0 "YES" assessments and return "FAIL".

RATIONALE FOR THEME BASED CRITERIA ASESMENTS

Criterion 3 relates to the strategy of the landlord and its ability to communicate its strategy to residents

Criterion 4 relates to the landlords operational control over resident involvement. It has a lower threshold due to identified challenges in 'profiling' residents, managing resident involvement projects and measuring involvement efficiency.

Criterion 5 relates to the resident involvement culture of the organisation. Although it has fewer units it is given roughly equal weight to Criterion 3 as TPAS consider culture crucial to effective delivery.

INTERIM ASSESSMENT (POST ON SITE)

UNIT SCORE AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Unit 1.1 | 0 |
| Unit 1.2 | 0 |
| Unit 1.3 | 0 |
| Unit 1.4 | 0 |
| Unit 1.5 | 0 |
| Unit 1.6 | 0 |
| Unit 1.7 | 0 |
| Unit 1.8 | 0 |
| Unit 1.9 | 0 |
| Unit 1.10 | 0 |
| Unit 1.11 | 0 |
| Unit 2.1 | 0 |
| Unit 2.2 | 0 |
| Unit 2.3 | 0 |
| Unit 3.1 | 0 |
| Unit 3.2 | 0 |
| Unit 3.3 | 0 |
| Unit 3.4 | 0 |
| Unit 3.5 | 0 |
| Unit 3.6 | 0 |
| Unit 3.7 | 0 |
| Unit 3.8 | 0 |
| Unit 4.1 | 0 |
| Unit 4.2 | 0 |
| Unit 4.3 | 0 |
| Unit 5.1 | 0 |
| Unit 6.1 | 0 |
| Unit 6.2 | 0 |
| Unit 6.3 | 0 |
| Unit 7.1 | 0 |

CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| 1 | The landlord should achieve "YES" for at least 22 (73%) units | FAIL |
| 2 | The landlord should "no" for no more than 5 units | PASS |
| 3 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 9 units in Theme 1 | FAIL |
| 4 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 8 units in Theme 2&3 | FAIL |
| 5 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 6 units in THEME 4,5&6 | FAIL |

TARGET FOR ACCREDITATION

| | |
|----|---|
| 22 | More units raised to "YES" across the entire assessment |
| 0 | More units raised from "NO" across the entire assessment |
| 9 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Theme 1 |
| 8 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Theme 2&3 |
| 6 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Themes 4,5,6&7 |

NOTES:

For any given unit if there is no assessment inserted in the unit sheet (i.e. evidence is still required or assessment has not reached that stage) the formulas which produce the assessment will continue to deliver a result. These results should be overlooked.

e.g. If no results have been input then the first criteria will count 0 "YES" assessments and return "FAIL".

RATIONALE FOR THEME BASED CRITERIA ASESSEMENTS

Criterion 3 relates to the strategy of the landlord and its ability to communicate its strategy to residents

Criterion 4 relates to the landlords operational control over resident involvement. It has a lower threshold due to identified challenges in 'profiling' residents, managing resident involvement projects and measuring involvement efficiency.

Criterion 5 relates to the resident involvement culture of the organisation. Although it has fewer units it is given roughly equal weight to Criterion 3 as TPAS consider culture crucial to effective delivery.

FINAL ASSESSMENT (POST SCRUTINY)

UNIT SCORE AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Unit 1.1 | 0 |
| Unit 1.2 | 0 |
| Unit 1.3 | 0 |
| Unit 1.4 | 0 |
| Unit 1.5 | 0 |
| Unit 1.6 | 0 |
| Unit 1.7 | 0 |
| Unit 1.8 | 0 |
| Unit 1.9 | 0 |
| Unit 1.10 | 0 |
| Unit 1.11 | 0 |
| Unit 2.1 | 0 |
| Unit 2.2 | 0 |
| Unit 2.3 | 0 |
| Unit 3.1 | 0 |
| Unit 3.2 | 0 |
| Unit 3.3 | 0 |
| Unit 3.4 | 0 |
| Unit 3.5 | 0 |
| Unit 3.6 | 0 |
| Unit 3.7 | 0 |
| Unit 3.8 | 0 |
| Unit 4.1 | 0 |
| Unit 4.2 | 0 |
| Unit 4.3 | 0 |
| Unit 5.1 | 0 |
| Unit 6.1 | 0 |
| Unit 6.2 | 0 |
| Unit 6.3 | 0 |
| Unit 7.1 | 0 |

CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| 1 | The landlord should achieve "YES" for at least 22 (73%) units | FAIL |
| 2 | The landlord should "no" for no more than 5 units | PASS |
| 3 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 9 units in Theme 1 | FAIL |
| 4 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 8 units in Theme 2&3 | FAIL |
| 5 | The landlord should achieve "YES" or "PARTIAL" for 6 units in THEME 4,5&6 | FAIL |

