

The Tutu Foundation (UK) Review into Institutional Racism at the Westway Trust

Annex 2
Community Advisory Group (CAG)
Minutes for the period
26th September 2018 - 25th July 2019



Author

Head of the Review, Dr. Habashi FRSA

Secretary to the Review, Christine Okiya
Strategic Director, Bevan Powell MBE

Independent Advisors to the Review, Dr. Bankole Cole and Charles Crichlow QPM



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (01),
 Wednesday 26 September 2018, 14.00-16.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (01), Wednesday 26 September 2018, 14.00-16.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorp Close, London SW10 5XL

Attendees:	
Alan Brown (AB)	Westway Trust Chairman (Co-Chair for Community Advisory Group)
Alex Russell (AR)	Joint CEO Westway Trust
Angela Spence (AS)	Westway Trust Board – Lead for Inclusion
Miss Lee Woolford – Chivers MBE (LW)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Malcolm Phillips (MP)	Area Manager Hestia (CAG Member)
Niles Hailstones (NH)	Chair: One Voice Community Collective / Westway23 (Co – Chair for Community Advisory Group).
Apologies:	
Bevan Powell (BP)	Inclusion Advisor to Westway Trust
Sakinah Touzani (ST)	Westway Trust – Adult and Community Learning Manager

In attendance: Nadia Habashi (DrNH)– Reviewer
 Christine Okiya (CO)- Secretary

AGENDA ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION NO:
1	<p>Welcome and Apologies (AB) The Chair (AB) opened the meeting at 4pm, welcomed everybody, and thanked all those who are contributing to the Review which he stated was an important watershed for the Trust and Community. He emphasised that the process must be seen to be transparent and forthright with the community.</p> <p>AB also outlined how the structure of these meetings will be followed i.e. item by item as listed on the agenda. AB then invited the Co -Chair (NH) to say something as the person round the table with the greatest history of the Trust.</p> <p>NH said it was an opportunity to get everything out in the open and form some kind of structure to deal with issues in the future. To ensure that things that have happened in the past cannot happen again, by having safeguards in place.</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 26 September 2018 (Minutes 01).



2	<p>Why a Review? Discussion and Q&A (AB and NH) AB invited NH as the person with the greatest history around the table to give a brief explanation of how this Review came about.</p> <p>NH gave a brief history as to how the Review came about. NH said the community felt issues raised in the past had not been dealt with and this needed to change. He stated that in the last 3-4 years aspects of community such as culture, were being eroded and therefore it was important to change the dynamics.</p> <p>NH said the last 3-4yrs of interaction with the community has seen the community and its culture being eroded. Those in the community that were experiencing what was happening wanted to get something in place to ensure it does not happen again. Over the past 3-4 years, these things have been brought up constantly, but the community feels nothing has been done about issues raised hence the need to change these dynamics and create a new paradigm.</p> <p>AB added that in the first 2 AGMs when he joined the Trust, he resisted this kind of process because he was concerned the process would bring allegations about past figures in the Trust, some of whom have left and others who are not alive and would not have the ability to respond. However, at the last AGM, he realised that a Review would not be about individuals but about the issue of Institutional Racism as per the definition. The issue of Institutional racism is a lot harder to recognise in society and a lot of learning needs to go on in this area. This Group is here to contribute candidly to the Review, and the Group should be pulled on any issues as necessary</p> <p>AR said DrHN and BP are working with the Trust to help the staff understand the Review. AR wants the Trust to embrace and be fully engaged with the Review process. The Trust has made a start to ensure the staff are fully aware of the Review and are fully engaged and up to speed.</p> <p>DrHN said her, BP and CO have attended staff meetings to explain the Review and during these sessions some important issues came out of the meetings including inclusion and wider diversity which will inform the Review. DrNH said we need the staff to be fully involved and to realise that this is to make the organisation better. DrNH, BP and CO met staff on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15th August @13.30 (Face to face meeting) with Equality and Diversity • 30th August @14.00 meeting with Westway Trust Staff regarding the Review, scope and institutional racism <p>NH said that for the Review to work, everyone needs to be honest collectively as racism affects all people in society in a negative way, due to certain stereotypes and notions that society has put on us, therefore the Review process needs to look deeper. People have to question their own notions as when this does not happen, then the Review becomes like a process that does not have any teeth.</p>	
---	--	--

2

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 26 September 2018 (Minutes 01).



	<p>AS emphasised that if the Group is not frank and honest round the table, then this Review is a waste of time not worth the paper it is written on. We have to acknowledge we need to be aware of any unconscious biases which we may have before we get started as this may affect what influences and advice we give.</p> <p>MP said the Review is refreshing and pleasing that this work has started and that staff have been included in it. MP acknowledged that this is difficult work, and staff may want to talk about it. MP therefore questioned if there is any ongoing plan to support staff as they may be affected in different ways.</p> <p>AR said this has been brought up during her interaction with BP and DrNH and they have discussed this issue which AR will take up. DrNH said the Trust should consider different avenues of what can be done to support staff.</p> <p>AR said she will pick this up, consult with MP, and set up an ongoing mechanism to support staff during the process of Review to include the period after the Review.</p> <p>NH reinforced what MP said and acknowledged that because of the issues that the Review may highlight and being aware of what is being done, it was important to consider how the review will affect people psychologically and said it was helpful that MP is on the group.</p>	01
3	<p>Terms of Reference (Dr NH)</p> <p>AB said the main point he has to make is that the Review is in a reasonably good place. Everyone in the Group was happy with what was covered in the Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference were discussed to include and make some amendments:</p> <p>Comment on Page 2- point of clarification – as evidence is collected should the Trust be asked to respond and can this be made more explicit. DrNH said this was more of a process and she suggested putting in an addition to the graph at the end. As there will be check-up points. This is the responsibility for the Trust to do as a response to the Review. The Trust and the Community will be given draft reports so the organisation will be aware of what is going on.</p> <p>NH said in this process, there needs to be some level of awareness as this may lead to how some of the processes may have been created. People should not feel like there is no space or place for them to want to share.</p> <p>AS wanted clarification on whether there will be points in the process at which the Reviewer goes back to the Community Advisory Group when writing the reports. NH said this has been missed in the past when previous Reviews have been done as the community has not been involved in the process. NH said we need a community oversight at all points. He said that the questions/request should be</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 26 September 2018 (Minutes 01).



	<p>copied to both the Trust and to the Community Advisory Group taking into account confidentiality.</p> <p>DrNH gave a quick Review of what is involved in the Review – to ensure the Group is clear of what is happening and what to expect. AR said the Group would want to hear all issues that people have and try and solve them.</p> <p>DrNH is to make amendment to the terms of reference to clarify this issue.</p> <p>DrNH wanted to know who is responsible for overseeing this process – this group or the Trust - AS thinks it should be the Group to maintain the transparency.</p> <p>DrNH said the Group will be given drafts at different points in the process as this is the role of this group to Review, which is important to ensure the process is being followed properly. The Group agreed that in order for people to have confidence in the process, it needs to be transparent.</p> <p>DrNH to amend the Terms of Reference and also the graph showing the Review process to capture the agreed .</p> <p>NH asked if the definition of Institutional Racism can be amended. The Group agreed that this is a good idea. NH would put some lines together and email it to DrNH consideration. DrNH, said this will be a positive thing for the Group if an acceptable definition was agreed and used.</p> <p>DrNH is also going to raise the idea of amending the definition to the Review Advisory Board on the 27 September at their first meeting.</p> <p>AR suggested that the Group should have a meeting with the Review Advisory Board. DrNH said she thought this is a good idea. It was agreed that a date is to be identified in the second half of October.</p> <p>DrNH will put this to the Review Advisory Board on the 27 September 2018.</p> <p>NH will lead on doing a community response as the Chair of Westway 23 and One Voice Community Collective to the Review.</p>	<p>02</p> <p>03</p> <p>04</p> <p>05</p>
4	<p>Review Process (AB and NH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicity The Group discussed various ways of how we can best ensure the Review is publicised including ensuring the Review is well published and taking into account accessibility, when and how. It was agreed the publicity would be in the form of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Website - Written communication to all member organisations and resident associations in the relevant boards - Westway organisations 	

4

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 26 September 2018 (Minutes 01).



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mediums set out in the community - Physical promotion as not all the people we want to link with use social media. <p>DrNH to draft a text through this Group to publicise the Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We should talk to people in the society and capture their experiences. DrNH said this can be done through community events such as the 'Black History Month'. If it is contextualised properly this will help to promote the Review. If it seen as a learning and understanding aspect for the community, then this may encourage people to participate. - NH said it should be made clear what the Review entails, despite some people being uncomfortable. <p>AB requested that as CO is the main contact person, the Group need an email for CO. DrNH said this is being sorted with Tutu foundation</p> <p>Proposals for the launch to be put to the group within the next two weeks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members of the Group discussed how to get to the community. It was agreed this could be done through community venues. - LW said we should be cautious of how we talk to people in the community regarding the Review who may have mental health issues as this can infuse other issues which happened in the past. DrNH said she would check with MP before going out to the community to ensure the community have access to any support it may need. • Venues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggested venues include; Westway Trust, Acklam Village, The Tabernacle, Kensington and Chelsea Social Council, Venture Centre. - AR raised the issue of whether we need to invite people in order to launch the Review. <p>NH volunteered to check what space is available to facilitate such an event. The Group agreed that 18 October (within the Black History Month) would be a good day for the launch.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DrNH to get the papers to the group by 3 October and has requested these are returned to her by 05 October. 	<p>06</p> <p>07</p> <p>08</p>
--	--	-------------------------------



5	<p>Independent Observer (AB and NH) DrNH suggested that there should be an independent Observer at meetings of the Group for purposes of transparency. The Group will have a different person at each meeting. The Independent Observer will be able to comment on the process and give feedback either orally or through email.</p> <p>The Group is in favour of having an Independent Observer in terms of transparency in the process. It was agreed that it is a good idea to rotate the independent observer and this will be put out when the Review is published. The Independent Observer should know that they will have to observe confidentiality and in addition are bound by the Chatham house rules. The Group agreed to invite Rev Steve Duvall for the second meeting of the Group.</p> <p>DrNH said she would get in touch with Rev Steve Duvall to secure his involvement as the independent observer to the 2nd meeting of the group.</p> <p>AS asked about the timings of the Review. DrNH suggested the Review can be launched during the black history month the proposed timings were discussed and agreed as below:</p> <p>It was agreed that the Review would be launched on the 18 October 2018 @ 7pm. Public call of evidence – Monday 22 October – 03/12/18 opening of the portal 6 weeks 3/12, Interview stage – 7/01/2019 – 21/02/19 dependent on the number of pieces of evidence received. CO is not available for the second meeting, however the meeting will be recorded and she will do the write up.</p>	09
6	<p>Dates and Venues for future meetings</p> <p>The dates and venues below have been agreed today:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friday 12th October 2018 9.00am-10.30 Westway Trust • Thursday 13th December 2018 18.00 - 20.00 Kensington and Chelsea Social Council • Monday 25th February 2018 15.00-17.00 The Tabernacle 	
7	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>CO checked with the group if they were content with actions allocated to them. She also checked that they were happy with the template she intends to use for the minutes which include the co-chairs signing off the note of the minutes. DrNH – the minutes will be put on the portal</p>	

The meeting was closed at 4pm.

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 26 September 2018 (Minutes 01).



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (01),
Wednesday 26 September 2018, 14.00-16.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL

 NILES HALSONES

Signed:  Print Name: A. J. BROWN
Chairs

Date: _____

Part B

Action Points

Action points arising from the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (01), Meeting on 26th September 2018

No:	Action	By
1	A mechanism to support staff during and after the Review be set up	AR
2	Terms of Reference and the graph showing the Review process is to be amended as discussed in the meeting	DrNH
3	The Group agreed that NH would put some lines together in reference to amending the definition of Institutional racism.	NH
4	The suggestion to amend the definition of Institutional Racism to be put to the Review Advisory Board to the Review on 27/09/18.	DrNH
5	The Community Advisory Group to meet with the Review Advisory Board in the second half of October. This proposal to be put to the Advisory Board	DrNH
6	A draft to be written and sent to the Group for approval	DrNH
7	Proposals for the launch to be put to the group within the next two weeks.	All
8	The Group to check what space is available to facilitate the launch. The Group agreed that 18 October 7pm (within the Black History Month) would be a good day for the launch.	NH

7

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 26 September 2018 (Minutes 01).



9	DrNH to get in touch with Rev Steve Divald to secure his involvement as the independent observer to the 2nd meeting of the group.	DrNH
---	---	------



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (02),
 Friday 12 October 2018, 09.00-10.30, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (02), Friday 12 October 2018,
 09.00-10.30, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London SW10 5XL

Attendees:	
Niles Hailstones (NH) – Chair for the meeting today.	Chair: One Voice Community Collective / Westway23 (Co – Chair for Community Advisory Group).
Alan Brown (AB)	Westway Trust Chairman (Co-Chair for Community Advisory Group)
Alex Russell (AR)	Joint CEO Westway Trust
Angela Spence (AS)	Westway Trust Board – Lead for Inclusion (Trustee)
Bevan Powell (BP)	Inclusion Advisor to Westway Trust
Malcolm Phillips (MP)	Area Manager Hestia (CAG Member)
Apologies:	
Miss Lee Woolford-Chivers MBE (LW)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Sakinah Touzani (ST)	Westway Trust – Adult and Community Learning Manager

In attendance: Dr Habashi (DrH)– Head of the Review
 Rev Steve Divall – Independent Observer

AGENDA ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION NO:
1	<p>Welcome and Apologies (AB)</p> <p>The Chair (NH) welcomed members to the meeting and introduced Rev Steve Divall as the independent observer. NH said that SD had an understanding as to why the CAG was taking place. NH informed SD, that as an independent Observer he would have the opportunity to feed back his observations of the meeting to the</p>	



	<p>Group. NH asked SD if he had any questions. SD said he did not have any questions as DrH had taken him through the process.</p> <p>NH said he wanted to add to the agenda a minute silence for members to observe and remember those who have gone before us. A minute of silence was observed.</p> <p>NH talked about the relevance of the issue being discussed, the importance of October (Black History month) and the drive towards a push for inclusion and diversity. NH said there was a range of issues taking place with regard to race in the wider UK context, which made the work more relevant and the impetus for the Group to fully address the issues at hand. NH asked AB if he had anything to add to what he had said AB responded that he did not.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of the last meeting.</p> <p>The Group went through the minutes of the last meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All actions were completed. CO made the changes as requested. • The Chairs to sign a clean copy of the minutes • No more changes and minutes of the 26 September 2018 were agreed by the Group. <p><u>Actions points from the last meeting</u></p> <p>01 – AR has emailed MP regarding mechanism to support staff during and after the review and there should be something circulated early next week 02 – DrH amended the TOR and the diagram illustrating the Review process 03 & 04 – 03 & 04 – DrH contacted the Review Advisory Board regarding the definition of Institutional Racism - the Board suggested that the definition cannot be changed as the Review adopted the definition of Institutional racism as outlined in the Macpherson Inquiry. The Board suggested that if necessary the definition could be changed after the Review. NH indicated that he discussed the issue of the definition with DrH and is happy with the approach. NH highlighted that he wanted the inclusion of lines from Haile Selassie’s 1963 address to the United Nations and the United Nations Proclamation of the International Decade for People of African Descent to be added /referred to in the review Terms of Reference. AB highlighted that the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals to be referred to also. DrH to action these tasks and put the documents on the portal for reference.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>DrH to put these documents on the portal for reference</p> <p>05 – The community advisory Group will be meeting with Advisory Board to the Review on 30 October 2018 @ 3.45 and lunch is organised. The Community Advisory Group has been advised of the time and venue by email. 06 – A draft of the publicity to the review was done by DrH and has been sent to the Group for approval. 07 – Proposals of the launch has been sent to the Group. 08 – NH has completed this task of exploring availability of space for the 18 October for the launch</p>	01



	09 – DrH has contacted Rev. Steve Divali to secure his involvement as an independent observer.	
--	--	--



3	<p>The Review (AB and NH)</p> <p>Press Notice</p> <p>DrH stated that the Group has been sent a copy of the press notice and changes were as received from AR and AB.</p> <p>AR said she had additional points to make, which she read out for DrH. AR pointed out that the current edition focuses on services, which is just one of the things the Trust does but it is necessary for the press notice to say that the Trust <i>also gives out funding and grants and deals with wider issues of use of the land</i>. AR suggested that the press notice should include; <i>funding and opportunities to utilise the land, benefit from the land which is essential to meeting the needs of local people, to enable all people leaving locally to thrive</i>. NH suggested adding <i>“provide access to services, funding, opportunities</i>. AB suggested that these suggestions should be emailed to DrH for her to include in the press notice. AR also said the press should include that the <i>“Trust would like to become a leading partner with the community”</i>. DrH will make all suggested changes to reflect the conversation and share it with the Group again.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>DrH will make all suggested changes to the press notice to reflect the conversation and share it with the Group again.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MP pointed out that there are no contact details on the document. DrH said the contact will be via the Trust as the Trust is dealing with the press. AB wanted to check the title whether it should be <i>“from the trust”</i> or <i>“at the trust”</i>. It was agreed it should be <i>“at the Trust”</i>. • AR asked whether everybody was happy with AB’s quote. All agreed that it was a good quote. • The press notice will go on the Westway Trust website and Mat Bradley will be the contact for social media. • NH requested that the press notice says the <i>“important role members of the community have played far”</i>. • AR asked if the document should say explicitly the African Caribbean society. • The Group agreed that it should be about the whole community and not just one section of the community as naming a particular section would be limiting. • AS wanted to know if we are still aiming for the same time line. DrH said this is still the aim. 	02
---	---	----

