

RSA Fellowship

Fellowship Council
2nd Meeting Summary
Tuesday, 15 December 2009
RSA
8 John Adam Street London WC2N 6EZ
13.00-16.30

Chair-persons:

Tessy Britton
Bob Porrer

Present:

David Archer
Avril Baigent
Tessy Britton
Kevin Cahill
Irene Campbell
Andrew Chidgey
Stephen Coleman
Sybil Crouch
Gerard Darby
David Dickinson
Jackie Elliman
John Elliott
Stephen Elliott-Hunter
Rosie Ferguson
Frances Gallagher
Jemima Gibbons
Andy Gibson
Emma Harrison
Susan Jones
Zena Martin
John McMullan
Charles Millar
Katie Moore
Ann Packard
Lopa Patel
Bob Porrer
Paul Buchannan
Emma Jones
Charmian Love
David Turner

Apologies:

Mark Ball
Gerry Acher
John Bale
David Biggs
Dave Clarke
Susan Jones
Stephen Jones
Alpesh Patel
Graham Sprigg
Helen Westropp
David Young

RSA Staff:

Matthew Taylor, Chief Executive
Belinda Lester, Director of Fellowship
Nina Bolognesi, Director of External Affairs
Julian Thomson, Director of Projects
Steve King, Director of Operations
Stephen Barton, Head of Fellowship Services
Michael Devlin, Head of Fellowship Networks
Laura Billings, Fellowship Research and
Strategy Manager
Olivia Rainford, Networks Manager

Welcome and Introductions

Bob and Tessy introduced the session and highlighted that the purpose of this second meeting would be to identify some of the key issues for the Council moving forward into 2010, as well as deal with some of the strategic tasks necessary to ensure efficiency; including a proposal for the decision making process.

The meeting confirmed unanimously Bob and Tessy as Co-chairs for the meeting.

Formal thanks offered to Bob and Tessy for their organisation.

The information pack had been sent out in advance of the meeting and was based primarily on the results of a questionnaire distributed amongst the Council Members.

Live-Blogging/Twitter

The issue of live-blogging and 'tweeting' was raised in advance of its position on the agenda, specifically addressing the concern that in the first Council meeting permission was not expressly granted by those present in the room in advance.

Discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of live-communication:

Negative

- Openness of discussion may be affected when Council Members have knowledge of live-blogging or twitter.

Positive

- Increases transparency: useful tool for Council Members not present today; engaging the Fellowship.

Suggestions:

- Flag issues of confidentiality at which point live-blogging would halt: Chatham House Rules.

Vote: for and against Chatham House Rules re: live-blogging/twitter

For: 30

Against: 1

Confirmed: live-blogging will take place and issues of confidentiality will be flagged, at which point all live communications will halt.

Agenda Items:

- Unattributed minutes to be completed and distributed; attributions to be listed only with regard to RSA Staff.
- Minutes of first meeting accepted.

- Nominations Committee update: Zena Martin and Irene Campbell were confirmed by Stephen King on the 24 November 2009; there is one position remaining and this will be re-visited in the New Year.

Structure and Strategy

Thanks to all who completed the questionnaire, great to see how much energy there is amongst the Fellowship Council. General conclusion is that Members want the Council to be effective.

The information pack had included information about a 'tight and structured' approach to strategic operations within the Council, versus a 'distributed and coordinated' approach.

It was asked whether the two models can ever be mutually exclusive; however, attention was drawn to the need to determine accountabilities when fixing tasks, as this will help secure sustainability when moving forward with Fellowship Council activities.

This led to a discussion on 'risk management', one member raised concern for the need to minimise the risk of failure in the Council's first year, and that this could possibly be secured through pursuing projects considered to be 'safe-bets'. It was also considered that each project could be different in terms of management style.

General consensus in the room suggested that a balance between the two models would be necessary and that by starting with a distributed model, patterns will emerge that may allow for a leadership/tight model.

Agreed: no need to vote on strategy model; assumption that a distributed model will work best initially. In general, the values of the RSA and the ambitions of the Fellowship Council are unlikely to be realised in a tight structure. Additionally there seemed general acceptance that with an experimental approach, some risks were unavoidable.