TARGET FOR ACCREDITATION

| | |
|----|---|
| 22 | More units raised to "YES" across the entire assessment |
| 0 | More units raised from "NO" across the entire assessment |
| 9 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Theme 1 |
| 8 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Theme 2&3 |
| 6 | More units raised to "YES" or "PARTIAL" in Themes 4,5,6&7 |

NOTES:

For any given unit if there is no assessment inserted in the unit sheet (i.e. evidence is still required or assessment has not reached that stage) the formulas which produce the assessment will continue to deliver a result. These results should be overlooked.

e.g. If no results have been input then the first criteria will count 0 "YES" assessments and return "FAIL".

RATIONALE FOR THEME BASED CRITERIA ASESSEMENTS

Criterion 3 relates to the strategy of the landlord and its ability to communicate its strategy to residents

Criterion 4 relates to the landlords operational control over resident involvement. It has a lower threshold due to identified challenges in 'profiling' residents, managing resident involvement projects and measuring involvement efficiency.

Criterion 5 relates to the resident involvement culture of the organisation. Although it has fewer units it is given roughly equal weight to Criterion 3 as TPAS consider culture crucial to effective delivery.

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.1 | The landlord draws its resident involvement approach from its corporate aims and clearly responds to the views of residents while setting those aims | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|--|
| The key document relating to resident involvement strategy (Compact or Involvement Policy) has a clear link to the Business Strategy and Corporate aims of the landlord | The Corporate aims of the organisation are stated in the document relating to Resident Involvement strategy. The ways that Resident Involvement can help to achieve those aims are described. |
| There is demonstrable resident influence over landlord strategic aims. | The landlord undertakes at least annually resident involvement activities that help it to review its corporate direction (e.g. business planning focus groups, strategic direction working parties). There is evidence that residents have input into key priority setting beyond simply at Board level. |
| There is a clear Corporate commitment to involving a broad diversity of residents | The RI strategy document includes a commitment to broadening resident involvement diversity. The reasons for this commitment are described. |
| The Business Plan and key policy documents (e.g. Equality and diversity, ASB, tenant handbook) show that they have been subject to resident influence. | There are references in the business plan to the processes of involvement that have been employed to reach the policy outcome. Other key documents (e.g. ASB policy, Equality and Diversity strategy) contain references to how residents have assisted to set the landlords' direction. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.2 | The landlord reviews and identifies what it wants to achieve towards its aims at least annually . | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| The main resident involvement strategy sets out the organisations core aims in involving its residents | The main strategy (<i>most probably its review or action plan</i>) should have clearly programmed tasks. These tasks should be clearly related to the aims of the organisation. Priorities for resident involvement should be clearly aligned with business priorities (as per 1.1). NB: Tasks should have a clear rationale. Although in some cases it may be appropriate to 'increase involvement' for its own sake there should always be a clear end product in mind. (e.g. we wish to set up a citizen's panel in order to ensure that our services reflect a broad range of resident aspirations). |
| Core departmental strategies refer to the role of Resident Involvement in their planned service reviews and changes. | Where departmental reviews or service changes are scheduled the approach to resident involvement in those changes should be mapped. |
| The landlord clearly differentiates between different 'types' of resident. | The main strategy document clearly shows which residents it will work with, how, and at which level (e.g. <i>tenants, leaseholders, the broader community</i>) NB: Many organisations will support the involvement of non-tenants in TRAs but they will not be able to take places on the Board. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.3 | The Landlords' aims are influenced by residents and related to their aspirations. The response to resident feedback is communicated in the main strategy document (either its 'statement' or action plan). | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|--|
| Resident feedback influences resident involvement priorities. This influence is reflected in the main strategy document relating to resident involvement. | The strategy document shows how residents have influenced priorities. <i>E.g. Our resident satisfaction survey has shown concern around ASB which has triggered a review.</i> |
| The landlord adapts services to meet local priorities within its area of operation. | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord has ways of adapting its practice to local need. There is evidence that any constraints to this approach are clearly communicated |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.4 | The landlord and residents know the boundaries to involvement | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| There are transparent standards for recognition of representative groups (e.g. TRAs) | The main strategy document relating to resident involvement sets out guidelines on the recognition and proper conduct of representative groups. Recognition criteria include clear expectations around equal opportunities. |
| There is a statement of the role of residents in the governance of the organisation | The main strategy document sets how residents can become involved in the governance of the landlord. |
| Residents and staff understand the limitations on involvement, and expectations are 'managed'. | The main strategy relating to resident involvement sets out who is responsible (both staff and residents) for making decisions. Individual tasks show how much decision making control will be available to residents and how long consultation periods will last. The limits to resident involvement are well communicated. <i>(This should be reflected in the action plan)</i> <i>E.g. Those areas of work that are retained for officers, such as individual allocations, should be recognised by residents and staff.</i> |
| The landlord has established a process for resolution of collective disputes | The main strategy describes a process for formal collective complaints. The provision commits the landlord to mediation, arbitration and the provision of independent resident advice where necessary. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.5 | The landlord is positive about the principle of resident management. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|--|
| The landlord provides information about Resident Management and supports those residents that wish to investigate it. | <p><i>(In the Local Authority sector)</i> the key strategic document (and/or other specialist documents) refer to the statutory Right to Manage</p> <p><i>(In the HA sector)</i> the key strategic document (and/or other specialist documents) refer to the 'support to manage'.</p> <p><i>(Both sectors)</i> the landlord undertakes tasks at least annually related to resident management. <i>(e.g. local seminars on resident management options or item in the residents newsletter)</i></p> |
| The landlord sees resident management as part of a continuum. | The document(s) referring to resident management make describe a range of devolved power options available to residents <i>(e.g. neighbourhood agreements, 'trigger point' agreements, delegated control over particular service areas)</i> . |
| (Alternatively) there is an agreed rationale for not undertaking resident management activities | Where the landlord does not actively promote resident management activities there is a clear rationale which is understood and agreed by residents. <i>(Interview and/or documentary evidence)</i> |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.6 | The landlord identifies how residents can be involved in strategic decision making across a wide range of forms of involvement. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|---|
| There are processes for sampling customer views which feed into strategic decisions. | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that customer feedback has had an influence on the strategic direction of the organisation. |
| The landlord employs 'informal' methods for residents to influence the strategic direction of the organisation. | There is evidence <i>documentary or interview</i> that the landlord employs 'informal' techniques to influence strategy (<i>e.g. focus groups, citizen's panel, involvement in working parties (not dependant on TRA membership).</i>) |
| There are a range of ways for residents to be formally involved in strategic decision making | The key document sets out ways in which residents can be involved in strategic decisions (<i>e.g. design of contract specification</i>) There is documentary and verbal evidence of the routes into strategic decision making (<i>e.g. only representatives from our federation who have received appropriate training can sit on interview panels</i>) It is clear which stakeholders (<i>i.e. 'type of resident'</i>) can take part in strategic decision making. |
| There is evidence that the views of residents in local neighbourhoods are sought, and that they can influence strategic policy | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord elicits views on strategic matters from groups that cover an area or neighbourhood. There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that landlord wide groups and/or the Board take 'neighbourhood' views into account when making strategic decisions. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.7 | The landlord devolves decision making power to meaningful influence over local area services. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|---|
| There are a good range of opportunities for communities to take or influence decisions that effect neighbourhood service provision | There is evidence (<i>documentary or interview</i>) that area or neighbourhood resident bodies can set priorities and take decisions. (e.g. there are devolved estate management or community investment budgets, there are fora that adapt contracts to local need or aspirations). |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.8 | The landlord uses (or is investigating) formal local and community of interest agreements to direct its work. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| The landlord has processes to formally set out local priorities and actively pursues them. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord will negotiate local priorities and set plans to achieve these (e.g. Neighbourhood based compacts) where residents want this. There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord actively promotes local agreements as a way to deliver local aspirations. |
| The landlord has processes to formally set out community of interest priorities and actively pursues them. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord will negotiate issue based or community of interest plans e.g. BME or Older People's Compacts) where residents want this. There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord actively promotes these agreements as a way to deliver residents aspirations. . |
| (Alternatively) there is a clear rationale for not developing or promoting formal local and community of interest agreements. | Where the landlord does not actively promote local and community of interest agreements there is a clear rationale that is shared by both residents and landlord. (<i>interview and/or documentary evidence</i>) e.g where landlords already devolve a great deal of power (i.e. achieve unit 1.7) it may be considered by landlord and residents that local agreements are not a high priority or serve no immediate purpose. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.9 | The landlord employs a broad 'menu of involvement' | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| The landlord employs a wide range of both 'formal' and 'informal' techniques to enable resident influence. | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence of a wide range of techniques in use. (e.g. surveys, focus groups, mystery shopping, formal involvement of TRAs, scrutiny panels, working groups) |
| The use, skills required, and time commitments of each form of involvement is well communicated. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that demonstrates to residents the appropriate uses of each technique. There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that communicates to residents the time commitment required by each form of involvement. There is <i>interview and/or documentary</i> evidence that shows that the landlord communicates the level of skill (residents and staff) required to undertake any given task. There is <i>interview</i> evidence that the time commitments and use of techniques is understood by residents and staff. |
| The landlord works with residents to decide which involvement techniques to employ for any given task. | There is <i>interview or documentary</i> evidence to show that residents have been involved in deciding the range of techniques to apply to tasks. (e.g. for a review of repairs and maintenance residents on a working group have worked with staff to define that TRA will be surveyed, a citizens panel will be formed and a mystery shopping exercise of completed repairs will be delivered). |
| Clear consideration has been given to using techniques that increase diversity in resident involvement. | There is <i>interview and documentary</i> evidence that the landlord has taken conscious steps to involve 'hard to reach' groups. (e.g. the landlord routinely consults with local BME community groups, it has set up a young tenant's forum). |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.10 | The main strategy document communicates the landlords' approach to delivering equality of access, involving 'hard to reach' groups. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|--|
| There is a clear response to discrimination including core standards of behaviour for staff, individual residents and TRAs. | There is a written expectation of non-discriminatory behaviour both by residents and staff. There is a core equality standard for TRAs. There is <i>interview</i> evidence that this expectation is understood and acted upon. |
| The landlord understands which groups are under-represented and seeks to find out why these groups are under-represented. | The main strategy document relating to resident involvement identifies priority under-represented groups. There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord is taking action to understand why these groups are not engaged with the landlord. |
| The landlord is taking action to ensure that under-represented groups can access resident involvement. | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord is taking programmed action to involve under-represented groups. |
| The landlord has a clear rationale for involving under-represented groups and considers the impacts of different involvement approaches | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the approach to involving under-represented groups is programmed and considers impacts. <i>(e.g. We have established a diversity balanced citizen's panel and consult with existing disabled community groups but we have not set up a formal BME scrutiny panel as this may have socially divisive impacts).</i> |
| The landlord has consulted with all sections of the community to determine the best way of achieving involvement of a diverse range of residents. | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord has consulted with all sections of the community to determine the best way of achieving involvement of a diverse range of residents. [Amend if amend the left hand column] |
| There are methods within the menu of involvement that allow for 'diversity balanced' sampling of resident views. | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that balanced approaches to gaining views are used. <i>(e.g. targeted surveys, targeted focus groups, balanced citizens' panel).</i> |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 1 Landlord demonstrates clear strategic commitment to Resident Involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 1.11 | The landlord communicates support available to residents. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|--|
| The landlord is committed to ensuring that residents have access to the appropriate information, training, individual and group financial support to empower them to exercise influence | The <i>main strategy</i> document relevant to resident involvement identifies that support is available. There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that gives detail as to the forms of support available and the process used to allocate this support. |
| The landlord informs residents that it will assist resident groups to deliver their wider local aspirations. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that support includes community development support that is focused on assisting residents groups to deliver a 'broader than housing' agenda if they aspire to this. |
| . | |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 2: The landlord knows its residents and their aspirations

