



REAP- Social Audit Project

Moray/Aberdeenshire

2000- 2004



Social Accounting what is it ?

Everyone understands the concept of financial auditing where an organisation records its financial transactions, which are then verified by an independent auditor at the year-end.

The same principal applies to social auditing, the big difference being social accounts carry information on social, environmental and economic factors- the so called "triple bottom line".

*"Social accounting and audit is a framework which allows an organisation to build on existing documentation and reporting and develop a process whereby it can **account** for its social performance, **report** on that performance and draw up an action plan to improve on that performance, and through which it can understand its **impact** on the community and be **accountable** to its key stakeholders. (Community Business Scotland Network 2001)*

How does Social Auditing work?

Below is a table showing the "Five Stage" social accounting model that was used as the framework for social audit clusters one, two and three.

Stage One	The first stage is deciding as an organisation that you want to measure and improve you performance.
Stage Two	The next stage is to clarify you mission, values, objectives and activities. It may seem a bit simplistic, but it is impossible to measure performance unless you have something to measure it against. Then identify the stakeholders and plan hoe to consult them about your performance. Once this is agreed you can look at the scope of the audit. Are you going to try to cover all aspects of your activities or only some parts? The answer to this question will impact on who you consult with
Stage Three	As its name suggests social auditing is an audit, which by definition is about counting and measuring things. This means that you have to begin to identify the kind of information you need to collect and begin to gather that information- what is known as the "social book-keeping" phase.
Stage Four	Once all of this information has been generated it is collated into the draft social accounts- from our experience the most intensive part of the process.
Stage Five	The final stage is to present these accounts to an independent audit panel. The role of the audit panel is not to comment on the work of the organisation, rather it is to ensure that the information contained in the draft accounts is a fair reflection of the information collected by the project and fed in by its stakeholders. Once the members of the panel are happy with the document, and when suggested amendments have been addressed, they release an audit statement to authenticate the accounts. The organisation is then encouraged to publish the findings- normally in an accessible abridged format.

why the Rural Environmental Action Project got involved?

The Rural Environmental Action project (REAP) is a part of the National Charity CSV and works with community groups and agencies in Moray and Aberdeenshire in North - East Scotland. The focus of REAP is not just environmental, being more about the wider concept of sustainability.

REAP's "customer" base are groups and organisations in the voluntary/community sector and their core business is in turn to achieve some form of social, community or environmental benefit to the wider community.

REAP had itself been through a traditional external evaluation process and finding this not particularly empowering either in terms of the process or the outcomes had decided to consider other ways of measuring its impact.

REAP approached the CBS Network at the end of 1999 with the view to delivering a social audit “cluster” where REAP could recruit local groups and CBS would provide training and mentoring support. This first “cluster” was seen to be a success, and following that largely through funding from the ESF Objective 3 programme and dedicated time of two supports/ mentors. REAP repeated the process in 2001/2003 and again in 2003/2004.

Why evaluate the process?

Many of the benefits and snags of social auditing have been well documented but REAP felt that it was in the unique position of having undertaken its own social audit cycles as well as mentoring, supporting and training other organisations to conduct their own social audits. We wanted to look a bit more deeply into the value and benefit of the process and what elements create the best conditions for the process to be successful and whether we at REAP were providing those elements.

The completion rate for organisations getting to audit panel stage and then publishing and disseminating their audit reports was relatively low, although many of the organisations said that they got a huge amount out of the process and it had changed their and the organisations working practice. At the end of 2003 the Social Audit Network (SAN) looked at the existing social audit model and decided that it needed to be re – visited.

Firstly to place more importance on the creating the correct environment within an organisation to complete the task: increasing commitment to the idea and planning in resources to carry it out. Spending more time looking at the mission, values, aims and objectives and ensuring that these were “embedded” within the organisation before measuring against them.

Secondly that the process could be carried out in a much more layered approach. There would be three stages as opposed to five and that each of these stages was an end in its own right.

For the purpose of this evaluation we have concentrated on looking at several things:

- The differences and lessons learned in each cluster.
- How the organisations found the overall process (five stage model)
- How useful the hand-book was.
- Comments on the training and the mentoring and support aspects of the process.
- How the organisations benefited from the experience.
- What the draw-backs were.

Methodologies and who was consulted

For the purpose of this evaluation Claire Ross (REAP) and Alan Kay (Community Business Scotland network) conducted two evaluation sessions in Moray and Aberdeenshire followed up by three individual interviews canvassing feedback from organisations that had participated in all three clusters. Claire also conducted semi-structured interviews with all the mentors/support people and trainers (REAP and CBS Network) involved.

