



**MEETING of the
GOVERNING BODY OF
SCOTTISH VETERANS' RESIDENCES
On MS Teams, Friday 3rd December 2021**

Record of Decisions

- Present: George Lowder MBE, Chairman
Richard Edlmann (RE)
Lt Ray Gidney RN (RG)
Iain Lindsay (IL)
Clive Masson (CM)
Sqn Ldr Derek Morrison (DM)
Isla Tabberer (IMT)
Maj Christian Taylor (CT)
Sandy Telfer (ST)
- In attendance: Jeremy Chittleburgh, Treasurer (JC)
George Corbett (DCEO)
Susie Hamilton, Head of External Relations (HER)
Martin Nadin OBE, Chief Executive (CEO) - Minutes
- Apologies: Sue Bomphray (SB)
Rev Neil N Gardner (NG)
Tony Jones QC (TJ)
Troy Johnston (TAJ)
Jonathan Tweedie, Vice-Chairman (VC)

	Subject	Raised by	Additional Documents	Decision
1	Chairman's Introduction	Chairman		
1.1	The Chairman welcomed Lt Ray Gidney RN to his first meeting as the RN's representative on the Governing Body. Following the Chairman's request all in attendance introduced themselves to RG.			
1.2	The Chairman noted that the Company Secretary, Susan Duthie had left SVR the previous day. He commented that Susan had played an instrumental role in completing the complex and detailed requirements during the merger of SVR and Scottish Veterans Housing Association. He had spoken to her the previous day to thank her for her work and support of SVR. He also noted that the Head Office Administrator, Joanna Milne, was moving on to a new role with the Scottish Government.			
1.3	He wished both every success in their future careers.			

2	Apologies	CEO		Noted
	Apologies had been received from Sue Bomphray, Neil Gardner, Tony Jones, Troy Johnston, and Jonathan Tweedie. The Chairman confirmed that the meeting remained quorate.			
3	Previous Minutes	Chairman	Minutes	Approved
	Minutes of the Governing Body Meeting of SVR held on 3 Sep 21 were reviewed and accepted as an accurate record of the meeting. There were no matters arising. Minutes accepted: Proposed by: Sandy Telfer Seconded by: Isla Tabberer			
4	Action Log	Chairman		
4.1	<p>The CEO reviewed progress against each serial of the Governing Body's Action Log:</p> <p>55. Risk Management Policy – 2 managers had completed the IOSH course. One further manager still to complete.</p> <p>63. Whitefoord House Bowling Green redevelopment – Close Action. The development of the Bowling Green into a garden has been postponed. The requirements of improving the energy and thermal efficiency of the campus and achieving net carbon zero are not fully understood, and until these are confirmed, the bowling green site should not developed as it could be required to site alternative power/heating sources.</p> <p>66. Service updates – CEO had provided a template – Close Action.</p> <p>71. TV advertising – 2 videos remain available for broadcast at a suitable time.</p> <p>73. Bellrock Close Review – Discrete Action Log initiated – Close Action.</p> <p>74. Art Club Business Plan – To assist ACVC in the short-term, the IRFC agreed for SVR to pay lease upfront. SVR will sub-let premises to ACVC and reclaim lease costs – Close Action.</p> <p>75. Voids – DCEO to present paper to help address this issue.</p> <p>77. 10% civilian resident ceiling dispensation – now embedded – Close Action.</p> <p>78. Rosendael Lodge – now occupied by Afghan family – Close Action.</p> <p>79. Community Placement Scheme – Company Secretary had written to Scottish Prison Service to withdraw SVR from the scheme – Close Action.</p> <p>80. Insurance cover of Rosendael Lodge – Insurers had confirmed they were content to continue to provide cover – Close Action.</p>			
4.2	<p>Bellrock Close Review Action List – the CEO reviewed progress against the open serials within the Bellrock Close Action List:</p> <p>Lone Working – Risk moved to Operational Register to be managed by SMT.</p>			