Roles of regional FC Members and appointed FC Members

Is there a difference between the roles and responsibilities depending on whether you are an elected or appointed FC Member?

General view is that there is no difference, Matthew Taylor expanded:

- The Fellowship Council consists of 20 elected and 20 Trustee nominated Members; The establishment of the Fellowship Council is an essential part of the RSA's transformation process. It is intended that the Council will be eventually fully elected, but the Trustees recognised that this is an important and experimental stage for the RSA and that it's implementation would be more effective if staged.
- Two places on the Trustee Board are reserved for Council Members.
- The RSA is presently involved in The Future of Membership Project with the National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO); addressing contemporary issues for membership organisations.

- Speaks of the ‘Third Way’¹; Fellowship as a self-governing body that will become a powerful commissioner of the organisation as a whole. As the Fellowship becomes more engaged, the more it will be able to drive change in the RSA.

It was confirmed that there is no formal difference between the roles and responsibilities of those who were elected to the Council, and those who were nominated. However, it is essential that communication and cooperation between the regional committees and the Council is established and maintained.

Leadership of the Fellowship Council

A proposal to appoint a Chair and Deputy-Chair for the Fellowship Council, with the primary role of co-chairing meetings and liaison with RSA Staff, was put to Council Members.

All Council Members were in favour of appointing these roles. Council Members were asked to self-nominate by notifying Michael Devlin, Head of Fellowship Networks, during the break.

It was agreed that the FC would elect members to be put forward for consideration as co-opt trustees, rather than all nominations be put forward.

Question: Are the two co-opted Trustee places reserved for the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Fellowship Council?

RSA recommends that the positions are distinct; the Trustee Board requires attendance at six meetings annually, which could be a heavy burden on top of the responsibilities of the Chair and Deputy Chair.

It was agreed unanimously that the role of Chair and Deputy Chair will remain separate to the co-opted positions on the Trustee Board, although individuals could put themselves forward for both should they wish to.

Question: For co-opted Trustees, if the term of a Trustee is three years, and the term of a Council Member is two years, do you continue to be a Trustee if you cease to be a Council Member?

Steve King stated that if you cease to be on the Council, you will also cease to be a Trustee. Matthew Taylor re-iterates that the governance processes related to this issue will be reviewed in one year to see how they have worked.

Question: With reference to ‘rotation and continuity’ (information pack page 9), why is there a direct line between the Chair and the Deputy Chair and what is the difference between their roles? Is the concept of ‘natural progression’ too prescriptive?

It was accepted that this will be an issue to re-visit at a later date, along with the Council structure in general.

¹ In contrast to the traditional ‘1st way’: e.g. the British Council, ‘creaking’, governance is a headache, notional decision making whereby the structures are poorly suited to the organisation. Or the ‘2nd way’: e.g. run as a business; trustees = governance and Members = participation in events and activities.

Question: Will the Chair and Deputy Chair receive administrative support from the House?

Yes, support from staff will be made available and, in addition, all Fellowship Council members and co-opted Trustees are eligible to have their expenses reimbursed for meetings they attend (subject to expenses guidelines set out on the Fellowship Council ning)

Discussion: Relationship between the Trustee Board and Fellowship Council

Responses and comments from Council Members included:

- There was some concern that the Fellowship Council would become a pseudo 2nd tier Trustee Board and that further understanding of this relationship would be necessary.
- In particular, transparency between the Council and Trustee Board communications would be an important factor in securing a good working relationship.

Question: Will the 5 year Trustee Plans be shared with the Fellowship Council?

Action: *Once the Nominations Panel have confirmed co-opted Trustee positions, the Trustee Board should address this issue.*

Feedback from Belinda Lester, Director of Fellowship and Matthew Taylor:

Trustees support the view that Council Members are focused on developing a positive working relationship; this is why two members of the Fellowship Council would be co-opted onto the Trustee Board. However, Council is still in its development stage and the issue of sharing documents and similar will be explored by Trustees. The Council was reminded that the two bodies have distinct responsibilities and functions – the Council's first priority is the Fellowship, and all members have been tasked with embodying 'active Fellowship'.