4



<p>Independent Observer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DrH reported that as directed by the CAG, she contacted SD to establish whether he was willing to be the first Independent Adviser to the Group. The offer was accepted and the ToR and role profile drafted and sent out.• DrH wanted to know how we can take the role of the Independent Observer forward. The Group agreed that the first one will be selected and the role will be advertised at the launch and put on the portal so that interested people can apply by email to Christine and they will be picked on a first come first serve basis• AB suggested that if it is agreed round the table, then everyone at the table should put a couple of names forward.• As Toby is an obvious person, the Group suggested Toby is invited to the next meeting because as it stands he already has 4 votes. <p>Action</p> <p>Each member of the Group should put forward two each of people who they feel should be Independent Observers.</p> <p>Action</p> <p>DrH to speak to Toby and invite him to the next meeting of December and email him TOR and job profile for the Independent Observer.</p> <p>Narrative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DrH said she had written a narrative which is a big document that one can pull information from whenever needed. DrH would like to make final amendments so the narrative can go on the website. All changes from today's meeting will be reflected in the narrative.• DrH said one thing is that timescales will be affected by the number of people who will submit evidence and request interviews. We will not know what the timescales are as these will be impacted by the number of submissions and interviews.• The issue of including people's names in the narrative was brought up. AB said he is concerned that some of the people whose names are raised in the document are unable to defend themselves. DrH said these names are on the Trust's website so these names can be found when one accesses the website. The Group acknowledged that this is something to look at, but agreed that these names will keep coming up especially as the review progresses as these names are in the public domain.	<p>03</p> <p>04</p>
---	---------------------



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was suggested that we could ask individuals who are around how they feel about their names being included in the review or otherwise the names will have to be redacted, or abbreviated, though we know that the review will be specific. AS said, there is a difference when we are recording what was said in a public meeting as opposed to saying we are investigating someone. • MP asked if there is any benefit of including names in the narrative and said he is happy for the narrative to be redacted. MP suggested that in the narrative all names are redacted while in the review specific references can be made. • NH asked the Group to make a decision if they want to be specific in the narrative. • DrH will provide options from which the Group will pick the best option taking into account transparency and accountability. She will get the revised narrative out to the Group tomorrow. • NH said the Group should invite the community to share their experiences and perceptions. AR reminded the Group that this was agreed after the last meeting. This was sent through email. • The Group had no further questions <p>Action DrH is going to write the narrative with options and present it to the Group.</p> <p>Action DrH will insert experiences and perceptions in the document. DrH will reset the document and send it back to the Group.</p> <p>Community Flyer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group were unable to discuss the community flyer till the narrative has been concluded. 	<p>05</p> <p>06</p>
--	--	---------------------



4	<p>The Review Launch (AR NH DrH)</p> <p>Launch Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NH said the Group definitely needed to look at the date for the launch• AB said that it was important for the Group to discuss the launch date. Whilst there was a tentative date, he questioned whether it could be achieved. NH explained that if the date were to be revised, consideration would need to be given as to the next suitable date to ensure momentum for the review was retained. He highlighted, that it is better to work towards that date with less time and work harder, rather than to push it back to a place where it would further delay the process.• MP said the launch could take place at the same time as the launch of the portal. DrH said the Portal is ready though not for submissions.• AR highlighted concern that people may not be given adequate time for the launch. She stated that the launch could be undertaken on 18.10.18 whilst the launch event could be undertaken at a later date. She explained that the launch was about disseminating information on the website, whilst the launch event was about providing people with information about the review and process and encouraging people to participate in it. As such consideration should be given to providing more lead in time for the launch event.• MP said that in a sense the Group is working to a future where there is transformation and access and should therefore not look at this in isolation to the review of institutional racism.• BP further said that the Group is working to a Trust which is able to be the best community partner it can be. Part of this is about rebuilding the trust, confidence of the community and ensuring that its legitimacy is not questionable.• The Group agreed that the launch and launch event should be kept 'tight'. If necessary it should be delayed by a week. MP said the Review is the key to a healing process – If this is done in the Black History month, the Group needs to give itself time to let this sink in. Time should be given to make this happen.• AB questioned whether if the Group went with the date of the 18 October 2018 whether a significant number would attend.• The Group discussed and agreed the 29 October 2018 as a possible date for the formal launch. NH said it will be good to do something in the community telling them what we are doing – 'a soft launch' – a community gathering.
---	---

7



- DrH stated that the portal would be accept submissions on 29 October 2018.

Press and Publicity

- AB explained that whilst it was important for the review to be publicised, it would not be helpful if launch was hijacked by the press or activists who were not from the community. It was important to have all appropriate channels available to reach the intended audience. NH agreed with AB, and explained that it was difficult to codify, due to the nature of the issues under examination. AB stated that in work of this nature, there is a standardised response to questions which may be asked. He wondered whether this arrangement could be adopted. DrH explained that FAQs were written and circulated. AB said it was important to re look at the FAQs. DrH to have another look at FAQs. It was agreed that there should be a standard response to the press.
- MP stressed that it was important for clarity of the nature of what was intended to be achieved. He stated that the focus was on local press and local media. However, once the process had been completed then it needed to have wider publicity, which could be used to celebrate achievements. The initial launch is concerned with listening to people from the local community.
- AR said that if the Group was to undertake national press now, there is a possibility that it could lose control of what it is trying to achieve and potentially undermine what is being done.
- AS stated that there is an assumption that standardised yet adaptable statements for the media were available to ensure members have correct responses to hand for national and local media. She agreed that the focus should be one of an awareness of the national context where the review had a transformative role.
- AB suggested there should be a further review of the FAQs, to make sure that the CAG was content that the right questions were asked and that the right responses were provided.
- It was discussed that standardised lines would bring suspicion from the community. In reality the situation is bigger than that. NH stated that he himself needs to be trusted by the community and that he cannot stop being himself because of the review. NH made it clear that he will still operate as a member of the community and still needs to engage with the community.
- AB pointed out that the reason for the FAQs is not for the whole Group to use them robotically, but for each one in the Group to put the responses in their own words when responding to questions.



	<p>Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The whole Group to have another look at the FAQs to ensure they have enough questions and correct responses. Send any additional FAQs to DrH. • DrH asked what members thought was the vision statement of the review. NH said this was a challenge as this work had never been undertaken before. AS stated that the information in the press notice and part of the discussion articulated by BP was part of the vision statement. • Dates for the launch: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community gathering 18 October 2018 – casual just for the community - Full launch 29 October • NH informed members that he would be taking part in the radio conversation with Piers. AB welcomed this and said it was a positive element of publicity for the review. The Group agreed that NH should highlight the review launch and dates. Invitations for the launch will be sent out by the Trust. <p>Invitations</p> <p>Action</p> <p>AR and Gary to speak to DrH about content of the invitations. If there is anything else that comes up should be sent by email to the Group members.</p>	<p>07</p> <p>08</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>The Secure Portal (AB and NH)</p> <p>The secure portal which is ready for public view can be accessed at https://www.tutufoundationuk.org/the-review. All documents developed as part of the review will be uploaded onto the portal. To ensure that the submission process is secure individuals, will need to upload their submission via a google email account.</p> <p>The Group understood the rationale for the Gmail account, however, they accepted that this could exclude people from the submission process. NH said he would be able to provide extra support to those who wanted to submit evidence, yet did not have google accounts. He said that as a community organisation, the community can go through the Village and they will put it through the Portal. The community event is a good start for how this can be done. The portal will be up and running on the 29 October 2018.</p>	



6	<p>Dates and Venues for future meetings</p> <p>The dates and venues below have been agreed today:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wednesday 12th December 2018 18.00 - 20.00 Kensington and Chelsea Social Council • Monday 25th February 2018 15.00-17.00 The Tabernacle 	
7	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	

The meeting was closed at 10.30

Part B

Signed:  Print Name: A.J. BROWN

.....  NILES HALSTON

Action Points

Action points arising from the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (02), Meeting on of 12 October 2018

No:	Action	By
01	DrH to align the terms of reference with the various UN declarations	DrH
02	DrH will make all suggested changes to the press notice to reflect the conversation and share it with the Group again	DrH
03	Each member of the Group should put forward two each of people who they feel should be Independent Observers.	CAG
04	DrH to speak to Toby and invite him to the next meeting of December and email him TOR and job profile for the Independent Observer.	DrH
05	DrH will provide options for writing inclusion/non-inclusion of the names in the narrative from which the Group will pick the best option taking into account transparency and accountability. She will get the revised narrative out to the Group tomorrow.	DrH



06	DrH will insert experiences and perceptions in the document. DrH will reset the document and send it back to the Group. The Group had no further questions	DrH
07	The whole Group to have another look at the FAQs to ensure they have enough questions and correct responses. Send any additional FAQs to DrH.	CAG
08	AR and Gary to speak to DrH about content of the invitations. If there is anything else that comes up should be sent by email to the Group members	DrH, AR, Gary



**Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (04), Monday 25 February 2019,
18.30-20.30, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL**

Attendees:	
Niles Hailstones (NH) – Chair for the meeting today	Chair: One Voice Community Collective / Westway23 (Co – Chair for Community Advisory Group).
Alan Brown (AB) –	Westway Trust Chairman (Co-Chair for Community Advisory Group)
Alex Russell (AR)	Joint CEO Westway Trust
Angela Spence (AS)	Westway Trust Board – Lead for Inclusion (Trustee)
Malcolm Phillips (MP)	Area Manager Hestia (CAG Member)
Sakinah Touzani (ST)	Westway Trust – Adult and Community Learning Manager
Apologies:	
Miss Lee Woolford-Chivers MBE (LW)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)

In attendance: Dr Habashi (DrH)– Head of the Review
Christine Okiya (CO) - Secretary
Isis Amlak (IO) – Independent Observer

AGENDA ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION NO:

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



1	Welcome and Apologies (NH) The Chair (NH) welcomed members and Isis Amlak (Independent Observer) to the meeting. NH informed IO that the Group will ask for her thoughts on the meeting at the end. NH stated that as per the Group's tradition that a minutes silence be observed.	
2	Minutes of the last meeting. The Group went through the minutes of the last meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All actions were completed. ST requested that the minutes did not reflect the discussion and that she did not suggest that a communications plan should be written. She suggested that it was probably Alex. Alex stated that she was content to 'own' the statement.• No other matters arising Action: CO to make a correction on item 9 – change ST to AR	01

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



3	Independent Observer to the CAG Isis Amlak is the Independent Observer to the meeting. She confirmed receipt of the TOR, role profile and papers for the meeting. She signed the Confidentiality Agreement.	
---	---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



4	<p>Review Update</p> <p>Dr Habashi spoke to the “update report” (circulated to members). This provided an overview of the work of the Review team to date with the focus on written submissions and interviews only.</p> <p>DrH highlighted that at the last meeting, the group discussed the issues and challenges around public participation in the review (submissions and interviews). The group directed that community engagement activity be undertaken. This has been undertaken and has been successful and increased the number of interviews and the levels of supplementary evidence submitted.</p> <p>DrH then gave an update on current status.</p> <p>Submissions:</p> <p>Dr Habashi reported that the team have received 10 written submissions to the Review via the portal. She added that she was content with the submissions due to their comprehensiveness in that they addressed the issues set out in the call for evidence.</p> <p>Interviews:</p> <p>DrH reported that to date, the team has had 54 interviews scheduled, of which 53 are face to face interviews, and 1 telephone interview. She said that as of 22 February 2019, 40 interviews have been completed. She reported that all interviews are audio recorded and transcribed and that interviewees will be provided with their transcript within two/three months after the interview process. She added that all transcripts and audio recordings are stored on the secure portal for the access of only the Review Team. The majority of interviews are taking place in the agreed venues as per the direction of CAG. However, Bay 56 has been deemed unsuitable for the interviews, due to the cold weather.</p> <p>The Review Team has received 7 requests for interviews to be undertaken out of North Kensington. All of the requests have been accommodated, of those requests one individual requested disability access parking which was accommodated.</p> <p>Interviewees have been grouped into 7 categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trustees Past/Present (7)• Westway Past/Present (12)• Stakeholders (7)• Community Representatives (19)• Member Organisation (4)• Tenant and Miscellaneous (2) <p>DrH requested an extension on the timeframe for interviews from the Group. This was due to the fact that it was likely that the number of interviewees would exceed 60 and</p>
---	---

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



that the closing date for the interviews was 22nd February 2019.

AR wanted to know if DrH would still be able to deliver the report as planned on 15th May. Dr Habashi said she would not be able to complete the report as the number of interviewees has increased. However, she would be able to submit an interim report with emerging findings. DrH said that through the interview process and as a result of the review of the written submissions a number of specific incidents, some around contested areas, have been identified. They require robust examination which requires time. DrH added that the transcription takes time and that it is difficult to code and identify themes until the transcription is completed.

AR asked if there are any cost implications with the extension of the review. DrH responded that there would be a cost increase as the costing was based on 20 interviews, anything above that would result in an increase. She added that there was an initial reluctance in community participation in the review which she felt was in part due to the history of the Trust's consultations and engagement activity, but that people are now starting to see that the review is different and this has encouraged participation.

AB stated that he was happy for additional time to be allowed as he always felt that the numbers of interviews would increase and that timelines would need to be flexible in the knowledge that there would be additional interviews. AB asked what members felt about an extension. NH said he was happy with an extension.

AR said she was happy with an extension of time, however she wanted to understand cost implications. AR said she wants to be sure that there is transparency for the Trustees.

AS wanted to know if there was a definitive deadline, which people could be provided with so that they could ensure they were involved.

DrH stated that there was still a lot to do, but that she felt that a further month for interviews would be helpful and that any additional interviews would be identified in March. She added that the maximum number of interviews she is undertaking is four a day. However the number has been exceeded on a number of occasions to fit in with interviewees preferences.

DrH informed the group that a good cross section of interviewees had come forward many of whom were central to the history of the Trust and key events.

MP asked if there are any areas/categories missing.

DrH said, in terms of missing she still needed to interview :

- Tenants – not as many as DrH had wanted as there are a number of issues around leases etc



- Representatives of Member organisations

DrH outlined that the issue of supplementary schools had been flagged as an area of interest and that the experiences of those who were displaced as a result of the creation of the Westway were crucial to understanding the history and treatment of specific groups.

MP suggested DrH should prioritise these categories in the extended period.

DrH also reported that she is grateful for the Group in terms of the establishment of the wellbeing process and that she had recently referred a further two people for counselling. Those individuals had been left traumatised by their experiences that they were not physically able to go near to where they once worked.

NH asked DrH if she felt that an extra month would be sufficient. DrH highlighted that she was conscious of two things. The Grenfell Inquiry which has been delayed for a year (which would likely have an impact on individuals who required closure) in addition to around forty years of people's experiences of the Westway. She highlighted that these factors were significant and that people could perceive that the review is an 'academic exercise'. However, the review stems from the development of the Westway which is a significant time period and it requires a significant level of thoroughness to ensure that the conclusions made are robust and able to withstand scrutiny.

Conclusion on extension period:

AB said the desire for people is for the review to take place for as long as it needs within reason and balance. An additional month provided a level of reasonableness and balance.

AR said the group could take stock when we get to the 25 March 2019 as there is further meeting of the CAG just after this date.

NH agreed that a review was needed once the revised date had been reached. If at this point there is a need for further interviews as a result of emerging patterns or issues which DrH needs to verify then this can be reviewed. NH indicated that he knew at least 10 people who requested to be interviewed. DrH said she is at 54 interviews, but she thinks the maximum will probably be 70.

DrH said we will have had emerging findings by May 15.

The initial period has been extended to 25 March with priority to focus on tenants, member organisations, supplementary schools, and people who have been displaced as a result of the building of the Westway.

DrH said, if the Group is in agreement, then she will put the new date on the website today. DrH said she will keep updating the document and send it through.



	<p>AR asked if we are putting this up publicly. DrH stated that the document had been uploaded as it was requested by a member of the community who requested an update about the review. The document was also made available at the AGM.</p> <p>MP asked whether the document was being made public. DrH said a member of the public had asked where we were with the review and so something was sent out. AB said while we have to be as transparent as possible, we also have to respect the process. MP said one of the side effects was that when AS uploaded the report on her organisation’s website, there was an influx of people demanding counselling. The Group agreed that all updates should come through the Group and that information on counselling would be sent separately to the Group.</p> <p>IO asked if the process was just adopting qualitative methods such as the interviews. DrH said that both qualitative and quantitative methods were being utilised; analysis of data in the area of staff and trustee recruitment, and turnover, awarding of funding and tenancies. IO suggested that it would be beneficial to ‘capture numbers’. She added that if this was done, then it should be done properly and not on tight timeframes.</p> <p>IO suggested the material should be supplemented with quantitative material especially if time is running out, other people can be captured through the use of surveys as well. DrH said her understanding when talking to people was that there was a preference for the oral tradition of engaging with the process. DrH added that she felt she had obtained a richness of information across a large period of time with different interest groups. DrH stated that whilst she felt IO’s point was a valid one, she did not feel that a survey would add much to the process.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>The Group to review whether the timeframe for interviews should be extended beyond 25 March 2019.</p> <p>DrH will do regular monthly updates which will be sent to the Group.</p> <p>(DrH left after presenting this item)</p>	<p>02</p> <p>03</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Changes to the CAG membership (NH, MP) – See DrH statement at the end of this item.</p> <p>NH gave background as to why DrH and BP were no longer going to be members of the Community Advisory Group.</p> <p>NH said he and MP went to a meeting after his return from the Gambia. The meeting was to discuss Bay 56, where NH expressed his concern about the disparity of what was going on. At the meeting, he explained that whilst the review was ongoing (NH) could still be arrested (without a lease). On the basis of that conversation, NH wanted to understand what could be done to improve the</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



situation. However, after the meeting, DrH sent an email out stating that there had been an agreement between NH and AR. This was not the case.

