



Economic
and Social
Research Council



UNIVERSITY OF
SURREY

Housing with Pride

Working together to create
LGBTQ+ inclusive social housing

An ESRC Impact Accelerator funded 'policy into practice' project to amplify the voices of and engage with LGBTQ+ residents living in social housing to achieve inclusivity through implementation of the HouseProud Pledge Scheme. Housing with Pride [website](#)

Contents

1. Project Summary	3
2. About the project	4
-Background and objectives	
-Project Steering Group	
3. Workstrands, activities and outputs	6
4. Securing the Pledge Scheme	8
-Pledge Scheme Sustainability Workshop	
-Partner Proposal process	
-Pledge Pulse Survey	
5. Future directions	11
6. Conclusions and recommendations	12
7. Appendices	13
A. Pledge Scheme Education toolkit template	
B. Evidence submitted to All Party Parliamentary Group for Council Housing and the group's Report of 7/12/2021 (with Letter as Addendum 5 of the Report)	
C. Resident Group summary	
D. Pledge Sustainability workshop output	
E. HouseProud Partnership Proposal and call for Expressions of Interest	
F. Pledge Scheme Pulse Survey	

Project summary

Following the success of the **Housing with Pride knowledge exchange project** (completed February 2020) funded by the UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence (CaCHE) this project sought to significantly extend the work conducted between the University of Surrey and partners that established the HouseProud Pledge Scheme as the first national LGBTQ+ social housing equality framework; the overarching aim of this stage being to secure the future sustainability and governance of the Pledge Scheme.

This report details the background to the project and explains the process undertaken to secure the immediate future of the scheme and the steps and tasks required in managing the scheme in the short-to-medium term. Recommendations for its longer-term sustainability are also provided.

Project timeline: April 2021 – February 2023

Overall, in conducting this Housing with Pride project the Steering Group and its partners were able to:

- Re-establish interest and engagement with the Pledge Scheme following the Covid-19 pandemic and its impact on the social housing sector.
- Appoint a partner to jointly oversee the day-to-day management of the HouseProud Pledge Scheme.
- Support development of the Pledge Scheme via:
 - Communication with and survey of existing Pledge Scheme signatories
 - Identifying how the Pledge Scheme partners could further embed resident involvement in the management and direction of the Pledge Scheme
- Promote and highlight the Pledge Scheme to a range of audiences within the housing sector and elsewhere.

About the project

Background and objectives

The culmination of the '**No Place Like Home**' research commissioned from the University of Surrey by HouseProud, and subsequent work to improve the lives of LGBTQ+ residents living in social housing, the HouseProud Pledge Scheme was developed as a simple, easy-to-adopt EDI framework to help social housing providers be LGBTQ+ inclusive. Launched in May 2019, the Pledge Scheme was endorsed by the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Residential Development, London and had been adopted by 16 social housing providers by the end of 2020.

Designed to enhance existing resident involvement activities and encourage new partnerships, the scheme ensures that residents can have direct and long-lasting impacts. Housing providers who sign-up to the scheme have a year to deliver three core Pledge Scheme commitments, which are: LGBTQ+ resident input at senior/strategic level; demonstration of commitment to the values of the Pledge and LGBTQ+ inclusivity by displaying support for the pledge scheme on corporate and resident communications; and initiation of a programme of staff training about LGBTQ+ lives and resident concerns. Following the delivery of these commitments, providers can choose to commit to and work with involved LGBTQ+ residents on additional pledges.

The publication of the UK Government's Social Housing White Paper in November 2020, entitled 'A Charter for Social Housing Residents', provided the impetus to significantly extend and expand the Pledge

Scheme. The Charter emphasises the need for housing providers to listen to resident's voices and concerns and include them in responses and decision making. Although the Pledge Scheme directly addresses this, offering housing providers a framework to work with LGBTQ+ residents to put policy into practice, this may not happen without further intervention because issues around resident inclusion, knowledge concerning how to implement the Pledge commitments and the lack of resident voice on a national scale are currently missing. This project aimed to address these issues by further amplifying residents' voices and concerns on a broader national scale and by seeking a sustainable long-term future for the Pledge Scheme. In addition, we were aware that the Covid-19 pandemic had significantly impacted the social housing sector and could have proved challenging to the implementation of the Pledge Scheme itself.

The main objectives of the project were to:

- Address the auditing, governance, and sustainability of the Pledge Scheme
- Explore ways that LGBTQ+ residents could be more actively engaged in the Pledge Scheme and its management.
- Explore the needs of housing providers in implementing and delivering the Pledge Scheme.

These were addressed through the establishment of three workstrands, each with its own objective and aims and chaired by a member of the Housing with Pride project Steering Group.

About the project

Project Steering Group

The Steering Group was established to contribute to and monitor progress across the workstrands, to address any challenges that might arise and to ensure delivery of the project objectives. Members of the Steering Group comprised representatives from leading social housing providers, LGBTQ+ resident groups and LGBTQ+ charities, most of whom had had active involvement in the initial research and/or subsequent projects, as follows:

Project Lead

Professor Andrew King
University of Surrey

Project Research Assistant

Dr Frances Sanders
University of Surrey

Workstream Lead

Kevan Forde
Housing Consultant

Workstream Lead

Tina Wathern
Housing21 (formerly at Stonewall Housing)

Workstream Lead

Anna Kear
Tonic Housing (formerly also
Co-Chair, HouseProud)

John Stevens

Clarion Housing Group

Bob Green, OBE

Housing & Equalities Consultant/
Tonic Housing

Alice Wallace

Equalities Consultant
(formerly Opening Doors)

Karl Lewis

L&Q

Michael Verrier

Chair L&Q LGBT Resident Forum/
Tamil Housing Board member

Taro Nega

L&Q LGBT Forum member and
Housing Consultant

Bev Bond

NHG LGBT+ Resident Forum member

Stephe Meloy

L&Q LGBT Forum member

Jamie Hickling

WLM, Co-Chair HouseProud

The Steering Group met online on six occasions and once 'in person' during the project; this was partly the result of the Covid-19 pandemic, but also to facilitate attendance.

Workstrands, activities and outputs

The **knowledge exchange action research methodology (KEAR)** developed and pioneered by Andrew King in previous research was drawn upon to translate policy into practice through the inter-linked workstrand activities overseen by the project's Steering Group and conducted by its members and affiliates, where appropriate.

Workstrand 1: Pledge Scheme Education toolkit development

Lead: Tina Wathern

Housing providers were shown in previous projects to require resources to understand the needs of LGBTQ+ residents and find ways to work with them. Steering groups members discussed ways of supporting this and created a template that could be used by providers.