Agenda and Minutes

It was agreed that advance circulation of agendas for Fellowship Council meetings would be necessary, with a preference for distributing two weeks in advance to the Council meeting.

Minutes would be approved by the Chair and Deputy Chair (in the case of this meeting, by the two co-chairs) and the unconfirmed minutes made available to all Fellows on the website. The minutes would then be formally confirmed at the next meeting.

Minutes would be circulated amongst the Council within ten working days of each meeting.

Guests and Observers at Fellowship Council Meetings

A number of points were raised in relation to the prospect of sharing the activities of the Council as widely as possible. For example:

- The prospect of live-streaming future meetings via a webcam
- Encouraging young people to come and observe how the Council works

It was felt that at this stage, Council discretion would govern each case of an observer wishing to attend a meeting, and that live streaming would only be of benefit if there was a genuine demand for it. Council members were reminded that very few Fellows would have the opportunity to attend meetings, so transparency should be achieved in ways that reach as many Fellows as possible.

Significantly, achieving a balance between transparency and the freedom to speak openly in meetings was felt to be of primary importance. The pending Working Groups were seen as a

contributing factor in representing the interests of those who cannot attend meetings; a 'voice' for the Fellowship.

It was suggested that the issue of engagement at this level should be revisited in one year.

Communications

It was noted that over 300 emails had been received by the Co-Chairs of this meeting. A more streamlined solution was strongly encouraged.

It was agreed that the council develop a regular email newsletter for FC members (and RSA staff attending the FC meetings) to keep members up-to-date on FC activity, projects and activities involving members, details of projects organised centrally, regionally or by interest groups, news of the Trustee Boards and RSA staff etc.

It was agreed that we should maintain both open and closed ning websites for discussions. As the tool is a valuable tool for engagement and transparent discussion it was agreed that FC members will take on individual responsibility for initiating and contributing to conversations.

Action: Jemima Gibbons has kindly offered to develop and manage the Council Newsletter

Important Note:

Council Members are strongly encouraged not to use the 'Reply All' button when responding to emails.

Action: Andy Gibson offered to look into a communications solution for this issue; including the suggestion of using software that prevents a 'Reply All' function. Andy suggested that perhaps a Google group could be considered, as it allowed members to create their own contact frequency settings.

It was agreed that RSA staff attending council meeting and receiving all papers and correspondence as follows: Matthew Taylor, Belinda Lester, Michael Devlin, Stephen King, Nina Bolognesi, Julian Thomson, and Vivs Long-Ferguson.

Frequency of Meetings

It was accepted that three meetings for 2010 would provide the optimum opportunity for the Council to be successful, and that after a period of one year, they would review how many meetings should take place on an annual basis.

Action: Belinda Lester to review current meeting dates and propose new dates for 2010. The RSA is also happy to consider Council Meetings that take place outside of London, whilst taking into account that rail fares are often cheapest to London.

Important Note:

Since the meeting, the dates of 23 March and 29 June have been proposed, in addition to 5 October.

Terms of Reference

It was agreed that the meeting adopt an 'interim agreement' of the Terms of Reference, to be reviewed at a later meeting.

Elections

Two elections were held, both following the format of 'Preferential Voting'. The first was for the position of Deputy Chair, and the second for the two co-opted Trustee positions.

Important Note:

No election was held for the position of Chair as Tessy Britton was the only candidate and was accepted by the Fellowship Council.

Nominations for the position of Deputy Chair:

1. Paul Buchanan
2. Kevin Cahill
3. John Elliot

Nominations for the Trustee Board:

1. David Archer
2. Stephen Coleman
3. Zena Martin
4. Lopa Patel

Election Results

Fellowship Council Chair: Tessy Britton

Fellowship Council Deputy Chair: Paul Buchanan

Co-opted Trustee Board Members: Zena Martin and David Archer (both subject to approval by the Nominations Panel).

