



# Governance consultation response

## Overview

The consultation period ran from midday on the 25<sup>th</sup> November to midday on the 29<sup>th</sup> November.

The governance working group consists of 10 members at the time of writing.

A total of almost ten thousand impressions were made via the Pride Glasgow Facebook account, with just over one thousand engagements.

Approximately twenty people attended our public governance meeting, plus several people at any one time via the live stream.

## AGM poll

Forty-two responses were received to the AGM poll with Sunday 16th being the clear preference.



## Formal consultation submissions and our response

Four formal consultation responses were received with an aggregate Net Promoter Score of +25 (-100 is “Very little improvement” and +100 is “A great deal of improvement”).<sup>1</sup>



There were several suggestions for improvement which are detailed below, but the majority of comments were those of support for the proposal.

The table below outlines the suggestions received, and our response.

Suggestion	Response
Change LGBT to LGBTI+ throughout	We agree and have incorporated this into the final papers.
Put more focus on community engagement	We have revised our Mission, Vision and Values to make our wider community engagement role clearer.

<sup>1</sup> Given the small dataset size, caution should be taken over this figure. Indeed, one reply was received with -100, despite the comments being very positive.



<p>The PG19 event management team should be recruited as soon as possible.</p>	<p>We agree, and our published timeline for this is ambitious.</p>
<p>Increase the minimum number of trustees from three to five to make it commensurate with the size of the community we serve.</p>	<p>We agree with the sentiment expressed and we expect that in practice there will never be fewer than five trustees. We also considered the impact of clause 88 of the constitution, which comes into effect if the number of trustees falls too low. Keeping the minimum at three means that two trustees could resign, fall ill or become ineligible without paralysing the organisation. On balance, we decided not to increase the constitutional minimum.</p>
<p>The Pride Forum should not have reserved places, as it should be entirely skills based.</p>	<p>In the case of the Board, we agree; appointment should be entirely skills based. No reserved places are suggested.</p> <p>In the case of the Forum, we disagree with this point; the Forum is intended to be a representative body and is elected rather than appointed. We decided not to make this change.</p>
<p>There should be a reserved place for an Ally (straight person) on the Pride Forum.</p>	<p>We agree and have incorporated this into the final papers.</p>
<p>A suggested list of topics for Board meetings and a risk-based decision-making approach.</p>	<p>We agree with many of the suggested topics, and these will be brought to the attention of the new Board. We don't consider it necessary to write these into the formal documents.</p>
<p>Pride should support causes and organisations that are not LGBTI+ related (an example of the '84 miners' strike support was given).</p>	<p>We appreciate the potential and power that solidarity across organisations can have. Nothing in the governance documents prevents this, although there are restrictions in charity law on duplicating effort and on direct inter-charity financial support. We decided to make this an agenda item for our first AGM as it does not need to be in the formal documents.</p>