Below is a table showing the organisations that were consulted it is worth noting that cluster three were in the final stages of the report writing at the time this research was carried out.

Cluster	Who we consulted
One	Milltown day Workshops REAP The Lhanbryde Challenge Mearns Area Project
Two	The Volunteer Centre (Moray) The Lhanbryde After School Club The Phoenix Community Stores
Three	Moray Anchor Projects The “Y” Project StartOver Community Care project The Lhanbryde Community Challenge The Mearns Healthy Living Network The Banffshire partnership

Cluster One– 2000/2001

Cluster one was funded as a pilot through the local enterprise company (Moray, Badenoch, Strathspey, Enterprise)

There were introductory information sessions held in advance to explain the process to potential participants.

Ten groups were involved in the training, seven of which went to panel and three who did not complete.

Initially it was quite difficult to recruit groups and this was done very much on the basis of organisations that REAP knew, being involved. Bringing in CBS Network made it easier to recruit groups as they have credibility in the field.

In the pilot Alan Kay and John Pearce from CBS Network did all of the training and mentoring input.

Organisation	Values, Aims and Objectives established	Social Accounting Framework put in place. Stakeholders consulted.	Report completed audit statement issued	Followed through with continued social accounting
Grampian Credit Union	✓	✓		
Grampian Service Brokerage	✓			
Lewis Grassic Gibbon Centre	✓	✓	✓	
The Lhanbryde Challenge Project	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mearns Community Transport Project	✓	✓	✓	✓
Milton Day Work Shop	✓	✓	✓	✓
Moray Furniture Store	✓	✓		
Rural Environmental Action Project	✓	✓	✓	✓

Feedback Specific to Cluster One:

“ I cluster one the support was from out with the area and this kept us to deadlines” (Participant)

“Cluster one made much more use of the handbook (using it like a bible). I think that the handbook is important for laying down the foundations.” (participant)

“ I felt that there was too much training in cluster one but in the other clusters to little. The training could be a little slow and pedantic at times. The training reflects the people that deliver it as does the handbook. The style at REAP is a bit more interactive. I think that the formal learning can be done in one session and the other input needs to be more inter-active.” (Participant)

“ I much preferred the first cluster because I was involved in a much more hands on basis. I feel that training and mentoring are very different roles. Training is just imparting information where as the visits (mentoring) is about building up a relationship, developing trust and a base of information about what the organisation does in a very intimate way.” (Trainer)

Cluster Two 2002/2003

Again for cluster two there were information sessions held in Aberdeenshire and Moray and an information leaflet was produced outlining the process. The organisations seemed to be more open to the concept and keen to be involved. Nine groups took part, four going to panel, four did not and one dropped out.

Community Business Scotland Network only provided the training input and REAP took on the mentoring support for local groups. There was a lower completion rate in this cluster and an overall lower capacity level amongst the groups.

Organisations involved

Organisation	Values, Aims and Objectives established	Social Accounting Framework put in place. Stakeholders consulted.	Report completed audit statement issued	Followed through with continued social accounting
Grampian Support Forum for Credit Unions	✓	✓		
Forres After School Club	✓	✓	✓	
Lhanbryde After School Club	✓	✓		
The Moray Leisure Centre	✓	✓		
The Phoenix Community Stores	✓	✓	✓	✓
Rural Environmental Action Project	✓	✓	✓	✓
SMS Health Promotions	✓			
Volunteer centre Moray	✓	✓	✓	✓

Feedback Specific to Cluster Two

"I could see the potential for the participating organisations- particularly the After Schools Clubs. There was a theme in this cluster of under-capacity within the organisations to actually complete the process, with one or two exceptions" (Mentor)

"I didn't like this cluster so much. I wasn't sure if the organisations had been properly prepared. Sometimes it seemed that they didn't know why they were there and what they were getting into. The venues moved about a bit, the venue does matter, it colours the whole atmosphere. The roles were more unclear between CBS Network and REAP." (Trainer)

"I felt that the support from REAP was excellent..but there was too much time between the training days" (Participant)

Cluster Three 2003/2004

In this cluster seven organisations took part and to date four have gone to panel. Three did not go to panel although two of those organisations have produced reports, that have come out of the social accounting process.

Two of the organisations in this cluster had “inherited” social accounting as part of the criteria on which their funding was awarded.