Developing the Fellowship Council activity through networks, groups and projects

Julian Thompson, Director of Projects, was introduced. Julian was formerly a Research Director at Ipsos MORI, the market and social research agency. He specialised in qualitative, participative and futures research across the public, private and voluntary sectors. In moving to the RSA he is looking forward to using research as a means to effect social change, rather than just investigating it.

Summary of RSA Projects

RSA Projects is simply 'the RSA in action'. It is the RSA acting in pursuit of its central aspiration – to fulfil our human and social potential by encouraging, mobilising and enhancing the capability of people to tackle seemingly intractable problems. Projects should be the combined effort of staff, Fellows, citizens, institutions and other partners working in concert. This team acts as a hub to support RSA-wide activities.

RSA Projects aim to work in a genuinely interdisciplinary way. The disciplines, themes or categories that are currently most strongly represented in the Projects portfolio are as follows:

- Learning and education
- Enterprise
- Arts and design;
- Communities and citizenship
- Public Policy (through the 2020 Public Services Trust)
- Social psychology

This list is not exhaustive; there are many historic areas of RSA work that are not represented here (e.g. environment) and many new possibilities for growth if we can genuinely connect with Fellowship.

There is a constant need to balance rigour, discipline and conceptual clarity with the freedom and uncertainty needed to encourage experimentation and innovation.

The goal for this year is to start blending the activity of Fellows and Staff so that Projects have greater reach, capacity and impact.

In line with this, Projects would like to work with the Council to develop a framework that will allow for this transformation to take place.

Examples of current RSA Projects

1. User Centred Drug Services

Team is currently working in Crawley and Bognor Regis to re-design the services that are provided for people with drug and alcohol addiction, based on the latter's genuine needs. The aim is to influence the social context that surrounds them in such a way as to encourage them to pursue a habit-free life. The team recently held local workshops with users, service providers and practitioners, leading up to a major event at the RSA on 18th January.

The project is an example of finding people in communities that are under-resourced, lacking in capabilities and working together on solutions.

2. Connected Communities

Connected Communities is working to map the social networks of particular deprived areas in order to equip people with the social capital they need to tackle their problems

Fellows have been involved in most projects at various stages; they are often approached or volunteer with a view to supporting the need for skills, resources, engagement and so on. For example, in Peterborough Fellows are working together to generate a social media space for the community. This participation maximises the value and power of RSA projects.

It is hoped that these examples and the new framework will allow the RSA to move from something like a 'cottage industry', to a genuine force for social good.

In general, the 'acid test' for RSA Projects, is does a piece of research contribute to the bigger vision. The measure of success, given the historical significance of the RSA, could be determined by what appears on the RSA timeline in 20 years.

The RSA Projects Team is made up of individuals with a variety of skills from a range of backgrounds. The task now is to build an interdisciplinary approach to their work, to build bridges and knit them together, achieving a holistic, problem-centred approach to action, as opposed to a subject or discipline-defined approach.

Challenges and Goals

Over the next few months the priority will be to review the existing portfolio, develop clear protocols for identifying and acting on project opportunities and to increase the capacity of the JAS team to encourage Fellowship activity in projects. As the year progresses we will develop stronger collaborations with Fellows on specific projects, and also aid them in setting up their own independent projects. Opening up a dialogue with Fellows and the regions is an integral part of this and how we get there is something to discuss with the Council.

There is a need for us to understand:

- what motivates the Fellowship
- what the terms of engagement would be

With a view to:

- consolidating the capacity of RSA Staff

There will be an element of 'learning as we go'; however, it would be useful to identify areas in which project activity could be launched with a view to becoming initial hubs of combined Fellowship-Staff Projects that reflect a decentralised approach. The task is to develop a framework for managing this process and ultimately, its success could lead to a national project – ambitious thinking for the long-term.

