

## **Committee: Cabinet**

**Date: 17 July 2023**

Agenda item:

Wards: All

## **Subject: Modernising our approach to Community Engagement**

Lead officer: Polly Cziok, Executive Director for Innovation and Change

Lead member: Cllr Eleanor Stringer, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Civic Pride

Contact officer: Kris Witherington, Engagement and Consultation Manager x3896

---

### **Recommendations:**

- A. That Cabinet agrees the proposals for a more resident-facing approach to community engagement, through a new model for community forums as well as additional support for resident associations
  - B. That Cabinet agrees to the proposals to supplement the biennial residents survey with a new digital engagement platform that includes a citizens panel
- 

## **1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1. Following the findings from the previous engagement there was a clear desire from participants to see improvements in how the Council engages with them on decisions that affect their community.
- 1.2. Following a review of existing corporate engagement structures, this report sets out a case for change which will provide a new approach for engaging with residents and other stakeholders, making the most of new digital tools and through refreshing some of our existing structures.
- 1.3. It also forms part of a wider review of Communications & Engagement, with External & Internal Communications forming the other elements of the service.
- 1.4. The proposals also include plans to improve coordination of consultation and engagement across the organisation and in conjunction with other partners.
- 1.5. The report recommends investment in capacity to deliver a step-change in how residents can engage with the organisation.
- 1.6. This new approach includes re-formatting the Community Forums; building on our relationship with local communities; replacing the biennial residents survey and improving our digital engagement offer.
- 1.7. These proposals will link with the plans set out in the *How We Work With Communities* report, being considered by Cabinet and will support the Council ambition to nurture Civic Pride.

## **2 DETAILS**

- 2.1. Currently the three main areas of focus for the Community Engagement team includes servicing the existing engagement infrastructure, delivering corporate projects, and providing support and assistance to service teams in delivering time-limited consultations.
- 2.2. Corporate activities include:
- Administering the five community forums
  - Delivering the biennial residents survey
  - Managing the council's e-petition system
  - Maintaining the online consultation hub
  - Managing the Healthwatch Merton contract.
  - Time-limited corporate priorities, often delivered in conjunction with other teams across Council.
- 2.3. The team also provides advice and support to services across the organisation to assist with statutory and non-statutory consultations.
- 2.4. The level of support will vary considerably depending on the project and the capacity and skills of the service team, but will usually cover issues such as stakeholder mapping, consultation design and delivery, and analysis of results.
- 2.5. This can include internal consultations as well as public or projects targeted at a defined stakeholder group. The team will also support the delivery of consultations by partner organisations that impact on Merton, for example Government Departments, the Boundary Commission, the Mayor of London, Transport for London, and NHS organisations. Recent examples have included the Ultra-Low Emission Zone, the Review of Parliamentary Boundaries and Your London Fire Brigade.
- 2.6. Just under 250 such projects have been registered on our consultation hub since April 2018, with some receiving significant levels of support, such as the Parking charges reviews in 2018 and 2020 and Waste services consultation in 2022.
- 2.7. In 2021 Merton Council undertook a large-scale engagement exercise, that aimed to identify priorities for the borough's COVID recovery programme. As part of this exercise residents identified a desire to be engaged in the decisions that would determine how the borough recovers from COVID-19:
- “An inclusive community that all age groups and people from different backgrounds could feel part of – and that offered opportunities to engage with each other – was a key part of many respondents’ ambitions for the future. They wanted to use the recovery from Covid-19, for instance, for reopening community centres or investing in activities to engage children and young people and bring different generations together. This was seen as an opportunity to rekindle a sense of community that many had valued in the spirit of mutual aid during the lock-downs”. Pg 33*
- Our engagement showed that residents were passionate about the potential of their local area and were keen to be involved in decisions around its strategic direction. Pg 77*

- 2.8. Delivering regular activities on the scale of the 2021 project would involve substantial resources and increased capacity but the project also offered an opportunity to test models of working that can be incorporated into our ongoing offer to residents. This includes improving the digital routes for engagement and adopting a more open approach to resident engagement.

### **Nurturing Civic Pride**

- 2.9. The plans set out in this report aim to improve channels for resident engagement, ensuring that successful engagement is supported, and gaps are identified and address.
- 2.10. By building trust and communications with residents and key stakeholders the proposed programme will aim to support the Council's ambition to nurture Civic Pride in Merton.
- 2.11. The proposals include reforming the Community Forums, strengthening face-to-face engagement, improving our digital offer, and strengthening our coordination of work across the organisation.