We put much more emphasis on the building blocks: clarifying values, objectives and activities and more time at the “scoping” stage (deciding what to evaluate).

There was much more support given by the mentors in-between training sessions and REAP took on more facilitation work for organisations at the consultation stages.

In cluster three REAP needed to sell the idea of social auditing against other evaluation methods such as Investors in People, “The Big Picture” and LEAP.

Organisations involved were:

Organisation	Values, Aims and Objectives established	Social Accounting Framework put in place. Stakeholders consulted.	Report completed audit statement issued	May follow through with continued social accounting
Banff and Buchan Partnership	✓	✓		
Community Care Project	✓	✓	✓	✓
The Lhanbryde Community Challenge	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mearns Healthy Living Network	✓	✓	✓	✓
Moray Anchor projects	✓	✓	✓	
StartOver	✓	✓		
The “Y” Project (YWCA)	✓	✓		✓

Feedback Specific to Cluster Three:

“There was a much higher level of mentoring in cluster two and three with a deliberate effort to give more support. This had positive impacts, even in those cases when groups did not actually go to panel. For example one group was able to look at its internal structures and develop an excellent new work plan as a result of the process. On reflection I felt that some groups in cluster three had too much support.” (mentor)

“The third cluster seems to have been much better. The capacity of the organisations was better and REAP had to do a lot more work. REAP are also a lot more experienced now. The surgeries were helpful and identified ways of doing short-cuts. It’s all to do with the confidence that comes with experience, it’s a steep learning curve and there were some challenges.” (Trainer)

“Did not have that many individual visits - but loads of 1:1 contact via telephone and during other non-social audit meetings. Very useful as often felt isolated and unsupported in my own workplace. Enjoyed the surgeries - especially the methodological one.” (Participant)

How difficult did the organisations involved find each component of the social accounting process?

In February and March of 2004 when REAP and the CBS Network endeavoured to evaluate how the organisations involved with clusters one, two and three had found the process. They asked them to score against each step of the “Five Stage” model.

The blue crosses represent cluster one, the red cluster two and the black cluster three.

Scoring: difficult (1) or easy (5)

Agreeing the Mission of our organisation	1	2 X	3 XXXXXXX	4 XXXXX	5 XX	DK
Agreeing our Values	1	2	3 XXXXXXX	4 XXX	5 XXXX	DK
Agreeing our Objectives...	1	2 X	3 XXXXXX	4 XXX	5 XXXX	DK
...and the Activities we undertake to achieve them	1	2 X	3 XXXXXXX	4 XXX	5 XXX	DK X
Preparing the Stakeholder map....	1 X	2 X	3 XX	4 XXXXXX XX	5 X	DK XX
...and deciding which were the Key Stakeholders who must be consulted	1 X	2 X	3 XXXX	4 XXXXXX X	5 X	DK X
Deciding what information must be collected (social book-keeping)....	1	2 XX X	3 XXXX	4 XXX	5 XXX	DK X
...and setting up the systems to make sure it is collected	1	2 XX X	3 XXX	4 XXXXXX X	5 X	DK X
Deciding what questions to ask the stakeholders and how....	1	2 XX X	3 XXXX	4 XXXXX	5 X	DK X
...and carrying out the stakeholder consultations	1	2 XX	3 XXXXX	4 XXXXXX	5	DK X
Writing up the Social Accounts	1 X X x	2 XXXX XX	3 X	4	5	DK XXXXX
Coping with the social audit panel meeting	1	2 X	3	4 XXXXXX	5 XXX	DK XXXXX
Revising the social accounts following the social audit panel meeting	1	2 XXXX XX	3 X	4 XX	5 X	DK XXXX
Preparing a summary version of the audited social accounts for publication	1	2 XXXX X	3 X	4 XX	5	DK XXXXXX
Following through the issues raised by the social accounts within the organisation	1 X	2 XXX	3	4 XX	5 XX	DK XXXXXX
Planning the next cycle of social accounting	1	2 XX	3	4 XXXX	5	DK XXXXXXX X

Comments of the overall process:

Getting the whole organisation on board with the concept.