General Discussion

Responses and comments from Council Members included:

- There is existing frustration amongst the Fellowship where the House has not got involved with existing projects e.g. the Youth Awards Project (Anthony Earl FRSA) and the Carers Project (Jonathan Jewell FRSA and Joyce Arram FRSA). Even Fellows in London feel isolated.
- There is a need to look closely at what is already happening in the regions, with a view to tracking activity e.g. what is the relationship between the Use Centred Drugs Services and the work being undertaken in Scotland following the Drugs Commission Report?

Belinda Lester: Need to highlight the role of the Networks Managers and the challenge ahead to work more closely with project activities, whilst testing different ways in which the activity model might work.

- General feeling is that Council Members are encouraged by this engagement with RSA Projects.
- Decision is made not to break into smaller groups to identify the specialist groups the Council works towards, as people feel it would be more productive to continue in the open forum manner that has been initiated.

Networks and Connectivity

Belinda Lester explained that following a series of connectivity issues, a functional Fellowship directory will be up and running in the New Year.

The Team continues to work on 'back-end' technology solutions and understanding how Fellows use the RSA.

Further responses and comments from Council Members included:

- Projects as atoms of development; Fellows want to participate at a local level
- Need interdisciplinary forums at a local level with a view to seeing what themes emerge and then connecting at a national level.
- Visual aids: would be worth having a map where you can connect the issues. This would be a useful tool to aggregate what the central issues are and how we can organise around this problem.

Julian Thompson: How do the aims of the RSA get incorporated and acted on by local networks, allowing the aims of the RSA to be pursued independently by the Fellowship?

- Important to share lessons from previous projects with other Fellows; share the 'ripple' effects of success stories.
- A communicative infrastructure that allows us to share ideas, knowledge, skills, project work and networks would be invaluable.
- Monitoring and evaluation of projects is something that needs to be factored in from the start.

Julian Thompson: Currently conducting a formal evaluation of Opening Minds. It is a question of how far back we go; how do we access the 'cultural memory' of the Fellowship?

- Important to consider knowledge management when embarking on such a task; people need to know *who* to ask, rather than just dumping information about project activity or evaluations.
- Possibility of the Directory having some functionality that could enable this, allowing Fellows to access the functional side of expertise.
- Clarification is needed with regard to the information that would be available, and what sort of access would be provided.

Julian Thompson: three areas for consideration:

Benchmarking

- How do we identify what is a good project?
- The ability to judge why/how things may be inappropriate

Branding

- Using branding effectively

Transparency

- Recognising the impact of projects
- Being clear about the role of financial incentives in galvanising Fellowship activity. A need for greater understanding with regard to the blurring of boundaries between public, private and 3rd sector motivations.

- There is some difficulty in using the website to explore how Fellows can engage with Projects. There is also a need to sign-post Fellows' projects elsewhere.
- How do FRSA projects move to the centre of the agenda? Allowing for a fundamental transformation in the way that policy is made – moving from Whitehall to the regions.
- Advance planning for Project areas could be shared with the Fellowship.

- Projects should be high risk and experimental, this is what separates the RSA from other organisations; 'predictable change' should be left to traditional academic platforms. No need to re-invent the wheel.
- The RSA needs to define change in a way that people understand. How do we generate discussion in a way that no one else does?
- Society tends not to listen; this would be a valuable lesson for government. If the RSA can achieve discussion in an inclusive way, this would set us apart.
- The Networks Project generated valuable lessons, we know what we want to achieve, however the operational side of things needs to be taken forward.
- What are the terms of engagement between Staff and Fellows who are trying to initiate projects? Who does the RSA give money to?
- Sharing research and inviting suggestions from Fellows would increase the transparency of the RSA, making research objective, as opposed to hidden.
- There are opportunities for existing projects to be exploited e.g. design directions. Would it be possible to have a 'Fellow's Choice' in RSA award schemes?
- Events can be perceived as a wasted opportunity for further engagement with wider society, who is tuning in? How can this be an effective resource? With Live-streaming, are we moving towards a TED style community?
- In the South West Region the feedback from Fellows has been a desire to 'keep it local'; perhaps this is a project in itself?
- With regard to a membership directory and its value for supporting projects, it would be essential that we clarify what sort of access to information would be available.