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 2.1 | The landlord has systems in place to survey its residents. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| The landlord is committed to undertake a regular (at least once every five years) survey of all its residents. | <p>There is <i>documentary</i> evidence of the landlord's commitment to undertake a regular survey of all of its residents</p> <p>There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the survey has included a question related to satisfaction with involvement opportunities.</p> <p>There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord has considered and acted upon the trends evidenced by earlier surveys.</p> |
| (Alternatively) there is a clear reason and/or rationale for not having undertaken such a survey. | <p>There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord cannot have completed a survey of all of its residents (<i>e.g. it has recently merged with another organisation</i>).</p> <p>There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord has used an alternative way of gaining robust evidence of resident expectations across its whole stock and a credible explanation for why a survey of all residents would be ineffectual.</p> |
| The landlord has an active approach to sampling residents' views | <p>There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord regularly uses 'market research' techniques (<i>e.g. targeted surveys, focus groups</i>) to investigate the reasons for different levels of satisfaction across neighbourhoods and communities of interest.</p> <p>There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord regularly uses 'market research' techniques (<i>e.g. targeted surveys, focus groups</i>) to investigate options for changing services.</p> |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 2: The landlord knows its residents and their aspirations

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 2.2 | The landlord 'diversity proofs' its research and has a clear view of its resident profile. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|---|
| The landlord can profile its residents | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord has a profile of its residents by age, gender, disability and ethnicity, which is based on reliable sources and shows credible research method. Where appropriate (e.g. where the landlord's stock is spread over a larger area, or rural and urban), there should be a local or area profile. |
| The landlord interprets differences in satisfaction levels in different communities. | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord uses its resident profile to target particular research into areas of dissatisfaction. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 2: The landlord knows its residents and their aspirations