4.3	<p>Resident Drug Use – No tolerance policy emphasised to Bellrock Close Manager during induction and initial interview with CEO.</p> <p>Drug Prevention & Education – Risk moved to Operational Register to be managed by SMT.</p> <p>Staff Dynamics – staff structure to be revised in New Year with introduction of a Depute Manager. Individual training needs assessment and Collective and whole Team training requirements to be actioned following introduction of revised structure.</p> <p>Admissions Policy – now standardised across SVR.</p> <p>Policy inconsistency – Residence Managers now meet weekly to facilitate standardisation of practice across the organisation.</p> <p>Arrears – Bellrock Close Administrator now in place. Revised arrears policy on circulation.</p> <p>Voids – ‘storage rooms’ now emptied of abandoned possessions and available as accommodation.</p> <p>Employment – SVR strategy published on the intranet and staff can see that preparing Residents for employment is a strategic objective.</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement – Residence Manager has commenced meeting key stakeholders and referral agencies and is developing a referral network.</p> <p>The Chairman asked that the Action List retained both Open and Closed Actions until all had been resolved so that the history of completion could be seen.</p>
-----	--

5	Sub-Committee Reports	Chairman	Brief	Noted
5.1	Audit and Risk Committee – the CEO briefed that the last committee meeting was held on 26 Oct 21. The key issue had been acknowledgement of the Business Continuity internal audit recommendation to include Business Continuity assurance as a specific Audit and Risk Committee responsibility (within the Committee’s TORs). The TORs had subsequently been amended to reflect this,			
5.2	Investment Remuneration and Finance Committee – the Chairman noted that the last committee meeting was held on 18 Oct 21. An update on the investment portfolio has been given by Julian Rathbone. The VC had been satisfied with Julian’s assessment and responses to his questions. The Committee was content with the performance of the portfolio.			
5.3	Given the value of the portfolio, there had been discussion whether there was any need to realise any cash. Following JC’s reassurance to the Committee that sufficient cash was available to maintain the cashflow to pay for planned projects and required external maintenance, it had been decided not to realise any assets.			
5.4	The Committee had taken the CEO’s pay award paper and following discussion requested some further work. Committee members provided very strong recognition of the nature of the work undertaken at SVR, particularly that of the catering, domestic and administrative staff, and recognising the high levels of churn in the hospitality and care sectors, noted that SVR must remain able to retain staff. Consequently, the Committee wanted to make an attractive award to retain SVR’s			

5.5	<p>high quality staff. The Chairman noted that the award was generous, at 4% overall, but this was in recognition of inflationary pressure, was a retention measure, and the Treasurer had confirmed it was affordable. The Treasurer commented that the proposed award was a component of the proposed 2022 Budget, which was subject to Governing Body approval later in the agenda.</p> <p>Quality Committee – CM confirmed that the Committee had met on 2 Nov 21. He drew attention to 4 issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Committee wished to recruit a volunteer Resident/Tenant to serve on the Quality Committee. The CEO had undertaken to write to the Residents and Tenants to seek a volunteer. ➤ No complaints were received in Q2 and only 1 in Q3 (regarding catering). ➤ The Committee wished to meet quarterly and align its meetings to precede the Governing Body meetings to provide an appropriate information flow from the committee to the Governing Body. ➤ SVR was likely to benefit from project work that was being undertaken by GP trainees at St Andrew’s University, who were required to undertake Third Sector placements during their studies, 				
5.6	<p>CM also noted (following the resignation of Pippa Shields) that he had taken over as Chairman of the Quality Committee.</p>				
6	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;">Treasurer’s Report</td> <td style="width: 25%;">JC</td> <td style="width: 25%;">Brief</td> <td style="width: 25%;">Approved</td> </tr> </table>	Treasurer’s Report	JC	Brief	Approved
Treasurer’s Report	JC	Brief	Approved		
6.1	<p>Management Accounts – JC referred to accounts up until the end of September 2021, which had been circulated. He identified the principal challenge as the loss of income from void rooms, particularly at Whitefoord House, which had had quite a significant impact on the overall position. Rosendael had however, exceeded its income target, and Bellrock Close had managed to hold its forecast budgetary position.</p> <p>6.1.1 He commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There had been good focus from the Residence Managers on addressing non-technical rent arrears (Resident and Tenant contributions) and that good payment plans were in place. He also noted that the turnaround time for technical arrears (payment of Housing Benefit) was currently slow. ➤ There had been some savings in terms of staff costs, but he recognised the organisation had to be mindful of staffing levels, and seek to fill gaps where it could, to ensure it could deliver the service the Residents needed. ➤ He noted the perennial challenge of containing catering costs, particularly general food costs, which was subject to significant inflationary pressure. ➤ There had been some additional overheads relating to the Digital Transformation Programme (DTP) expenditure, but he was content with what was being done and that the organisation was beginning to see the benefit through better quality management information. <p>6.1.2 Fundamentally however, the organisation’s financial performance was most affected by the loss of income from accommodation voids.</p> <p>6.2 Cashflow – The Treasurer noted that the organisation remained cash positive, with £776k to hand at the end of September. He noted that the apparent operating deficit was largely due to a non-cash adjustment for depreciation of capital works undertaken over the last few years. He concluded that there was nothing further he wished to highlight and was happy to take any questions.</p>				