As far as NH was concerned, there was no agreement, it was just a conversation acknowledging work done and the basis of the meeting was about the current situation at Bay 56. It was not a CAG matter.

NH said the note and its contents was sent out by DrH as a result of the discussion with those present at the meeting. AR said she did not send out the email but believes DrH may have *'jumped the gun a bit'*.

NH said that the situation illustrated a lack of guidelines /impartiality. It came over as if an agreement had been made. If an agreement did exist, NH would no longer be occupying Bay 56. The conversation was about what is happening in Bay 56 and also to acknowledge the great work that has been done there. The conversation was about the current situation of Bay 56 and NH does not know how it became a CAG issue.

MP said he was invited to come to a meeting which he thought was a CAG meeting, and when he heard the agenda of what it was going to be, MP excused himself as soon as he realised it was not a CAG meeting. MP then expressed his concerns to DrH about partiality and keeping things separate.

NH said he wanted to make clear that they (NH) are illegal occupants of Bay 56 and they are not being paid for what is going on. The situation is part of the disparity of what is going on and what the conversation was about.

NH went on to explain that this is the basis on the decision to change to membership. NH said in terms of the CAG meetings, DrH will introduce her agenda items and then leave the meeting. She does not have to be involved with the rest of the meeting. NH said CAG have to keep its focus on this review and not on what may happen in Bay 56.

NH said, as far as he is concerned, what was discussed was an issue directly between Bay 56 and the Trust. NH said he had received some wording from AR, and they will have a conversation to discuss further. NH explained that, when AR said she was going to create a strawman he didn't think AR meant it literally. This was said in reference to the email AR sent him about the wording on a joint vision for the cultural space at Acklam. NH said in that email, there is not a single practical solution to the situation in Bay 56. AR explained how she understood the conversation to be; that her (AR) and NH had agreed a broad vision of how the space might evolve from what it is now to, fully formed functioning set of spaces. AR said she wrote up what she understood the vision they had discussed to be and then expected feedback from NH. AR said she had understood, maybe wrongly, that would be the basis for them to say they collectively share this vision and that would enable the signing of a licence, as there is a licence, but NH is not willing to sign because NH is worried about the next stage.

Christine Okiya. Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



<p>AS said when she saw the email from DrH, she was concerned as to what this had to do with CAG and also appeared as though a decision had been made in the middle of the review. AR reiterated that the email did not come from her, however, AS said there was an assumption as it came from the meeting with AR.</p> <p>MP said the narrative was that AR had made this agreement, ST said she could see how this may have caused confusion in it being a CAG matter as there was mention of healing rather than suggesting that there was something shady going on. MP said he was not implying that anything shady was going on, he just wants the Group to be clear of who is doing what, clarity of how things are stated on the agenda.</p> <p>MP said this leads him on to raise another issue. He said CAG does not feel like a community advisory Group, MP wanted to know whether the Group can have a conversation about expansion. MP stated that there needed to be a greater community feel. NH said that the Group does not feel like a community advisory Group, as it needs to have much more representation of the community. ST asked if NH and MP was suggesting some people on the Group should be removed or whether more should people should be recruited. NH said that more people needed to be recruited. MP said at the end of the process, if the Group is asked who was there, people should be able to see the community.</p> <p>AR suggested that more people and more credibility was needed and that there should be an open recruitment process where the community is allowed to decide who can be brought in. She said the Group could suggest names and people who want to engage should be given the opportunity. NH said as the community representatives, members on the Group should be allowed to recruit new members the same way the Trust recruited people to the Group. NH asked how AB and AR recruited to the Group from the Trust. AB and AR could not remember how they recruited, but AR thought it was because of the people's roles with the Trust. NH suggested that in the same way that the Trust selected people to the Group, the community should be given the same respect to select community members to the Group.</p> <p>NH suggested we should recruit 3 additional people from the community to the Group and this would make the community the majority which is a good thing.</p> <p>ST wanted to know what the recruitment process will be.</p> <p>NH said names will be passed through the Group. AB suggested that the Group decide names by email in the next two weeks.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>Names of those to be considered to join CAG, will go to the Group via email and a decision will be made before the next meeting.</p>	<p>04</p>
--	-----------

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



	<p>DrH statement in reference to this item</p> <p><i>"On review of the minutes of the last meeting in relation to the meeting regarding Bay 56. There were a number of misunderstandings which I would like to clarify. Bevan Powell and I were asked to pull together this meeting, which we did. As a result of the meeting, I was asked by those present at the meeting to take a note of the discussion and disseminate it to the CAG, which I did.</i></p> <p><i>As a result of this misunderstanding, Bevan and I agreed that we would no longer attend meetings of the CAG and that I would just present my reports and vacate the meeting. We have complied fully with the express wishes of the CAG. This has been done so that we cannot inadvertently influence or interfere with the process/decision making which is quite rightly the role of the Trust and the Community."</i></p>	
--	---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



6	<p>Request from WT Trustees to observe meetings (NH, MP)</p> <p>AB said he got a request from the Trustees to observe meetings. The Group wanted to know if there was a way of Trustees knowing what was going on without observing meetings, as they would not be independent.</p> <p>NH said he was not sure about letting them observe the meetings, but he would go with whatever decision the rest of the Group come up with.</p> <p>AS said, she believed the Trustees would get some assurances of the process through observing.</p> <p>The Group was in agreement that allowing Trustees to attend meetings would mean that many more members of the Trust would be in attendance, when the Group is working to have more community members on the Group. It was pointed out that the Trustees have access to the minutes which they can access at any time as they are on the portal from which they can follow what is happening.</p> <p>ST said the issue of the Trustees attending CAG meetings was one of fairness. She provided an example - at the last meeting when she suggested a member of staff attend as an independent observer, the Group was in agreement not to allow this person on as there was a possibility she would not be impartial and ST believes the same theory should apply in terms of scrutiny of the process.</p> <p>AR said there was another dimension that the Trustees were also councillors too.</p> <p>AS said as both her and AB is on the Board, there is an opportunity for Trustees to ask questions, where they need to know about how the process is proceeding. For example DrH and BP came to the last Board meeting, they had an opportunity to ask questions.</p> <p>AB said they have a custom within the Board that if a Trustee wanted to attend any meetings, they are normally allowed to attend. He felt that they just wanted this further extension, however, he recognised that this meeting is different.</p>
---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



AB wanted to know if there is any reason why they cannot have access to the minutes. The Group was reminded that the minutes are on the portal, and all are welcome to view.

MP suggested it would not be a problem if Trustees were invited to attend meetings but not as Independent Observers, but if they wanted to talk about how the review was going. This could be an agenda item.

NH said, as we already had a similar conversation in the last meeting, the Group is in agreement not to have Trustees attend as Independent Observers. However, it did not mean that the decision can't be changed in the future.

In conclusion on the point of Trustees attendance at the CAG:

The Group was in agreement that Trustees should not attend as Independent Observers, but can come to CAG meetings to meet the Group and ask questions etc.

Trustees should be made aware that they can access minutes

AB to give feedback at the Board meetings – this could be a regular item on the Board's agenda.

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



7	<p>Community Engagement</p> <p>NH said, we need to look at ways of how we can improve our engagement with the community. Most of the relevant groups and ways to engage have been captured in DrH’s report which she presented under item 4.</p> <p>NH said the Group should continue to do more community engagement.</p> <p>AR said she would touch base with DrH on the gaps that she needs to fill, and will support DrH to help her reach these groups which DrH mentioned under item 4; tenants, members organisations and supplementary schools.</p> <p>AS said she has a list of organisations which the Team could engage with.</p> <p>NH said the Group should use the connections that the Group has, as it is the responsibility of CAG members to connect as many people as we can.</p> <p>Action: Group to continue to engage with the community</p>	05
8	<p>Expenses</p> <p>NH said some members of the Group including himself had incurred expenses whilst working on the review and he requested help from the Trust for payment of these expenses. He said transportation for some members of the Group, (for example Miss Lee) would require assistance with travel expenses. NH said he wanted also to put in a request for himself, as he had incurred a telephone bill which has led to his phone being cut off. He wanted to know if the Trust can help him have his phone restored.</p> <p>NH said he is currently not doing any work whilst working on the review as they are in an occupied building with no resources, other than themselves. This is difficult as they are unable to do any other work while working on the review.</p> <p>AS suggested that time spent doing this work should be recorded. NH said the work they are currently doing is unquantifiable. AR said the Trust would clear NH’s phone bill, he just needed to provide receipts.</p> <p>ST wanted clarification on DrH position in relation to the CAG meetings - which NH clarified saying DrH will be presenting specific items on the agenda, but she is not a member of CAG. NH said DrH needs to focus on the review process.</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



	<p>AR wanted to know if DrH should be in the room when the trustees come to the meetings. This would depend if DrH is presenting.</p> <p>Action</p> <p>AR to pay NH telephone bill as soon as he present the receipts for the phone bill</p>	06
9	<p>Observations of the Independent Observer to the Review</p> <p>IO gave an overview of points from her observation of the meeting; She welcomed the fact that work was being done and there is a process in place.</p> <p>IO said it is imperative that the work is done properly, so if there is a need to extend perimeters in time and/or budget, then they should be extended.</p> <p>IO said, there is a need for people to feel confident, therefore we need to be guided by the process.</p> <p>There should be transparency in the process, where people feel engaged so that there is no question in future.</p> <p>IO said she agrees with the decision not to have Trustees at the CAG meetings as independent observers.</p> <p>IO said she also agrees with recruitment of more members to the Group. She said this review is a road to reparation.</p>	
7	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>ST wanted to know the next Independent Observer – she was informed that it is Emzee but Emzee is yet to confirm. The Group requested that CO should circulate the suggested names to the Group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AR asked about agenda items for meetings – it was agreed agenda items will be sent to the Chairs and the secretary. <p>The next meeting is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wednesday 27th March 2019, 16.00 - 18.00 @ Westway Trust, Downstairs Conference Room, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL <p>Action:</p> <p>CO to circulate suggested names of Independent observers.</p> <p>Agenda items for the next meeting to be sent to AB, NH and CO</p>	07 08

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



--	--	--

The meeting was closed at 07.45 pm.

Part B

Signed:  Print Name: A.J. BROWN

Chairs

Action Points

Action points arising from the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (03), Meeting on of 12 December 2018

No:	Action	By
01	CO to make a correction on item 9 – change ST to AR	CO
02	The Group to review whether the timeframe for interviews should be extended beyond 25 March 2019	CAG
03	DrH will do regular monthly updates which will be sent to the Group.	DrH
04	Suggested names of those to be considered to join CAG, will go to the Group via email and a decision will be made before the next meeting.	CAG
05	Group to continue to engage with the community	CAG
06	AR to pay NH's telephone bill as discussed in the meeting.	AR
07	CO to circulate suggested names of independent observers	CO
08	Agenda items for the next meeting to be sent to AB, NH and CO	CAG

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 February 2019 (Minutes 04).



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (05),
Wednesday 27 March, 16.00-18.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (05), Wednesday 27 March 2019,
16.00-18:00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL

Attendees:	
Alan Brown (AB) – Chair for the meeting today	Westway Trust Chairman (Co-Chair for Community Advisory Group)
Niles Hailstone (NH)	Chair: One Voice Community Collective / Westway23 (Co – Chair for Community Advisory Group).
Alex Russell (AR)	Joint CEO Westway Trust
Angela Spence (AS)	Westway Trust Board – Lead for Inclusion (Trustee)
Apologies:	
Miss Lee Woolford-Chivers MBE (LW)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Malcolm Phillips (MP)	Area Manager Hestia (CAG Member)
Sakinah Touzani (ST)	Westway Trust – Adult and Community Learning Manager

In attendance: Dr Habashi (DrH)– Head of the Review
Christine Okiya (CO) - Secretary
Sarah Tuvey (IO) – Independent Observer

AGENDA ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION NO:

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



1	<p>Welcome and Apologies (NH)</p> <p>The Chair (AB) welcomed members and Sarah Tuvey (Independent Observer) to the meeting. AB informed IO that the Group will ask for her thoughts on the meeting at the end.</p> <p>AB stated that as per the Group’s tradition that a minutes silence be observed.</p> <p>Attendees agreed that whilst the meeting would go ahead, as there was only one community representative present, decisions would be deferred to an occasion when more community representatives were in attendance.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of the last meeting.</p> <p>The Group went through the minutes of the last meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All actions were completed. DrH made a comment regarding item 5 of the minutes (lease of Bay 56). She stated that it was important that the contents of that discussion and the reason for the email to members of the CAG needed to be accurately reflected in the minutes. DrH said that she was tasked by those who attended the meeting to send out an email to members of the CAG regarding the meeting and its contents, which is what she did. <p>AB suggested DrH sends an email out to the Group, indicating what she wants to be reflected in the minutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No other matters arising <p>Action: DrH to send a statement to the Group indicating what she wants reflected in the minutes. CO to make the necessary changes</p>	01

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



3	Independent Observer to the CAG Sarah Tuvey is the Independent Observer to the meeting. She confirmed receipt of the TOR, role profile and papers for the meeting. She signed the Confidentiality Agreement.	
---	--	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



4	<p>Review Update</p> <p>Dr Habashi spoke to the “update report” (circulated to members). This provided an overview of the work of the Review team to date with the focus on written submissions and interviews only.</p> <p>DrH highlighted that at the last meeting, the group discussed the issues and challenges around public participation in the review (submissions and interviews). The group directed that community engagement activity be undertaken. This has been undertaken and has been successful and increased the number of interviews and the levels of supplementary evidence submitted.</p> <p>DrH then gave an update on current status.</p> <p>Submissions:</p> <p>Dr Habashi reported that the team have received 10 written submissions to the Review via the portal. She added that she was content with the submissions due to their comprehensiveness in that they addressed the issues set out in the call for evidence.</p> <p>Interviews:</p> <p>DrH reported that to date, the team has had 70 interviews scheduled, of which 68 are face to face interviews, and 2 telephone interviews. She said that as of 24 March 2019, 62 interviews have been completed. She reported that all interviews are audio recorded and transcribed and that interviewees will be provided with their transcript within three months after the interview process. She added that all transcripts and audio recordings are stored on the secure portal for the access of only the Review Team. The majority of interviews are taking place in the agreed venues as per the direction of CAG.</p> <p>The Review Team has received 9 requests for interviews to be undertaken out of North Kensington. All of the requests have been accommodated, of those requests one individual requested disability access parking which has been complied with.</p> <p>To aid the analysis of the findings, interviewees have been grouped into categories, which denotes their relationship to the Trust.</p> <p>The groups are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trustees Past/Present (9) • Westway Past/Present (13) • Stakeholders (9) • Community Representatives (25) • Member Organisation (4) • Tenant and Miscellaneous (2)
---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



DrH said an extension on the timeframe for interviews is necessary but this is at the discretion of the Group. DrH said the need for an extension of the timeframe is due to the fact that there are certain people who need to be interviewed due to a number of issues having arisen from a number of interviews and the documentary evidence/ submissions. This is so that a number of issues can be clarified. She outlined that a number of people have requested to be interviewed but that they have not confirmed dates as of yet. In relation to the issues identified, DrH said that she was unable to go into details at the moment.

AB said, everybody who wants to be interviewed should be interviewed. NH stated that he felt that they were 'almost there' with the process and that it was important that everything that needed to be dealt with is done. NH said it is therefore necessary to make another extension. He stressed that this should be the final extension and that this would illustrate that the review is not a tick box exercise.

DrH outlined that she has identified and approached five 'significant' individuals for interview. She added that in the event that they refused to be interviewed that this would be noted in the report. It was stressed that names would not be used but that the 'category' would.

The Group agreed to another extension of a month from today which takes the deadline to 27 April 2019.

AS asked if this extension will impact on the interim findings and DrH said it will not.

AR wanted to know if the interim report will be released without interviewing all the needed people. DrH said, the interim report will be released as the interim findings, would just be for the Group, it will be a first working draft.

On the issue of supplementary evidence, DrH said she has received over 4000 pages of supplementary evidence and is waiting for further supplementary evidence from a number of interviewees and also from responses to information requests from official sources. DrH said NH has also promised to provide some supplementary evidence.

DrH said there is an area that she has found in the supplementary evidence which she needs to review and this is taking a long time. Some of the information is quite old, going as far back as at least 2008. She said Martin Parker and Mark Lockhart have helped enormously in providing her with information.

DrH outlined that at a meeting of the Review Advisory Board, they discussed and agreed that they would develop a matrix grid to examine 'institutional racism'.