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 2.3 | The landlord uses survey data to assist with targeting resident involvement resources & sets its research programme with reference to resident views | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|---|
| There is a clear link between survey responses and resident involvement priorities for action. | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord has used survey data to decide its resident involvement priorities. |
| The landlord sets its market research programme with resident influence | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that groups of residents outside of the Board have been involved in considering the targeting and design of market research. |
| The landlord has investigated opportunities of using residents as interviewers in market research surveys | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord has considered with residents whether there is potential for resident survey work to take place. |
| The landlord runs 'resident led surveying' projects. | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that residents have been enabled to act as surveyors through appropriate training. |
| (Alternatively) where the landlord does not undertake resident led surveying there is a clear rationale for this choice. | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that, where "resident surveyors" are not used, this approach has been considered and both landlord and residents accept that there are good reasons why it is not practicable for the organisation. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 3: The landlord has clear aims, measures and feeds-back outcomes.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 3.1 | The landlord provides core 'resident focussed' documents which inform about and enable resident involvement. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|---|
| There is a regular resident newsletter that is subject to resident influence. | <p>The landlord produces a newsletter at least 3 times a year.</p> <p>The newsletter provides a range of corporate <i>and</i> community based information.</p> <p>There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that residents contribute to newsletter content.</p> |
| There is a comprehensive and accessible tenants' handbook that has been subject to resident influence. | <p>There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that there is a tenants' handbook that gives core information about the landlord (e.g. phone and face to face contact, rent payment, repairs and maintenance, resident involvement) and other useful information (e.g. housing advice, utilities)</p> <p>There is <i>interview</i> evidence that the handbook has been subject to resident influence.</p> |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 3: The landlord has clear aims, measures and feeds-back outcomes.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 3.2 | The landlords' policies, service standards and other information are easily accessible by residents. The landlord does not rely entirely on its newsletter and tenancy handbook to inform residents. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|---|
| The landlord has service standards, set in negotiation with residents. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence of clear service standards. There is <i>documentary and/or interview</i> evidence that these standards have been set in negotiation with residents. |
| 'Core' policies are easy to obtain. | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that core housing and community policies (<i>e.g. Resident Involvement Strategy, ASB Policy, Lettings Policy, Arrears Policy, Equality and Diversity policy</i>) are easily available to residents either in brief or complete form. NB: Landlord might make core policies available in offices, through the newsletter, or by request. |
| Core policies are available in full by resident request. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that core policies are available in full by request. |
| Staff are well informed regarding the provision of information about the landlords policies and service standards | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that staff know where to find policies, can advise residents on their contents, and facilitate resident access to them. |
| The landlord 'signposts' other sources of support and advice | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord signposts other sources of support and advice for residents (<i>e.g. CAB, Housing Advice Centre, CVS</i>) |
| The landlord ensures that residents have timely access to information to allow them to be involved. | There is <i>observation</i> and <i>interview evidence</i> that residents have had information in advance of meetings (and other forms of involvement where appropriate e.g. focus groups). There is <i>interview</i> evidence that staff answer information related queries and provide support regarding this to residents. |
| Information is provided in accessible formats | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that information is available in targeted community languages, and in a format appropriate to visual or other impairment (<i>e.g. large print, Braille, recording</i>) There is <i>interview</i> evidence that, where residents have 'flagged up' particular needs, information is provided in appropriate formats. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 3: The landlord has clear aims, measures and feeds-back outcomes.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 3.3 | The landlord compares its performance (a households) with an appropriate peer group of other landlords and feeds back performance to the resident body. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|---|
| The landlord employs a process for comparing its performance with its peers. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord regularly benchmarks performance information with its peers. There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that residents are involved in this process. |
| The landlord feeds back its performance to the resident body. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord reports its performance against targets to the whole tenant body at <i>least annually</i> . |
| The landlord feeds back on deteriorating services and celebrates service success (all households or neighbourhood based). | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord acknowledges when services are under pressure and communicates the action being taken to resolve issues. There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord communicates when services are performing well. |
| | |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 3: The landlord has clear aims, measures and feeds-back outcomes.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 3.4 | The landlord has a clear process for resident performance scrutiny. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|---|
| The landlord employs a process for comparing its performance with its peers. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord regularly benchmarks performance information with its peers. There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that residents are involved in this process. |
| The landlord feeds back its performance to the resident body. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord reports its performance against targets to the whole tenant body at <i>least annually</i> . |
| The landlord feeds back on deteriorating services and celebrates service success (all households or neighbourhood based). | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord acknowledges when services are under pressure and communicates the action being taken to resolve issues. There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord communicates when services are performing well. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 3: The landlord has clear aims, measures and feeds-back outcomes.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 3.5 | The landlord has robust processes to ensure its accountability to residents for services. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| Landlord and residents are clear about the process by which residents can hold the landlord accountable for local (neighbourhood or area) performance. | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the boundaries to resident accountability are understood and shared. <i>(e.g. we will make gardening and cleaning schedules available but it has been agreed by the board that it is inappropriate for residents to sign-off work).</i> |
| Local service issues raised by residents are resolved quickly or a reasonable explanation is given | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that where residents have raised local service issues they have quickly been resolved or the reasons for delay have been clearly explained. |
| There is a process that ensures that residents (collectively) can hold the landlord to account for local service issues | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that, where unsatisfactory service issues are repeated, or the reasons for delay have not been given, a formal response can be sought and given by local resident representatives. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 3: The landlord has clear aims, measures and feeds-back outcomes.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 3.6 | The landlord uses resident evidence to target its involvement projects. Its projects have identified outcomes and are assessed against these outcomes. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|---|
| The landlord produces an action plan for its resident involvement | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord produces a resident involvement action plan at least annually . There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that action plan tasks are closely related to the strategic aims of the organisation (e.g. feedback has told us that our repairs service is not performing well so we have mapped our approach to involving resident in review of this service). |