6.2.1	ST asked to what extent did SVR need to take steps to secure a viable financial position given the current inflationary pressures?
6.2.2	JC responded by confirming that with one exception, Residence utility costs had been fixed with suppliers for 3 years just prior to the significant rises in energy costs. He noted the more collegiate approach of the Residence Managers was providing scope to find efficiencies and savings across the organisation, and that the DTP was and would continue, to allow better analysis of information to identify efficiencies. He also identified that, if necessary, SVR was able to delay projects (unless required for Health and Safety reasons), to offset significant material cost increases and secure better value for money as costs receded.
6.2.3	DCEO added that following the advice provided by SVR's specialist consultants, appropriate inflationary uplifts to the 2022 rent submissions to the Local Authorities (LAs), had been sought. This included addressing food inflation and the one remaining utility contract yet to be renegotiated.

7	Budget 2022	JC	Brief	Approved
7.1	<p>JC commenced by confirming that the Governing Body had received the Budget Commentary and the figures. He noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposed budget had been produced following a significant period of discussion between his staff, the Residence Managers, the CEO, and the Senior Team. ➤ The budget had been based on a 4% increase in rent levels but that the rent submissions to the LAs has sought larger increases, and subsequently if approved, would deliver greater income. ➤ It reflected void levels in accordance with SVR's KPI, but noting the recent historic levels, in particular at Whitefoord House, there was potential for some inaccuracy in the modelling. ➤ A range of other areas had been considered and that for these 2% inflation had been included, having taken the view that further savings could be found across the organisation. ➤ The key decision to be taken was the proposed salary increase, which was a mean increase of 4.0% (range 3.75 – 4.25). ➤ There was a proposal to spend £410k on major repairs and capital expenditure and the budget reflected the full in-year cost of these. There was, however, scope to defer these, or reduce the scale of those to be completed in-year, if it was identified that there was insufficient cash available. 			
7.2	<p>JC then briefed on the impact of failing to achieve the surplus forecast in the 2022 budget (due to void levels), the effect of depreciation, further income derived from investments and donations, all of which if the modelling was accurate, projected a surplus of £131k in I&E.</p>			
7.3	<p>For approval of the 2022 budget, he sought agreement for the pay award, that the rest of the assumptions were accepted, and that the capital projects would be undertaken, only if the cash situation was in an appropriate position and there was not a significant number of voids. For wider context, he confirmed that the cashflows had been modelled out to the end of December 2023, and with the capital expenditure, and everything else proceeding as forecast, the cash low point would be £400k in January 2023, which was the key message he wished to impart. He regarded this as a relatively strong position and was happy to take questions.</p>			

7.4	There being no questions, the Chairman confirmed that 2 resolutions were required, the pay award, for which a briefing paper had been provided, and the wider 2022 budget.
7.5	Decision: The Governing Body unanimously supported both the pay award and the 2022 budget and resolved to approve both.
7.6	The Chairman thanked the Treasurer for his work in putting the 2022 Budget and Brief together.
7.7	CM asked the CEO if he was able to provide any feedback on have the staff regarded the pay award. CEO responded that he could only represent the views of the Senior Management Team as they were the only employees who had seen and discussed the award, but they were appreciative, and comfortable with the differentiation of award (3.75% for SMT and senior support workers, 4.2% for RLW, and 4.25% for the remainder). The Residence Managers had thought that the award would be appreciated.