Activities and outputs:

- Three workstrand meetings took place between June-November 2021 with scoping of suitable information and evidence.
- Outline of Pledge Additional Resource toolkit (see appendix A)



Workstrands, activities and outputs

Workstrand 2: Amplifying resident voices

Lead: Anna Kear

LGBTQ+ resident's voices are central to the implementation of the Pledge Scheme and its progress within housing provider organisations. Integral to this is the need to continually raise awareness of resident concerns and experiences and across a diverse cross-section of residents and housing types. Housing providers were approached to establish which ones have a specific group in place through which LGBTQ+ residents can raise issues and/or work with their provider on matters affecting their lives as a social housing tenant or leaseholder. Policy makers were engaged to highlight issues related to LGBTQ+ residents' experiences through letters of evidence

Activities and outputs

- Two workstrand meetings (June & October 2021)

- Webinar presentation at Housing LIN HAPPI Hour, entitled 'Housing with Pride' - 17th June 2021. Link to recording and slides [here](#)
- Submission of Letter of Evidence to All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) for Council Housing Tenants meeting 07/12/2021 and its Report (see appendix B)
- Submission of letter to the Levelling Up, Housing and Communities call for evidence regarding The Regulation of Social Housing and its associated report (see item 61 on page 26 of the report [here](#))
- Resident Group survey (conducted by HouseProud) – January 2022. (see appendix C)
- Presentation by Andrew King at LGBTQ+ Housing Conference, 30th June 2022, Brighton
- Presentation by Michael Verrier and Jamie Hickling at Housing Quality Network (HQN) online conference, 17th November 2022

Workstrand 3: Governance, sustainability, and profile

Lead: Kevan Forde

This workstrand had two principle objectives. Firstly, to advance the auditing of the Pledge Scheme and the role of residents in the process. Secondly, to secure the long-term sustainability of the Pledge Scheme. However, as time progressed, it became clear to Steering Group members that securing the future of the Pledge Scheme was of immediate importance and this became the key project deliverable.

Activities and outputs:

- Two workstrand meetings (June & November 2021).
- Pledge Scheme Sustainability Workshop – March 1, 2022.
- Partner proposal development.
- Pledge Pulse Survey.
- Formation of Pledge Partnership between Houseproud and Stonewall Housing in November 2022

Securing the Pledge Scheme

A fundamental aim of the Housing with Pride project was to secure the Pledge Scheme. In order to achieve this, three key activities were undertaken: a Pledge Scheme sustainability workshop; creating and implementing a Pledge partnership process; and undertaking a Pledge Pulse survey to ascertain current engagement with the scheme and obtain feedback on ways it could be improved.

Pledge Scheme Sustainability Workshop

Designed to identify the best model to secure the immediate future of and longer-term sustainability of the scheme, envisaged to be with an organisation or organisations that support the collaborative ethos in which the Pledge Scheme had been designed and established and with the necessary infrastructure to promote, manage and audit the scheme.

Workshop facilitated by Gary Austin (Circle Indigo) and attended by Steering Group members and key partners. Key outcomes of the workshop (see appendix D for full report):

- Analysis of current situation and identification of issues and challenges, opportunities and ideas.
- Identification of a preferred sustainable and realistic pathway to ensure the longevity of the Pledge Scheme beyond December 2022, that should:
 - Ensure residents are included in the management, evaluation/auditing and governance processes associated with the Pledge Scheme.

- Identify ways to foster organisational collaboration and align the Pledge Scheme with commensurate, but different schemes, within the housing sector e.g., Stonewall Housing Inclusion Standard, Pride in Practice (LGBT Foundation), Pride in Care (Opening Doors)

- Develop action plan incorporating next steps, responsibilities and timelines.

Participants felt that now was the time to put in place a board structure, with distinct roles and clear responsibilities, to ensure strict governance of the Pledge Scheme. It was also recognised there were opportunities for wider collaboration and partnering with like-minded and suitable organisations.

Three possible future scenarios for the HouseProud pledge scheme were identified:

- Partnering arrangement (short to medium term) with a suitable partner (LGBTQI+ or housing association). This was the preferred scenario although the option to explore what a tiered offering could look like was not ruled out.
- Tiered offering (semi-open source, non-paid and paid tiers).
- Charitable or foundation status (possibly longer-term scenario).

Securing the Pledge Scheme

Key actions identified:

- Creation of business case (partner proposal)/ call for expressions of interest (EOI).
- Identify potential partners and criteria for partner assessment.
- Research and review outsourcing the evaluation and accreditation processes.



Partner Proposal process

The partner 'brief' (see appendix E) and process to identify and recruit a suitable Pledge Scheme partner were developed in collaboration with and endorsed by members of both the Housing with Pride project Steering Group and the HouseProud Management Board. Specific stages of the recruitment process were conducted as follows:

- Calls for EOI - August-September 2022
- Review of EOI proposals (Housing with Pride Steering Group and HouseProud Management Board) – October-November 2022 (?)
- Interview panel & partner recommendation (University of Surrey, LGBTQ+ Resident and HouseProud representatives) – November 2022
- Partner endorsement (Housing with Pride Steering Group and HouseProud Management Board) – November 2022
- Pledge Partner appointed (HouseProud) – December 2022

Pledge Pulse Survey

The Housing with Pride steering group designed a Pulse Survey in conjunction with the HouseProud Committee in Summer 2022 (see appendix F) to find out what was working well with the scheme and what could be improved. Between September and November 2022 this survey was distributed by HouseProud to housing providers who were existing Pledge Scheme signatories along with those who had recently signed-up.

The survey received 6 responses. Of these, 3 were existing Pledge Pioneer signatories, 2 had recently signed up and 1 was not aware of their current Pledge accreditation status.

Responses have been analysed and grouped around 3 core thematic questions:

- (i) what activities have been undertaken at their organisation because of the Pledge Scheme;
- (ii) what have been the main challenge;
- (iii) what further information, resources and supports are needed moving forwards.

Securing the Pledge Scheme

(i) What activities have occurred?

- (a) implementation of the core commitments – all those who responded stated that it was clear what the 3 core commitments of the Pledge Pioneer status were although they were at different stages in relation to implementing those core commitments. Of these, staff training and management engagement had occurred most frequently. Staff had been informed about the Pledge Scheme and their organisations' involvement with it. One organisation had undertaken quite considerable staff engagement activities, including training, both online and in-person, and highlighted the scheme in communications to staff. Some survey respondents indicated that senior management support/buy-in was crucial to the success, or otherwise, of implementing the Pledge.
- (b) communications and profile raising – of the three existing Pledge Pioneers, a multimedia approach had been employed. This included articles in organisational publications, social media engagement, attendance at Pride and organising specific events, and actively engaging an LGBT+ charity in partnership working. A new signatory was making communication plans, especially around resident engagement and understanding their needs.

(ii) What have been the main challenges?

- (a) resident engagement – finding ways to consult and engage with residents had been difficult for all those who responded to the survey. One survey respondent made the point that without residents' voices being amplified it can be difficult emphasising the priority of LGBT+ inclusion, compared to race or disability.
- (b) sharing, supporting and networking – one of the key challenges that Pledge Pioneers seem to face is feeling that they are isolated and unsure who else is also undertaking the Pledge. One survey respondent suggested that existing pledgers, especially those who had been accredited for some time, could support new signatories.

(iii) What further information, resources and supports are needed moving forwards?

- (a) clarification about how the Pledge Scheme is audited including what information is required in the submission.
- (b) a video highlighting the issues the Pledge Scheme is addressing and why
- (c) bespoke training or accreditation for specific groups of providers e.g. repairs operatives
- (d) information about what happens to accreditation if core commitments are not fully met or if mergers take place that bring a Pledge Scheme signatory into partnership with one without.
- (e) good practice guidelines on how best to engage residents

Future directions

In terms of future directions of the Pledge Scheme, the following have been suggested as part of this project:

1

Formation of a Pledge Scheme Oversight Board – including remit, roles & responsibilities, membership (number, affiliation), separate community panel, terms of reference.