| Resident involvement action plans are subject to resident negotiation | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that residents are involved in setting resident involvement priorities and monitoring progress against these aims. |
| Action plan tasks have measurable performance outcomes, have processes for monitoring progress and have identified impacts at completion. (i.e. Tasks are based on SMART targets) | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that action plan tasks have desired outcomes and that their impacts are regularly assessed. (E.g. after discussion with our training advisory group we decided that our formal training is intended to support the ability of residents to engage with housing issues and to increase the 'employability' of residents. This year of 30 residents who received training, all said that they felt better informed and 5 of them said that training assisted them into work. The latter 5 are no longer involved as residents but we consider this a success.) NB: only in a few circumstances will 'increasing involvement' be the only outcome associated with a project (e.g. increasing involvement from 'hard to reach' groups) – most people are involved because they want to achieve something and outcomes should be assessed against these resident and landlord expectations. |
| Action plan tasks apply basic cost/benefit assessment | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that inputs (resources and direct costs) into individual tasks are measured. There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that the cost effectiveness of this investment is regularly assessed E.g. Our young persons' forum costs £500 each year to run. Information from the forum showed us that there is little demand for fully furnished supported accommodation which saved us in the region of £600 p.a on furnishing provision. |
| NB: Although TPAS expects that the planning of Resident Involvement projects is currently under-developed it also considers this a crucial area of work. It will not be possible to achieve a yes assessment of this unit without documentary evidence that each project has been planned and has clear outcomes that are communicated to residents. | |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 3: The landlord has clear aims, measures and feeds-back outcomes.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 3.7 | The landlord has a clear focus on efficiency (see also 3.6). | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| The landlord routinely records its resident involvement costs. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the resident routinely records its resident involvement costs. e.g. the landlord records spend against budget committed to resident involvement (TPAS recognises that there are often significant hidden costs related to resident involvement such as officer time attending meetings). |
| The landlord benchmarks with and learns from other providers. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord searches out good practice both formally and informally to inform its approach to resident involvement.] |
| The landlord considers outsourcing its resident involvement projects and services. | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord has considered with resident representatives whether its resident involvement service could be more efficiently delivered by an external body. There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord has considered whether individual projects could be more efficiently provided by an external body. |
| The landlord considers joint procurement of services. | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord works with other providers to consider whether resident involvement services (e.g. training, mystery shopping) can be procured more efficiently. The assessment should take into account the views of the residents of participating landlords. |
| The landlord has considered the cost/benefits of its resident involvement activities. | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord has reviewed resources committed to resident involvement against impacts achieved in the last three years. There is <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord performance manages its resident involvement service (see 3.5) |
| The landlord seeks external funding and resources to support resident involvement activities. | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord seeks external funding and resources for its resident involvement activities There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord assists local groups to access funding for resident involvement activities. |
| NB: In recognition of the fact that the efficiency agenda is not yet well developed provision of <i>interview</i> evidence alone will be sufficient to achieve a <i>partial</i> assessment. | |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 3: The landlord has clear aims, measures and feeds-back outcomes.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 3.8 | The landlord devolves power to ensure quick resolution of problems | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| The landlord ensures that frontline officers have the authority to resolve estate and community related problems quickly. | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that both residents and staff are confident that the frontline officers can resolve day to day issues quickly. (e.g. there are small environmental improvement budgets, issues raised at estate walkabouts do not stay unresolved). |
| The landlord, frontline staff and residents are clear about the limits of the power and authority of front line officers. (see also 3.4) | There is <i>interview</i> residents and staff understand where issues fall outside of the front line officers' power and authority. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 4: The landlord has a partnership ethos which delivers 'broader than housing outcomes'.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 4.1 | The landlord is clear about how it work to delivers a 'broader than housing' agenda. It has a clear focus on community cohesion | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|--|
| Landlords and residents are clear how far the landlord's responsibility for 'broader than housing' activity extends. | The landlord states in documentation which (if any) areas of community investment it prioritises. There is <i>interview or documentary</i> evidence of a shared understanding of which groups (non TRAs) qualify for community investment support. <i>(E.g. On an estate where there is no TRA but there is an active community group the landlord and residents should be clear whether this 'non registered' group could apply for activity based funding (or whether community groups which are not primarily TRAs can register).</i> |
| The landlord supports residents' 'broader than housing' initiatives within the parameters that have been set. | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that within the agreed boundaries the landlord supports residents in their relationships with other organisations to deliver their 'broader than housing' aspirations. |
| There is a clear commitment to supporting community cohesion activities both corporately and through working with TRAs and resident groups. | There is a <i>documentary</i> evidence of commitment to and explanation of the landlord's commitment to community cohesion. There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord regularly supports community cohesion activities. <i>(E.g. Manningham Housing Association and William Sutton Housing Association jointly fund a community involvement officer in Bradford. One of the roles of this officer is to help Asian communities and White British communities to understand each other better. The medium to long-term aim of this work is to lay the groundwork for 'cluster' lets of homes on almost exclusively white peripheral estates to Asian families).</i> |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 4: The landlord has a partnership ethos which delivers 'broader than housing outcomes'.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 4.2 | The landlord has effective strategic relationships with key partners and stakeholders & particularly considers the value of community based solutions at a local level. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| The landlord delivers some of its resident involvement targets through the broader community sector. | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord directs some of its resident involvement expenditure towards community sector partners where other organisations are better placed to deliver. (E.g. we have funded x community sports project by Ex to deliver youth engagement including 2 young persons' surveys each year). There is <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord seeks to support TRAs to form relationships with other community and voluntary sector organisations. |
| The landlord forms effective strategic relationships with key stakeholders | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the landlord forms effective formal partnerships with strategic stakeholders (e.g. council service departments, police, support providers.) |
| Residents and staff form effective relationships with local networks and partnerships | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence of local partnerships to deliver improved community services (NB: local partnership arrangements may often flow out of strategic relationships). There is <i>interview</i> evidence of staff signposting local networks and organisations that may assist residents achieve their aims. There is <i>interview</i> evidence that residents know where to access information regarding other local organisations and make use of this information. |
| Partnerships are seen in the light of efficiency and diversity | There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that the skills, 'reach' and values of community and voluntary sector organisations are considered when undertaking tasks. (E.g. a BME community based organisation may be better placed to achieve the involvement of particular groups within the community.) |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 4: The landlord has a partnership ethos which delivers 'broader than housing outcomes'.