8	Residence Committee Reports	CEO & IMT	Report	Noted
8.1	Bellrock Close – SB had been delayed and was unavailable to provide an update. CEO commented on the excellent progress being made under the new manager, who was exploiting his considerable experience within the sector to good effect.			
8.2	Rosendael – IMT confirmed that she had met with the new manager and held a meeting with the Residents in October. She felt the manager was settling in well and had brought greater formality to the meetings by producing an agenda with the key themes to be discussed. She felt this had helped increase the number of attendees. The meeting had been in 2 parts; the more formal agenda items had been followed with a less formal chat thereafter.			
8.2.1	There had been the usual discussion regarding food and activities. Two key issues regarding the let of the Lodge to an Afghan family: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Several Residents had felt they had not had the opportunity to discuss the let of the Lodge prior to the family’s arrival. ➤ It was asked why the Lodge had been let to an Afghan family and not a UK Service family. 			
8.2.2	IMT recorded that the manager had introduced the theme of ‘Feeling Safe’ during meetings and discussions, in which he sought to discuss societal changes and expectations around behaviour, and what that might mean for Residents and staff.			
8.2.3	The next Residents’ meeting was scheduled for 17 December 2021.			
8.3	The Chairman responded by reminding the meeting that previous discussions had sought to ensure that the Rosendael Residents were very much to be included in the conversation around the decision to let the property to an Afghan family. He was quite disappointed that they felt they were not part of the conversation as it had been important to consult with them and gather their support. Either they had not been consulted, or chose to ignore it, or we did not consult very effectively. It was important for them to understand what we intended to do and the reason we were doing it. He noted that SVR had unsuccessfully sought to let the Lodge to a Service family over a period of 18 months, and having been unable to attract any interest, we had then decided to convert it into 3 self-contained flats. This had eventually proven to be too expensive and in the face of this and the lack of Service family			

	<p>interest, it had been the right decision to let the Lodge to the Afghan family. He concluded by saying that he felt we were able to provide the Residents with appropriate answers in response to their questions but that it was disappointing to have to do so in a reactive and not proactive manner.</p>
8.4	<p>CEO commented that he thought that the Residents' meeting had taken place at the same time as media reporting about terrorist activity that had been carried out by the (adult) son of a refugee family. This was a cause of concern for some of the Rosendael residents, as despite providing confirmation to them that the Afghan family had gone through security vetting in Afghanistan and on arrival in the UK, we had been unable to confirm the ages of the children prior to arrival at the Lodge. Given that the children were all primary school age or less, he hoped that concerns about the family would have dissipated.</p>
8.5	<p>Chairman stated that it was important to ensure the Residents remained onside and that a good relationship was maintained between them and the family, and a schism was not allowed to develop.</p>
8.6	<p>IMT noted that although there had been concern from some Residents, others had proposed sending a welcome card to the family on their arrival. CEO noted that subsequently several Residents had visited the family and offered a personal welcome.</p>
8.7	<p>ST asked if there had been any reaction or feedback regarding the family from neighbours and those living close to the Lodge. IMT responded that the Residents meeting preceded the family's arrival and the views of the neighbours had not been discussed. It was likely that this could be considered at the next meeting on 17 December. ST went on to enquire about the prospect of the family becoming integrated within the Rosendael 'Campus' and being able to use some of the facilities. He recognised that the age of the children might be a limiting factor. IMT confirmed that giving access to Rosendael itself had been inappropriate, but it was expected that the family would start using the grounds/garden by 'natural evolution'. All were waiting to see how the family settled in and how the relationship would build.</p>
8.8	<p>CM mentioned the scale of the number of Afghans that had settled in Glenrothes (100) with more in Dundee. He thought it likely that more would settle in Glasgow and Edinburgh, and it was useful to understand that this was a sizeable diaspora that would be in society for a while to come. The Chairman noted that one of the risks of accommodating the family, which we had been happy to take, was that we had set a precedent and that there was pressure in Edinburgh to find suitable accommodation for Afghans.</p>
8.9	<p>Whitefoord House – In NG's absence, CEO noted that it had been a challenging year in terms of void levels, but that encouragingly there had been a recent increase in enquiries for accommodation. He confirmed there had been an outbreak of Covid-19 affecting 5 members of staff, none of whom become seriously ill. Two Tenants had also contracted Covid-19 and sadly, one had died.</p>

9	CEO's Report	CEO	Report	Approved
9.1	<p>CEO referred to his written report and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The rebasing of Universal Credit by the Chancellor had led to an increase in the number of Residents making applications for hardship grants. ➤ Occupational Therapy student placements had been undertaken at Whitefoord House and Bellrock Close by students from Queen Margaret University and Glasgow Caledonian University respectively. These had been 			

