

NUMBER OF ATTENDEES: 134

NUMBER OF CO-OPS: 56

AGENDA ITEM	FEEDBACK	CEHL RESPONSE
<b>General Feedback</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New agenda and incorporation of co-op led discussion time was well received</li> <li>• Some challenges were experienced with venues being double booked at Bendigo and Peninsula</li> <li>• Active discussion of CEHL items prevented many forums from achieving the full 45 minutes for co-op time. All made time for some discussion, however, and the opportunity was generally welcomed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This format will be continued for the September forums</li> <li>• Staff will double check bookings in the week before the forum</li> <li>• Staff will check in with participants where conversations extend beyond the time allocated to see how they want to prioritise the time</li> </ul>
<b>Organisational Update</b>	<p><b><i>Tenant Satisfaction Survey</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some members asked whether survey printouts could be sent to non-computer literate people</li> <li>• More information was requested about how results will be published and how does this feed into CEHL services</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Engagement Review</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested in one forum that the engagement review be done as a regional forum so that members can hear how others wish to be engaged</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>Tenant Satisfaction Survey</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aust Post timelines make it difficult to rely on paper versions. Family, friends or other co-op members can often help, otherwise members can call CEHL to explore other options.</li> <li>• The results will be published in Co-operatively Speaking and consulted in future planning by CEHL staff and board members.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Engagement Review</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members are free to nominate how they want to participate when they are called, but the review also needs to hear from co-ops who don't typically attend regional forums.</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	FEEDBACK	CEHL RESPONSE
<p><b>Organisational Update continued . . .</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns were expressed in 3 forums regarding the use of consultants, who they report to and the related costs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Victorian Housing Register VHR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification of impact sought</li> <li>Appreciation that CEHL is fighting for co-ops in this debate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CEHL will draft further information for member co-ops about the criteria that guides when and how consultants should be used in the Program</li> </ul> <p><b>Victorian Housing Register VHR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further information will be presented at the upcoming conference and directly to co-ops once a final position is known</li> <li>It is good to feel that we are meeting this challenge together</li> </ul>
<p><b>2018 Conference</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More information about the content and availability travel and accommodation re-imbusement was requested</li> <li>Attendees at two venues voiced concern about the choice of venue and cost to the program, with suggestions that members be consulted when planning the conference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agenda is still under development but discussion themes have been shared in Co-operatively Speaking and on the CEHL website</li> <li>All co-ops eligible for subsidised accommodation have been contacted by email and information about travel reimbursement is provided on registration</li> <li>The program has very specific requirements for our conference venue, and often a dedicated conference venue is the most cost effective way to achieve that. However, this will be further explored as part of the engagement review</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	FEEDBACK	CEHL RESPONSE
<b>Rent Model Review</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries and concerns were put forward at several forums about whether CEHL will increase rents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CEHL Board has established the Rent Model Advisory Group (comprised of co-op members with an independent financial adviser and chair) to explore how the Program can meet its affordable housing obligations and be viable into the future. RMAG is responsible for making recommendations to the CEHL Board on a revised rent model that reflect feedback from Program participants and aligns with the Program Principles and minimum requirements set by the Board. More information is available in background papers on the CEHL website and updates will be available as the consultation progresses.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ballarat attendees expressed concern about day time sessions instead of evenings, noting this excludes those who work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfortunately it is difficult to find times that suit everybody. Those that can't attend are able to offer feedback via the online survey. The engagement review will also explore suitable times for consultation meetings to be held in future.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is independent technical expert – what are their qualifications?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peter Murray is the independent technical expert to RMAG. He is responsible for providing financial advice to the group and validating data and information presented by CEHL. Peter has extensive financial and accounting experiences in both the commercial and not-for-profit sectors.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is it difficult to push a button now to get the information we need about Program Costs?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work is planned to analyse current and future Program costs, including appropriate service levels to co-ops. It is possible that RMAG will identify further costs analysis in their recommendations to the CEHL Board.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can CEHL do research the diversity of who is in the Program, who is housed now</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have a breakdown of households by rent type (minimum, assessed and maximum). This information has been provided to RMAG to inform its deliberations.</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	FEEDBACK	CEHL RESPONSE