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 4.3 | Formal partnerships are governed by clear terms of reference. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|--|
| All formal partnerships are governed by negotiated terms of reference | <p>There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that partnerships (strategic and local) are governed by terms of reference (or alternative formal document)</p> <p>There is <i>documentary and interview</i> evidence that partner relationships are identified (<i>i.e. lead partner, agreed working protocols</i>)</p> <p>There is a process to identify benefits to both partners (<i>particularly where one partner is more powerful such as a relationship between a landlord and community sector organisation</i>).</p> <p>Where there is an exchange of services there is <i>documentary</i> evidence of expectations of service. (<i>e.g. timely delivery of services</i>)</p> <p>There is <i>documentary</i> evidence of how diversity and equality of access outcomes will be delivered and monitored within the partnership.</p> |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 5: The landlord has effectively embedded resident involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 5.1 | Staff are aware of the role of resident involvement, have resident involvement targets, and are positive about resident involvement. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|---|
| Staff at all levels are aware of resident involvement and are supportive of its role. | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that all staff are aware of the function of resident involvement There is <i>interview</i> evidence that most staff are supportive of resident involvement. |
| All staff have resident involvement targets in their work | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that all staff have resident involvement targets in their work plans. (e.g. a finance officer is involved in designing a survey on the operation of service charges should be working with residents' representatives or informal consultation arrangements). |
| All staff can point to positive impacts of resident involvement | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that all staff can point to positive benefits that have accrued through resident involvement. All frontline staff can point to their own experience of positive benefits. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 6: The landlord is committed to training, development and resource support of resident involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 6.1 | Staff are skilled in resident involvement | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|--|
| The landlord provides training to staff on resident involvement. | There is <i>interview and documentary</i> evidence that all staff teams have received basic training in resident involvement and that this is included in induction programmes. |
| Frontline staff have received skills audits that include how to interact with and support residents and resident groups | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that staff training audits identify enabling resident involvement as a core expectation for customer facing staff. |
| The landlord ensures that training is provided to equip staff with skills appropriate to resident involvement work | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that staff who wish to can access skills that will help them enable and empower tenants. There is <i>interview</i> evidence that staff with weaknesses in resident involvement have received training. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 6: The landlord is committed to training, development and resource support of resident involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 6.2 | The landlord supports the development of resident skills. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|---|--|
| The landlord provides a range of informal and 'ad hoc' training | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that residents can access informal training in housing and resident involvement issues (e.g. committee skills) |
| The landlord provides a 'formal' training programme | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that residents can access formal training (e.g. training sessions, seminars, workshops) in core skills (e.g. housing issues, committee skills, equalities) There is <i>interview</i> or <i>documentary</i> evidence that residents' input or feedback is reflected in the topics and character of the formal training programme. |
| The landlord provides training in broader community issues and/or signposts and supports residents to external sources of this training | There is <i>interview</i> or <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord provides training for broader community issues (e.g. food hygiene, IT skills) There is <i>interview</i> evidence that this provision has been negotiated by residents. Where the training to which residents aspire falls outside of the agreed landlord remit there is <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord signposts sources of training and supports tenants who wish to undertake it. |
| The landlord ensures that resident representatives with very responsible roles have the required skills to deliver their role | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that resident representatives that take a very responsible role (e.g. interviewing staff) have had their skills audited and received appropriate training. |
| The landlord monitors that its training is fairly distributed | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence that the landlord monitors the take-up of its training (e.g. for diversity, level and area) and sets targets for increased take up by under-represented groups. |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 6: The landlord is committed to training, development and resource support of resident involvement