2

Partnership/ workshop with Rainbow Roofs and HouseProud North West to bring residents from Housing with Pride and the Pledge Oversight Board and Community panel together

3

Develop and make available (via Pledge partner websites) educational materials including case studies of existing Pledge signatories

Conclusions and recommendations

The Housing with Pride project was formed during a challenging time for housing providers, social housing residents (particularly LGBTQ+ residents) and those undertaking equality, diversity and inclusion work. The pandemic had exacerbated existing inequalities and created new ones and the social housing sector, as a whole, seemed to still be recovering from this turbulent period.

Overall, the Housing with Pride project met its objectives, particularly its key objective of securing a Pledge partnership to put the Pledge Scheme on a secure and sustainable trajectory. Yet there remain many aspects of the work that commenced as part of the project that are still to be continued. This is particularly the case regarding the involvement of LGBTQ+ residents in the governance of the Scheme and ensuring that residents voices are heard within the wider sector.

The new Pledge Partnership, between HouseProud and Stonewall Housing, with the continued involvement of the University of Surrey offers a sustainable path for the Pledge Scheme to develop and grow. The Housing with Pride project recommends an early intervention between the parties to (a) increase resident involvement in Scheme governance and accreditation (b) develop educational training materials further, including bespoke ones for specific providers and (c) the commitment to the creation of a national LGBTQ+ residents' forum.

Appendix A:

Pledge Scheme Education toolkit template

Contents

- 1. Introduction to the Pledge Scheme**
- 2. Case studies**
 - a. Housing organisations/providers
 - b. Resident experiences
- 3. Pledge Implementation**
 - a. Implementation pathway – could include process diagram
 - b. “How to” guides – to include LGBTQ+ staff group set-up, collating and submitting evidence, etc.
 - c. Forum seed pack – how to set-up a resident forum
 - d. Barriers to implementation and strategies to overcome them
 - e. Monitoring /timeline
- 4. Pathway to sustainability**
- 5. Scheme alliances/points of intersection**
- 6. Useful resources & contacts should include**
 - a. Housing with Pride video
 - b. Links for unconscious bias training videos/modules/resources
 - c. Others that are provider specific

1. Introduction to the Pledge Scheme

Overview: The HouseProud Pledge is a scheme that all social housing providers (housing associations, local authorities and ALMOs) can sign up to, to demonstrate their commitment to LGBTQ+ resident equality and support. It has been developed by HouseProud and the University of Surrey in association with residents, staff members and sector leaders to address the issues raised by the findings of 'No Place Like Home?', the largest study ever undertaken to understand LGBTQ+ experiences of social housing.

Background and rationale: The home is of central importance to LGBTQ+ residents because it should be a place where people can freely express their sexual orientation and/ or gender identity without fear or prejudice. Sadly, despite recent changes in equality laws, LGBTQ+ residents continue to experience discrimination in their everyday lives, including in relation to their housing. Our research found that 60% of trans respondents did not feel that their neighbourhood was a safe place to live and one in five gay men reported modifying their home in some way (e.g., moving pictures or books) to hide their sexual orientation from a visiting repairs operative or housing officer. A third of respondents also felt that their housing provider was not able to deal effectively with issues like harassment.

Residents told us that they want their landlord to move beyond token gestures – the HouseProud Pledge provides a framework for landlords to work with involved residents to take action and demonstrate their commitment to LGBTQ+ equality and support. With the recent launch of the Social Housing Green Paper, the Government has called on the sector to empower residents and strengthen accountability. The HouseProud Pledge has been designed to help housing providers work with involved LGBTQ+ residents and foster positive relationships.

Aims/What's involved: Many housing providers already work with LGBTQ+ involved residents – signing up to the Scheme offers recognition for this. The HouseProud Pledge scheme is based on two levels of accreditation – Pledge Pioneer and Pledge Plus. We ask that all housing providers deliver three core commitments to foster engagement with LGBTQ+ residents (Pledge Pioneer). Following the delivery of these, landlords can work with involved residents to co-design projects and achieve the higher level of accreditation (Pledge Plus).

Appendix A

Pledge Scheme Components:

Expressing interest in the scheme		Signing up to the scheme and levels of accreditation	Activity during the year	Annual reporting of HouseProud	Subsequent years
Social housing providers (including housing associations, local authorities and ALMOs) can express interest in the scheme at any time and can contact HouseProud for more information.	1. Pledge Pioneer accreditation (necessary)	On signing up to the scheme, the housing provider will be awarded Pledge Pioneer status and encouraged to use the Pledge Pioneer logo in corporate and resident communications.	<p>The housing provider must commit to making significant progress in delivering the following core commitments within the first year of signing up to the scheme:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make sure that LGBTQ+ residents can have input at executive/ strategic level. 2. Increase LGBTQ+ visibility through use of the Pledge Pioneer symbol. 3. Initiate a programme of staff training to improve understanding of LGBTQ+ lives. <p>The housing provider must make sure that residents are updated on progress. This could be via regular presentations to the LGBTQ+ resident group or a section outlining progress in the organisation's annual report.</p>	<p>The housing provider, resident group or approved representative must submit a report to HouseProud within a year of signing up. This should provide evidence that the core commitments have been met, or that substantial progress has been made in delivering them.</p> <p>Evidence required includes the terms of reference outlining how the landlord engages with involved LGBTQ+ residents.</p> <p>Accreditation by HouseProud can be reviewed if providers slip in delivering the core commitments.</p>	<p>Once the core commitments have been achieved, continued accreditation over subsequent years will require the annual submission to HouseProud of a short report, demonstrating their continued delivery.</p> <p>Accreditation by HouseProud can be reviewed if providers slip in continuing to deliver the core commitments.</p> <p>Once providers have delivered the core commitments, they may also choose to work with LGBTQ+ residents to deliver Pledge Plus goals.</p>
	2. Pledge Plus accreditation (optional)	<p>In addition to delivering the core commitments, landlords can also commit to Pledge Plus goals, which will see them work with involved residents to set achievable and time-bound objectives. This will enable housing providers to work towards Pledge Plus, the higher level of accreditation.</p> <p>On signing up to the scheme, some housing providers may already have the formal structures in place to consult with LGBTQ+ residents and agree with them to work towards Pledge Plus accreditation.</p> <p>For other providers, Pledge Plus accreditation is something to aim for once they have delivered the Pledge Pioneer commitments.</p> <p>Objectives should be co-created with involved LGBTQ+ residents to address specific issues.</p> <p>Pledge Plus accreditation can only be awarded if the housing provider continues to deliver the core commitments necessary for Pledge Pioneer accreditation.</p>	<p>Pledge Plus goals must be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound).</p> <p>Landlords must commit to delivering at least one goal each year, but larger providers with more resources may be in a position to deliver two or more.</p> <p>The housing provider must ensure that residents are updated on progress. This may be via regular presentations to the LGBTQ+ resident group or a section outlining progress in the organisation's annual report.</p>	<p>The housing provider, resident group or approved representative must submit a report to HouseProud within a year of agreeing the goals.</p> <p>Pledge Plus accreditation will be awarded on the basis that goals have been achieved or that substantial progress has been made in achieving them.</p> <p>Accreditation will not be awarded if the provider fails to provide evidence of delivering the goals or the involvement of LGBTQ+ residents in creating them.</p>	<p>Pledge Plus goals are designed to be incremental and allow housing providers to deliver other goals over subsequent years.</p> <p>Continued accreditation will require the annual submission to HouseProud of a short report, demonstrating the delivery of Pledge Plus goals.</p> <p>Examples of good practice can be shared with other providers on the HouseProud website.</p>

Appendix A

2. Case Studies

a. Housing organisations/providers

“Quote”, “Pledge goal”, “Action(s)”, “Evidence”, “Outcome(s)”

Needs populating with examples from organisations that have completed the Pledge Scheme (to include Pioneer and Plus levels) and their experiences/ feedback/ tips.

b. Resident group experiences

As above – resident perspective.