"It was difficult to involve Management Committee in agreeing mission, values, objectives - reaction was "whatever you say"! (Participant)

"The support at the beginning should be more focussed, letting the audience know exactly what social auditing entails. It's quite hard to sell social auditing to your stakeholders they see it as navel gazing." (Participant)

Creating a change in organisation culture

"The whole process of social auditing is extremely helpful for our organisational changes" (Participant)

"Organisations that use the social accounting process as a management tool and link into their business plan are more likely to get on with it" (Trainer/mentor)

"Values are important and to embed the process it's good to concentrate on them in the getting ready stage. Values hook people in, there is not enough time spent on the generally. Values are what makes an organisation different..values are the soul of the organisation" (Trainer/Mentor)

"It's only really embedded in the culture of the organisations if people really take it on board and continues to do it. I think there is an issue there; the percentage of organisations embedding social accounting in their organisations has been low. They did it once and it was useful but that's it and people move on within the organisation. I think this will improve in the future because there is a lot of external pressure to do this sort of thing in one format or another" (Trainer/Mentor)

The importance of clarifying Mission, Values, Aims and Activities

."A lot of the ground work has been done beforehand with a social audit in mind. This meant that the vital stages were reasonably straightforward. However, in the light of this social audit, more may be needed to address values, objectives and activities" (Participant)

"The setting out of our organisational aims and objectives was quite a difficult but enjoyable task and it really fulfilled our "own" social audit objective of clarifying and validating who we are and what we do." (Participant)

"Volunteer sector organisations do not often think about their mission, values and activities they are often really blown away about doing this bit it facilitates a lot of discussion. It's import to have these discussions early on in the process to get boards and management committees to discuss the values and objectives and get them to approve them."(Trainer/Mentor)

Staff Driven

" Comments on follow up, etc reflect the fact that we lost our social audit enthusiast and staff changes have made the flow for the next cycle difficult."(Participant)

"Hard getting consensus on the values, aims, objectives. This was driven mainly by the staff. Social audit was written into the bid of the next project." (Participant)

" Some of the organisations have had clear reasons for doing the social audit (issues of independence from a larger organisation, internal conflict between management and staff etc) The difficulty is when the staff that are committed to the process move on. The wider organisation itself sometimes does not have the same commitment to the process. Sometimes they never bought into it in the first place and sometimes they can even have a negative perspective thinking it a waste of time." (mentor)

Methodologies

“More time could have been spent on looking at different alternatives to questionnaires as a method of collecting information. I was not familiar with more participatory practices - so did not feel confident in using them.” (Participant)

Issues that came up

“Although I have really enjoyed facilitating the stakeholder consultations and - as a volunteer - was prepared for the outcomes of them, I was totally unprepared for the lack of support from my line manager and this caused some internal friction. Therefore a support session on personal involvement, and reactions would be beneficial. We did cover a little of this in the last session, but no-one really wants to lay all the negative points of their organisation around the table for others to hear - we have to sometimes work with them. A more 1:1 session with all the affected parties would be more beneficial” (Participant)

“There was some “fall-out” within a participating organisation which was quite difficult to deal with. Social Accounting sometimes throws up inter-personal dynamics they need to be handled sensitively. As a mentor I think that guidelines for such eventualities should be part of a wider mentor package, including opportunities for on-going professional development perhaps through SAN (Social Audit Network)” (Trainer/Mentor)

Writing Up the Report

“Enjoyed the process but am concerned about the time needed for report writing” (Participant)

“Step three: producing the audit and writing the report, there is no simple solution to producing the report perhaps get someone else to do it It costs money but sometimes it’s worth it. One organisation got a volunteer to write the accounts it can be done. People allow themselves to be too easily daunted. But there is possibly space for more training input at this stage. Perhaps need to think about weaker groups with their IT and written skills a lot of it can be cut and pasted from other documents: funding applications, annual reports etc”(trainer/mentor)

“The level of paper processing etc is extremely admin/operational/ task orientated” (participant)

Creating the right conditions for successful social accounting :

Training Input and the Handbook

One of the themes that came out in the evaluation was the importance of the training input. The consensus was that the training was invaluable in supporting the process with the greatest bonus being the networking and informal support networks that creating between the projects undertaking the process.

Were there was slight concern was the on delivery and style of the training and the frequency of the workshops and where the input should be placed and the issue of changing workshop venues. Initially all the training was done by CBS Network but in cluster two and more in cluster three REAP started to do more of this as we gained in confidence, the session around methodologies was very well received. In cluster three. This hand over was developed and future training will be delivered by REAP.

The blue crosses represent cluster one, the red cluster two and the black cluster three.

