

Nomination Process:

Guidance for Nominating Communities as Part of Social Action Inquiry Scotland

Aim of this Resource

This document was created to assist the Core Team and Guides of [Social Action Inquiry Scotland](#) with nominating communities to access funds. The information and format of the nomination process reflect the parameters of the Inquiry and practises the agreed values of the Inquiry.

Considerations When Nominating a Community

As part of Social Action Inquiry Scotland, we are seeking to partner with communities to resource their social action, and for them to share through storytelling *what helps and hinders their social action*.

As co-created and agreed upon during one of the Guide Gatherings, below are the qualities the Inquiry is seeking within the communities it wishes to learn from. These qualities are considered key to enabling the Inquiry to learn *what helps and what hinders social action*. The qualities and a short definition are:

Grassroots Action

What we mean by this: that the people or community driving the social action are part of the community the action aims to serve.

Add Value To What Is Already Happening

What we mean by this: that they have a vision of the future they are trying to create and not creating a proposal in response to the social action funds/resources available from the Inquiry.

Not Mainstream

What we mean by this: that the communities' social action takes place on the edges of society. This includes marginalised communities, radical ideas, and challenging systems and structures. The planned social action might ordinarily find it difficult to access funding because it doesn't fit into typical funding criteria.

Willing To Contribute To Learning, And Have The Capacity To Do So

What we mean by this: that the community are willing to welcome and partner with the Inquiry to enable the Inquiry to observe and share what helps and what hinders social action.

Diverse range

What we mean by this: that the Inquiry welcomes nominations that represent the cultural, economic and geographical diversity in Scotland.

To revisit your reflections during the exercises outlined in the [Power Flower Tool: Understanding our Power, Privilege, Trauma, and Marginalisation](#) with the aim to promote a fuller understanding of the different aspects of your identity and how the impacts of some of those aspects may affect your choices during the nomination process.

Sending in Nominations

For fairness and in an attempt to remove bias, the Inquiry has decided to standardise the nomination process. The information provided to the question form on page 4, which will be placed into a template and then shared with everyone involved in the selection of the nominated communities.

Format for Nomination Questions

Nominations can be sent in written or in an audio format. The invitation is for nominations to tell the story of the social action being planned or already taking place. The Inquiry recommends that nominations comment on the qualities sought after by the Inquiry and how it connects to the social action the community plans to do.

Written nominations

If you want to submit a nomination in written form keep the total word count to 500-700 words or less. You can submit your nominations by telling the story by freewriting or we have created a question-and-answer document for you to use if you prefer.

Audio Nominations

If you are sending nominations by audio keep the length of the recording to a maximum of 10 minutes. Similarly, to written submissions, you can use the example document to frame the structure to your verbal submission if you find this helpful.

If you are unsure about any of these options, please get in touch as we are happy to discuss options that suit your needs.

Question and Answer Form

This form can be completed to submit a written nomination or used as a guide to structure a submission that is audio recorded. Please answer the following questions or requests:

1. Please provide the location of the community if applicable.
2. In a sentence or two, how would the community describe itself?
3. If possible, please provide a photo of the community or work they are doing.
4. Describe a little bit about the people or community driving the social action and the community the action aims to serve.
5. Why are they doing this and what do they want to change by doing so?
6. What is the social action the community is carrying out? What has their story been so far?
7. What are your thoughts about the community's interest in sharing its story with the Social Action Inquiry Scotland?
8. How likely is it that the community will welcome partnering with the Social Action Inquiry Scotland?
9. Tell us a little bit about the areas of social action (issues, geography, etc) that the community wants to have an impact on?

Process for Nominating Communities

Background on the Decision-Making Method

Some intentions that were broadly agreed in relation to the nomination and decision making processes:

- Voting power is equal amongst all decision makers.
- Nominations are given equal standing.
- A process for if there was a deadlock.

Therefore, the decisions agreed upon by the Inquiry to do this were:

- Enable every nomination to be read by everyone so that they could detail their preferences.
- Include everyone's preferences in the final result.
- Anonymised casting voting was selected as a method to respect an individual's autonomy to make their choices. And not be unduly influenced by the varying presenting skills of nominators.
- The core team of the Inquiry to take on the role of finalising the decision-making process format.
- Acknowledgement that there is no perfect system and reflections after the process will assist in which process to adopt, for example, potentially a more targeted approach.

Decision Making Process and Results

The schedule below outlines the online meeting carried out in July 2022 by Social Action Inquiry Scotland as part of the community nomination process:

10:00 – 12:00: Everyone working independently on reviewing the standardised nominations using the [Google form](#) (selection tool).

12:00 – 12:30: Everyone independently listed choices by preferences and sent them to the Inquiry Core Team. Inquiry Core Team inputted preferences into a weighted table.

12:30 – 13:30: Lunch break.

13:30 – 15:00: Share results based on the weighted table and whole group decision making on the communities the Inquiry is going to partner with.

15:00 – 15:15: Comfort Break.

15.15 – 15:45: Reflections on the nomination and decision-making process.

Evaluation of the Process

A full explanation behind the methods and choice points follows:

The Core Team of the Inquiry decided that because there were 8 nominations the process chosen would use a preferential voting system to record 1st preference to the 8th preference. The 8 nominations were numbered to maintain the anonymity of the communities. A weighted scoring was used to assign a value to the aggregation of all the preferences. The purpose of this was to provide the Inquiry with a list of the preferred communities that was a total of all the individual preferences. The result being a collective decision.

The Inquiry decided on the points allocation starting with 1 point for 8th preference because they wanted to honour the work that was being done by every community and recognise that the decision wasn't about which communities were most worthy, because they all were. The choices decided on the day were on who the Inquiry felt were most suitable, right now, to partner with.

The Inquiry decided on a 1pt increase for each preference ending with 8 points because the Inquiry wanted to negate the potential for results like that of 'first past the post'. Chiefly that minority views would have little power.

The Inquiry elected in advance not to have a round of discussion in advance of the selection process. The rationale for this choice was to eliminate people being persuaded by power dynamics that might exist in the group or swayed by more eloquent

orators. We agreed it was more valuable for people to use the activities proceeding selection and their own intellect to make their own choices.

Finally, the Inquiry made a choice not to disclose the use of a weighted scoring system prior to the selection process because it may have nudged people towards listing their preferences strategically.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1		Preferred choice								
2		1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	
3	Nomination number									
4	1	8	42	18	10	4	3	0	1	86
5	2	40	7	6	10	8	6	4	0	81
6	3	8	0	12	10	8	3	6	4	51
7	4	32	0	24	5	0	15	4	0	80
8	5	8	21	0	25	16	3	0	1	74
9	6	8	28	6	10	8	6	4	1	71
10	7	8	0	12	0	4	6	6	6	42
11	8	8	7	12	5	12	3	6	2	55
12	Weight of Preference	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
13										
14										

Table 1 - Weighted Table for Nomination Process

The Core Team of the Inquiry populated **Table 1** with the preferences from everyone involved in the nomination process. The results were then calculated and shared. The four communities with the overall highest result were contacted to ask if they would like to partner with the Inquiry. The fifth highest result was the first reserve in case any of the communities decided not to partner with the Inquiry.