3. Pledge implementation

a. Implementation pathway – to include process diagram

b. “How to” guides

- Setting up an LGBTQ+ staff group
Examples of existing groups /best practice
- Identifying and setting up Pledges/goals
- Collating and submitting evidence

c. Setting up a LGBTQ+ resident’s group: the forum seed pack

Examples of existing forums and good practice – resident voice in the audit process

d. Barriers to implementation: strategies to overcome common barriers

Discussion and examples of barriers
Interactive exercises

e. Managing the Pledge Scheme within the organisation

Monitoring, timelines

4. Pathway to sustainability

Appendix A

5. LGBTQ+ EDI scheme alliances / points of intersection

'Maximising impact, minimising duplication'

[Discussion piece about crossover with other schemes \(below\) and how to manage/avoid duplication of work](#)

Pride in Care | Opening Doors **(openingdoors.lgbt)**

Designed to be delivered to care staff / anyone working in the care sector with older LGBTQ+ people – National remit
Opening Doors is the specialist older LGBTQ+ people's organisation- was London based but is now national

Quality Mark: Lancashire LGBT **(lancslgbt.org.uk)**

Originally the Navajo kitemark – designed for anyone working with LGBTQ+ people (not older people specific) Local to Lancashire.

Navajo – In-Trust Merseyside **(merseysideintrust.org)**

An off-shoot of the original Navajo kitemark – local to Merseyside – not older LGBTQ+ specific

6. Useful resources

[Link to housing with pride video](#)

[Needs populating with other resources indicated by the provider](#)

LGBT Foundation - Healthcare Professionals

Pride in Practice – Health funded – delivered to GP's

Pledge Project | houseproud-lgbt

National – designed for Housing Providers -pledge/pledge pioneer

LGBTQ+ Specialist Training **(stonewallhousing.org)**

National – originally called the Charter Mark – now called the Inclusion Standard- designed for Housing Providers – includes a pre/post assessment audit and training.

UK Workplace Equality Index **(stonewall.org.uk)**

Equality index aimed at employers/ employees, also have Diversity champions

Appendix B: Evidence submitted to All Party Parliamentary Group for Council Housing and the group's Report of 7/12/2021 (with Letter as Addendum 5)

APPG Council Housing - Tenants meeting

This is a written submission from the 'Housing with Pride' project steering group, to inform the APPG on Council Housing about our work and some of the issues that concern LGBT+ council tenants, as you seek to represent the interests of council tenants in parliament.

'Housing with Pride' is a knowledge exchange project to increase LGBTQ+ resident inclusivity in the social housing sector. The project is a collaborative one between the University of Surrey, HouseProud (the LGBTQ+ social housing network), and LGBTQ+ social housing residents. Research we have conducted has shown that despite over a decade of equality laws, together with some examples of good practice, many lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer (LGBTQ+) people living in social housing provided by a local authority (or housing association) continue to experience discrimination in their everyday lives, especially in relation to their housing. The '**No Place Like Home**' study captured some of the voices of LGBTQ+ social housing tenants (of which 13% were local authority tenants)

- A third felt their neighbourhood was not a safe place to live as an LGBT*Q person.
- A fifth of gay men reported that they regularly modify their home if their landlord or a repairs person visits to make their sexuality less visible.
- A third of survey respondents felt that their housing provider was not able to deal effectively with issues like harassment.
- Only a half of survey respondents felt a sense of belonging to their neighbourhood, whilst a quarter reported feeling lonely.

We are working to support social housing providers to improve their services for LGBTQ+ residents. A summary of our work to date, with links to the key documents, can be found here:

<https://housingevidence.ac.uk/housing-with-pride-blog/>

The full publication can be found here:

<https://housingevidence.ac.uk/publications/housing-with-pride/>

We are now working on the next stage of developing further support and would be happy to discuss this with the APPG. We would particularly welcome your support for the **HouseProud Pledge Scheme**.

With regards,

Andrew D H King

Professor Andrew King

University of Surrey, Guildford, UK.

Tenants Meeting 2021 Report All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) for Council Housing

The APPG for Council Housing is a cross-party group of MPs which 1) campaigns to increase the number of council houses being built, as a central part of the solution to the housing crisis, and 2) seeks to represent the interests of council tenants in Parliament. The APPG is chaired by Matt Western, MP for Warwick and Leamington. Its Secretariat is Defend Council Housing, a tenants organisation that oppose privatisation of council housing and instead campaign for direct investment.

In October 2021, the APPG invited council tenants and housing campaigners to present (online) their views to MPs on the issues for council housing both in their local areas and nationally. Tenants were represented from across the country, from Rochdale to Swindon, as well as a number of tenants from several London boroughs including a representative from Grenfell United.

Each participant was given opportunity to speak. Several themes developed during the meeting which are outlined in this short paper. The campaign also received written evidence, both from those in attendance and from tenants who were unable to attend. These have been attached as an addendum to the report.

Shortage of Council Housing

Several participants highlighted the lack of council housing available to those who need it.

Some areas have thousands of people on the waiting list for social housing in their areas. For example, a speaker from a campaign in Rochdale, which is aiming to save seven tower blocks from demolition, told us that their area has over 7000 on the housing waiting list. The London Borough of Southwark has 16,000 households on its waiting list.

Land that could be used for building social rented council homes is instead being developed for housing which doesn't meet the needs of local communities. Public land is often sold off to the highest bidder, instead of being used to benefit local communities by building much-needed council homes. Fossett's for the People have been campaigning for former-NHS land in Southend to be used to provide around 400 genuinely affordable council homes. The current plans are instead for 135 (private) executive homes. Similarly, a speaker from Islington Homes for All described the battle they've faced over the former Holloway Prison site, which has been sold to a large housing association. After dedicated campaigning, the site will now provide 42% social rent homes – but this is a site that could have provided 100% social rent council homes if the land had been kept in public hands.

Appendix B

Permitted developments, allowing use of commercial buildings as homes, which do not need to go through local planning processes, have allowed modern slums to flourish, instead of secure, highquality new council homes being built. Powerful evidence was given by Harlow Defend Council Housing who told the meeting of tiny, hazardous rooms totally unsuitable for families to live in, miles away from schools and GP's. The speaker finished by saying "if ever there was a case for building 100,000 council homes a year it is now".