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



<p>Which would aim to ensure that the report was accessible and worked within the framework of the definition.</p> <p>The 'grid' would seek to populate the areas where institutional racism was in evidence at the Westway Trust (by way of policies, practices, behaviours and attitudes)</p> <p>AB said, it is fine to populate the matrix with written policies, but this does not necessarily mean behaviour are/have been racist. DrH said this needs to be done in an accessible manner so that communities can understand. It should not be too technical, but that it was important that people could understand whether/ the extent to which institutional racism has affected the Trust and the community it serves.</p> <p>DrH said this should be a way of practise. DrH said, they (the Tutu Foundation) are governed by the Macpherson report. DrH said they want to do it in an illustrative manner and maybe when she gives a presentation for the interim report, it will be more of a discussion as to how the position has been arrived at. . DrH said the report will be given to both the Community and the Trust and it's up to them how they take it forward, in terms of shaping it / how it looks, when it goes out publicly.</p> <p>DrH said that the reports accessibility was paramount for the Independent Advisors and the Tutu Foundation. She stressed that many people are waiting for the report, so things have to be done properly in a way that people understand in terms of what it means for them. So when CAG is doing their response to the report, it would be done under the framework of the definition.</p> <p>DrH suggested that it maybe necessary to do a bit of planning before the interim report is presented. This would ensure that the findings can be used in the most effective manner especially in terms of staff. Staff is a key group in terms of their morale as is the Board. She added that how this should be done should be a consideration of the CAG.</p> <p>AB said, the Group will be in a better position to make a decision on this after they see the direction of travel.</p> <p>AR asked if an independent Observer is needed at the meeting at which a presentation on interim report will be given.</p> <p>AB said his first instinct is not to have the IO, there however, the Group agreed to hold this till the whole Group is together.</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>02</p>
---	-----------

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



	<p>DrH will do regular monthly updates which will be sent to the Group.</p> <p>(DrH left after presenting this item)</p>	
5	<p>Co-Chair arrangements</p> <p>AB said he believes this is on the agenda as he is stepping down at the end of May. He made it clear that he had already said to AR and Mark Lockhart that he would not look for another term beyond the current term which was previously going to end on 30 September. He explained, that the Trust undertook a decision to conduct a 'big governance review,' the last one being five years ago and it just seemed right that whoever was going to succeed him should have the opportunity to participate in that review, so that seemed it sensible to bring his departure forward four months.</p> <p>AB said his resignation raised questions about the Co-Chairing arrangements. AB said he is very happy to be guided by the rest of the Group, but he has no strong feelings about this, he has previously thought maybe the thing to do is as long as he is the chair of the Trust, he should continue co- chairing with NH. If the Group thinks that's no longer appropriate, then that is fine by him. AB then asked AS's opinion. AS shared her opinion but pointed out that there is only NH present from the community, she asked NH how he feels about making a decision about this. AS said she felt that because AB has been part of the process and has built the co-chair relationship with NH, AB should try and see this through to a particular conclusion.</p> <p>AS said, obviously AB is not going to be here for the whole of the process, but she feels that for AB to 'drop off' now would cause some damage. She said that is how she views the situation, but that it ought to be a conversation where NH has an input. AB said, as we are in shortage of members, whatever decision is made, it will have to go to the rest of the Group. AB then asked how NH feels about the</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



	<p>situation. NH said he seconds what has been said; that as AB has started the process, he should continue for as long as he can. If it gets to a stage where it is unattainable, then the Group can revisit it. NH asked AB, how he feels about it on a personal level. AB said, he will be happy to stay till he finally leaves the Trust. AS said, the Group needs MP's input. AS said she recognises that there has to be a transition when AB leaves and so therefore, there will be a need for another arrangement. AS highlighted that AB being in the group sends a signal that he is committed to the process which he started. AB said a final decision will be made by the rest of the Group, NH said he will get in touch with others and explain what has been discussed to seek their opinion.</p> <p>Action: The Group to make a decision on Co-Chairing arrangements. NH to talk to other members who were unable to attend the meeting.</p>	03
6	New community members of the CAG	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



	<p>NH said they have spoken to a few people and explained the situation to them. He added that it was taking a bit longer as he had not been around to focus on the matter. However, he was now back and felt in a couple of weeks they would be able to recruit new members within the next two weeks.</p> <p>AB suggested this is done via email and that the new members should be in place to attend the next CAG meeting.</p> <p>Names of those to be considered to join CAG, will go to the Group via email and a decision will be made before the next meeting.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>NH to lead on recruiting new members to CAG NH to circulate the names of those considered for membership of the CAG by email.</p>	04
7	<p>Observations of the Independent Observer to the Review</p> <p>AB welcomed the Independent Observer to give her comments.</p> <p>IO gave an overview of points from her observation of the meeting;</p> <p>IO said that her hope is that all the interviews and all the other stuff within the Trust would become more transparent; the working of the Trust and other actions would be carried through. In the past, she has seen that what is discussed in the meetings does not transpire. She said that her hope is that this process will enable everything to be transparent.</p> <p>IO said she hopes people will have a better standing and understanding of how the Trust works so that people get a lot from it and that there is more truth in it. She said at the moment people do not have much confidence in the Trust. She added that she hoped that this situation would change as it would help everybody build a stronger community for both the people that work in the Trust and the community. Working together would have a massive value to the whole area, and hopefully that can be achieved</p> <p>AB said, he acknowledged right from the beginning that this work is just the beginning and that what is done after is critical. This is after the report.</p> <p>IO said sometimes, people can be thinking they are doing the best, but <i>'trying to offer someone butter who wants jam'</i>. Hopefully something better comes of it all. IO said the meeting had been shorter than she expected.</p> <p>AR said this could be because the Group has been working on this together for a while, so they have got a formula going and have built up trust.</p> <p>AB said that the meeting has only half its members in attendance.</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



	AS said that the Group is an between situation where not all information has been received	
8	<p>AOB</p> <p>NH said he wanted to express his view on the awareness of how things are done whilst the review is going on. He gave an example of the documentary. He suggested that the challenge of the documentary was that the community could be perceived as a piece of propaganda prior to the dissemination of the review report. The documentary would make it seem like things were okay. NH said this is one of the reasons why the documentary has been improved but it still needs further work. NH said the Group needs to be very much aware of these kinds of issues.</p> <p>AR said, it is not a documentary but a historical perspective of the Westway estate from lots of different community people. This has got lots of different perspectives from people, how it has developed over time, it's not about the Trust but about the land. The purpose of the recording is principally to help the induction of newcomers to the Trust. AR stated that she took on board what NH was saying.</p> <p>NH said that where it started off is not where it is now and it is not where it will end if it gets finished and 'put out there'. NH said that not everyone requested that certain information can be put on the documentary, he said CAG should remember that there is a review taking place at the moment and that things should not be put out before the results, as this may jeopardize what comes out of the review.</p> <p>AB said, he agrees with NH's point about the propaganda, but he also thinks when it comes out it should be done through the lens of the report. AB stated that he felt that the Group should come back to this issue.</p> <p>NH said he is using the documentary as an example of what the CAG should stay away from until the results of the review are out. NH said he was giving the group the lens of the community as the review is going on especially where he believes that the Trust is trying to undertake a damage limitation exercise. NH said the Trust needs to be aware of this as it can sabotage all the work that has been done.</p> <p>AS said that NH made a useful point and that it may be useful if the group thinks that if anything which is going out publicly which might have connotations with what NH is saying, it would be helpful to have a discussion.</p> <p>AR said the function of the organisation has to continue, and other than that, one of the issues which have been discussed is inclusion, which is not only about racism</p> <p>AS said she agrees with AR, but it's about a 'sense check'.</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (05),
Wednesday 27 March, 16.00-18.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL

	<p>AR said she has been sense checking with Bevan and she did sense check with Bevan about the documentary and he said it was fine.</p> <p>The meeting in May should have an hour added to it in case we need the extra time to discuss the interim report.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>CO to organise a longer meeting for the May meeting</p> <p>The next meeting is on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wednesday 17 April 2019, 16.00 - 18.00 @ Westway Trust, Downstairs Conference Room, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL 	05
--	---	----

The meeting was closed at 17.00 pm.

Part B

Signed:  Print Name: A.J. BROWN

Chairs:  N. HALLSTONE

Action Points

Action points arising from the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (03), Meeting on of 12 December 2018

No:	Action	By
01	DrH to send a statement to the Group indicating what she wants reflected in the minutes. CO to make the necessary changes	DrH, CO
02	DrH will do regular monthly updates which will be sent to the Group.	DrH
03	The Group to make a decision on Co-Chairing arrangements. NH to talk to other members who were unable to attend the meeting.	NH, CAG
04	NH to lead on recruiting new members to CAG	NH

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



05	CO to organise a longer meeting for the May meeting	CO
----	---	----

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 27 March 2019 (Minutes 05).



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (06),
Wednesday 17 April 2019, 16.00-18.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (06), Wednesday 17 April 2019,
16.00-18:00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL

Attendees:	
Niles Hailstone (NH) Chair for the meeting today	Chair: One Voice Community Collective / Westway23 (Co – Chair for Community Advisory Group).
Alan Brown (AB)	Westway Trust Chairman (Co-Chair for Community Advisory Group)
Alex Russell (AR)	Joint CEO Westway Trust
Angela Spence (AS)	Westway Trust Board – Lead for Inclusion (Trustee)
Clive Phillips (CP)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Anthony Chivers (AC)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Malcolm Phillips (MP)	Area Manager Hestia (CAG Member)
Sakinah Touzani (ST)	Westway Trust – Adult and Community Learning Manager
Apologies:	
Miss Lee Woolford-Chivers MBE (LW)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)

In attendance: Dr Habashi (DrH)– Head of the Review
Christine Okiya (CO) - Secretary
Marcia Robinson (IO) – Independent Observer

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



AGENDA ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION NO:
1	<p>Welcome and Apologies (NH)</p> <p>The Chair (NH) stated that as per the Group’s tradition a minutes silence be observed. He then welcomed attendees and introduced two new members, Antony Chivers (representing Ms Lee who is unwell) and Clive Phillips (Mangrove Steel band). NH informed the group that as Ms Lee can no longer attend meetings he will be looking for two women to join the Group. He highlighted that the difficulty has been trying to find people who are available to attend meetings and have insight into the issues. NH informed the group that he will suggest prospective candidates via email to CAG members and will try and recruit two female members of the group by the next meeting.</p> <p>The meeting started without the attendance of the appointed Independent Observer, Marcia Robinson. She joined the meeting later.</p> <p>Action: NH to suggest names via email to CAG members.</p>	01
2	<p>Minutes of the last meeting.</p> <p>The Group went through the minutes of the last meeting. The minutes were agreed and there were no matters arising. The minutes were signed by the Chairs</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



3	<p>Independent Observer to the CAG</p> <p>Marcia Robinson is the Independent Observer to the meeting. She confirmed receipt of the TOR, role profile and papers for the meeting. She signed the Confidentiality Agreement.</p>	
---	---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



4	<p>Interviews and Submissions</p> <p>Dr Habashi gave a brief update report (circulated to members) providing an overview of the work of the Review team to date, with a focus on written submissions and interviews only.</p> <p>Submissions:</p> <p>Dr Habashi reported that to date there have been 11 written submissions to the Review via the portal. She said the quality of the submissions is of a high standard and addresses the issues set out in the call for evidence. Over 5000 pages of supplementary evidence have been received. She stated that they are currently awaiting the transfer of 2 external hard drives of oral testimony and documents collated over a number of years.</p> <p>Interviews:</p> <p>DrH reported that to date, 82 interviews have been scheduled, of which 77 are face to face interviews, and 5 telephone interviews. She said that as of 12 April 2019, 69 interviews have been completed. She reported that all interviews are audio recorded and transcribed and that interviewees will be provided with their transcript within four months after the interview process. She added that all transcripts and audio recordings are stored on the secure portal for the access of only the Review Team. The majority of interviews are taking place in the agreed venues as per the direction of CAG.</p> <p>16 requests for interviews to be undertaken out of North Kensington have been accommodated. Of those requests, one requested parking due to a disability which has been complied with.</p> <p>To aid the analysis of the findings, interviewees have been grouped into categories, which denotes their relationship to the Trust.</p> <p>The groups are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trustees Past/Present (12) • Westway Past/Present (20) • Stakeholders (9) • Community Representatives (25) • Member Organisation (4) • Tenant (9) • Miscellaneous (3) <p>DrH said she will not be asking for an extension on the timeframe for interviews. AS wanted to know the update on the number of requests for counselling. DrH said we have a total of 10 people.</p>
---	---

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



5	<p>Expectations of the Review Report</p> <p>DrH gave an overview of how the emerging issues and the interim report will be presented. DrH speaking note which she read from to the CAG is presented in full,</p> <p><i>"This review has adopted a very rigorous approach and process. This was designed to be inclusive and participatory; to engender the trust and confidence of the community in the Trust's commissioning of this important work.</i></p> <p><i>Through the development and the involvement of the CAG, this has shown what is possible, when there is a commitment to address longstanding issues such as experiences and perceptions of racism.</i></p> <p><i>We are very grateful to the time and support of the Community and the Trust in the review. We believe that our current position, is as a result of a collaborative process between the community and the Trust which is underpinned by the importance of transforming an important part of the community- the Westway Trust.</i></p> <p><i>On the 22nd May, we will submit to the CAG and the Trust the emerging findings into the review into institutional racism at the Westway Trust. This will comprise the Interim Report.</i></p> <p><i>This will <u>not</u> be a public facing report.</i></p> <p><i>It is merely a report for the attention of the CAG and the Westway Trust. As such it will be restricted and embargoed from public dissemination. This is to enable you to understand the emerging findings and indicative conclusions. We will disseminate to you hard and numbered copies only.</i></p> <p><i>The interim report will support the discussions on your response to and handling of the final report. We respectfully request, that you seriously consider both reports due to the nature of what it is, a Review into Institutional Racism.</i></p> <p><i>This will <u>not</u> be the final report.</i></p> <p><i>The final report will be completed 3 months after the Interim Report. This is due to the fact that we are still interviewing and still going through a significant amount of information, which is central to the review.</i></p> <p><i>What I will and can say, is what the interim report and the final report, will and will not be.</i></p> <p><i>The interim report and the final report, will not name names.</i></p>	
---	--	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



For us, the primary aim of the interim and final report is to ascertain whether there was any evidence of the Westway Trust being institutionally racist now or in the past. The reports will be presented in such a way as to aid and help the organisation in its transformative process and its aspirations to be truly inclusive.

This review is a fundamental part of the change process. This review is the first part of the road to transformation to ensure that the Trust is inclusive, and relevant to all communities.

What we respectfully request and recommend to you is our approach, that at the meeting of the 22nd May when we present the interim report that there is no Independent Observer present.

This is on the basis that it is imperative that we ensure confidentiality at this important and critical juncture of the review process.

The interim report is for the eyes of the CAG. We respectfully request that the interim report is not circulated beyond the CAG. This is an important safeguard for the integrity of this report. We do not want it to be undermined in any way. This would do a great disservice to the people who have taken their time to engage with us.

For us, the report authors, the Interim report will show you the direction of travel, which the final report will take. It will also prepare you for your response to the final report and its handling.

For the review team, the CAG is critical to the new way of working of the Trust; accountable and part of the community. Therefore the CAG is a key part of ensuring that the final report and its recommendations are implemented and embedded.

It is our aim to complete the final report within 3 months of the interim report. However, we respectfully request that on submission of the report to the CAG and Trust it is embargoed for a period of 7 working days. This will give both the CAG and the Trust the opportunity to digest its contents and raise any issues with us, prior to its public release.

How the final report is disseminated to the community is a decision for the CAG.

However, we would like to present the final report to the CAG so that we have an opportunity to have an informed discussion with you about its contents, by way of a presentation and question and answer session. We respectfully request that Bevan,

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



Charles and Dr Cole also attend this session with myself and Christine. This would need a half day set aside.

It was agreed that the Interim report will be presented on 22 May, 15.30 – 18.30, venue yet to be confirmed. AR wanted to know if the Group will have a chance to read the report independently at the meeting, DrH confirmed everyone will have a chance to read the report and then she will take the Group through the report. MP said this could be a challenge dependent on the size of the report. DrH said the interim report will not be that big as it is just the emerging findings.

MP asked about the rationale for the interim report being presented outside the borough. DrH said, it is because of the integrity of the process and she also believes the Group needs to be in a relaxed environment to read it.

AB suggested and the group agreed that all mobile phones should be left outside the room during the meeting/presenting of the Interim Report.

NH suggested that a date be set for early September

Action:

DrH and the Review Team to present the Interim Report to the Group on 22 May 2019

02

The final report to be presented to the Group on Friday 6 September 2019, 10.00 – 14.00.

DrH outlined that the Group will have 7 working days from the 6 September, to develop a response. AR said potentially CAG should be able to start on a response after receipt of the Interim Report as there will not be anything new in the final report. DrH outlined that the final report would be detailed, comprehensive and long, but that it would not provide information which is different from the interim report, it would be just be more detailed and utilise some of the evidence submitted. DrH said, in addition there will be an executive summary as well as an easy read version of the report. NH said the 7 day period is for CAG to consider their initial response, the community will respond in a way in which they see fit, in the same way that the Trust will respond.

ST asked how the response will be formulated and whether it will be a Westway Trust response and a community response. NH said the Trust will respond and the Community will respond independently in the interest of transparency. He articulated that the community response should not be influenced by the Trust and likewise the Trust's response should not be influenced by the community.



AS asked if members of the CAG should agree an initial response. NH responded that if the community does not have its voice in the process, then it will look like the review is a damage limitation exercise.

NH added that it was important that there is an independent voice of the community inside the CAG because the community members will have to lead initiatives outlined in the report as the Trust has not had the tools to do this in the past.