Question: What is the data protocol? Would the database be generated on a regional basis?

Belinda Lester: The database would be less about 'regions'; however, data can be individually tailored to geographic or subject matter interests

Belinda Lester: We are aware that there is confusion about and a gap between Fellows' projects and RSA Projects. In the New Year we will be 'mapping the Fellowship'; to look at the ways which Fellows work together and use RSA 'products'. The RSA will also be launching a Seed Fund in 2010 to develop Fellows' activities; this will be a useful space to test the relationship between Projects and FRSA projects.

Julian Thompson: Important to note that the RSA does not as a rule fund its own Projects. Each piece of research is funded via external bodies.

Belinda Lester: the Networks Team has grown to seven people, including staff in Europe and the USA. Networks are now beginning to emerge on their own; their major role is to help connect Fellows.

Fellowship Charter

Laura Billings: *A summary of feedback gathered since October was sent to Council Members. In general, there was a lack of engagement with the process, possibly ambivalence due to concerns and confusion about its wording. There were mixed responses and it has been brought back to Council for development and implementation. Please see Appendix A for a summary of Feedback.*

Important Note:

The Charter is an important document which is intended to embody the cultural shift of the RSA. The intention is to work with the Council throughout 2010 to achieve a Charter that acts as a spur to action.

Further responses and comments from Council Members included:

- The relationship between the Royal Charter and the new Charter was raised. What is the purpose of a 2nd Charter when we are so far adrift from the first? A project could thus be to sit down and work out what the RSA is.
- It is difficult to imagine what the purpose of the Charter is.

Matthew Taylor: The organisation has evolved dramatically since the Royal Charter, which originated out of the need to clarify the purpose of the organisation. Our present work has been tested against this Charter (adapted about 10 years ago) in line with the Charity Commission. However, the first Charter is an historic document that does not mean a great deal when looking at expectations from society or the Fellowship with regard to the concept of a mutual relationship, or initiating social change. Thus, the second Charter is a living document about what the RSA means in the contemporary world and should be seen as reflecting the RSA's social mission.

Question: Where does the Charter fit in the terms and conditions of Membership? Is it a cultural document? Is it an operational document that can be used to remove people/dictate project value etc?

Laura Billings: The Charter is a value statement, an overview. An operational tool will be created separately to the Charter.

- Feedback from Fellows indicates that when asked why they became a Fellow there is a sense of 'shared values', a feeling of compatibility between the RSA and personal values.

Matthew Taylor: The issue of shared values has been of concern for some time; many Fellows complain that not enough is asked of them, that they don't feel a part of something, that they are simply invited to events. The Charter is organically emerging from this. A value statement is needed; this may work to highlight the fact that a subscription fee is a donation toward the charitable aims of the Society, as opposed to a fee.

Working Groups

Council Members were asked to volunteer to be part of a number of Working Groups that would lead activity in a variety of areas. Please see Appendix B for a summary of all Groups and Members.

Note: Working groups should be open to all Fellows as they develop and used pro-actively to engage widely with the Fellowship.

Closing Thoughts

Working Groups should be systematically reviewed every six months to allow the groups to reconvene.

Council Members were encouraged to share their progression on the Fellowship Council Ning as this would be a useful tool for sharing information.

It was also suggested that in the future, at the end of meetings, Council Members should be given a chance to reflect and evaluate successes, think about how we are doing.

Bob and Tessy thanked everyone for a very successful and decisive meeting.

Appendix A

Fellowship Charter Feedback Summary – December 2009

Background

Following requests from Fellows for clarity on their role during the current cultural shift of the organisation, the intention behind the Charter was to engage Fellows in this process, to develop a common understanding of our values and aims, to encourage the types of behaviours required to achieve this change, and to communicate the opportunities and possibilities available as Fellows.

The RSA has invested a lot over the last 3 years to develop Fellowship networks and engagement, and we have had consistent feedback about the desire for a framework in which to operate. We therefore developed the Charter over the course of the last year with input from Fellows, staff, and Trustees, and created the current version which was brought to the Fellowship Council with a request for input in its development and involvement in taking it forward.