The meeting also heard from the authors of a research paper entitled 'Challenging Stigmatization of Social Housing Tenants in England', which concluded that there needs to be a right to housing, accompanied by greater investment in council housing.

Tenants were critical of the Government's definition of affordable homes, at up to 80% market rents, which is clearly unaffordable for people in many areas. In many cases, providing 'affordable' housing is being prioritised over social rented housing. The right-to-buy was another policy criticised as it has led to the loss of council homes, which have not been replaced. Speakers mentioned how some councils are still selling off the little stock they have left.

Using empty homes was identified as part of the solution by some speakers – there are an estimated 1500 empty homes in Rochdale for example. Government policies should give councils greater powers to use empty homes for social rent council homes.

Where tenants are able to access social rented council homes, some raised concerns about how rents are set. The attached evidence from the Secretary of Haringey Defend Council Housing outlines how social rents have become more unaffordable over time. The Government should ensure that the rent-setting formula for social rents is still fit for purpose and the Regulator of Social Housing must be robust in challenging landlords where social rents are being set above what is permitted.

Ultimately, the solution to the dwindling stock of council housing is for the Government to set a target of building at least 100,000 social rented council homes a year and providing councils with the investment and support to deliver this.

Poor Conditions and Safety

The APPG heard shocking testimony from a tenant living in temporary accommodation at Denby Court in Lambeth, London. When the tenant first moved in, "the electrics were borderline safe, there were leaks, mould, exposed asbestos, and it was teeming with vermin...the worst thing, after Grenfell, no smoke/fire alarms, no fire safety, 13 months it took me to get smoke alarms". Tenants in this situation have very few rights due to its status as temporary accommodation, despite paying rent and council tax. The tenant has lived there for four years, is still unable to secure permanent housing, and now faces being relocated miles away as the estate is earmarked for redevelopment by the Council.

Appendix B

A speaker from Southwark Defend Council Housing described the underinvestment and safety issues in that area, including increasing disrepair - signified by issues such as heating failure, damp and mould. There appears to be a worrying trend of neglect and managed decline of some estates, in various areas of the country, which can then be used as a justification for demolition against the wishes of residents.

The representative from Grenfell United spoke to a “culture of non-compliance around health and safety”, which appears to persist in the evidence we heard.

A council tenant and representative from the Swindon Tenants Campaign Group highlighted the issue of how a Government settlement in 2012 landed councils with unmanageable housing debt. This is one of the issues which results in councils being unable to renew stock, let alone retrofit existing homes. The Government could reopen this settlement if it wishes.

Regardless, there needs to be greater investment in the upgrading and retrofitting of existing council homes – now is the perfect time to do this, not only to improve the lives of tenants, some of whom are living in shocking conditions, but to tackle the climate emergency and reduce fuel bills for tenants.

Estate Demolition and Regeneration

Some attendees were facing their homes being demolished, as part of regeneration projects by local authorities. One attendee described how residents in the Love Lane estate in Tottenham were pressurised to vote in favour of demolition leading up to their estate demolition ballot. Residents are calling for an independent inquiry into how this vote was conducted. There is a responsibility on councils to ensure that votes on demolition and regeneration are free and impartial, without undue influence and pressure from landlords. Councils should be subject to independent investigation and punishment where this is not the case.

A tenant from the Fred Wigg & John Walsh Towers in Leytonstone described their poor experience with the refurbishment currently taking place on their homes. The project has already taken place for two years and is expected for a further two. They described the lack of communication with tenants including a lack of clarity over what works are taking place when, prioritising contractor convenience over tenants, and the general upheaval to residents’ lives.

Local authorities should ensure that where refurbishment is taking place, it is done with the consent of current tenants and that they are updated and involved with projects during every stage. They should be carried out within a reasonable timeframe, to minimise the disruption to residents.

Appendix B

Discrimination

It is vital that council tenants do not face discrimination due to gender, race, sexual orientation, disability or any other protected characteristic. Evidence submitted by the University of Surrey's 'Housing with Pride' project steering group details how some LGBT+ council tenants feel they have to regularly modify their home if their landlord or a repairs person visits, in order to make their sexuality less visible. Some also felt that their landlord was unable to deal with issues such as harassment effectively.

More broadly, the authors of 'Challenging Stigmatization of Social Housing Tenants in England' told the meeting how Government policies have stigmatised social tenants – including through welfare policies, right to buy and failing to strengthen tenant voice. It is imperative that all tenants are safe and free from discrimination in their homes. Local authorities should consider signing up to the HouseProud Pledge, to demonstrate their commitment to LGBTQ+ resident equality and support. Government policies and the language used by politicians should be careful not to stigmatise council tenants – and should instead give a greater voice to the diverse community of council tenants across the country.

Tenant Voice

Running through all the evidence received by the APPG is a lack of genuine tenant voice in decisions being made by both central and local Government.

The Grenfell United representative expressed their disappointment that reforms proposed in response to the tragedy of the Grenfell Tower fire are still yet to be presented to Parliament four years later. The Social Housing White Paper, which contains proposals to help strengthen the voice of social housing tenants, was released last year. The Government has not followed up with any legislation based on the paper, and it was not referenced in the Queen's Speech which laid out the Government's priorities for this Parliament. The APPG has previously written to Housing Minister Eddie Hughes, urging him to bring forward this legislation as soon as possible, and will continue campaigning for this.

Where new council housing is being built, it needs to happen in consultation and with the consent of existing communities. There is a particular issue with 'infilling' in inner-city London, where councils are building new council homes between and on top of existing ones as a response to the shortage of available land to build on. Southwark tenants expressed their concern about the level of disruption this causes for current residents and how this is leading to the loss of communal facilities or shared green spaces.

Appendix B

We heard evidence from the Chair of Southwark Group of Tenants Organisations, whose funding is going to be stopped by Southwark Council, which will leave residents with less of a say over what happens to their homes. They called for greater protections for tenant organisations and a more significant role for the social housing regulator to ensure that tenants are at the heart of decision-making, which should be considered as part of any legislation based on the Social Housing White Paper.

Tenants were clear that a significant cultural shift needs to take place, so residents have a greater voice and stake in the management of their homes. Government policies need to be urgently developed – and passed through Parliament - to encourage this.

Summary

Quite simply, we will not reduce the great need for social homes without building large quantities of social rent council housing – at least 100,000 a year. This means prioritising this in Government housing policy and returning to investing in the bricks and mortar of new council homes.

Public land should be used for high-quality council homes instead of being sold off to the highest bidder.

Additional investment is badly needed for the upgrading and retrofitting of existing council homes, so no tenant is living in poor or unsafe conditions.

Landlords must listen to council tenants. Without this happening, many of the issues discussed will unfortunately persist. Tenants must be given greater input into the management of their homes.

This should be facilitated by legislation and we will continue to press the Government into presenting a Bill to Parliament based on the Social Housing White Paper, as has been so forcefully called for by Grenfell United.

The APPG for Council Housing will send this report to interested MPs and Peers – including Ministers in the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. We will use this evidence to continue campaigning in Parliament to increase the number of council houses being built, as a central part of the solution to the housing crisis.

We thank every tenant and housing campaigner who fed their views into the APPG. We hope that central Government and local authorities will listen to their voices and put council tenants at the heart of decision-making about their own homes.