AB agreed with NH and added that when the report comes out, the CAG will probably put out a relevantly short simple collective statement, and the community and the Trust will provide more detailed responses from their own perspectives.

AR said part of this process is to move beyond the Trust and the Community to being one. NH responded that he felt that this was an aspiration as it had not happened yet and so they had to ensure that the community is still autonomous in the process. AC asked whether this meant in effect that 'we cross that bridge when we come to it'. NH said yes. He stated that part of the problem with the Trust is of being unable to deal with these issues, processes and a lack of ability to being adaptable to what is going on. He added that what the CAG was doing, was something different. Therefore new processes have to be adapted instead of following old processes. NH stressed that CAG community members have to ensure, that what is done, is for the benefit of the community.

MP stated that it was important to understand that there were aspirations on both sides. The community has an aspiration that the Trust will deal with this in a certain way and so does the Trust, however, we can not guarantee this and cannot say how we are going to respond.

AS stated that as long as members remained flexible during the process. She stated that no one was saying that the CAG is to be abandoned straight after the process. However, there needs to be a mechanism by which the Group can keep coming back together to look at what happens beyond the final report.

She said that we could be in danger of a response from the CAG following the interim report looking staged to the community, but a joint statement could recognise that the Trust and the Community have worked together through the CAG and could outline the process the CAG has gone through. Beyond that, there needs to be some level of flexibility about what the response is going to be.

AR said the Group is working on the basis of Ubuntu which is the philosophy of the Tutu Foundation, which encourages us to work together to recognise our common humanity,

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



	<p>our connections and interdependence as fellow human beings in order to reconcile, emphasising what we have in common rather than our differences, working towards becoming more as one. NH emphasised that this is still an aspiration, he added that we are a long way away from Ubuntu.</p> <p>DrH said that an important consideration for the Group is the implementation of the action plan. DrH said one thing she is conscious of is how the report and its recommendations will be embedded and how the organisation will transform as a result of that.</p> <p>DrH stated that these were considerations for the meeting of May 22 and September 6. She added that as the final report will be a public report when it is published, the Group needs to consider how it responds to questions from the community. She stated that it would be good to have a conversation with them to explain why the report was written the way it is written (e.g. not naming names), and how the community and the Trust are going to go forward. NH said the work of the CAG will continue after the review has finished to ensure that any recommendations are implemented.</p> <p>ST suggested that, it was important for the group to have a conversation about what is meant by the concept of institutional racism.</p> <p>DrH said that the review is underpinned by the Macpherson definition of institutional racism and that the interim and final reports will unpick the concept and relate them to the findings. DrH informed the group that the review team are developing an effective framework by which people can better understand how this applies to the Trust. This can be discussed at the 22 May meeting.</p> <p>DrH left after presenting</p> <p>NH said the meeting will come back to consider the issue of Institutional racism later. He added that he felt it was going to be a very lengthy discussion and as such it was important to go through the agenda items and then move to any other business (AOB). NH made the comment that the framework of the review is around the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry definition of Institutional racism, which is within the terms of reference of the review.</p>	
6	<p>Conclusion of items from the last meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-Charing arrangements 	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



<p>The group discussed whether there was an agreement that AB would continue co-chairing with NH until he leaves the Trust at the end of May. All community members of the CAG agreed that AB should continue to co-chair until the end of May. AC wanted to understand how this will impact on the process. AS said AB will leave after the 22 May meeting after which she will step in. AC wanted to know if AS is stepping in because she has been around for a long time. AB explained that the proposal is that AS will step in, in the interim, after he leaves due to her capacity as acting chair of the Trust. AS said beyond the review, the CAG will need to be assessed as it may be decided that there is a need for a different composition and chairing arrangements.</p> <p>AS highlighted that it would be beneficial to review the Group once the report is out. MP said that this piece of work and the relationship with the community sends an important signal about the relationship of the Trust and the community, so the co-chairing roles should continue. NH agreed and added that whoever took on AB’s role, should be the co-chair and that would be the person he will co-chair with.</p> <p>NH said the only thing he would question, is looking at how the next meeting works after AB has left, as he felt and hoped that AB would stay till the completion of the review process. He added that AB chairing just the next meeting would not make much difference, but that the change would introduce a new dynamic. NH said that after the May meeting, meetings were scheduled for June, July and September, so it was important to start to look at the transition now. MP said as AB is leaving at the end of May, there are not many options, so the Group have to concentrate on the role and not the individual. AB will have seen the process through to the interim report. Once that report comes out, concentration should be on the role and not the individual. AC said that as a person who has just joined the group, he feels it could be a natural progression to move forward, after having seen the process to the publication of the report. AC wanted to know if anyone disagreed with the interim arrangements. Members assured him that no one was opposed, however the issue was brought back to the table because there was only one member of the community at the last meeting and a decision was needed from other members as well.</p> <p>AS wanted to know if we can change the meeting for June from 26/06/19 to 25/06/19. The group is happy for this change.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>CO to source a room for the 25 June 2019, 16:00 – 18:00 pm</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. New Community members of CAG – this item was covered at the beginning of the meeting. Clive Phillips has joined as a new members and NH continues to look for 	<p>03</p>
---	-----------

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



	<p>two female members who are available, willing and understand the issues involved.</p> <p>II. Independent Observer (IO) at the next CAG meeting (22 May 2019).</p> <p>This was agreed that there will be no IO at this meeting</p> <p>The next item is supposed to be Institution Racism but this has been moved to AOB</p>	
7	<p>Communicating Interim and Final Report</p> <p>The group agreed that this item was covered under item 5</p> <p>AS said communication of the final report should be put on the next agenda of the 25 June 2019.</p> <p>MP said the report should go to the community first, before it goes to the press. MP wanted to know what the impact of the review process has been on staff, he wanted to know if AR is feeling the repercussions and whether there is support in place to deal with this. AR said there has been training, workshops and conversations with different groups such as the Equality and Diversity group and different channels have been created. There were also regular updates. AR said Dr Habashi and Bevan Powell have attended a Board meeting to give an update on the process. AR thinks a second stage (workshop/training) is needed with the staff as it's a tough environment in Westway Trust. AR said the wellness package has been updated.</p>	
8	<p>Observations of the Independent Observer</p> <p>NH asked Marcia for her comments on her observation of the process today and how she feels about it</p> <p>IO gave an overview of points from her observation of the meeting.</p> <p>IO said, she felt the chairing was good. The questions that she did hear were in relation to community voices as opposed to the investigation. She said that the right to reply was followed up and put in place. She advocated for an open door policy and said that in relation to recommendations made by the review report not everyone would agree on everything. She stressed that it must be made clear that this may be the case and that there should be a level of flexibility on the negotiations wherever possible. She added that policing of the recommendations would be welcomed though it would be hard.</p> <p>IO congratulated the Group on a job well done so far and said the feedback was great.</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



9	<p>AOB</p> <p>The item on Institutional Racism is covered here. ST said that as an interim report is imminent that she wants to be able to psychologically prepare for it. ST said she believes that as a Group it would be useful to think about what institutional racism is in reality, (practical examples) because some people might have completely different ideas or perspectives. AB said that institutional racism in this process is defined by the McPherson Inquiry definition.</p> <p>ST responded that it was just a definition, but that something more definite was needed so that the Group is joined up. She said she would benefit from practical examples to capture some top line issues as to what the group thinks is institutional racism, in the event that staff ask questions.</p> <p>AB said institutional racism goes beyond direct acts of racism and includes unconscious bias, as it is something which doesn't just lead you to go the courts, it is more subtle than that . NH clarified that he is in no doubt what institutional racism means in practical terms. He felt that the discussion was more for the benefit of the Trust - in terms of the Trust knowing what it means in practical terms. NH highlighted that members of the community have experienced it and the majority of the community know what it is in practical terms.</p> <p>NH stated that he felt that the Trust is not up to speed with what institutional racism is and if that is the area we are talking about, then more work is needed. NH said he is not against training or doing workshops on institutional racism, but it is more for the benefit of the Trust getting prepared for what is going to come from the report.</p> <p>ST said she asked the question to aid her own understanding as a member of the Group. She said, as a Group, the definition has never been fleshed out and if somebody wanted a conversation about it, she needed to be confident that she could respond effectively, this was especially as she was on the staff council. AB suggested that slides similar to the ones used at a training event at the Trust last year should be put together and shared at a training/workshop event on Equality and Diversity. ST said that Institutional Racism was very subtle. AS said institutional racism is not always subtle, she gave an example of a recent experience she had, where her son applied for the Civil Service Graduate Scheme. NH said he is willing to help with a workshop, but it has to be done properly, he said he has done anti-racism training before and he knows how to present things in a certain way , he said, he is prepared to do that, but it has to be something official done with the Trust with a</p>
---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



<p>framework around the discussions which have taken place. There is a difference in perception in terms of what institutional racism actually is and what it is connected to, NH said from his perspective it cannot be separated from history. It is not just an act that happens which is isolated from history or all the other aspects that surround us. At the centre of this, are notions of superiority. NH said these are things that the community is dealing with. At the centre of all this, is the system that has been developed. NH said this is a difficult conversation to have, and he is willing to look at this, not just look at the surface without tackling the real issue.</p> <p>MP stated that the Group is trying to resolve something which is really difficult. But that it was important for everyone to be on the same page, something about us revealing something to each other and there is something about us having a difficult conversation and getting real with this issue before dealing with the report which is going to be challenging. He suggested that the Group does something together as a group prior to the start of the meeting of the 22nd.</p> <p>In addition, MP said there was something that occurred to him right at the start, the venue for the meeting on the 22 May. The Group were in agreement about having the next meeting at a neutral venue. The Group discussed OREMI, as an option and asked MP to check availability, if the venue was not available AR agreed to help with sourcing a venue for the meeting on the 22 May 2019.</p> <p>Action MP, AS and AR to find an alternative venue for the meeting on 22 May 2019</p> <p>The next meeting is on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wednesday 22 May 2019, 15.30 - 18.30, Kensington and Chelsea Social Council, 111-117 Lancaster Road, London W 11 1QT	04
--	----

The meeting was closed at 18.00 pm.



Part B

Signed:  Print Name: Alan J Brown
Chairs:  ALAN J BROWN

Action Points

Action points arising from the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (03), Meeting on of 12 December 2018

No:	Action	By
01	NH to look for two female community members appropriate to join the group and share the names via email with CAG	NH
02	DrH will present an interim report to CAG on 22 May 2019	DrH
03	CO to source a room for the 25 June 2019, 16:00 – 18:00 pm	CO
04	The Group by the help of AS, MP and AR to find an alternative venue for the meeting on 22 May 2019	MP, AS and AR

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 17 April 2019



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (07),
Wednesday 22 May 2019, 15.30-18.30, Linden House, Upper Hall, Hammersmith, London, W6 9TA



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (07), Wednesday 22 May 2019, 15.30-18:30, Linden House, Upper Mall, Hammersmith, London W6 9TA

Attendees:	
Alan Brown (AB) (Chair for the meeting today)	Westway Trust Chairman (Co-Chair for Community Advisory Group)
Niles Hailstone (NH)	Chair: One Voice Community Collective / Westway23 (Co – Chair for Community Advisory Group).
Alex Russell (AR)	Joint CEO Westway Trust
Angela Spence (AS)	Westway Trust Board – Lead for Inclusion (Trustee)
Anthony Chivers (AC)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Clive Phillips (CP)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Emzee Haywoode (EH)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Malcolm Phillips (MP)	Area Manager Hestia (CAG Member)
Marcia Robinson (MR)	Director of Just Solutions 123... & the Trees4Grenfell initiative; CAG Observer, now CAG member.
Nicole Belfon (NB)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Sakinah Touzani (ST)	Westway Trust – Adult and Community Learning Manager
Apologies:	
Miss Lee Woolford-Chivers MBE (LW)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)

In attendance: Dr Habashi **(DrH)**– Head of the Review

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



Christine Okiya (CO) – Secretary
 Charles Crichlow (CC) – Independent Advisor to the Review
 Bevan Powell MBE (BP) – Strategic Lead to the Review

AGENDA ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION NO:
1	<p>Welcome and Apologies (AB)</p> <p>The Chair (AB) stated that as per the Group’s tradition a minutes silence be observed. He then welcomed attendees and introduced the new community members; Marcia Robinson, Nicole Belfron and Emzee Haywoode.</p> <p>AB reminded the group that this was his last meeting and AS would be taking over from the next meeting scheduled for June.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of the last meeting.</p> <p>The Group went through the minutes of the last meeting. The minutes were agreed and there were no matters arising. The minutes were signed by the Chairs.</p>	
	<p>Presentation of the Interim emerging findings report and reading time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB reminded the group that as agreed at the last meeting, the emerging findings interim report would be restricted and embargoed, no electronic equipment was allowed and all phones and electronic equipment were switched off. DrH explained that this was to safeguard the integrity of the review, report and the role of CAG as strategic decision makers. • AB requested DrH to give a brief overview of how the interim report was going to be presented, for the benefit of the new members. • DrH gave a quick overview of the order of presentation of the interim report. DrH went through what was discussed at the last meeting. She stated that BP and CC would lead the session. <p>Hard and numbered copies of the emerging findings interim report were given to CAG members. Members were given reading time of 20 minutes after</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



	which the group gave their reflections. At the end of the meeting, copies of the report were collected to avoid undermining the work being done.	
--	--	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



2	<p>Reflections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MP stated that it was important to acknowledge and appreciate the difficult nature of the issue and the purpose of the meeting. He added that this was an important responsibility for the community after the last 50 years and that the process was an opportunity for the Trust to 'put something back', as the community are not happy with what the Trust has done and so the community have worked with the Trust to repair things. He highlighted that the community should view the report as 'sacred' and together with the Trust, they should attempt to begin a process of reparation to allow both the Trust and the community to heal. • NH stated that it is important that the history of the community is acknowledged, which is what he highlighted in 2015. He added that the report showed that he wasn't going mad and that it validated the concerns which have been raised over many years. • AB congratulated DrH and her team for a well written report and said this gave confidence that the final report will be well written. • AB asked a question about Table 1 and wanted to know whether the final report will include evidence. • DrH responded that evidence from interviews, written submissions and documentary evidence will be included in the body of the final report. • BP stated that it was important to recognise that the final report will not include everything. He added that the report and review process is very robust and that any challenge to its validity would stand up to public scrutiny. • MR asked if documents referred to in the report will be attached as appendices, she added that it would be easier if people were able to access the related documents in the report, rather than having to look for the documents themselves. <p>DrH responded that all public documents can be accessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NH stated that it was a well written report, which covered most areas of work. He added that 'today represents the day the community moves forward'. He expressed that he found it difficult to put it in words how he felt. He acknowledged that it would be challenging for the Trust, however, he also recognised that it was important for the community to be allowed to do what it (the community) needs to do in order to get to where the community needs to be. • NH recognised that the work as demonstrated by the report has been well done, he found that there is nothing in the report which was new to him. NH said the CAG and the community must make sure that this work 'counts for something'. He stated, that whilst he had mixed emotions, this was no longer a 'ghost' but a reality. He added that the report highlighted all the issues raised by the community. NH congratulated the Review team and acknowledged that it has not been an easy task. He added that the team were committed to making perceptions and experiences publicly known.
---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (07),

Wednesday 22 May 2019, 15.30-18.30, Linden House, Upper Hall, Hammersmith, London, W6 9TA

- NH stated that he was extremely happy that the TFUK undertook this work and that they understood how something like this should be done.
- AS said, in the conclusion of the interim report, the language of perception is not definitive, and also pointed out that on the timeline, there was a change in constitution in 2013. DrH said, in 2013, it was not a constitution review but a governance review. DrH said there is a reason for the use of the word perception.
- AR said she found the report very moving and she fully accepts what is covered in the report, AR acknowledged NH's contribution and everybody around him, without whom this work would not have happened. AR says she feels emotional about people who have had to suffer but she wonders how this report/information will be given to people who have been through this experience. AR said, she needs a bit of time to take the contents of the report in.
- AB agrees with AR about her concerns of communicating the report to the community and staff
- CP stated that as someone who has had issues with the Trust, he believes CAG should stick together otherwise having come this far, it will be a wasted project. CP said he realised this was racism from day one, and CP emphasised the need for the group to stick together and see this process through
- NH said they (CAG) will decide what happens with the group, and how things move forward.
- AB said, he agrees that CAG has to go on after the final report
- MR gave her commitment to the group
- MP said over many years, the community has got to a point where the problems are publicly identified. He commended, the report, said it is an amazing piece of work, he commented that he has concern with the Macpherson definition. He said it was important that the report acknowledges the willingness of the Trust for the review to take place. He said the work starts here and commitment has to be redoubled. He said, It's a pity that AB is leaving.
- AB said the governance review will, in thinking about the future recognise that the Trust should never make decisions in isolation, it should ensure the community is involved. CAG should be the right sounding board
- MR said the timeline in the table does not show the closing down of Acklam Adventure Playground which is a major event in this process
- DrH said the table will be much bigger in the final report and all this will be included
- BP said this interim report is to give an earlier indication of the direction of travel. He said for some people, it's not about the report but how the community moves forward collectively
- AB asked whether summary points of the interim report can be shared with the board or at least if a conversation about the report can take place
- AS said, this would be jumping the gun a bit, as CAG and the Trust need to look at it first and therefore, no information can be given to the board