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 6.3 | The landlord supports and celebrates resident involvement | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|--|
| Resident involvement is accessible | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord arranges its meetings at appropriate times and venues (e.g. venues are DDA compliant, meetings take place at a variety of times that do not exclude working people or people of a particular religion). |
| 'Individual' resident involvement is financially supported | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord makes provision for out of pocket expenses, childcare and advocacy services to individuals participating in resident involvement activities. |
| 'Collective' resident involvement is financially supported | There is clear process for financially supporting representative groups which is agreed with residents. |
| The landlord supports residents to deliver on residents' 'broader than housing' aspirations. | There is <i>documentary</i> or <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord works with TRAs to consider what they wish to achieve, and the level of engagement that is required to achieve those aims. <i>(e.g. it is reasonable for a resident group to only have a social function and although they may not be registered they should have access to funding to achieve this.)</i> Where TRAs aspire to more challenging tasks (e.g. setting up a resource centre, exploring tenant management, setting up a community business) there is <i>documentary</i> or <i>interview</i> evidence that the landlord has offered assistance or signposted alternative support services or funding. |
| Resident involvement is celebrated in a variety of ways | There is <i>documentary</i> and <i>interview</i> evidence that ways of celebrating/rewarding resident involvement have been negotiated with residents (e.g. regular feedback on community successes in newsletter, prize giving ceremonies, parties, fun days, attendance allowances). |