Appendix B

Addendum 5 – Housing with Pride project steering group, University of Surrey

This is a written submission from the 'Housing with Pride' project steering group, to inform the APPG on Council Housing about our work and some of the issues that concern LGBTQ+ council tenants, as you seek to represent the interests of council tenants in parliament.

'Housing with Pride' is a knowledge exchange project to increase LGBTQ+ resident inclusivity in the social housing sector. The project is a collaborative one between the University of Surrey, HouseProud (the LGBTQ+ social housing network), and LGBTQ+ social housing residents. Research we have conducted has shown that despite over a decade of equality laws, together with some examples of good practice, many lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer (LGBTQ+) people living in social housing provided by a local authority (or housing association) continue to experience discrimination in their everyday lives, especially in relation to their housing. The '**No Place Like Home**' study captured some of the voices of LGBTQ+ social housing tenants (of which 13% were local authority tenants)

- A third felt their neighbourhood was not a safe place to live as an LGBT*Q person.
- A fifth of gay men reported that they regularly modify their home if their landlord or a repairs person visits to make their sexuality less visible.
- A third of survey respondents felt that their housing provider was not able to deal effectively with issues like harassment.
- Only a half of survey respondents felt a sense of belonging to their neighbourhood, whilst a quarter reported feeling lonely.

We are working to support social housing providers to improve their services for LGBTQ+ residents. A summary of our work to date, with links to the key documents, can be found here:

<https://housingevidence.ac.uk/housing-with-pride-blog/>

The full publication can be found here:

<https://housingevidence.ac.uk/publications/housing-with-pride/>

We are now working on the next stage of developing further support and would be happy to discuss this with the APPG. We would particularly welcome your support for the **HouseProud Pledge Scheme**.

With regards,

Andrew D H King

Professor Andrew King

University of Surrey, Guildford, UK.

Appendix C: Resident Group summary

Feedback from the HouseProud survey to ascertain which social housing providers have an existing LGBTQ+ resident group

Housing Provider	Resident Group	Contact details	Interested
L&Q	Yes	Yes	
Notting Hill Genesis	Yes	Yes	
Anchor	Yes	Yes	
Southern Housing Group	Yes	Yes	
Mosscafe St Vincent's Housing	Yes	No	
Octavia	Yes (new)	No	
Homes for Lambeth	No		Yes
Peabody	No		Yes
Raven Housing Trust	No		Yes
RBKC - Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	No		Yes

Appendix D

Housing with Pride Workshop 1st March 2022 - Summary Report of the Workshop

This is a brief summary of the Housing with Pride workshop held on Tuesday 1st March 2022 (online). Full feedback captured is documented in the pdf of the Mural digital whiteboard used during the workshop and shared with workshop participants.

The workshop focused on the following:

- Analysing the current situation
 - Identifying issues and challenges
 - Reviewing what is not working with funding and governance
- Outlining opportunities and ideas
- Identifying preferred sustainable scenarios for moving forwards
- Documenting actions for immediate next steps

Current situation (issues and challenges)

Some concern that discussions such as these had been happening for 1-2 years with no concrete solutions or actions, had things really moved on?

Questions raised around how the HouseProud pledge scheme sat alongside other schemes offered by others and what the differentiator was.

Residents were concerned about losing their voice and were keen to ensure this did not happen moving forwards.

What was also evident was the need for stronger governance with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability (delegated authority).

Opportunities and ideas

Participants felt it was important to build on all the really good work and strong foundation that had been built.

It was important to ensure continued involvement of residents and that their experience voice is heard and acted on.

Now was the time to put in place a board structure, with strong governance and clear roles and responsibilities.

It was also recognised there were opportunities for wider collaboration and partnering with like-minded and suitable organisations.

Preferred scenario(s) for moving forwards

Three possible future scenarios for the HouseProud pledge scheme were identified:

- Partnering arrangement (short to medium term) with a suitable partner (LGBTQI+ or housing association)
- Tiered offering (semi-open source, non-paid and paid tiers)
- Charitable or foundation status (possibly longer-term scenario)

Each were reviewed by workshop participants for possible benefits and disadvantages and then a snapshot vote was taken.

All participants present preferred a partnering arrangement with a suitable partner but were also willing to explore what a tiered offering could look like and how it might operate.

Appendix D

Actions for immediate next steps

Action(s)	Who?	When?
Create a 'brief'/business case <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Documenting our back story and narrative• Scope and ambition• Red lines and negotiables	Andy & Frances	
Draft a list of potential partners <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft evaluation criteria for assessing potential partners• Outline recruitment process and who should be involved• Document transition process for gap between Housing with Pride and new partnership including fast track plan• Research who might be interested in partnering with Housing with Pride and what they could bring and what we bring to them• Accept expressions of interest from potential partners		
Set up a Housing with Pride board structure with clear roles and responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify what a board should look like and how we recruit to it (proportional representation)• With appropriate governance in place (including delegated authority)• Draft board terms of reference resources required• With wider representation (e.g. Rainbow Roofs)• Set up meeting with Rainbow Roofs)		
Review clarify and document how the Pledge scheme sits alongside other schemes <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the pledge card and where does it differ from others?• Who is in the pledge expressed an interest etc.• Engage and inform organisations who already have the pledge about new 'processes' etc.		
Review branding of the pledge scheme <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To include House Proud and Housing with Pride• Relaunch with partners using social media		
Research and review outsourcing the accreditation and evaluation		
Outline how to use the residents as ambassadors; role responsibilities etc.		
Research and review what a tiered pledge scheme offering could look like and how it would operate		

Appendix E:

HouseProud partnership proposal/ call for Expression of Interest

HOUSEPROUD PLEDGE PARTNERSHIP PROPOSAL August 2022



INTRODUCTION

This partnership proposal sets out the intent to find a suitable partner to take forward and develop the operation of the HouseProud Pledge scheme, with HouseProud and resident groups, as a member of the proposed HouseProud Pledge Advisory & Oversight Board.

For the avoidance of doubt, there are no fees associated with commissioning this partnership proposal. The Pledge scheme will continue to be called the 'HouseProud Pledge'.

OVERVIEW

1. History of the HouseProud Pledge Scheme

HouseProud was set up in 2014 as the nationwide network for lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT+) people working in social housing. Its key aims are to be a forum for sharing information and promoting best practice, to raise awareness of LGBT+ issues across the sector, to be a network and safe space for LGBT+ social housing colleagues and to improve service delivery for all our customers. HouseProud is a voluntary membership organisation of LGBT+ people working in social housing. It has an elected management committee, with terms of reference, but it has no legal constitution or funding.

In 2017, HouseProud commissioned the University of Surrey (Professor Andrew King, Frances Sanders, and Dr Paul Stoneman) to undertake research on the experiences of people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer (LGBTQ+) social housing residents and published the report '**No Place Like Home**' in February 2018. The study found:

- A third of survey respondents felt their neighbourhood was not a safe place to live as an LGBTQ+ person.
- A fifth of gay men reported that they regularly modify their home if their landlord or a repairs person visits to make their sexuality less visible. Whilst many lesbian women routinely assess people at the door
- A third of survey respondents felt that their housing provider was not able to deal effectively with issues like harassment.
- Only a half of survey respondents felt a sense of belonging to their neighbourhood, whilst a quarter reported feeling lonely.