<p><b>New website</b></p>	<p><b>Content Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include Office Bearers duties</li> <li>• Space to share information about grants etc.</li> <li>• Member handbook – new members get kit, but what about refreshing general information for ongoing members</li> <li>• Can there be a regional page on the Member portal</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern was expressed that the website should not be used as the only form of communication – dropouts and unstable service in some areas can lead to long download times</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the initial upload of the new website will largely refresh the existing content, these suggestions are very welcome and will be considered as the website is future content is developed, starting with the member portal</li> <li>• CEHL is very conscious that we need to communicate in diverse ways to reach all our members. The Engagement Review will be an ideal time to make suggestions of suitable alternatives</li> </ul>
<p><b>CEHL Referral process improvements</b></p>	<p><b>General Feedback:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This item was the most discussed in most regions. General approval was expressed regarding the new directions and positive feedback was offered about the information card – very practical. Some concerns remain, however about current delays</li> <li>• Members in the Gippsland region shared a disappointing experience with very low potential applicant attendance at the Sale session. Feedback about the new presentation format was very positive, however,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is good to hear that the proposed pilot is welcomed by co-ops. It is hoped that changes might help to reduce some of the delays and frustrations currently experienced</li> <li>• The Sale experience was very disappointing with only 4 of 20 people who had registered to attend. We are currently doing some intensive investigations to try to understand the low demand in some areas</li> <li>• The new info session format has now been delivered in 4 regions and seems to be working well</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	FEEDBACK	CEHL RESPONSE
<p><b>CEHL Referral Process Improvements continued . . .</b></p>	<p><b>Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do people on EOI list still receive letters?</li> <li>• Can CEHL vet for appropriate applicants housed?</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns Expressed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There needs to be a co-op member at each information session to speak to realities of being in a co-op</li> <li>• The old process of having three sessions was good because it gave applicants a good understanding of co-op and weeded out those who were not genuinely interested in co-op</li> <li>• Long delays have been experienced when 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> lists requested and the 48 hour turnaround on eligibility checks can stretch to weeks. This has an impact on co-op income</li> </ul>	<p><b>Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following a recent update to our database and website, people registered on our Expression of Interest list will now be contacted to update their details on a regular basis.</li> <li>• An initial screening by CEHL to ensure people are currently interested in the area of a vacancy is part of the new pilot process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns Expressed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEHL invites representatives from 2 local co-ops to present and answer questions at each applicant info session</li> <li>• Unfortunately, we have found that the length of time between the info sessions and possible vacancies often means that detailed information can be years out of date by the time an applicant becomes a member. For this reason the current info session stresses the general obligations of being a co-op member. Details of how co-ops work are best offered as induction training and are included in the New Member workbook</li> <li>• Second and 3rd lists can only be issued when all eligible applicants on earlier lists have been contacted or considered and reports returned to CEHL. In areas of low demand we may need to develop a new approach to attract interested applicants. Lengthy delays in eligibility checks most often occur due to incomplete information being provided by candidates</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	FEEDBACK	CEHL RESPONSE
<p><b>CEHL Referral Process Improvements continued . . .</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback provided to CEHL is not always heeded – a person not eligible for a 3 bedroom house was referred to another 3 bedroom vacancy</li> <li>• Many people contacted for interview are already housed, no longer in need, and some have been deceased</li> </ul> <p><b>Future Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEHL requested to disseminate more information about participation requirements.</li> <li>• Expression of Interest - should be able to say the region you want to live in. Has not changed for two years. People want to change regions but don't know how</li> <li>• Rent assessment could be better covered in the information sessions, making it clear that rents are capped</li> <li>• CEHL should advertise itself and co-op housing more</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has certainly been a challenge and should improve now that we are using a single database to record contacts about all applicants and members. We are also working to speed up our processes to confirm with applicants when co-ops report that applicant's circumstances have changed</li> </ul> <p><b>Future Suggestions:</b></p> <p>This is a key feature of the new Information sessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a very strong feature of all Applicant information sessions</li> <li>• Applicants on referral lists have been able to nominate up to 3 areas they want to live. This questions is now also asked of people at the Expression of Interest stage</li> <li>• Broad information about the rent model, including rent caps, is include in the information session. Applicants are also issued session notes with this information included</li> <li>• That is certainly a priority and is part of the current business plan</li> </ul>