It was presented at the 2009 AGM in a visual format, as part of an exhibition, in an attempt to bring it to life, to represent the large amount of information and history taken into account to get to this point, and to signpost a possible future for the RSA and its Fellowship.

Issues

The Charter in its current form has not been widely reviewed or supported. Levels of feedback from the Fellowship have been low, and the content of the feedback has highlighted several issues. This may be due to poor communication (the visual representation not making the text or purpose clear), confusion over feedback methods, or ambivalence from the Fellowship.

The bad:

- Confusion around the purpose of the Charter and concern about the level of consultation
- Concern about imposing a 'code of conduct' and the emphasis on participation
- Concern over the tone of text

The good:

- A positive reaction from Fellows identifying aspects of their own skills or lives which they view as relevant to and enhanced by their Fellowship
- Support for creativity in using a visual format and for the positive values outlined in the text
- Understanding of the necessity to start somewhere

Proposal

We see the Charter as fundamental to the transformation and future direction of the RSA and the Fellowship.

Therefore, in order for the Charter to be meaningful to Fellows, and achieve the desired effect of clarifying what it means to be a Fellow and creating the right messages and tools to encourage action, I would like to work with Council members and the wider Fellowship to take this forward together over the next year, and have a truly co-developed Fellowship Charter to present at the next AGM in October 2010.

COMMUNICATION

Confusion around purpose *"What perceived issue or problem is it trying to solve?"*

Concern it is being imposed by staff with too little consultation *"I don't know the history of this initiative"*

Concern over signing up with an implicit agreement preferred *"I would not feel it helpful to "sign up" to being collaborative. I think we all go about it in our own way"... "Each year I renew my subscription I re-affirm my support for what the RSA is about"*

Concern that Charter only relates to Fellows *"a lot of the effective action by RSA comes - or should come - from collaboration between staff and Fellows"*

Understanding of the necessity to start somewhere *"Seeking the suggestions of 27,000 independent-minded individuals any earlier would have probably killed the idea stone dead"*

TEXT

Concern with 'code of conduct' feeling *"this is at best unnecessary and at worst pretty patronising"*

Concern over emphasis of participation for already busy people, and nagging rather than supporting *"I just don't think you get there by making people feel guilty for not participating"*

Confusion over the difference with the Royal Charter *"We cannot have two fundamental documents in one organisation, both of which are called a 'charter'"*

Concern that the tone of the text is too smug or arrogant *"the language seems to me a bit bombastic, over-egged and boastful"*

Concern that the text is too elitist or introspective *"we should be saying something about our willingness to engage with wider public concerns and debates"*

Concern that an emphasis on voluntary efforts as Fellows will stifle social enterprise *"It makes it difficult to bring into the mix the non-profit and social enterprise activities of Fellows"*

Support for text as realistic and possible to achieve in different ways *"this is a great idea, there are many Fellows I know would respond well to this."... "It reads well and fits within the RSA values"*

Mixed response to key words *"I also like the "Inspire, Support, Enable" slogan, even though some consider it tautologous"... "Inspire, Support and Enable are really good" ... "Key words too soft"*

Request for a more detailed supporting document with service level agreements *"Adding a parallel statement that demonstrates the availability of support for Fellows will help to encourage us all to consider what we can do"*

VISUAL DESIGN

Support for creativity and innovation in presenting the Charter with visual imagery *“I love the whole design and thinking behind it. The illustration is lovely - particularly like the coloured lines” ... “graphic form effectively links the RSA's history and its current activities”*

Concern that the Charter text wasn't clear *“does not provide an easily legible copy of the charter as a document”*

Concern that imagery is UK-centric *“doesn't show global / international aspect of Fellowship clearly, London-centric picture of John Adam Street”*

Appendix B

As part of the vision, the Fellowship Council will be working in partnership with the RSA staff to enrich the experience and maximise the potential, of Fellowship. The working groups represent an important initial entry point into facilitating this work and will be accompanied by ongoing support and enabling of Fellows.