	<p>useful and had added value. He expected that SVR would host subsequent placements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In progressing the Sustainability Strategic Objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Electric Vehicle Charging Points had been installed at all 3 sites. ▪ 10 members of staff had completed carbon literacy training and he had applied for accreditation as a Carbon Literate Organisation. He expected that staff would continue to develop knowledge and understanding of carbon literacy for SVR to become an intelligent customer and be able to identify the measures and action needed to achieve net carbon zero as an organisation and in our properties.
9.2	DCEO referred to the rent and capital works sections of his written report, which had been covered earlier in the 2022 Budget discussion.
9.3	Employment Rent Relief Fund (ERRF) – DCEO referred to his written proposal that had been circulated with the Board Pack. He briefly set out the reasons why the current scheme didn't have sufficiently broad eligibility and his proposal to extend the scheme to include potential Residents who were in employment and would not be able to claim full Housing Benefit, and to extend the duration of payment of the grant from 12 weeks to 6 months (extendable by the CEO given extenuating circumstances). He confirmed the financial and moral benefits of his proposal.
9.3.1	IL confirmed his support and gave a brief example of an individual for whom the ERRF would have been applicable. ST also verbally confirmed his support.
9.3.2	RE asked if there was any regulation that would prevent the scheme being applied. DCEO confirmed that SVR was required to charge the same rent to all Residents but was able to apply subsidies in particular circumstances, which should be time limited, and this had been confirmed by our Housing Benefit Consultants.
9.3.3	The Chairman asked why the scheme had not been implemented earlier. DCEO replied that it was principally a failure to appreciate the extent to which we were able to extend the scheme. Previously, SVR's model had sought to assist Residents into employment and then support them to move on to their own accommodation, rather than bring in already employed Veterans.
9.3.4	JC commented that from the Treasurer's point of view adoption of the scheme would see rooms being utilised for which we would receive income instead of empty rooms for which we would receive nothing, even if it was less income than receiving the full rent charge.
9.4	Decision: The Governing Body unanimously resolved to implement the scheme immediately.
9.5	<p>HER – highlighted the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SVR had received a sizeable grant from the Armed Forces Resilience Fund and a grant from the Albert Hunt Trust towards Covid-19 costs. Further general grants totalling c£7k, including one from the Caledonian Ball Trust had also been received. ➤ A 10-year-old who had raised funds on behalf of SVR would be featured on BBC's The One Show. This would include video clips of staff and Residents saying thank you, which hopefully would provide some brand awareness. ➤ SVR's Google advertising had been refocussed on to Edinburgh and Whitefoord House to mitigate the increase in void levels, together with some targeted Facebook adverts. There had been an increase in accommodation enquiries, but this was yet to be confirmed as related to the advertising. HER

	<p>had requested the Operational Teams to ask enquirers where they had heard about SVR and report back their findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A claim for compensation for an alleged data breach had been received from a former Resident. The claim was being dealt with by SVR's legal advisors who believed the claim had no merit. 			
9.6	Company Secretary – The Chairman referred to the Company Secretary's written report.			
9.6.1	He confirmed that he had had a discussion with the CEO whether SVR required a dedicated Company Secretary, or whether the function could be outsourced. He thought the latter option was the most cost-effective and that the financial resource saving could be directed to do other things within the Head Office. The Governing Body would be kept up to date with developments.			
9.6.2	CEO replied that he had met with Balfour Manson (BM) that morning and now understood the limit of support that BM could deliver in the role. On reflection he thought that with some additional delegation to the Operational Managers, outsourcing to BM was the better option.			
9.7	CEO confirmed that it was now a requirement of the SHR that RSLs maintain records of the protected characteristics of their trustees, employees, and tenants. SVR had now gathered this data, which was anonymised, and he would be happy to share it with interested members of the Governing Body.			
10	Service Updates	RG/CT/DM/IL	Brief	Noted
10.1	<p>Royal Navy – RG thanked all present for their introductions and warm welcomes. His brief covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The key personnel changes involving CDS, First Sea Lord and Second Sea Lord. ➤ Operations – 500 RN personnel had participated in Op RESCRIPT in support of Scotland's Covid-19 response. 43 Cdo had provided support to vulnerable communities consequent to the impact of Storm ARWEN. ➤ Personnel – With 40638 serving in the RN, this was the highest number of serving personnel since 2012. There had been 34% increase in Officer applications and a 28% increase in Ratings applications. ➤ The first Type 31 frigate had begun construction at Rosyth, which should provide a significant boost to local employment. 			
10.2	Army – CT was unable to brief due to a technical issue with his microphone.			
10.3	<p>RAF – DM referred to his written report that had been circulated with the Board Pack. He highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The number of programmes with RAF involvement concerned with tackling mental wellbeing and resilience but noted it was too early to see if RAF Veterans are better able to cope. The scope of RAF was widening with reference to resilience and wellbeing and had participated in the International Day for People with Disability. ➤ The RAF's Occupational Wellbeing Survey had launched in September and would conclude in December with its findings being used to inform and shape policy. ➤ RAF Charities were all providing support to various elements of the RAF family to cope with the challenges of the Covid-19 Pandemic. 			