The HouseProud Pledge Scheme was developed by the University of Surrey and HouseProud in response to that report, and launched in May 2019 with endorsement by the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Residential Development, London.

A knowledge exchange project, 'Housing with Pride', (with funding from UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence (CaCHE)) has tracked the progress and

Appendix E

learning of the first Pledge Scheme signatories through workshops with staff. This led to development of a promotional animation video to raise awareness about the need for housing providers to be supportive and inclusive of LGBTQ+ residents' lives. The **Housing with Pride report** gives the key learning points that emerged from the project. The current 'Housing with Pride' project (due to complete in December 2022) represents a collaboration¹ involving several partners and has LGBTQ+ social housing residents on its Advisory Board. The project seeks to make a national impact in the way that housing providers listen to and engage with their LGBTQ+ residents. The project also responds to the government's Social Housing White Paper (2020) - A Charter for Social Housing Residents.

HouseProud North-West is an independent local group setup to support LGBT+ staff working in social housing organisations in that region. Representatives from HouseProud North-West attend the House Proud steering group meetings to share information between the parties. HouseProud North-West has established an umbrella LGBT+ resident network called Rainbow Roofs which aims to provide residents with a voice on housing related matters.

2. Overview of the Pledge scheme, and anticipated costs

The Pledge Scheme is an equality framework that any social housing provider can sign up

to. It was designed to work flexibly for all social housing providers, regardless of size and geographical location. The scheme provides a framework for landlords to work with residents to take action and demonstrate their commitment to LGBTQ+ equality and support.

The scheme has been designed to enhance existing resident involvement activity and to ensure that residents can input directly into landlord policy and practice. The scheme is based on two levels of accreditation:

- **Pledge Pioneer:** all housing providers have a year to deliver three core commitments, including making sure that involved LGBTQ+ residents can input at a strategic level. These are designed to help providers get the basics right before working with involved residents to explore other commitments.
- **Pledge Plus:** following the delivery of the above commitments, landlords can choose to commit to additional pledges. These see them work with involved residents to set achievable and time-bound goals on an ongoing basis.

Each organisation needs to demonstrate evidence of how they meet Pioneer status one year after signing-up to the scheme, after which they can sign-up to Pledge Plus. Accreditation is currently assessed and agreed by HouseProud's Management Committee.

Whilst the Pledge Scheme complements other equality, diversity and inclusion initiatives undertaken by housing

¹Between HouseProud, University of Surrey, Stonewall Housing, Tonic Housing, Opening Door (London) and other social housing providers

Appendix E

providers, the collaborative partnership with residents is a key cornerstone and provision that distinguishes it from the existing, EDI schemes on the market. This inclusive approach means there is greater cultural sensitivity and flexibility, and the scheme will be more fitting for the specific demographics of different organisations. In signing up to the Pledge scheme, housing providers will gain accreditation for work that currently may go unrecognised.

By the end of 2020, sixteen organisations had signed up to the Pledge Scheme; seven of these had achieved Pioneer status and two had attained Pledge Plus. The scheme brochure, sign-up information and the 2020-21 Pledge Project Report are all available via the HouseProud website: <https://www.houseproud-lgbt.com/pledge>

Since the Pledge scheme was set up over 50 social housing providers have reached out about the scheme and over 30 have now gone on to sign up.

Costs

The Pledge Scheme is currently free for housing providers to sign-up to. The administration, evaluation and accreditation process has been undertaken by HouseProud Management Committee members.

The costs of setting up and reviewing the Pledge scheme have been covered by funding from the Economic and Social Research Council via the UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence (CaCHE) and subsequently the University of Surrey Impact Acceleration Account and in-kind contributions from housing providers.

ESRC funding is expected to cease with the conclusion of the Housing with Pride project in Dec 2022.

We have outlined the potential costs of operating the Pledge scheme below, which are based on work to-date. The Pledge Scheme has benefitted from the goodwill of a range of stakeholders: residents; staff members and support from housing providers, which is difficult to quantify. The no-cost approach of the Pledge Scheme also makes it difficult to incorporate reliable costings or projections and any future financial model will be developed with potential partners.

- The Pledge Scheme is currently administered by members of the HouseProud Management Committee, and we estimate that to maintain the Scheme would require approximately 7 hours a week. This includes the time required to monitor the Scheme, communicate with stakeholders, and provide assistance to members.
- Information about the Pledge Scheme is currently hosted on the HouseProud website. We estimate that to maintain the current level of web content would require approximately 5 hours a month, in addition to any costs related to web hosting.
- Attending networking events and conferences helps us to promote the Pledge Scheme. We estimate that this is the equivalent of approximately 4 hours a month.

The above reflects our estimates to maintain the Pledge Scheme as it currently stands, but any development work would be additional to this. Charging for accreditation, or for consultancy, would also likely require

Appendix E

additional resources, including regular catch-ups with housing provider contacts and attendance at staff meetings, etc.

3. Rationale for partnership

An organisational review of the Pledge Scheme in 2021 and feedback from HouseProud members raised concerns in relation to its long-term stewardship and sustainability; specifically, with respect to the appropriateness of a staff network managing the scheme but also having the resources to do so. Whilst committed to the Pledge Scheme, HouseProud recognised that the voluntary and un-constituted nature of their network means it has insufficient capacity to oversee and implement the Pledge Scheme as it continues to develop and expand. Hence, to ensure its continued growth and success, the HouseProud Steering Committee are seeking to find a partner organisation able to support the Pledge Scheme, i.e., one able to raise and hold funds, including the potential to apply for funding.

4. Opportunity

The Pledge Scheme offers a unique and highly workable approach to LGBTQ+ resident inclusivity for a range of organisations and for residents in the housing sector. It is expected that a partnership arrangement will provide an equitable solution for the continuation and further the potential of the Pledge Scheme: for example, possible scenarios for the future management of the Pledge Scheme may include a tiered approach (i.e., hybrid model with non-paid and paid tiers and/or flexible pricing model, dependent on

organisation size) an outsourced model (i.e., involving a separate, paid for, evaluation and accreditation body) or combined approach (i.e., combines elements of the different approaches). It is hoped that the partner will fully support the efforts of the current 'Housing with Pride' project team by fulfilling their ambition to help develop the first National LGBTQ+ Residents Forum, a ground-breaking milestone in the social housing sector in the UK and a significant development in terms of the Government's new housing charter. In addition, it is envisaged that the Pledge Scheme may be extended with potential in the longer-term to develop independent charitable or foundation status.

5. Partner requirements

The partner organisation must:

- Be committed to LGBTQ+ equality and inclusion and to championing the rights of LGBTQ+ social housing residents.
- Exist independently from any social housing organisation, unless both partners can form an agreement to ensure an appropriate level of independence (financial and ideological) is maintained.
- Be willing to partner with HouseProud and work inclusively with resident groups and as a member of the Pledge Advisory & Oversight Board (see point 6) to develop the best working model for the Pledge Scheme to ensure short-to-medium term sustainability of the scheme. For example, this may include creation of a communication strategy and online presence, as well as further development of the governance and evaluation processes.