The workshops were well organised	1	2	3	4 XXXXXX X	5 XXXXXX	DK X
The presentations at the workshops were clear	1	2	3	4 XXXXX	5 XXXXXX XX	DK X
The workshops were inspirational	1	2 XX	3 XXX	4 XXXX	5 XXXXX	DK X

The workshops were participative enough	1	2 XX	3 XXX	4 XXX	5 XXXXXX	DK X
The training materials handed out were clear and user-friendly	1	2	3	4 XXXXXXX XX	5 XXXXX	DK X
There was sufficient opportunity for discussion and active participation	1	2	3 X	4 XXXXXX	5 XXXXXX	DK X
It was valuable to learn as a group and from each other	1	2	3	4	5 XXXXXX XXXXXX X	DK X
The number of workshops was just right	1	2 XX	3 XX	4 XXXXXXX	5 XXX	DK X

Importance of Networking with other organisations at the workshops

“Very good to meet others and go through the process together” (Participant)
“The workshops were enjoyable and I enjoyed the networking experience, we covered all the bases” (participant)

Importance of the workshops as a supporting element

“Workshops were great, needed for inspiration, focus - more would have been good. Surgeries, I felt did not really appreciate where we were at and therefore gained nothing for me.” (Participant)

“Planning to a regular schedule would be helpful eg. one workshop every 1 - 2 months Workshops were enjoyable but would have appreciated more. There was a lack of support within the organisation - however the support given was much appreciated” (Participant)

*“Too much sitting around one big table - enjoyed it better when we broke into smaller groups for detailed discussions. Some of the presentations were quite long - was in the Manual already. Could have pre-read it and discussed it in half the time?
Importance of meeting other groups” (Participant)*

“I felt that there was too much training in the first cluster but in the other clusters too little. The training could be a little slow and pedantic at times. Our style at REAP is a bit more interactive. I think the formal learning can be done in one session and other input needs to be more inter-active.” (Mentor/Trainer)

“The training package has evolved differently in different places. Some places do all the training at the beginning of the process and they need to go back and forth and refresh people’s understanding towards the end of the process.. It’s an interesting model. With some the training is more spaced out and the training happens when it needs to in the overall process. Often stages one and two happen quickly and step three later. My view is crack on with the training...celebrate completing step one and step two and don’t fret if you don’t complete step three.) (Trainer)

Creating the right conditions for successful social accounting

Mentoring and Support Input

The mentoring and support input was also seen by nearly all the organisations to be a crucial element in creating the right conditions for the training process.

Cluster one was mentored and supported by CBS Network. This worked well as they had a firm background in the process having written and successfully delivered the training materials for some time. In cluster two and three the mentoring was done by the REAP staff, it was perhaps somewhat patchy in cluster two and a vertical learning curve for the mentors but the quality of service greatly improved as we gained in confidence and knowledge.

The visits from the facilitators were helpful	1	2 X	3	4 XXXX	5 XXXXXXXXXX	DK
There was a sufficient number of individual sessions/visits	1 X	2 X	3 XX	4 XXXX	5 XXXX	DK X
The support I received was just right	1	2 X	3 X	4 XXXX	5 XXXXXXXXXX	DK
The balance between workshops and visits was about right	1 X	2	3 XX	4 XXXX	5 XXXX	DK XX

Importance of the mentoring visits

“Visits were invaluable” (Participant)

“These visits were very beneficial to me but with hindsight would have been good to have used some of the time with more of the staff, Board, volunteers involved” (Participant)

“as involved with a meeting from REAP and found this very helpful and interesting. Good to have support from experienced folk.” (Participant)

“ I did not have that many individual visits - but loads of 1:1 contact via telephone and during other non-social audit meetings. Very useful as often felt isolated and unsupported in my own workplace. Enjoyed the surgeries - especially the methodological one” (Participant)

“We only had one support visit from REAP I felt that we needed far more hand holding than we got. We didn't ask for it to be fair, because we didn't know we really needed it at the time-(lack of perspective)” (Participant)

“There was a higher level of mentoring in clusters 2 and 3 with a deliberate effort to give more support. This had positive impacts, even in those cases when groups did not actually go to panel – e.g one group was able to look at its internal structures and develop an excellent new work-plan as a result of the process. On reflection I felt that some groups in cluster 3 had actually had too much support, as a mentor you can't do it for them.” (Mentor)

“The mentoring/support element is crucial-we encourage the organisations to send us their work and that we'll get back to them and comment but very few do, very few are pro-active. Local mentors work better- long distance mentoring is more complicated. We need to cut down on the training and up the support and mentoring this would improve the process hugely. However some people don't want the support, and to be honest some of the people you don't like or click with as much. I tend to work with people that are on the same wavelength and more responsive.” (Mentor)

Lessons Learned and the Creation of the Three Stage Model

In December 2003 the Social Audit Network met in Liverpool to look at the existing social accounting model with the purpose of re-formatting it, to be a simpler and more flexible process.