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



	<p>yet. She asked what the expectation from the board would be if they were given a summary of the report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AC said if the board is expected to not say anything about the report, then there is no need to say anything to the board. He said until the group has the full picture, the report should not be shared • NH said trying to not leak the report to the board ambiguously is difficult • ST agrees that there is no need to mention the report, a summary would leave the board members wondering and will therefore not be helpful • AR expressed concern about the wellbeing of people especially the staff. AR said something needs to be done together with staff. If the final report is given straight away to the staff, it may have a damaging impact. AR said the Trust has the responsibility of people's welfare. AR said the group needs to start bringing all people together; the Trust and the community. • ST said she does not think the group should focus on the board, but should instead consider who should be first to receive the information – in order of priority • NH said as the community representative, the community members of CAG have to be the voice of the community, they are always going to do what benefits the community, NH said in the society we live in, institutional racism is a debate, therefore, it is going to cause waves however we present it. • AC agreed with NH and said the group has to be unified in whatever it does, and however it does it. He stated that Acklam was a very big thing in his life, and expressed his commitment by his perseverance to be at the meeting, for him this is a starting base and he intends to be here and hopes everybody else will be • MP said work has been done and has to continue • ST talked about an informative strategy for change, which should put the community at the forefront • MR believes the report will be leaked any way, whatever the group decides to do • NH said the report should be kept the way the group agreed, which is it has to be kept confidential till September. It's individual responsibility to ensure it is not leaked. There is no need to talk about it loosely. NH asked that everybody at the table has the integrity NOT to leaked the report • NB suggested that everybody in the room should sign a confidentiality agreement, she said the group should sign this agreement to ensure it is legally binding. • DrH said the Review Team's lawyer had suggested it but the team had decided against it as the group has been built on trust. • MP said that for this kind of work, there has to be a level of trust. The fastest way to mess this project is to talk about this beyond CAG and spoiling it for the community • MR said people will feel reassured about the confidentiality agreement • NH said he wasn't aware of the confidentiality attached to the group 	
--	---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



Capturing initial thoughts and recommendations

- NB said she was happy with everything in the report.
- EH said the Team just needs to check the times, for example when Sherraine Williams became a Trustee, etc, otherwise it was a well written report.
- ST stated that she felt the report was well written and that she needed to process and capture things which were impactful for her.
- NH said seeing things written down in a report is a big encouragement.
- CP said, if he was a Trustee, he would know what was coming from the report. He added that it was an important opportunity for the CAG and the community to use the report to go forward and not to stop. He stated that this was a part of a process. He recounted his own experiences with the Trust and the impact on him.
- EH asked whether it was possible if some Trustees did not know what had gone on both before and during their time as Trustees.
- AR asked the group how they felt the community and staff might receive the report.
- NH stressed that it would be a challenge for the Trust to engage with the community. He added that the historical facts of what happened is not something which is easily explained away and that the CAG had an opportunity to set a precedent.
- BP said that the report has happened, because of the work of everybody around the table. They have made it possible and the review team have got to this point because of their collaboration. He thanked everyone who has given evidence and encouraged others, to do so. BP stated that it was a privilege to bring justice to the community. BP said it is because of the community's resilience and campaigning, that the process has taken place. BP acknowledged that this has been a very challenging piece of work.
- AR suggested that there should be a framework - a grid which illustrates historical and current issues. She added that it was a 'lot to get heads around' and that it would be useful to take each piece by piece in order to formulate recommendations.
- NH stated that the procedure of how it is done links historical events and patterns over the timeline and therefore it is difficult to separate matters. He agreed that issues which are currently 'live' need immediate attention in addition to historical events.
- MP observed that some of the language in the report was challenging. He suggested that the report adopts plain English and also where possible, provides examples by breaking down words and concepts such as 'institutionally arrogant'.

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ST said in terms of approach, the report needs to be broken down. She wondered if there is enough time for planning the response and how recommendations are going to be prioritised. • AS said CAG needs more meetings in order to work out a way forward. • NH said there is a need to get together to plan the response. • BP suggested that the CAG make the recommendations, as the team does not want to undermine their role and work. • NH said he would welcome recommendations from the Review Team. This was echoed by AS. <p>DrH stated that it was okay for the Review Team to be involved but the recommendations had to be owned by the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AC said the group needs to work out how the information is used to formulate the recommendations. • NH said the group needs a structure to be able to capture all the information and dissect the issues. • AB said this can all be captured so long as all the points are covered, he added that this would be dependent on how it would be covered in the agenda. • BP suggested that CAG can produce a separate document with recommendations which can be presented to the stakeholders. • NH said recommendations will come from real things, practical issues and where it comes from specifically. NH said it is good that the Tutu Foundation is involved and their recommendations will have weight as this is an international organisation. • CC said, it would be useful for the CAG to think of a reparatory framework in going forward. Issues which they should consider would be ‘what does an apology mean; how to guarantee non – repetition; how to embed the history into the corporate memory; how to ensure the restitution and restoration of institutions which have been removed. • AC stated that it was important that the Board and the Trust were fully integrated. • NH stated that any framework would be based on historical events; • CP insisted that to ensure that history didn’t repeat itself, that there was a need for a structure which was based on something tangible. • MR added that the interim report will allow for limited recommendations. • EH said she needs time to breathe and process the contents of the report. • NB said at the next meeting CAG needs to consider a structure for setting up the recommendations. • CP stated that now that the CAG had got this far it was important to stick with CAG because of past experience. He said he will always continue fighting against injustice. 	
--	---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR said it's a good report, CAG needs to reflect on how to take people with them, in addition, the Trust's role with the council also needs to be considered . AR stated that she would like the Review Team's views on this. • NH said that there is a historical need to separate the two and what they represent. • MP said the interim report was a positive reading and he is inspired by being involved in this work. He said he is fortunate finding himself in the reality we are living in. He said he is by nature an optimist and having been there during the Stephen Lawrence inquiry, he said the willingness the Trust gave is very audible. He said this demonstrates a way the Trust and the community can be a beacon. MP said the group will need recommendations by the Review Team /TFUK. He added that the CAG needs to deal with the recommendations, without breaking them down until they are meaningless. The recommendations should be taken bit by bit and know that everybody they concern is important. This will be time consuming, but necessary. • MR said she agrees with comments from everyone in the group, and that she felt that the CAG would need more time to deal with the recommendations. • ST echoed what other members of the group said. She added that the report made her sad and emotional, but that the CAG is now at a stage where it's work is more substantial. • AS said continuation of the CAG is important and that the group needs to consider how this will be achieved after the Review. • AC said he was humbled by the responsibility which awaits him and the group and their work cannot be taken lightly. • NH said that 2021 will be the 50th anniversary of the Trust and that it was important for the group to celebrate that milestone with a new model/paradigm. The Trust was the first of its kind in the UK and was a model for others therefore it is inevitable that there may be issues in other areas. • AB said he had mixed feelings about leaving CAG, he was delighted when he read the interim report. He wished the group good luck for the future. <p>Please see Alan's official statement on the report;</p> <p><i>At the last Community Advisory Group meeting we received the interim report from the Tutu Foundation. The report is confidential but clearly indicates what we should expect in the final report due in September. I was delighted with the professional nature of the report which gives me confidence that the final report will be something that the Trust will be able to work with in conjunction with the Community.</i></p>	
--	---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



9	The next meeting is on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June - Wednesday 25 June 2019, 16.00 - 18.00), Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London SW10 5XL 	
---	---	--

The meeting was closed at 19.00 pm.

Part B


NILES HAILSTONE
 Signed: 
Print Name: ANGELA SPENCE

Chairs

Action Points

Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (07), Wednesday 22 May 2019

No:	Action	By
01	Charles was going to share his framework with the group	CC
02	Tutu review team is going to come up with some recommendations	Review Team

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 22 May 2019 (Minutes 07).



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (08),
Tuesday June 2019, 16.00-18.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London, W10 5XL



**Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (08),
Tuesday June 2019, 16.00-18:00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London
W10 5XL**

Attendees:	
Niles Hailstone (NH) Chair for the meeting today	Chair: One Voice Community Collective / Westway23 (Co – Chair for Community Advisory Group).
Angela Spence (AS)	Westway Trust Acting Chairperson (Co-Chair for Community Advisory Group)
Alex Russell (AR)	Joint CEO Westway Trust
Anthony Chivers (AC)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Clive Phillips (CP)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Emzee Haywoode (EH)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Sakinah Touzani (ST)	Westway Trust – Adult and Community Learning Manager
Apologies:	
Charles Crichlow (CC)	Independent Advisor to the Review
Miss Lee Woolford-Chivers MBE (LW)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Malcolm Phillips (MP)	Area Manager Hestia (CAG Member)
Marcia Robinson (MR)	Director of Just Solutions 123...&the Trees4Grenfell initiative, CAG Observer, now CAG member



Nicole Belfon (NB)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
--------------------	---------------------------------------

In attendance: Dr Habashi (DrH) – Head of the Review
 Bevan Powell (BP) Strategic Lead to the Review
 Christine Okiya (CO) - Secretary

AGENDA ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION NO:
1	<p>Welcome and Apologies (NH)</p> <p>The Chair (NH) stated that as per the Group’s tradition a minute’s silence be observed. He welcomed attendees and gave apologies received.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of the last meeting.</p> <p>The Group went through the minutes of the last meeting. The minutes were agreed.</p> <p>The Group agreed that in going forward, all minutes till the end of the review are not made public, until after the review. They will be placed on the secure area of the portal.</p> <p>Matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting have been placed on the agenda for today’s meeting.</p> <p>The minutes were signed by both Chairs.</p>	



3	<p>Reparatory Justice Indicators</p> <p>DrH stated that the Reparatory Justice Indicators (RJI), were proposed at the last meeting by CC. CC recommended a RJ framework for the consideration of the CAG. She explained to the CAG that the framework would be included in the final report. The RJI template was circulated to the CAG for their consideration. She explained that the template outlined practical outputs of RJ such as; apology; guarantee of non-repetition; restitution- individual/institutional and compensation. She added that the template also included practical considerations such as outcomes, monitoring and risks to non-delivery.</p> <p>BP stated that the RJI template was not overly complicated and that it provided the CAG with an opportunity to own and monitor the way forward. He added that the review team would not populate the framework, as this would be a discussion for the CAG to have amongst themselves and for them to have with the community.</p> <p>NH explained that the issue of an apology was ironic. That this was the responsibility of the Trust and that it should know what it is apologising for.</p> <p>EH stated that she was at a meeting where NH was previously asked to provide wording for an apology however, she felt that the issue is one for the Trust and is underpinned by responsibility and ownership. She added that the Trust must know what it is apologising for and that if it doesn't know what it is apologising, there is a problem.</p> <p>EH highlighted that as the review was about institutional racism, she assumed that a lot of the work being done now was to understand what institutional racism is. So that when an apology is needed the whole Board understands what it is. She stressed that the Board should be doing its 'homework' now.</p> <p>NH stated that whilst the Trust has the responsibility and ownership of the apology, it does not mean that the Group cannot have a conversation on what the Trust should include in an apology.</p> <p>BP added that the group should identify how particular points within the apology should be addressed and that the Group needs to sit down and work out the content.</p> <p>DrH and BP explained in detail the Reparatory Justice Indicator Template, developed by the review team.</p> <p>Formal public apology</p>
---	---

3

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review -
Institutional Racism, minutes (08), Tuesday 25 June 2019



	<p>It was suggested the Trust should take responsibility for this indicator. NH said for this to be authentic the apology should come from the Trust. If it is not done properly then it will be a waste of time. The Board may receive feedback, but the Trust should take responsibility.</p> <p>AS asked how an apology would be perceived in the community as Alan Brown has resigned and would not be leading an apology. She highlighted that she was currently the interim chair and that soon the Trust would be appointing a new chair. AS highlighted that the process started with someone else and that they will not be there to provide a final apology.</p> <p>AR responded by stating that the Trust had to take leadership and that whoever is the figurehead of the organisation, would lead an apology. She added that it was not about one person, it was about the whole organisation.</p> <p>BP stated that some may see Alan Brown's departure as part of the transformation</p> <p>NH stated that it was important to remember what happened previously. The community went through this before, when Angela left and Alan joined, there was supposed to be change. He added that it was important to remember that there is a history with the community and that it needed to see tangible change. This was not going to be based on what the chair or the Trust said, it had to be seen in the structure of the Trust changing. The community would see that there is change and no one would need to convince them.</p> <p>DrH confirmed with the CAG their agreement that the apology was the responsibility of the Trust</p> <p>Guarantees of non-repetition</p> <p>BP said one of the things the review team would like to make as a recommendation is to engage Independent Inspection twice a year, once every 6 months for 3 years. He explained that just as education and health have regulatory bodies with an inspection framework the results of which are recorded and made publicly available. He suggested that the review team could develop and undertake an inspection under the Tutu umbrella or alternatively the CAG could identify and appoint another organisation to undertake the inspection.</p> <p>AC stated that his initial reaction was that it would make sense for the Review team (TFUK) to do the inspection. This was as a relationship had been developed and the Review Team understood what was going on. However, he felt that 3 years wouldn't be sufficient and suggested 5 years twice a year.</p>	
--	--	--

4

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review -
 Institutional Racism, minutes (08), Tuesday 25 June 2019



	<p>NH said the only way they would bring in another independent group to do the work was if the CAG was not satisfied with the work the review team were doing. Other than that, he agreed that it made sense not to start a whole new relationship with another organisation who may not even get on the same level as the review team, and that the CAG had a working relationship with the review team.</p> <p>AR asked if the Trust should provide the indicators. BP stated that it would be for the CAG to develop the indicators.</p> <p>DrH informed the CAG that BP was requested by chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC), Rt Hon.Yvette Cooper MP to submit his proposal to bring Institutional Racism within the Equality Act. The HASC had recently uploaded BPs submission to its website. She added that the review team would develop the idea contained in the submission as part of an inspection framework. She highlighted that it was important for the CAG to recognise that what they were part of was a best practice model of working with the community to find solutions to challenging issues. The review team would like to develop this model of working and present it to the HASC in the future so that it could be used by other organisations. DrH said a copy of BP submission will be emailed to the Group</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>A copy of BPs submission to HASC will be sent to the CAG</p> <p>NH responded by saying that this went back to the issue of the dissemination and communication of the report. He added, that this should set a precedent, as what happened in the Trust, could also have happened in other charities. He agreed that it could be something like the inspection framework, which was just explained, but that it must be disseminated widely so that people could learn from it and study it. As he believed that the issue of institutional racism has never been acknowledged and that it was still a big issue.</p> <p>BP stated, that whilst the review team would be behind the inspection framework, the leadership and driving force was the CAG. He added, that in the future when communities or the charity commission are looking to address similar issues, they would look to the CAG as a model of best practice, and the people behind the transformative process. BP concluded by stating that it was a huge opportunity for the whole process which the CAG have been involved in from the outset which can help many other organisations.</p>	01
--	---	----



	Restitution – Individual and Institutional	
	<p>BP referred members to the diagram on the second page of the RJI template. He stated that the Review team were recommending the development of a civil rights and cultural centre. He stressed that the importance of the work was underpinned by the context, history and learning contained within the area and that if the CAG had a civil rights and cultural centre, it could start to pull together the history of the area with the civil rights elements together. He added that civil rights have not been recognised in the UK instead there is a narrative of 'somebody else's civil rights. Whilst this part of London has had a significant civil rights movements; the mangrove nine; the race riots; the death of Kelso Cochrane; the reverberations against the Caribbean community as a result of Cochrane's death; the Grenfell fire; the Moroccan community. Diverse groups in the area have at one point or another have had civil rights issues. A civil rights and cultural centre would bring everything together and recognise the work of the Trust, communities, challenges, historic context and injustice.</p> <p>BP highlighted that whilst it would be envisioned that the centre would have an exhibition element, the Review Team did not want to be openly prescriptive, as they had developed a template, which the CAG could start to populate. He added that one of the key elements was partnerships with a number of organisations and the importance of an archive available for learning. This would be a mechanism to memorialise and acknowledge the history. The CAG would have the opportunity to use the centre as a cohesive tool to bring together all communities. The tool has three major elements; education; economic justice; cultural renaissance and awareness.</p> <p>BP highlighted that the Trust operated with an overarching theme of education, but that this was through an equation which straddled between commercialisation and supporting the community. He added that he felt that the community had yet to fully have an opportunity to understand and adjust to that equation. He reminded the CAG that at the previous meeting CC discussed the issue of activist leadership and executive leadership and that an individual should be able to sit between the two.</p> <p>BP advised the CAG that it should look to organisations to provide support. He gave the example of Birmingham University, the only university in the UK with an institute of race. He added that it could provide support to a centre, in terms of civil rights and social justice as there were a range of opportunities.</p> <p>DrH added that it was important for the CAG to look at the current context, which the review operated in, especially</p>	

6

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review -
 Institutional Racism, minutes (08), Tuesday 25 June 2019



