



## Transition Group 4- Meeting Notes & Key Actions

**Present:**

**Professor Ian Welsh (IW) Chair**

**Polly Chapman (PC)**

**Angus Hardie (AH)**

**Irene Mosota (IM)**

**Claire Pattullo (CP)**

**Ailsa Clark (AC)**

**John Halliday (JH)**

**Yvonne Strachan (YS)**

**Jennifer Robertson (JR)**

**Secretariat: Beverley Francis, Chris Martin, Alistair Grimes, and Jenny Smith**

**Apologies: James Hilder, Martin Avila**

**Date: 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2022**

**Venue: The Trades Hall, Glasgow**

| 1. Apologies & Welcome   | Action |
|--|--------|
| Apologies had been intimated by James Hilder and Martin Avila.   |        |
| <p><b>2. Note of the last meeting</b></p> <p>The notes of the meeting were approved without amendment.</p>   | BF     |
| <p><b>3. Matters Arising</b></p> <p>BF indicated that all actions had been completed or were being discussed at the meeting. The Chair apologised for the misrepresentation of Claire and Jennifer’s attendance. He made clear that the meeting would continue on today as long as needed.</p> <p>The Chair also indicated that he had decided in the preceding week to issue a <u>very draft</u> outline of a report. It was not intended that this would be discussed in detail today, but it was important to bounce around ideas. The invitation to offer recommendations in correspondence had not been taken up, and it was important to start to move towards recommendations. This would be a live document on Teams to enable the group to offer comment.</p> |        |
| <p><b>4. Membership Options</b></p> <p>AG was invited to introduce his paper that sought to reflect and summarise discussions to date as well as move the thinking forward. John Halliday explained he had also put down some thinking, and this was just to enable it to be shared coherently given he was unable to attend the full meeting.</p>   |        |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <p>The recurring issue of definition and characteristics of membership social enterprise continued to be the main issue taxing the group. The exploration of private gain and how it is to be treated is the singular issue for some in the group. The Group explored whether a narrative on ethical business and social enterprise was needed. A compromise position was emerging that recognised that social enterprise was a verb, and also a noun, and that they were perhaps not mutually exclusive.</p> <p>It was noted that it might be possible for the group to say something about the need to review the code, and that it could do so by inviting sector wide involvement. Some noted the many changes that had occurred since it was written in 2018, and this should be the context for discussions. The shape and origins of social enterprises was changing, as well as how they are funded. It is a more popular model and different legal models had emerged – shift to ethical business. It was noted that some B Corps were SES members and fully code compliant for example.</p> <p>The SEWF definition was considered too wide by some and did not reflect Scotland’s unique position.</p> <p>Irrespective of the definition agreed, there was agreement that some form of panel / verification process would be useful. There was support for an “aspiring” or “start-up” category that granted associate membership for up to 2 years to provide opportunities to enable social enterprises to grow and become more compliant with membership criteria. It was noted that an appeal mechanism might be needed.</p> <p>SES, in these arrangements would be able to hold the thinking on this, and to support the growth of social enterprise as a model and support start-ups to take this approach.</p> <p>John Halliday made the point, that was supported, that SES in its memorandum and articles should ensure members were based in Scotland or traded here to be eligible for membership.</p> <p>The Group briefly reflected on the matter of “passport” membership, the circumstances in which membership of an intermediary granted access to SES benefits. There was broad agreement that such arrangement might be best arranged under a discount rather than for free, to preserve the financial wellbeing of SES. In addition, AH pointed out that such members needed to hold a distinct relationship and should not be passive actors in the relationship</p> |     |
| <p><b>5. Draft Final Report</b></p> <p>The Chair reiterated that this was on the agenda to record the working draft report that would be on Teams and that comments and contributions were welcome. For ease of editing, it was agreed that members would use the “comments” function in order that all views could be seen, and secretariat would be able to try to accommodate in a further version for the next meeting.</p> <p>Secretariat would manage a further version for issue prior to the next meeting, and that comments by close on Sunday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2022 would be welcomed. This would give 48 hours or so to adopt a further version for consideration at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>[post meeting note: it is suggested that a further draft would be “ frozen” on or around the 6<sup>th</sup>/ 7<sup>th</sup> October 2022 but that this would be the substantive item for the meeting],</b></p>  | All |
| <p><b>6. Engagement Update</b></p> <p>BF provided an update on the proposed engagement events, and that registrations had been slow. The event scheduled for Monday is to be rescheduled and promoted amongst rural and highland social enterprises.</p> <p>In response to AH, she indicated each event would comprise a short presentation by the Chair, setting out the background to the work, and the main themes emerging. Notes would be taken and fed back to members at their next meeting. There would be a Q and A session and open discussion on the themes presented, and provision had been made in the draft final report to set out views expressed in an annex.</p>   |     |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>AC thought it important that the impression was not given that the event would be a strong influence on the final recommendations, and that we should not over promise. This was noted and the event set accordingly in this tone.</p> <p>There were also plans to hold a further final consultation on the draft recommendations, again to test wider opinion, and could be accompanied by a survey. The ongoing TSI/SEN survey was ongoing, and CP and JR agreed to continue to update members with survey results, and the questions could be aligned to any future survey.</p> <p>AG raised the matter of the potential role of Community Enterprise who were available to undertake survey work. The Chair indicated that in previous discussion, this offer of support was felt unnecessary at that time, but CM indicated that the resource remained at the Groups disposal. If not utilised, the SES Board would utilise it to develop the thinking on implementation of the recommendations. CM agreed to advise and update colleagues on this matter</p> | <p>IW</p> <p>CP/JR</p> <p>BF</p> <p>CM</p> |
| <p><b>7. Arrangements for next and future meetings</b></p> <p>The next meeting is at the Grassmarket Community Project in Edinburgh on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2022. Members were reminded to offer comments on the draft report in Teams using the comments function by close on Sunday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2022 to enable an updated version to issue in good time for the meeting, allowing for significant work anticipated by the secretariat.</p> <p>The final meeting is on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2022 in Glasgow, followed by a lunch to mark the final meeting.</p>   | <p>BF/AG</p>                               |