10.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Annual number of RAF personnel leaving the service remains between 2300 – 2500 with over 90% finding employment within 6 months of leaving. <p>Merchant Navy – IL referred to his written report that had been circulated with the Board Pack. He highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The retirement of Peter Tomlin as Chief Executive of MNWB who had been succeeded by Stuart Rivers. ➤ Port welfare visits had recommenced following the lifting of Covid-19 measures. Grants of up to £500 to stranded seafarers were continuing. 			
11	Staff Wellbeing Survey	CEO	Brief	Decision
11.1	<p>The CEO explained the rationale for conducting the survey was an acknowledgement of the potential adverse impact of the Pandemic on staff wellbeing. It had been a paper survey of 69 questions with follow up interviews conducted by SVR's in-house therapeutic counsellor. 63 members of staff had completed the survey which was an extremely high rate of uptake. The principal findings were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 82.5% of staff were coping with stress, had a normal reaction to stress or were exhibiting eustress. ➤ 17.5% of staff presented a concern, were suffering from severe stress, or were very close to becoming extremely unwell. 			
11.2	<p>He had discussed the findings with the Counsellor to provide context and comparison for the findings.</p> <p>Putting the findings in context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The results were a snapshot of what the individual felt at the time. Conducted on another day the results may have been different. ➤ Some of the findings are indicative of overall life-stress and not that due solely to employment at SVR. ➤ Some of those showing elevated stress were those who because of their roles had had to be on site throughout the Pandemic and were unable to work from home. ➤ Some with a narrow worldview and focus and for whom their work-life is disproportionately important can find relatively trivial events to be major stressors in the workplace. ➤ Overall, SVR is doing well in comparison to similar organisations but there are pockets of workplace stress. 			
11.3	<p>In follow up to the survey it was planned to have small team discussions with the CEO and respective Operational Managers to identify with staff the causes of stress in the workplace and find solutions to mitigate the stressors. The survey will be repeated in 2022 as a commitment to staff wellbeing and to see if any changes have made a difference.</p>			
11.3.1	<p>The Chairman asked if SVR had an Employee Support Service. CEO responded that there wasn't a designated service but as part of the Charity's insurance cover, all employees had been provided with a confidential helpline phone number that they could call should they require support, and that in-house counselling was available if requested by an employee.</p>			
11.3.2	<p>JC asked if all staff were aware of the phone number. CEO replied that although the number had been published as a staff announcement on the HR portal, it was likely</p>			