Appendix E

- Have the resources to dedicate appropriate support to the day-to-day administration of the Pledge Scheme and be able to seek funding to cover these costs (e.g., through the Scheme itself and/or grants, etc.).
- Maintain the legacy of the Pledge Scheme and acknowledge contributors/contributions accordingly.

The partnership must include the following:

- The setting up of an Independent Pledge Scheme Advisory Board which has a proportional representation of HouseProud members, partner organisation members, LGBTQ+ residents and the University of Surrey.
- The commitment to the inclusion of resident representative(s) in the assessment/auditing process of the Pledge Scheme.
- The commitment for the Pledge Scheme to be independently evaluated every three years.

6. Role of Pledge Advisory and Oversight Board

The purpose of the Board will be twofold:

- To provide oversight of the Pledge Scheme and through which the partnership will be governed, and
- to provide the mechanism by which LGBTQ+ residents are represented and have a voice in the governance.

HouseProud representation on the board will be taken from the HouseProud Management Committee. It is envisaged that the Pledge Scheme partnership will be advised by the Board with respect to any decisions concerning the future direction and sustainability of the scheme. The 'Housing with Pride' project is working on a set of

recommendations which, it is envisaged, will provide the partnership with a basis for the Board's Terms of Reference.

7. Implementation Plan

HouseProud will work with the partner organisation (and Board when established) to plan and document the transition process to the new partnership, including the development of a fast-track plan to ensure continuity for existing signatories and organisations in the sign-up process.

Current signees to the Pledge scheme have been advised of a review period postponing further accreditations being made. This includes a survey requesting their feedback, to inform the review.

High-Level Timeline/Schedule

August to October 2022:

- Survey of Pledge scheme participants
- Advertising of partnership opportunity via social media etc
- Identification of partner
- Partnership agreement and development of transition plan
- Establishment of Pledge Advisory and Oversight Board
- Notification of partnership to existing signatories and across housing sector

November to December 2022:

- Development of Board materials, including the terms of reference, etc.
- Review branding of the Pledge Scheme (to include HouseProud and 'Housing with Pride')
- Outline how to work with residents as ambassadors, etc.
- Research and review how a tiered pledge scheme could operate.

Appendix E

- Research and review a) options of charitable status and b) outsourcing the accreditation and evaluation.

January 2023:

- Re-launch the Pledge Scheme using social media approved for use by both partners, in conjunction with the Pledge Scheme Advisory and Oversight Board and be appropriately resourced to deal with enquiries/calls for support.

8. Expressions of Interest

Expressions of interest are invited from organisations that meet the Partner requirements set out in section 5. The expression of interest should set out how your organisation meets the Partner requirements, how you plan to approach this opportunity and what experience you bring. Please clearly state the name of the organisation and the lead contact person's details.

Assessment of the expressions of interest will be made using the scoring matrix, see below

Enquiries and/or expressions of interest should be registered by the 30th Sept 2022 via Email: HouseProud_LGBT@outlook.com

All expressions of interest should be signed by an appropriate person stating the authority given to make the submission.

HouseProud Pledge partnership proposal EOI Assessment: (date here)

Requirements (the below will be assessed against the scale on the right)	Organisation 1 (Name here)	Organisation 2 (Name here)
Meets the Partner requirements		
Understanding of the brief		
Suitable capacity and expertise to deliver the requirements, including being able to raise and hold funds, and apply for funding.		
Approach to developing the Pledge scheme and finding a successful and sustainable operational model		
Reputation and demonstrable track record of relevant experience		
TOTAL SCORE	0	0

COMPLETE SCORES 0-4 IN YELLOW BOXES

Assessment	Detail	Score
Excellent	Demonstrates clearly and convincingly how all of the requirements will be delivered in an excellent way	4
Good	Demonstrates how nearly all of the requirements will be delivered to a good standard	3
Fair	Demonstrates how some of the requirements will be delivered to a fair standard	2
Poor	Provides only limited information on how the requirements will be delivered resulting in a poor standard	1
Very poor	Either no answer provided or the answer fails to demonstrate how the requirements will be delivered in accordance with the specification	0

Appendix F: Pledge Scheme Pulse Survey

Pledge Scheme Pulse Survey 2022

This Pulse Survey is being undertaken by HouseProud because it has been approx. 18 months since the last assessment and awarding of accreditation for the HouseProud Pledge Scheme. This Pulse Survey is designed to get an indication of what is working, what challenges there are and how things could be improved with the scheme itself. The survey should take no more than 20 minutes to complete.

Thank you for your time and input – your feedback is extremely important to us and will contribute towards the review of the Pledge Scheme.

About you and your organisation

1. What is your name, role, and the name of your housing organisation?

Name:

Role:

Organisation:

2. What level of accreditation does your organisation currently have within the HouseProud Pledge Scheme?

- Pledge Pioneer
- Pledge Plus
- None – just signed-up
- Don't know

3. Are we contacting the most relevant person in your organisation with this survey, or would you like to update the contact details?

- Yes
- No

If no, please provide contact details:

Appendix F

Registering

Thinking about your experiences of registering on the HouseProud Pledge Scheme:

4. How easy was it to register that your organisation was working towards the HouseProud Pledge?

- Easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Difficult
- Don't know/cannot remember

If you answered DIFFICULT, how can we improve this? :

5. How easy was it to understand what is required for each level of the HouseProud Pledge Scheme?

- Easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Difficult
- Don't know/cannot remember

If you answered DIFFICULT, what other information would have been useful? :

6. How has your organisation communicated or publicised its working towards the HouseProud Pledge Scheme over the past 18 months?

Appendix F

Working towards the Pledge in your organisation

Thinking now about how your organisation has put the Pledge Scheme into practice over the past 18 months:

7. What steps have you taken to implement the HouseProud Pledge Scheme with staff?

8. What steps have you taken to implement the HouseProud Pledge Scheme with residents?

9. What support would you have liked during the process of working towards the HouseProud Pledge Scheme?

10. What do you think has worked well in implementing the HouseProud Pledge Scheme in your organisation?

11. What challenges has your organisation met in putting the HouseProud Pledge Scheme into practice?

12. And, if applicable, how has your organisation tried to mitigate those challenges?

Preparing for the next accreditation review

Thinking about what has been achieved in your organisation in relation to the HouseProud Pledge over the past 18 months:

13. What staff training on LGBTQ+ equality, diversity and inclusion has your organisation carried out in the past 18 months? [Please include details, e.g., roles, numbers, training format, etc.?

14. In what ways are residents included and engaged in your organisation's implementation of the Pledge Scheme?

Appendix F

15. Please provide examples which you think particularly demonstrate good practice in your organisation's implementation of the Pledge Scheme?

16. Is it clear what will be required for the submission for accreditation?

Yes

No

If NO, how can we improve this?

17. Do you envisage any challenges with any aspect of your submission?

Yes

No

If YES, please explain what challenges you anticipate and why

18. Is it clear how your submission will be assessed?

Yes

No

If NO, what additional information would you like to see?

Final thoughts

19. We are currently reviewing and consolidating the Pledge Scheme. Based on your organisation's experiences, how do you think HouseProud can improve it?

20. Are there any additional comments you would like to make us aware of?
Please write them here.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey