



Transition Group 2- Meeting Notes & Key Actions

Present:

Professor Ian Welsh (IW) Chair
Polly Chapman (PC)
Angus Hardie (AH)
Irene Mosota (IM)
Martin Avila (MA)
Ailsa Clark (AC)
John Halliday (JH)
Claire Pattullo (CP)
James Hilder (JH)
Jennifer Robertson (JR)

Secretariat: Beverley Francis, Chris Martin, Alistair Grimes, Kim Wallace (for item 4) and Jenny Smith

Apologies: Yvonne Strachan

Date: 29th July 2022

Venue: SCVO (Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations) Offices, Glasgow

1. Apologies & Welcome	Action
Apologies had been intimated by Yvonne Strachan.	
2. Note of the last meeting The notes of the meeting were approved subject to the following changes: Jennifer Robertson to be shown as present. Under terms of reference, it is to be noted that the Chair indicated that he had a level of confidence in the recommendations being accepted by the SES (Social Enterprise Scotland) Board.	BF
3. Matters Arising BF indicated that all actions had been completed or were being discussed at the meeting. Assistance to navigate teams was available from Jenny Smith, and the Chair asked that the public contact email for the TG (Transition Group) should be widely publicised. It was noted by the Chair that the preparations of papers for the next meeting would be impacted by key people being on leave.	BF
4. Technicalities of Membership KW set out some of the key considerations set out in her paper, which was welcomed by members. The group offered a diverse range of thoughts prompted by the paper that it might wish to see reflected in the final recommendations. These focused on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a clear value proposition to justify any fee structure 	

- Clarity on the role of membership income in terms of its necessity or arguing for SG grant to be seen as a key investment in the sector and supporting infrastructure without a reliance on fees
- The relationship between membership and voting rights, a balance between reach and representation and income generation
- Some principles that might inform an approach, contribution to overheads, a movement to be resourced, issue of independence, and generating income
- The impact of a pay bar on organisations and the administration of fees, balanced against people feeling vested by contributing, however small
- Nominal contributions through membership would secure strength in the movement and give confidence and power to the SEI but this is balanced with other ways of raising income
- Recognition that corporates and some others should pay for membership to access the skills and experience of the sector, can this subsidise full members who do not pay?
- Developing a distinctive narrative on why SES was different to SCVO and what was the added value

It was noted that the discussion on the role of the SEI (Single Enhanced Intermediary) is key, and ideally would have come first – with some consensus on the idea that SES should not compete with its members or undertake activities that detract from members interests. There was a strong view that form should follow function. Any new activities should not displace other SE business. For example, collective procurement could be a new service of value and would attract members.

PC noted that she recalled a previous SES Board paper on membership options, and she wondered if this was still available.

There was further discussion on whether code compliance was a requirement of full membership. The Chair agreed to revisit this once the package of recommendations could be seen. The issue of CIC by shares and the nuances were recognised as critical flags for some, and the issue of passported benefits for network organisations had to be resolved in the next iteration of thinking.

CM

5. Intermediaries – Purpose, Culture, Values, and Behaviours

Related discussion took place informed by a further paper presented by AG.

The values set out in the paper drawn from SES and SENS Scot were broadly agreed but could be further refined. Their outworking into behaviours and working practices would be useful in the next iteration.

The table of potential functions, the group had found useful, and some might be added including, networking / peer support, learning exchange, broad government departmental reach, research, and insight, and leading a deep understanding of the sector and its needs.

There was agreement at a level of principle that the SEI should not compete with members or others working in the space for functions and services, rather work collaboratively for mutual benefit.

It was thought useful to map into the analysis who was doing what currently to assist understanding the gaps. It was thought SES should have a role commenting on the quality of business support, rather than deliver it itself.

Ethical and Ambitious were offered as additional values.

MA offered up the idea that the functions of other intermediaries being migrated to the SEI (e.g., policy and practice conference).

<p>It was thought that SES does not have the capacity to undertake research for itself but would partner with others, (who?) to manage research. Identifying the needs of the sector in this respect was a significant role.</p> <p>JH favoured a strong single sentence for values rather than single words. This was to be reworked in future iterations.</p>	
<p>6. Mapping the Landscape</p> <p>The group noted the 2019 diagram that was out of date in some respects and it was a complex and dynamic eco system. Particular points raised in discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How Highland and rural communities were represented and the need to be inclusive and sensitive to the need for local variation. • SES may need to work with others to fill gaps if identified • How does SES behave in what is a dynamic eco system, not a fixed landscape • SENS (Social Enterprise NetworkS) were a fundamental relationship, is this a governance relationship and do we understand what we mean by that • Relationships and signposting are vital aspects of the role • Local was important, and local intelligence about what needed and how influence the governance / role of SEI • With whom might the SEI find common cause? • The idea of avoiding a dominant relationship as an intermediary and finding common ground and purpose with others • Important to learn from the past and build on what is there – is it broken? How has SES addressed inequalities in the past? <p>The Chair suggested that any recommendations would have to be subject to some review after the conclusion of the group, recognising the agile nature of the work. There is a question of accountability for the SES Board and SG.</p> <p>There was considerable discussion on how local networks influence governance, but how they receive what they need without services being imposed. The issue of representation versus representative was aired. The difference and nuance were considered important. Any future Board member of SES would be bound by the interests of SES above their own. Is voice a more accurate representation of the issue?</p>	
<p>7. Consultation and Engagement</p> <p>It was noted the TSI/ SEN survey results would soon be known. The Group agreed that they wanted to have firmed up their thinking before engaging with stakeholders. The Chair offered to meet with the TSI Network at a planned event CP was organising.</p> <p>It was noted the SES Bulletin with a reach of 2000 could report on the Groups work.</p>	<p>CP/ IW</p> <p>BF</p>
<p>8. Arrangements for next and future meetings</p> <p>It was noted the next meeting would be at the Melting Pot, Edinburgh. All meetings had now been scheduled except the last. The Chair indicated that a dinner could be accommodated after the final meeting in Glasgow in October.</p> <p>It was agreed a paper consolidating some of the thinking and narrative so far would be prepared for the next meeting, but not published at this stage. AG will develop a paper for the next meeting. It was agreed to look in more detail at SES Memorandum and Articles at the next meeting to frame a broader discussion on governance.</p>	<p>BF</p> <p>AG</p>