<p><b>Advisory Committee Updates</b></p> <p><b>Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was general agreement across most regions of the importance of members giving feedback to draft policies</li> <li>• Some people have experienced the <i>Have your say</i> button doesn't always work</li> <li>• It was noted that if two people provide feedback in policies together, there is no way to indicate that it is two people's opinions but not co-op feedback. Is there a way to make that possible?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed</li> <li>• The <i>Have Your Say</i> button is now a permanent link at the top of the new website</li> <li>• It isn't possible to for two individuals to combine their policy feedback. Two people wanting to express opinions on the website need to each to provide separate feedback. Feedback provided on behalf of a co-op is particularly valued as the co-op holds membership of CEHL</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	FEEDBACK	CEHL RESPONSE
<p><b>Advisory Committee Updates</b></p> <p><b>Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) continued . . .</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for Terms of Reference and detail of expectations for role of PAC representative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Info about the role of PAC and the PAC consultation process is on the CEHL website at: <a href="https://www.cehl.com.au/Category?Action=View&amp;Category_id=84">https://www.cehl.com.au/Category?Action=View&amp;Category_id=84</a></li> <li>The PAC charter (same as Terms Of Reference TOR) is now at: <a href="https://www.cehl.com.au/Category?Action=View&amp;Category_id=47">https://www.cehl.com.au/Category?Action=View&amp;Category_id=47</a></li> </ul>
<p><b>Training Advisory Committee (TAC)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A question was raised in one forum about the training that facilitators receive and how they gain appropriate expertise in technical subjects like maintenance.</li> <li>It was observed that recent training has gone from content heavy to process heavy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All CEHL staff are recruited according to the range of skills and experience required in their roles and receive ongoing professional development training. Members from each team regularly collaborate and share skills and, where training requires technical expertise, a technical expert will be involved in designing the content and often be involved in facilitating the session.</li> <li>Training sessions are designed to meet needs expressed by co-ops to CEHL staff and TAC members and to assist co-ops to meet current program requirements. Specific suggestions for future training content can be considered by TAC in their planning process.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Newsletter Advisory Group (NAG)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Co-op led discussion</b></p>	<p>Many regions found that they did not have time to discuss all the topics they wanted to explore.</p> <p>It was suggested that proposed topics be planned in advance and advised to CEHL so that they can include the topic(s) for the next forum on the invitation.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	FEEDBACK	CEHL RESPONSE
<p><b>Co-op led discussion continued . . .</b></p>	<p><b>Topics suggested included:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication between co-ops and CEHL</li> <li>• Co-op team building activities</li> <li>• Roles of directors</li> <li>• Strategies for having difficult conversations</li> <li>• Filling director roles/succession planning</li> <li>• Sharing experiences at VCAT</li> <li>• Sharing experiences of maintenance contractors and their contact details</li> </ul>	
<p><b>General questions and discussion</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solar project – how is it progressing? Interest was expressed in a regional installation project in Ballarat</li> <li>• It was suggested that a code of ethics that should be developed as a standard across all co-ops</li> <li>• Members at one forum expressed concern about the loss of information when a Co-op Development Coordinator (CDC) changed and requested that co-ops be informed of change in a timely way</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The larger project we are participating in is progressing slowly. As such, we are working internally to start answering some of the questions we had hoped to answer through the project that will allow us to consider how CEHL will approach solar in relation to responsibilities, rents, investment, etc. We have noted that Ballarat is interested in creating a regional approach</li> <li>• The CEHL website has best practice guides for a Code of Conduct for Members and a Code of Conduct for Co-op Directors. Suggestions to improve these documents are always welcome</li> <li>• Staff members who are leaving are asked to write up handover notes for new staff receive a briefing about their co-ops when they start, but new staff will need to get to know each co-op before they can fully understand how they can best be of assistance</li> </ul> <p>Co-op Development and Strategy (CDS) team leaders receive the initial calls from a co-op that does not have an allocated CDC in order to plan the most appropriate response, and only allocate a new CDC as the first contact person after they have completed a 3 month induction program</p>

AGENDA ITEM	FEEDBACK	CEHL RESPONSE
<p><b>General questions and discussion continued . . .</b></p>		<p>We will improve communications to co-ops during this time so that they know how their needs can be met</p>
<p><b>General questions and discussion continued . . .</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some members expressed concern that December not a good time for a forum as people already busy</li> <li>• Mornington attendees requested that workshops on important issues like the rent model review be held of an evening as many people work and can't attend during the day</li> <li>• Attendees at the South East forum requested a workshop on property and allocations process, possibly in June?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would be good information to share during the engagement review so we can better plan the calendar for 2019</li> <li>• This is also helpful information to be included in the engagement review</li> <li>• Workshops on the property allocations process will be held in each region once the regional plan for that region has been finalised. It would be helpful for all co-ops to submit their FDP plans so that regional plans can be completed</li> </ul>