<p>11.4</p> <p>11.5</p>	<p>that not all staff were aware of it.</p> <p>Decision: Chairman asked that 2 actions were undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ That the confidential helpline number was reiterated to staff; and ➤ SVR investigates provision of an Employee Support Service. <p>ST asked what, in the CEO's opinion, the stressors were likely to be. CEO replied that the best insight he could currently give was that for some, the existing challenges of support and social care delivery, had been exacerbated by the restrictions imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic. He hoped that by conducting the small team discussions in the New Year, he would be able to provide more accurate insights and he would pass these on. The Chairman added that the SVR findings were very similar to those being experienced in his business, and which were attributable to Covid-19 and the increase in anti-social behaviour across the UK, Scotland, and Edinburgh, and generally people being less kind and tolerant.</p>			
<p>12</p>	<p>Risk Register</p>	<p>CEO</p>	<p>Register</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>12.1</p> <p>12.2</p> <p>12.3</p> <p>12.3.1</p> <p>12.3.2</p> <p>12.4</p> <p>12.5</p>	<p>The CEO reviewed each individual risk:</p> <p>002/21 – Resident Drug Use. CEO had covered this during his Bellrock Close Review Update and subject to SB's agreement the risk was to be mover to the Operational Register and managed by the SMT.</p> <p>001/21 – Financial Impact of Covid-19. Reference was made to the ERRF, which was expected to add to the mitigation and reduce void levels and increase income.</p> <p>The Chairman asked HER if SVR remained able to claim grants for Covid-19 costs going into 2022. HER confirmed that the Armed Forces Resilience Fund grant mentioned earlier provided cover up to the end of Q1 2022. The Chairman asked if there was any indication that financial support would be extended into FY2022? HER responded that no new funds had been announced and she thought further funding would be dependent on how the Covid-19 situation continued.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that he had been briefed that the next budget was going to be very difficult, and it was very unlikely that any new funding would become available from 1 April 2022. Existing pre-Covid-19 structures were going to change, and it was quite a bleak scenario, which would only improve if there were big Barnett Consequentials forthcoming from the UK Government. He suggested that further investigation would be valuable as he suspected SVR would incur further Covid-19 costs into the middle of 2022. HER confirmed that additional staff costs had been included within the rent submissions to the relevant Local Authorities. DCEO confirmed that additional staff costs had been included in the 2021 rent submission and had been retained for 2022.</p> <p>002/20 – Infectious Disease. A further round of virucidal cleaning had been completed at Whitefoord House and he had earlier covered the outbreak of Covid-19 amongst the Whitefoord House staff. A local Environmental Health Team visit to the campus had been unable to provide any additional recommendations to the existing measures.</p> <p>002/19 – Business Continuity. Internal Audit had found a Reasonable Level of assurance. Action remained on the CEO to complete the plan and bring it forward for Governing Body approval. He would also arrange Business Continuity training for appropriate staff.</p>			

12.6	004/19 – Internal Audit. The criteria for transfer of the Risk to the Operational Register had been achieved and the Governing Body agreed its Transfer.		
12.7	004/18 – Data Protection and GDPR. The new privacy statements had been published and having done so; all outstanding actions were complete. The Governing Body confirmed that the Risk could be Archived.		
12.8	001/18 – Policies and Procedures. CEO confirmed that the policy suite had been transferred to SharePoint. The Tenant Participation Policy had been submitted to TPAS Scotland for a desk top review, with a report expected during the second week in January 2022.		
13			
	KPIs	CEO	Report
13.1	The standard KPI pack had been included with the Board Pack.		
13.2	The CEO reported that he had attended on online meeting hosted by the Data Lab Scotland regarding its programme of projects to be undertaken by MSc students from across Scottish Universities. He was investigating the feasibility of such a student undertaking a 12-week project with SVR improve data visualisation and design relevant dashboards. He would report back in due course.		
15			
	AOB	Chairman	
15.1	ST reported that he had been approached by the President of Archaeology Scotland with an offer for SVR Veterans to undertake archaeological activity, including Op NIGHTINGALE (an initiative controlled by the MoD, to assist the recovery of wounded, injured and sick military personnel and veterans by getting them involved in archaeological investigation), with the Society, and would this be of interest? He had forwarded the key points of contact to the CEO. CEO thanked ST for passing on the information and he would engage the Residents through the operational managers to see if there was any interest.		
15.2	Afternote: CEO and Whitefoord House Manager subsequently had an online meeting with the Society’s Project Manager who had offered participation in several ‘digs’ throughout Scotland. These are being progressed.		
15.3	The Chairman closed the meeting by formally noting the phenomenal achievement of the SVR staff throughout what had been another extremely challenging year and that he wished to convey the thanks of the Governing Body. He was particularly impressed that despite the heavy workload of daily service delivery, progress had continued to be made on improving SVR’s performance, processes, and governance. He also thanked the Members of the Governing Body for their time and energy. He wished the compliments of the Season to All.		
18			
	DONM – Friday, 11th March 22, 12.00 - 14.00, Microsoft Teams and Whitefoord		