<p>regarding the Windrush scandal. She informed the group; the United Nations were currently being presented with its report into mental health and well-being and that it advocated that key to this was equality and justice. This was particularly pertinent in an area, which had experienced trauma and injustice around Grenfell.</p> <p>ST asked where the model (triangle) came from, she wanted to know if this was best practice.</p> <p>DrH said the review team developed it as a result of their work with the community and what they learnt whilst uncovering issues identified as part of the review. She added, that it was also felt that there was a lack of a lasting legacy to the issues in the area, and that this was not solely related to the Trust, but the area as a whole.</p> <p>BP added that in essence the idea stems from centres like the Martin Luther King centre in Atlanta and the Nelson Mandela Centre in Johannesburg. The idea would be to create a whole narrative around the whole history for a place where people can study, where there is some kind of memory. The idea recognises that there is no civil rights centre in the UK, which for the review team, is in a sense a denial of civil rights.</p> <p>BP explained to the CAG if it accepted this recommendation that the review team would provide more detail and that it wouldn't be too prescriptive as it would include elements, which the CAG would want to see.</p> <p>EH stated that she liked the model. She added that Grenfell happened because it was ignored for so long. She said that Grenfell happened for a number of reasons and that it added to the trauma, which was already in place.</p> <p>The CAG agreed the reparatory justice indicators template however, they felt that in reality people may not see it as directly dealing with issues they have faced.</p> <p>CP informed the group that Roger Matland made sure that the community didn't get involved when they closed CIP and pushed forward its commercialisation plans. He added that Matland did not allow the place to be used.</p> <p>NH said the Group needed to keep sight of the live issues which need to be dealt with and that the sooner the issues were dealt with the sooner the community would start to see the start of the reparation process.</p> <p>DrH pointed out that there is a number of issues to look at; the impact on people who lost out in terms of careers, tradesman-</p>	
--	--



	<p>ship, service users, staff – three different categories need to be considered.</p> <p>NH stated that it was going to be very challenging to deal with and that a structure needed to be created which dealt with different situations to bring different solutions. He added that he felt that the CAG should bring in change by any means necessary, he felt that the more things in the community were dealt with the more the community would see the change. He explained to the members his feeling that the CAG was still at the point of trying to resolve the issues and that there has to be real change within the next six months.</p> <p>NH informed members that he was going to include some 'community scepticism' into the discussion. He stated that whatever was done, must be visible and that if nothing is seen to be happening, it wouldn't matter what is brought to the table.</p> <p>CP highlighted that it was why he advised the CAG to follow through, because this has been going on for years.</p> <p>AR suggested, the next meeting should explore the RJI, in terms of long, medium and short-term recommendations required to deliver change.</p> <p>AS said the Group needed to look at things they can identify and change. Considering what can be achieved, how the report will be communicated and disseminated, and what the Group want the report to affect. She provided an example of how the Trust opens itself in terms of its governance and decision-making. She asked if this was something the CAG would like to see change relatively quickly and be visible to the community. Adding that it was important that they identified what things could be done immediately.</p> <p>NH explained that it was important to ensure that what was done was successful and that they could not take time about it as it would create scepticism.</p> <p>BP said the Group benefits from the involvement of CP in terms of how he sees the world, he has an opportunity to feed into this process, the CAG is part of the transformation and with AC's involvement, they collectively can all help to decide what the indicators will be.</p> <p>NH stated that he agreed with the RJI in terms of the following elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apology • Guarantees of Non-repetition • Restitution 	
--	---	--



	<p>Recommendations – supporting transformative strategies for change</p> <p>The group agreed that it needed to set an additional date for the meeting to take place in August. The meeting in August, will take place on August 14, 12.00 – 14.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL</p> <p>Action: CO to co-ordinate and agree a schedule of meetings for the CAG.</p> <p>The Group agreed that some of items on the agenda be carried forward to the next meeting. These items were as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations – supporting transformative strategies for change • Supporting community and staff through the change process • Communication and Dissemination of the Final Report <p>The Group agreed that it needed to discuss in detail the logistics of the final report.</p> <p>BP said that time would be needed to develop an action plan.</p> <p>AR said the Group needs to understand DrH timetable for the report.</p> <p>ST said the point that BP is making is valid because the Group is trying to work out time, when the Group should try to work out process. The Group needs to work out what things it should be doing then work out that the timeframe matches it rather than focus on the time first.</p> <p>AS said, they need time to talk to the board after the report is received by CAG.</p> <p>NH said at this point in time, it will come close to Black History Month, so the report cannot be left for long otherwise it will hit October. Whatever happens, it will hit Black History month, even if the report came mid-September, by the time it will resonate, it will be October. This is just the way it is happening, and he does not think we should try to change the time frame but, just accept that the process may go into October.</p> <p>ST asked whether by this time, the CAG and the community will have been able to consider the report, she wanted to know who objected to the report coming out in October.</p> <p>DrH said, the Group does not have to have the seven days, it can delay it, the review team will however, work from the 6</p>	03
--	---	----



	<p>Recommendations – supporting transformative strategies for change</p> <p>The group agreed that it needed to set an additional date for the meeting to take place in August. The meeting in August, will take place on August 14, 12.00 – 14.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL</p> <p>Action: CO to co-ordinate and agree a schedule of meetings for the CAG.</p> <p>The Group agreed that some of items on the agenda be carried forward to the next meeting. These items were as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations – supporting transformative strategies for change • Supporting community and staff through the change process • Communication and Dissemination of the Final Report <p>The Group agreed that it needed to discuss in detail the logistics of the final report.</p> <p>BP said that time would be needed to develop an action plan.</p> <p>AR said the Group needs to understand DrH timetable for the report.</p> <p>ST said the point that BP is making is valid because the Group is trying to work out time, when the Group should try to work out process. The Group needs to work out what things it should be doing then work out that the timeframe matches it rather than focus on the time first.</p> <p>AS said, they need time to talk to the board after the report is received by CAG.</p> <p>NH said at this point in time, it will come close to Black History Month, so the report cannot be left for long otherwise it will hit October. Whatever happens, it will hit Black History month, even if the report came mid-September, by the time it will resonate, it will be October. This is just the way it is happening, and he does not think we should try to change the time frame but, just accept that the process may go into October.</p> <p>ST asked whether by this time, the CAG and the community will have been able to consider the report, she wanted to know who objected to the report coming out in October.</p> <p>DrH said, the Group does not have to have the seven days, it can delay it, the review team will however, work from the 6</p>	<p>03</p>
--	--	-----------



<p>September and it is up to the CAG as to how it works around the dates.</p> <p>NH said he does not think it will take that long to respond as the community already knows what is in the report. He added that he felt that the community should be able to respond quite quickly and that the original plan was that the CAG had 7 days to respond.</p> <p>AS stated, that a long time period increases the risk of something potentially going wrong. She said that there was a period of up to four weeks from the moment they receive the report. She wanted to know if the Group needs seven days from the initial receipt of the report?</p> <p>DrH stated that the review team would be happy to take out the working days, which would take them to the 13 September 2019.</p> <p>BP said the key group to read the report, digest and understand it, is the CAG. As they are going to make the recommendations and they will be presenting the report to the Board and the public. He added that, when it came to presenting to the Board and the public, it was a joint CAG response.</p> <p>BP stated that the CAG was managing the process jointly and as such when it came to, informing the community about the report, the CAG will want to be able to explain to the public and the Board, the main issues and recommendations. He stressed that it was important that the CAG owned the narrative about how the review was run, and how it would move forward. He added that the CAG would not look for the recommendations to come back, instead it would say what it will be doing in the future. He highlighted that it was important for the CAG to consider how it all fitted into the process as it needed to give itself enough time, as that was critical as whilst everyone talked of times and deadlines, the group would need to build in time to prepare and present.</p> <p>ST stressed that it was important for key issues to be considered in order to manage the process, the first was an action plan, even if it came out in October she added that the CAG needed to consider what it needed to do to get the process right and then work around the times.</p> <p>AS highlighted that the Group needed to put a date in the diary for a long meeting to discuss communication and dissemination of the final report. (A long meeting is scheduled for 6 September 2019).</p>	
--	--



<p>NH asked if it is possible for everyone to find space for one day when the Group can discuss the issues in detail.</p> <p>The Group agreed that this could be the 6 September as they had already set aside half a day.</p> <p>BP asked the group to clarify what his and DrH roles will be at the future meetings. He explained that in previous CAG meetings, DrH would present and leave and he didn't attend. He asked how the Group want to take this issue forward.</p> <p>NH stated that it could work like it has at today's meeting, that they can present and attend when they are needed and normally after presenting there may be some questions, which they only could answer.</p> <p>AR explained that she felt that the review team needed to be present when presenting the report as expertise on the framework would be required.</p> <p>NH said after the review team have presented the framework, he would also present a reparatory framework, which is operated by One Voice, so the Group can see how things are aligned with the grassroots. He stressed that there needed to be a schedule and structure, communication and dissemination and absorption of it as well, this will be considered at the next meeting.</p> <p>ST asked if recommendations are coming out of the final report or are, they going to be delayed.</p> <p>DrH said there will be a range of recommendations, but that the review team wanted to take consideration of what the CAG wanted.</p> <p>BP responded that it was an issue of authenticity and that this was the reason why the review team was reluctant at the last meeting to say that they would produce lots of recommendations. He added that it would have to come from CAG as a Group, in terms of all the issues that the Group has raised. The kind of things the Group would like to see the Trust put in place, so that the review team has big picture recommendations, but this would not overshadow those stemming from the community. The CAG has to have something reflected in the report in terms of recommendations, it believes are important.</p> <p>ST stated that it would be helpful if the review team provide a skeleton of the overarching recommendations.</p>	
--	--



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (08),
 Tuesday June 2019, 16.00-18.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London, W10 5XL

	<p>NH stated that the group needs to consider whether they are at a specific place, with specific issues which would in themselves produce the answers to what has already happened. He added that the group consider how things that have happened can be rectified so that they produce the things, which need to be done. He stressed that the solutions should come out of the history and that this was part of the direct agenda of dealing with what has happened.</p> <p>ST informed the group that she would be unable to attend the meeting of the 24 July, as she would be on holiday. However, she stated that she would either send in her written thoughts or give them to AR, she would also try to dial in for the 24 July meeting.</p> <p>Action: ST to either send her thoughts for the next meeting to AR or send them to CO via email</p>	04
	<p>The next CAG Meeting is scheduled to take place on Wednesday 24 July, 16:00 – 18:00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL</p>	

The meeting was closed at 18.00 pm.

Part
B

Action Points

Action points arising from the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (07).
 Meeting of 25 June 2019

No:	Action	By
01	A copy of BP's submission to HASC to be sent to CAG members	CO
02	To add rehabilitation and satisfaction to the RI template	Review team
03	Send schedule of CAG meetings	CO
04	ST to either send her thoughts for the next meeting to AR or send them to CO via email	ST, AR, CO



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (09), Wednesday 24 July 2019,
 16.00-18:00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London W10 5XL

Attendees:	
Angela Spence (AS) Chair for the meeting today	Westway Trust Chairman (Co-Chair for Community Advisory Group)
Niles Hailstone (NH)	Chair: One Voice Community Collective / Westway23 (Co – Chair for Community Advisory Group).
Alex Russell (AR)	Joint CEO Westway Trust
Anthony Chivers (AC)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Clive Phillips (CP)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Emzee Haywoode (EH)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Malcolm Phillips (MP)	Area Manager Hestia (CAG Member)
Nicole Belfon (NB)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Apologies:	
Miss Lee Woolford-Chivers MBE (LW)	Community Advisory Group Member (CAG)
Marcia Robinson (MR)	Director of Just Solutions 123...&the Trees4Grenfell initiative, CAG Observer, now CAG member
Sakinah Touzani (ST)	Westway Trust – Adult and Community Learning Manager

In attendance: Dr Habashi (DrH)– Head of the Review
 Bevan Powell (BP) Strategic Lead to the Review
 Charles Crichlow – Independent Advisor to the Review
 Christine Okiya (CO) - Secretary

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (09),
Wednesday 24 July 2019, 16.00-18.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London, W10 5XL

AGENDA ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION NO:
1	<p>Welcome and Introductions (AS)</p> <p>The Chair (AS) invited the Group to observe minute’s silence. AS welcomed attendees to the meeting</p> <p>AS informed those who were not present at the last meeting, that this meeting would focus on details in relation to the review recommendations.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising</p> <p>The minutes were reviewed and agreed by the Group.</p> <p>All actions were completed</p> <p>Matters arising from the minutes are on the agenda for today.</p> <p>The minutes were signed by the Chairs</p>	

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019
(Minutes 09).



3	<p>Recommendations supporting transformative strategies for change (Short, medium and long term)</p> <p>AS asked members if they had any suggestions for recommendations to support transformative strategies for change (short medium and long term)</p> <p>BP reminded the CAG that the review team already provided draft recommendations</p> <p>NH asked the CAG if they were up to speed with the suggested recommendations. He added that whilst focusing on short term actions, consideration was given to them being able to bring about change relatively quickly, in a tangible manner and related to what has been identified through the review process. He said that this would support efforts in going forward. NH articulated that it was important that the community could feel that there was change and that there was a level of honesty in the practicalities about what and how things would be done and he cited the Village as an example. He stressed that it was critical that the community were aware of what resources (spaces) were available and that the community were able to have identified spaces to help it move forward so that it can best deal with the issues. AS asked how could this be done effectively and in partnership with the community as the Trust would have to be able to respond to the demands. She asked members how it would like to examine the 6 recommendations made by the Review Team and what it would look like to the community and how it would fit into the process.</p> <p>NH responded that the CAG would be the central focus and that the community should be able to feed into the process of what is required now, he stressed again that something should happen quickly and that solutions should come through the process, otherwise there would be a danger of expecting the community to trust 'something' which hasn't gone away for 50 years.</p> <p>BP stated that that he wanted to ensure that he understood what was being said, irrespective of needs are and responses, that the CAG overall governance vehicle and as such all needs, issues and responses should go through the CAG. DrH added that it was important for the CAG to be retained, but the terms of reference would need to change as the CAG would have responsibility for the monitoring the recommendations.</p>	
---	---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



NH said it is got to be fully clear what the recommendations are, what CAG can do, things have been suggested and may have agreed things along the way so we need to get a clear understanding in terms of how the CAG will operate once they have been allowed

MP asked for clarification as to what the Trust's position is and what the members present thought were the likelihood of recommendations being accepted.

AR said this is like chicken and eggs, at some point we will have to say these are the things which will be an appropriate response to this report, and we will do that for the CAG to sign it, and then that needs to go to the board of trustees. CAG is responsible for how something develops, but the board will have to agree stuff. AR said to her my mind this process is about putting things on the table and thinking things through.

The CAG is then responsible for identifying the recommendations, and then the Trust has the discussion with the board when the report is ready, at the point of saying here is the report and here are the recommendations of that report and therefore start the discussion. This is how AR thought the process will work. She said she liked the ideas brought by the review team and CAG should build on this.

NH said that is the point he was making, that it needs to be clear that there is a community presences. He said he needs to reiterate that there is also a community representation on this CAG and that we as community, will meet as the community outside this meeting to discuss what we agree or what we want from the meeting.

AS asked if NH is saying that outside this meeting, there will be work that goes on that the community want and that is fed in into CAG

NH said, there is a reality that is happening on the ground and then there is a process of what we are dealing with now and how this actually interweaves.

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019
(Minutes 09).



He said, we should look at these things and see how we can get ahead by looking at them and try to pre plan what is going to be the solution. It is going to take time for us as a community to come together and discuss, what we want to put on the table even as part of CAG with members of the Westway Trust. NH said the community are in a situation where something that is happening has not happened before. The community are in the middle of a reparation movement, whether the Trust or RBKC or whoever support it or not, it's happening. NH said reparation is already happening, something is not going to be created that is not already happening, it actually organically links in to where it is supposed to link in, what is happening on the ground also illustrates what needs to be fixed, what has brought us to the table, what needs to be developed, what needs to be supported, there is historical and spiritual connection. This is where the healing is happening, the community has never been listened to from day 1, decisions are made by people who do not live in this area, and there is stuff outside going on that people in this room do not know about.