The ambition is for the Working Groups to be innovative and flexible rather than too traditionally structured, and as such there will be a need for a variety of styles of working depending on the nature of the Group and the subject matter it is discussing.

The work of each group will also vary in complexity and the different purposes of groups may require different modes of operation and levels of formality. In some cases they will be making operational or strategic recommendations to RSA staff and/or the Trustee Board, while in other cases they will have a freer remit. In all cases they will work in partnership with the appropriate RSA staff and will report on progress to the Council, where appropriate bringing recommendations for consideration by Council. It is recognised that some groups (e.g., the Seed Fund Group) will need to develop proposals quickly, between Council meetings; in these cases the action taken will be reported at or before the next Council Meeting. Each group will be convened by a Council Member and members of each group will be expected to contribute their expertise and knowledge and also, as appropriate, seek input from, and engage with, the wider Fellowship.

The terms of reference of each group – which will be in line with Council and overall RSA objectives and developed after discussion with RSA staff (and, in some cases, with the Trustee Board) - should be confirmed by Council, which will keep the work of groups under review.

RSA staff will provide appropriate support for working groups as far as resources will allow.

Working Groups.	
Regions	Charter
Council Convenor: Bob Porrer (agreed)	Council Convenor: To be agreed
Kevin Cahill	Gerry Acher
Irene Campbell	Avril Baigent
Jackie Elliman	Kevin Cahill
John McMullan	Andrew Chidgey
David Turner	Jackie Elliman
Gerry Acher	Rosie Ferguson
Helen Westropp	Ann Packard
David Biggs	Bob Porrer
Stephen Elliott-Hunter	Stephen Elliott-Hunter
Staff Lead: Belinda Lester	Staff Lead: Laura Billings

<p>Project Framework</p> <p>Council Convenor: To be agreed</p> <p>David Archer Sybil Crouch Gerard Darby David Dickinson John Elliott Rosie Ferguson Andy Gibson Charmian Love Charles Millar</p> <p>Staff Lead: Michael Devlin, working with Julian Thompson, Belinda Lester and teams</p>	<p>Seed Fund (linked to Project Framework)</p> <p>Council Convenor: To be agreed</p> <p>Gerard Darby Rosie Ferguson Charles Millar Charmian Love</p> <p>Staff Lead: Belinda Lester</p>
<p>Fellowship – supporting, connecting, mapping, developing specialist networks, new events.</p> <p>Council Convenor: To be agreed</p> <p>Jemima Gibbons Andy Gibson Susan Jones David Young Stephen Elliott-Hunter Paul Buchanan Tessy Britton</p> <p>Staff Lead: Michael Devlin, Steve Barton and team</p>	<p>Developing Partnerships</p> <p>Council Convenor: To be agreed</p> <p>Frances Gallagher Katie Moore Lopa Patel Susan Jones Helen Westropp Stephen Elliot-Hunter</p> <p>Staff Lead: Michael and teams</p>
<p>What is the RSA? (This is currently envisaged as a small-group research project)</p> <p>Kevin Cahill Tessy Britton</p> <p>Staff Lead: Belinda Lester</p>	<p>Gender Imbalance/Women’s Network (Specialist Network)</p> <p>Council Convenor: Katie Moore (agreed)</p> <p>Jemima Gibbons</p> <p>Staff Lead: Laura Billings TBC</p>
<p>Mental Health (Specialist Network)</p> <p>Council Convenor: Andy Gibson (agreed)</p> <p>Tessy Britton</p> <p>Staff Lead: TBC</p>	<p>Education (Specialist Network)</p> <p>Council Convenor: To be agreed</p> <p>John Elliott Frances Gallagher Tessy Britton</p> <p>Staff Lead: TBC</p>

Young Professionals (Specialist Network)

Council Convenor: Charmian Love (agreed)

Mark Ball
Stephen Elliott-Hunter

Staff Lead: TBC

Youth Projects (Specialist Network)

Council Convenor: Rosie Ferguson (agreed)

Zena Martin
Tessy Britton

Staff Lead: Chris Luffingham