### **Reforming the Community Forums**

- 2.12. From 21 February to 4 April 2022 residents were invited to complete a survey on their experience of the community forums. The survey covered residents experience of remote meetings during the pandemic, their experience of forums overall and their views on alternative models of resident engagement. In addition, responses were received on behalf of both the then Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups on the council.
- 2.13. Among the 70 responses more than half had not attended a community forum meeting during the pandemic when meetings were held online; and more than a third had never attended a community forum at any time. Among those who had never attended a meeting, two-thirds said they did not know when the meetings were taking place.
- 2.14. Of those who had attended an online meeting less than half said they found the meeting useful, although two-thirds of those who had ever attended a forum said agreed they were useful.
- 2.15. More than half of previous attendees also agreed that meetings are generally interesting, they were able to raise local issues, and that they preferred in person to online meetings but found it useful to be able to watch the meetings online. 85% agreed they were more likely to attend if there was an item they were interested in and 81% said they were more likely to attend if they could ask questions of elected officials.
- 2.16. However, two-thirds disagreed that they could influence local decisions by attending meetings. Less than half were satisfied with the community forums overall.
- 2.17. Respondents were asked if any alternative options would be better or worse than the current community forums. The choices were based on research into other face-to-face structures across London boroughs. Amongst respondents the most popular alternative was **public question time sessions with the Leader and Cabinet Members**. Other alternatives that

were also rated better than the current format were: **more support and contact with existing residents groups; ward meetings arranged by local councillors;** and **resident workshops** where groups of residents discuss and recommend solutions to a particular issue.

- 2.18. Attendance at the Community Forum meetings varies across the areas and dropped significantly for the online only meetings that took place during the pandemic. Attendance at in-person meetings have yet to return to pre-pandemic levels. However, we have seen additional viewers on YouTube after the meetings took place in the region of 70-100 views per meeting. The range of attendance at each forum is set out in the table below:

Forum	Pre pandemic attendance	Online only attendance	Post pandemic attendance
Colliers Wood	5-15	Less than 10	10
Mitcham	20-25	Less than 10	10
Morden	15-25	10	15
Raynes Park	50-60	10-20	20-30
Wimbledon	30-40	Less than 10	15-20

### **Face to Face engagement**

- 2.19. A new approach to delivering face-to-face engagement is now being recommended, and suggests the following features:
- a) High-profile ‘Leader’s Question Time’ sessions; with the ability for one-off, issues-based sessions as necessary through a mix of online, in-person or on-street engagement approaches
  - b) An annual community forum meeting in each area, based on themed workshops that focus on resident engagement
- 2.20. The Question Time events would be widely advertised as high-profile events, *chaired by an independent facilitator* and the panel could include members of the cabinet or other local public services such as the Police or NHS. The events would also be available online, either through recording or live streaming.
- 2.21. The annual Community Forum meetings would be facilitated by Council officers and invite residents and local businesses to participate in a collaborative workshop. Several relevant local themes could be covered by using techniques such as a Citizen’s Assembly or Knowledge Café. The findings and recommendations from these events would be reported into Council meetings, with the option of creating motions for Council to consider.
- 2.22. The team would also be able to support other engagement events as directed by senior officers. This could include topic specific meetings, either online or in-person or on-street roadshows in high streets or other locations.

## **Supporting existing local engagement structures**

- 2.23. In addition to reforming the community forums to improve the quality of resident engagement the proposal is to ***increase the engagement and support to resident associations and other local engagement groups*** that bring together residents and local businesses. This support will include:
- a) Support for those groups who wish to continue delivering community forum-style meetings in their area
  - b) A point of contact for resident associations and other groups
  - c) A regular e-newsletter aimed at resident associations
  - d) An annual event that brings together resident associations and other groups from across the borough
- 2.24. The support for groups or councillors that may wish to continue holding additional meetings along the lines of community forums could include venue hire and support with marketing for the meetings through Council channels. The groups would also need a point of contact within the Engagement team to arrange invitations for speakers or to raise issues of concern.
- 2.25. This same point of contact in the Engagement Team would be extended to resident associations and other resident groups. The support would not include providing an additional customer service channel but would include an offer to answer questions, signpost to relevant information and connect groups with other council services.
- 2.26. There is variable coverage of formal and informal resident groups across the borough. In parts of the borough there are well established formal structures holding well-attended regular meetings and with an active digital presence. In other areas there are successful informal groups using Whatsapp or other tools to communicate within a community.
- 2.27. The Engagement Team would work with Councillors and other stakeholders to build an understanding of what groups are functioning in each area, and how effective their reach is within their community. This would allow us to understand over time if there are gaps in provision and if local groups could be provided with support to develop their activity.
- 2.28. Working with the wider Communications Team we would also provide regular e-newsletters to organisations who sign-up through the Granicus system. The e-newsletter will focus on information about events, services, and activities that resident associations can cascade to wider audiences.
- 2.29. The Engagement Team would also deliver an annual event for resident associations that brings together these groups in a setting that mirrors other partnership structures.

## **Improving digital engagement**

- 2.30. Currently our digital engagement offer consists of an online consultation hub that lists all our consultation projects and an attached survey design tool that allows to build questionnaires to support our consultations.