Landlord Accreditation Matrix

Theme 7: Residents are involved in the governance of the landlord (ALMOs and HAs only)*

| Unit | Criteria | L/L Assessment | L/L Self-Assessment Comments | Prelim Assessment | Preliminary Assessment Comments | Interim Assessment | Comments | L/L Response | Final Assessment |
|------|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|
| 7.1 | The landlord has a considered approach to resident involvement in governance. | | | | | | | | |

| Standard Expected for Accreditation | Indicative Evidence |
|--|---|
| The landlord has residents on its Board | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord has residents on its Board. |
| The landlord has considered/reviewed a fair and democratic process for the selection/election of residents | There is <i>documentary</i> evidence of the process for election/selection of resident Board members. There is <i>interview or documentary</i> evidence that the landlord has considered with residents the most appropriate way of achieving good resident governance. |
| Resident Board members are clear about their role. | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that resident governors know the powers and limits of their role. <i>(i.e. that their commitment is to the good of the company, and that they should not use their influence unduly).</i> |
| Resident Board members are valued and their positive contribution can be demonstrated | There is <i>interview</i> evidence that resident board members are valued by other board members, and examples are given of how their contribution has influenced the decisions of the Board |
| There is effective and ongoing training for Board members and where appropriate supplementary training is available to resident board members. | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence of a robust approach to board training that ensures good governance. |
| There is an effective and ongoing approach to succession planning, especially with reference to resident board members | There is <i>documentary or interview</i> evidence that the landlord has an effective approach to ensuring that, should the situation arise, existing resident board members can be replaced by other residents with appropriate skills and abilities.. <i>(e.g. mentoring for prospective board members and a resident involvement structure that allows skills and experience to be developed).</i> |

* Guidance on the assessment approach to traditionally organised Local Authorities is provided in Chapter 3 of the accompanying report.