AS we have to ensure CAG is the representative it can be, to ensure that we are doing that, we are responding and we are building the mechanism to get the voices around the table because, obviously there is a limit to how many people can be around the table, who is around the table and needs to be the voices of the community for that to happen

MP questioned the fact that if CAG has no connection to the governance of the Trust, what power will it have to make changes happen

AS said the Trust itself is looking at the governance review, the Trust is looking at how it can be better

NH said this conversation happened in 2015, when the community started the conversation that led to this happening, and this will not wash on the street level. The language used will not work when you are trying to use that with people who have been disfranchised, excluded, have been told that before that there is going to be changing governance. NH asked as said by MP, how much power has CAG got to make things happen. The language used by the Trust will not help because the community will not believe them. If things at grassroots happen, we need to look at what can be done asap to change people's lives, we need to know how this can be done through CAG, things that are practical with tangible solutions that people on everyday level can feel, absorb and know that change is happening

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



	<p>CC suggested that what would be helpful as community representatives, if CAG could put on the table some of what you have seen as radical recommendations, so people can see, because what is radical and obvious to the community, you may discover that it is not radical at all or vis visa. He said the Review team needs the CAG to be explicit.</p> <p>NH said while the community can put recommendations forward to the board, it depends on the makeup of the board, and in the way the decision about what needs to change, and it actually happening, is dependent on another group of people, who have to decide on what the community are putting forward. CAG needs to be clear about that dynamic which, can be problematic.</p> <p>ET said keeping in mind this new idea of the Trust being transparent, fair, and more linked to the community, it does require community led approach as well, that's what the community are looking at, that is why the vacant post of chair is important. Both the Trust and the CAG have to be more bold.</p> <p>NH asked how the CAG is going to be supported, in reference to the people who are putting in their time, work and effort. The CAG is going to need a budget to do its work understandably, otherwise how is it expected to do its work, research and everything else that the CAG is supposed to do. Till now, all the community that has been fighting for has been for free, while the Trust has been getting exorbitantly high wages, this is one of the issues that needs to be looked into in terms of governance. CAG needs to know how the Trust is actually going to empower it, to be able to do the work that actually needs to be done. The CAG also needs to know if it can have authority to do stuff /work without being scrutinised, eg through leases, licenses to enable the community to do businesses, because this is what stops the community from doing business. This can be an example of something which can be done in a different way that could empower the community. Not everything has to be in partnership with the Trust.</p> <p>AR said she likes the notion of it but the Trust is liable</p> <p>NH wanted to know how some people got longer leases than others, for example, how did the boxing club get their licence for 25 years while some people cannot even get one year. It is obvious, the Trust is still uncomfortable when the community talk about where the real power is, which is on the land.</p>	
--	--	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



<p>NH wanted to know how the CAG can be empowered to know that what CAG is doing is going to have results, but if it is dependent on someone else's decision how can the community be confident in the process.</p> <p>NH said CAG is having this conversation because we have had the interim report, and if it wasn't suggesting that these things are true, we would not be having this conversation, we are having this conversation because 'shit has hit the fan', and something has to be done about it. The Trust needs to accept that the powershift has to happen.</p> <p>BP said NH has described what is needed all around governance and we need a recommendation around governance structure. BP suggested CAG should think this through as a recommendation for a model of governance, as decision making – what is needed for a transformational change. If the recommendation is supported by the executive of the Trust and the community then is the board going to be really obstinate to say they don't want that to happen.</p> <p>AC said he just needed to check, just in case there is no agreement, then what are CAG's options, just in case they do object so what happens after that, he is curious to know, what are CAGs options are.</p> <p>AR said the board is in favour of CAG getting more structures – they are committed to that, they don't want to pre-empt this but they want to have conversation with the community, so that commitment is there. The board is ultimately the body responsible for the organisation so the board has to think through things with a group of people including the CAG.</p> <p>AS said essentially it is about the governance of the Trust and how people are able to affect change, it has to be about how the CAG can make this work and it has to have some power for this to happen. She said, certainly she sees it as an interactive process in coming together where those decisions are going to be worked through governance</p> <p>DrH wanted to know if it is just governance or and participation?</p> <p>ET said a point was being missed as to why this group was created, which is because of how the community has been treated; the issues of racism so a group like this is much needed and it is already formed and if we are looking at</p>	
---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



<p>what the Trust is saying that it wants transformation, dealing with the community, then this is it. It is whether the Trust is determined to change or it is going to do lip service to it.</p> <p>AR said the governance has changed quite a lot in the last six months in terms of the composition now only 3 out of 15 who are involved in the governance, are not from the local area, and that has changed quite a lot, though there is more that can be done</p> <p>EH said, it's not just about that though, it is something that has been deeply entrenched in a certain place that has to be looked into, and that is not going to happen in terms of what is in place with the board at the moment. If we are talking about real transformation, then CAG needs something radical to actually happen.</p> <p>AR said she thinks all those around the table are all saying the same thing, creating an official route; a committee which has power and this could be the CAG .</p> <p>NB said she understands what is being said about the responsibility, however, this doesn't take away a board operating with a community group. There is no legality involved in this.</p> <p>AS – we were hoping to have the community involved in what that would look at the next steps but, ultimately the board is legally responsible for the organisation, it is about how do you create structures that enable the local people to be on the board, we got some of that, we need to look at what it looks like now and what it will look like in the future in terms of what we want to do.</p> <p>BP said in terms of evidence of models that already work, what is key to this, is who is signing off the recommendations, this has to be made explicit, as to what the community wants and what the executive want, this recommendation of governance is key to way the board operates, and this is not coming from the review team but from CAG.</p> <p>NH said the community and the Trust do not want the same things at the moment, what the Trust wants is not what the community wants. CAG needs to accept that and to realise that there needs to be some redevelopment to reach that point. The community does not want more representation, it wants</p>	
--	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).

8



<p>control over the resources that were left to it, it does not want to be dictated by those who have taken over what was left to them.</p> <p>NH said this is the language that is going to get the Trust in a lot of problems, the Trust cannot just be talking about representation because this has been said many times, the community needs to push this conversation so that the Trust understand the severity of what is coming round and the Trust has to do something different – for fifty years it has been run incorrectly. The community wants control of what was left for them</p> <p>DrH said as of now, there is no clarity as to whether the 23 acres is land protected by covenant for community use.</p> <p>NH said this is not the point, the point is where the power base is.</p> <p>BP moving to a point where the Trust becomes completely independent , you haven't got representatives from the council etc, it is how it gets to that point however you see it, ultimately that is what the recommendation is. You need to make this recommendation explicit. It is the community that is making the decisions – transforming the Trust so that is independent and reflects the needs of the local communities.</p> <p>DrH said in the vision of the people who created it, they wanted it given to the community but the council did not want that, they wanted to take control.</p> <p>One of your recommendations needs to be about pushing for independence</p> <p>NB said her concern is will the Trust be able to distance themselves from the RBKC and TFL. I can see the Trust distancing themselves from RBKC, but how will that work with TFL.</p> <p>DrH said everything can be renegotiated</p> <p>BP this can be renegotiated- new entity, resources allocation, this is part of it that everything needs re-writing so that the community becomes independent – this has to be an explicit recommendation when you can evidence the need for it, from the report and the evidence that is happening else where</p>	
---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



AS said we have to acknowledge that there are some people who have left the board, because it's not the time for them to be here now, and the board that is in place, there is absolutely a recognition of what we are doing in terms of going out for a new chair, we completely recognise that change needs to happen, what we are conscious of is making sure when we talk about community we are talking about the north Kensington community and how inclusive we are of that, how inclusive the processes that we put in place to ensure this happens.

NH wanted to know if the Trust itself supports the model of independence from the RBKC and the other bodies .He said he does not think that question could be answered at this meeting, he thinks AS needs to talk to other people, but he said he would like to ask the question that, regarding the notion that has been put forward of the community wanting the independence from other bodies, especially RBKC because that's definitely something that the community will be pushing for, because that is the thing that gave them control over the Trust from the beginning and from the story of what has happened RBKC have been very instrumental in installing their culture inside the Westway Trust and for us as the community, it is very important that that model can change and that can only be changed by becoming independent and no longer having influence in it - does the Trust support that independence or does it want to keep the relationship it currently has with RBKC.

AS said the board has definitely had this conversation of the council at some point removing itself from the Trust, what hasn't been discussed is the as and when – the details, which she can't answer.

AR said she supports the idea of independence and has been pushing for it for a long time.

NH said the CAG the group is looking for independence, but does the Trust align with that or not because if it is not aligned, it is going to look like a farce.

CC said that is precisely what he was saying earlier on, CAG needs to put stuff on paper before we cross the next bridge, one thing with bridges, it's best to cross it before you get to it.

AR said, it would be helpful if the report would say it as well, it would make it so much easier to have a conversation

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019
(Minutes 09).



<p>BP said the review team can't say it, it's for the CAG to say and now is the window of opportunity</p> <p>AS agrees but, she said this may depend on the council itself, she said that from the beginning her advice is not to have councillors on the board because it needs to be free from any political influence.</p> <p>DrH wanted to clarify with NH about what he said earlier that he wanted to do a piece of work with the community about understanding what the issues were.</p> <p>NH said the CAG as a community representative are going to need some kind of budgeting and resources, as they will need to organise with the community to network with other groups. It needs to be resourceful with a budget .</p> <p>AC asked whether CAG is saying it should have a budget and an office space where they can operate from</p> <p>NH said CAG is already in bay 56, the community is already operating there, it was set up as a centre for healing and reparation before this process started. The front of the building has a banner saying "Reparation" on it, that dates back to four or five years ago which has all the things we are talking about in the art work. NH suggested that the community is that the moment is also supported in order that it can use that base to continue doing the work that it is already doing, to centralise the response to this from the community in terms of what needs to be built.</p> <p>NH said, CAG should look at each situation in order to get the methodology out of how to deal with it as it is going to be tangible, for instance if we look at the flyover and the situation at Westbank. As far as the community is concerned it was pushed out of the building which was given to the art gallery. NH questioned the fact that the Westbank still has a licence which should have expired.</p> <p>ET interjected that they had a community mandate, which came up at the AGM, which could have been the 2016 AGM, nothing came back to the community when Alan was asked about it, this should have been reviewed then.</p>	
---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



NH said this is an example of the wrong decisions being made and the community has suffered as a result of this. He wanted to know what is going to happen when that lease runs out, whether it will come back to the community.

AS said the point she was picking up was that CAG can look at these things in its entirety with the community, and through the CAG, take each one, establish what is going on, and decide what next.

NH said, this brings up a number of big issues, for example how much land is actually left after what has happened. There the land or resources are actually left, because he knows a while ago, it was about 75 % was already in use and there were three places left to develop, Acklam, bay 20 and Acklam village, there is only one space left. The lease for Westbank is coming up, that is another space which can be used for reparations and repairing the damage that was done, in a very specific issue to the arts and culture and live music aspect of the area of what was going on.

DrH reported that she has asked for a breakdown of commercial and community use of the area which she should have in the next few days, and that will go in the report.

NH wanted to know what is going to be accessible when this lease becomes available, whether the people that were excluded from the community are going to be brought back to the table and have an input on what happens next, that the Trust is committed to repairing the damage that it did in the first place.

AS asked if utilisation of the space for the wider community is this the second recommendation that CAG was suggesting.

BP reminded the Group that they need to look at the big picture because sometimes we get lost in the detail. The Group needs to come together and think of how it starts to address the bigger issue relating to values and beliefs.

AC suggested that there are a few things that could be done in regards to that, like random checks that would obviously impact upon whether or not the people with the lease can still stay in the property, what sort of business they have, etc. Once this has been established and CAG is saying it's going to tackle

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



<p>this, then it can sit down and work out work out policies and angles in regards to that.</p> <p>BP said there should be some kind of framework with a criteria which focuses back to the local community. We acknowledge that individuals may have issues, but what does that mean to the broad community, and how can the CAG address it, so that the community benefits rather than an individual.</p> <p>NH said he thinks one of the hardest challenges the Trust is going to have is non-repetition. A culture has been developed that causes things to repeat and unless this is properly looked at and acknowledged by the Trust, it will by default repeat itself.</p> <p>AR said this is timely as the Trust this is one of the things the board are looking at - what the Trust needs/wants in the next quarter.</p> <p>AS said within the ethical framework of what the Group just talked about, the Group will have an opportunity now to be able to look at each one and as part of this group understand what that position is and have the conversation of what we want to see at the end of the process.</p> <p>AR suggested that the work done by Fluid should be shared with the group, however NH said the work done by Fluid had already been done by the community, yet Fluid was paid for it. AR said the work done by Fluid was commissioned and paid for by the GLA.</p> <p>NH wanted to know how much GLA paid, AR said around £50,000</p> <p>NH said Fluid did not tell him anything he didn't know and he would have done the work it did for less. He said bay 23 already did the work that fluid did and yet fluid got paid and bay 23 was not paid which is not acceptable. The Trust needs to value the expertise of the community.</p> <p>MP said there has got to be a change in how we consult with the community and it is important there has a change in the relationship, these things make a difference. One of the changes that MP would like to see is that commissions for work in the community should go through CAG rather than direct to external companies. Community work should be valued and the Trust should use community resources for purposes of research rather than paying other organisations.</p>	
---	--

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



	<p>CC said how charities and Trusts work with the local community and how the communities are not valued in monetary terms and yet when external firms do work, they get monetary rewards and this is fundamentally wrong. We need to look at how the Trust values its work with the local community -monetary-market services, recognising the value, looking at ethnic and gender pay gap – and cover this in the recommendation. As we go forward, the recommendation should be framed in this context .</p> <p>The Trust needs to consider what they pay external firms and that’s what they could pay the community(CAG) for better work as they know the community better.</p> <p>NH said CAG time needs to be valued, just as other people’s time is valued, it should be paid consultancy fee.</p> <p>AC questioned that if moving forward, we are all going to be one entity, then this will not happen as the wires of communication will be clear.</p> <p><i>Three draft recommendations proposed by the group:</i></p> <p><i>1 – Independency of the Trust from the council</i></p> <p><i>2- Utilisation of space by the wider community</i></p> <p><i>3- Community to be recognised and valued for the valid contribution it can make as community researchers and to be rewarded in monetary form</i></p> <p>The three recommendations to be circulated to the group for members to come back with agreed wording for the recommendations</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>The three recommendations to be circulated to the group for members to come back with agreed wording for the recommendations.</p>	01
--	---	----

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



4	<p>Supporting community and staff through the change process (including timeline)</p> <p>The group discussed how the report should be presented to staff and the Board.</p> <p>DrH asked the CAG for its preference in terms of how the report would be presented to staff and Trustees as the review team would like to undertake this between 17th - 20th September 2019.</p> <p>AS said the presentation to the staff would need to take place after the presentation to the Board.</p> <p>BP suggested that in terms of presenting the report, that as the CAG is the owner of the report it would be a mistake for CAG not to present. The review team would need to be represented at the presentation, however, if the report is presented by the review team, it would give a different perspective. The CAG would have to present the report as it is their report. DrH added that this would support authenticity of the process. AR suggested that the TFUK should present the report to staff, adding that staff would need time to read the report. AS suggested the report is presented to the staff the same way in which the CAG was presented with the interim report, the staff will need to read and absorb it as they will not know anything about it as it would be embargoed.</p> <p>DrH said the review team will present the report to the staff in the same format as the interim report was presented to the CAG. She added that the review team will provide an executive summary for staff to read and ask questions as the final report would be too lengthy to read and consider the contents.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>The review team to present the report to staff.</p> <p>NH added that the community will have their own response to the report and that it was necessary for the community to respond. BP asked the CAG that if it did not accept the report, what would this mean, as it owns the report. NH responded that the community should have a voice beyond the CAG, adding that the report was going in a positive direction, however he did not know what the final report would look like and the community would have their own direct response. He stated that initially, the idea was that there would be a unified response to the report from the Trust and community (CAG). However, he felt that the community is not yet, in a place yet to give a unified response. He said that it was previously discussed that they will have their own voice as a community to respond as would the Trust adding that this was reflected in previous minutes.</p>	02
---	--	----

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



AS asked for clarity, as to whether when the report comes out, the community would give its own response outside of the CAG she reminded the Group that there was a conversation that the CAG would simply give a broad statement acknowledging the report and that the Board would make its own response. The community would also make its response and that this was previously minuted.

NB asked if when the report is received in its draft format whether feedback would be allowed. DrH responded that the review team would take on Board amendments as a result of comments made by the CAG.

NB asked whether there was an opportunity for the research to continue in the event that issues arose which the CAG may not agree with, she gave the example of a researcher having access to certain items which may have been presented as part of their research. DrH informed NB that the remit of the review team specific to examine whether the Trust was institutionally racist, if it is, how has that been allowed to happen and what has been the impact of that to the community, and that it was important for the review team to stick to its brief.

BP said the final decision around what that report looks would be the CAG's.

NH informed the CAG that no matter how well they 'got along', he had 'put his neck on line' for the review to take place and he had to also protect the community if the process went wrong. BP responded that the process of the review was around the table and that it had shared everything and if the CAG did not accept this, there was no validity and there was no point of the report being done. BP asked that if the community was responding, who was it responding too and that after 27 September the CAG would own the report.

AR wanted to know, if the community does not agree, who would then respond.

CC stated that as long as there was broad support, even though there may be criticism it was not a problem. Everyone would work through their concerns together he added that not even the report author can guarantee that what is said in the report will materialise. However, what can be done is to work together and try to make it happen.

AS said that at the point at which the report lands, we need to put a joint statement which includes what happens beyond this CAG.

NH stated that he believed that up to now the work had been done properly, however, he didn't trust the Trust. He added that he felt that the community need an assurance of what it can do in the event that the report does not go the way the

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019
(Minutes 09).



	<p>community wants it to, emphasising that the community has its own voice aside from the CAG. AS said that once the report is presented to the CAG, there will be a period of time to read, respond, edit the report and then it would be finalised. She added that the CAG could prepare a statement about the report, processes and working together prior to publication, there was no need at this stage to go into detail, but it was important to acknowledge that the CAG have worked through a process to get to the final report. She added that the Board will provide its own response, after the report is published the CAG will own the report. AS stated that the CAG must acknowledge that it may not necessarily be the same group that will take the recommendations forward and that it needed to be realistic about this. She added that she felt that the CAG’s statement regarding the report, needed to be broad. As this would enable it to state that there was a need for it to evolve so that it could take forward the recommendations.</p> <p>AR – to provide dates for presentation to staff and the board</p> <p>Action</p> <p>AR to provide dates for presentation of the report to the board and staff</p>	03
5	<p>Communication and Dissemination of the Final Report</p> <p>This item was deferred to the next meeting on the 14 August 2019, 14:00 – 16:00</p>	

The meeting was closed at 19.00 pm.

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).



Minutes of the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (09),
Wednesday 24 July 2019, 16.00-18.00, Westway Trust, 1 Thorpe Close, London, W10 5XL

[Handwritten signature]

Part B

Angela Spence

Signed: *[Handwritten signature]*

Print Name: *NILES HAUSTONES*

Chairs

Action Points

Action points arising from the Community Advisory Group to the Review Meeting (08), Meeting on of 25 July 2018

No:	Action	By
01	The three recommendations to be circulated to the group for members to come back with agreed wording for the recommendations	Review team
02	The review team to present the report to the staff.	DrH
03	AR to provide dates for presentation of the report to the board and staff	AR

Christine Okiya, Secretary to the Community Advisory Group to the Review – Institutional Racism. 25 July 2019 (Minutes 09).