- 2.31. The recommendation is to procure a new system or systems that will also include additional options:
- a) A digital citizens panel where residents can be recruited and participate in regular online surveys
  - b) Discussion boards that can be used for more dialogue-based approaches but that includes automated analysis to avoid the impact on officer's time
  - c) Mapping options to enable consultations that are focused on geographical themes, as used in the Your Merton programme
  - d) A survey design tool that includes analysis of open text questions
- 2.32. The digital citizen panel will supplement the need for regular feedback from a representative sample of residents. As a result, we will continue to deliver a biennial residents' survey that provides a benchmark for trends over time and against national or regional surveys. We will then be able to use the Citizen's Panel to address issues raised by the resident's survey in more detail.
- 2.33. During the pandemic Zoom, Teams and other platforms were used to facilitate several engagement sessions on specific topics including the climate emergency and school streets. Digital engagement sessions should continue to be an option for delivering consultation and engagement.

#### **Improving corporate coordination**

- 2.34. Consultation and engagement is delivered across the council and by its partners through a wide range of mechanisms. Some of these are focused on specific population groups, such as our Youth Participation team, others focus on service user groups like Looked After Children or users of Adult Social Care services and others have a specific topic focus such as the Metropolitan Police's Ward Panels.
- 2.35. The expanded Engagement and Consultation Team will also lead on steps to improve coordination of activity across the council and with its partners. This will include developing a new internal network, identifying opportunities for improving skills and sharing knowledge and coordinating or supporting external events.

#### **Changes to staffing**

- 2.36. To meet the capacity demands of the new engagement model set out in this report we recommend increasing the Engagement and Consultation team by 2.5FTE from the current 1.5FTE to 4FTE.
- 2.37. An Events Officer would take responsibility for delivering the Question Time and Community Forum events.
- 2.38. A Community Development officer would be recruited to support the engagement with resident associations and support additional community forum meetings.
- 2.39. A 0.5FTE Engagement and Consultation and Engagement Officer would also be recruited to support the existing 0.5FTE role to oversee the new digital consultation package including a new resident panel.

- 2.40. An increase in the budget for supporting events would also be required to ensure events are marketed effectively and delivered successfully.

### **3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 3.1. Improvements could be made to our engagement programme without the investment requested. This could be done through the reformatting of the Community Forums but with significantly less activity than recommended and by replacing the residents survey with an improved digital offer.
- 3.2. Alternatively further investment could create a community development approach to engaging with residents. This approach would involve community development officers working in local geographical areas to develop trust and clear lines of communications with residents' groups,

### **4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED**

- 4.1. In 2022 a review of the community forums received 70 responses to an online survey and responses from both the then Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups.
- 4.2. As set out in 2.5 Your Merton identified a need to improve the routes for residents and other stakeholders to engagement the council.
- 4.3. Further discussion took place at the Wimbledon, Raynes Park, Mitcham and Morden Community Forum meetings. The proposals were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission, the Merton Partnership Executive Board and the Joint Consultative Committee with Ethnic Minority Organisations.
- 4.4. Feedback from all groups was broadly positive with a recognition that new approaches were needed to better engage residents. The Wimbledon and Raynes Park Community Forums have decided to continue additional meetings in the current format, managed by local councillors and the Raynes Park Association.

### **5 TIMETABLE**

- 5.1. Once approved by cabinet, officers will begin the recruitment and procurement necessary with a view to starting the new approach in autumn 2023 and consolidating it for the 2024/5 Council calendar.

### **6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1. The additional posts requested would cost in the region of £120,000 in addition to the current budget of £98,000.
- 6.2. Currently the budget for delivering the community forum meetings is £2,000 covering venue hire and marketing materials. The proposal is to increase this to £15,000 so that Question Time sessions, community forum and resident association events will have sufficient funding for venue and marketing costs.
- 6.3. This increase in budget forms part of the Communications Team growth bid for 2023/4 that has already been approved.

### **7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1. The constitution of the council sets out a requirement for community forums to be delivered and this proposal would continue to meet this requirement.
- 7.2. Failure to consult residents, stakeholders, and representative groups appropriately exposes decisions made by the council to the potential of Judicial Review. Increasing the organisations capacity, and tools for consulting with residents reduces this risk.

## **8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1. Attendance at Community Forum meetings is more likely to be from older age groups and not include a balance of black and minority ethnic groups that reflects the wider population. The approach recommended is intended to attract a wider audience and help the council reach seldom heard communities.

## **9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1. There are no crime and disorder implications. It is likely and crime and disorder issues will be raised by participants, helping inform the Safer Merton partnership.

## **10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1. There is a risk to the reputation of the council from poorly delivered engagement and consultation. This proposal is intended to improve the quality of engagement delivered.
- 10.2. Health and safety considerations will need to be addressed in the planning and delivery of public events.

## **11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT**

### **12 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 12.1. [Your Merton Report](#)