Much of feedback from organisations all over the UK as a whole has been reflected in this localised evaluation and the main lessons learned are as follows:

Learning points from the feedback from the organisations:

- There needs to be a “creating the environment” period before an organisation embarks on the social audit.
 - To ensure that the wider organisation is committed to the process (not just the staff)
 - To ensure that there are the resources within the organisation to undertake the process, and to budget in time and cost.
- More time needs to be spent on the organisation identifying and “owning” its mission, values, objectives and activities.
- The training input needs to have a better balance between “formal” and more “participative” inputs.

- Needs to be clarity about confidentiality and what will and will not be included in the final report. Things may come out of the process that are challenging and highly personal- how do you deal with these without being unduly selective with stakeholder feedback?
- Needs to be a clearer training input at the collating of information and writing up the report stages which many organisation find difficult and off putting.
- Beneficial to sustain a good level of mentoring and on-going support for organisations throughout the social accounting process.

Learning points from the feedback from the Trainers, Mentors and Support Organisations:

- Better that the support/mentoring is local rather than at a distance.
- Too incestuous when the support/mentors also chair social audit panels also REAP often had other “relationships” with the organisations involved.
- Needs to be on-going training and development for mentors and support workers.
- Need to recruit organisations that have real commitment and understanding of the process and not just to get the numbers in for REAP’s funding bodies.
- There needs to be more concentration on values and measuring the impact that the organisation is having on its service users (people that are benefiting from the organisation)
- The handbook has been revisited and is being designed to be more user friendly.
- Brand the work locally and pitch it to different organisations based on the revised process.

The Future

New Three Stage Model:

In March 2004 when the evaluation of the organisations took place there was a presentation of the new revised three stage model for social accounting. The process is much simpler with each step being a discreet process in itself.

PRE-STAGE- GETTING READY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding the process • Commitment within the organisation • Who will do the work? • Managing the process • Paying for it
STEP ONE: Social, Environmental and Economic Planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission • Values • Objectives and Activities • Stakeholder analysis.
STEP TWO: Social, Environmental and Economic Accounting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deciding the scope of the audit: Focussing on certain aspects Building completeness over time Doing what is possible • Collecting facts and figures • Consulting stakeholders • The social accounting plan • Analysing and compiling data as you go
STEP THREE- Social, Environmental and Economic reporting and Audit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting the social, environmental and economic accounts • The social audit panel (or other means of verification) • The social panel day • The social audit statement. • Using the audited social accounts • Publishing the social accounts

Comments on the three-stage model and other ways of improving the process:

"Need appropriate support for each of the 3 "modules" and for the Getting ready stage" (Participant)

"Need a checklist on what needs to be done and when" (Participant)

"The philosophy is very good- but the very act of inquiry is an immediate intervention into an organisation and this has consequences. I felt that there should be a disclaimer (especially for small groups and clubs) that perhaps underlying people dynamics etc. might come to the surface because of the process and they need to be prepared for the stuff. Inquiry creates amplification." (Participant)

"Values, aims and objectives need to be more rigorously done-there needed to be more ownership of the process throughout the whole organisation. Slow down the whole process of embedding values and educating internal and external stakeholders in the agreed values, needs to be a much deeper process to properly evaluate them." (Participant)

"Can't emphasis enough how important it is to keep it all really simple." Participant)

"There has to be a commitment to action the changes that are highlighted in the process-especially with internal stakeholders-otherwise you destroy trust and undermine the success for future similar projects." (Participant)

"Follow up meeting say six months after the audit panel to review process (ie did we publish a summary - did we action what we said we would)" (Participant)

"We like the 3 step process with an "assessment" at the end of each step" (Participant)

"The new structure feels better and it was particularly useful to have been actively involved in the development of the new model. Community Business Scotland Network have been very open to input from people in different clusters throughout the UK. My experience of using stage one/two of the process with groups thus far has been very positive."(Mentor/trainer)

"The new model is infinitely better. Smaller chunks, less threatening, before it was do it all or fail, people felt that. That stigma has gone now. My worry is that people won't do the audit stage, that's what gives it rigour, measuring the internal process and the organisation's impact"(mentor/trainer)