

**THE TASK GIVEN TO THE ORGANISATIONAL MODEL WORKING GROUP FROM THE FFR REVIEW WORKSHOPS**

Using an action research approach and taking direction from the findings of the FFR, the OMWG is tasked with “What the Preferred Model will be”

The Brief from Workshops	What Recommended Model Does	Recommendations of OWG
Using Model 2 as the base, consider the positive and preferred aspects of the 3 models and merge 3.	The model picks up Model 2 which reflects members’ desires for a flatter organization, and the preferred aspects of Models 1 and 3. It adds some further Activity Centers missing from the original three which OWG sees as necessary eg. Member Forums, Finance Group. The boxes shown in orange indicate where a centre or group already exists.	That the model be put to the members of MASG for adoption
Consider and outline how office bearers fit into the model	Provides an Accountability Group which consists of 6 members elected at a Member Forum. The Chair, Secretary and Treasurer Come from these 6 members. The current legal setting requires a minimum of 6 members on a body which is legally responsible externally for the organization. This enables compliance with Articles of Incorporation and avoids the necessity for changing them. The Accountability Group resides within the larger primary decision making body of the organization the Coordination Group or COG.	That the members adopt the suggestion of the Accountability group and its suggested role and responsibilities and its residence within the primary decision body the Coordinating Group so that current legal settings can be retained.
Articulate the roles and responsibilities of the people in the COG and other aspects of the model.	The model map outlines what roles and responsibilities could exist. The two way arrows represent firstly information flows between the COG and Groups and secondly that a member of each Group or activity centre will become a member of the primary decision making body the COG.	(Note: OWG has prepared a draft Template outlining a process for how individuals or potential or existing activity groups or staff could turn their ideas into proposal for consideration by the Coordination Group (COG))
Consider what training and skills we need to implement the Model.	The model allows for open participation in the Coordination Group (COG) and self determining activity groups clustered around peoples’ passions. and there has been a call for consensus decision making .	To encourage and assist with better meeting management and for consensus decision making in the COG, the OWG recommends training for all groupings in the organization in meeting facilitation and consensus decision making. Also in Code of Responsibility. Further thought will need to be given to other training needs as the model develops.

Consider legal ramifications of model	Incorporation and charitable status require certain legal settings eg a Committee of Management with a Chair, Secretary and Treasurer and a separate Management Committee of 3 persons for DGR status. The OWG considered it much easier to retain these settings to avoid complicated external requirement changes and to ensure that we are constituted in a safe way and able to claim tax exemption etc. We have chosen not to disturb these settings as the model can be implemented just as well with slight changes.	To avoid any legal ramifications we recommend retention of the current legal settings albeit slightly altered.  Providing reporting obligations are still met, retention will not affect the introduction of different ways of doing things eg COG, consensus decision making, having an Accountability Group instead of a Committee of Management.
Read and take direction from the “Dots”	The model incorporates the priority dots from the Workshops which were indicated as being important to add to Model 2.	
Clearly articulate how incorporation and DGR is maintained	Incorporation – Calls for maximum 9 and minimum 6 members of a Committee of Management. The Model has 6 elected members of the Accountability Group to meet this requirement.	That the Members Forum which in effect will be an AGM (as required by external bodies) elects 6 members each year to the Accountability Group.  We recommend retaining the 3 person committee associated with DGR.
Consider the scale (human and financial) of the model.	<p>Whilst this is a complicated model, relying on maximum participation of members and people in Groups or activity centers, it will need to grow over time as current resources will probably not stretch to achieve it.</p> <p>The OWG has identified 3 additional core staff positions which would be needed over time to make the model “hum”. Additionally it has identified the need for a “Go to” person within MASG which would be part of a Coordinator role currently being done partially by Dean.</p>	<p>We recommend that the COM or COG consider how and when resources might be obtained to enable these positions to be put in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinator</li> <li>• Volunteers Coordinator</li> <li>• Business Manager</li> <li>• Depending upon the level of support the COG decides to offer Groups, the possible need for additional Administration hours.</li> </ul>

Undertake an operational costing of the model	This has been done only in the roughest way and associated with the recommended future staff positions. Additional costs would be incurred around support of activity groups, member forums and unknown costs associated with the Coordination Group.	A rough Estimate of \$146,000 to introduce all of the model. This takes into account a 10% increase in overall costs to meet general support costs and part time salaries for recommended staff positions. Further work is needed to reflect what the final decisions bring into play from the model.
Consider how the model would deal with difficult and disruptive people particularly in the Groups and the COG	The Accountability Group with the COG indicates three responsibilities related to this Legislative compliance Dispute resolution Consensus block resolution In addition it heralds the need for the development of a Code of Responsibility	A Code of Responsibility is Developed and all MASG people are given training in this area. The code outlines what is expected in the conduct of all areas of activity and in commitment to the good of the organization as a whole. It outlines safety issues also.
Implementation Plan	A detailed plan and time line has not been done however a rough outline has been prepared	Further thought needed by COM or COG on a timeline for introduction but OWG recommends that the recommended model be made available to members at 7 <sup>th</sup> February Members Forum together with other papers which explain it and that members be asked to comment and/or adopt it.

**OTHER MATTERS – PRELIMINARY OUTLINE FOR CONSIDERATION**

**LOOK AT HOW RECOMMENDED MODEL REFLECTS THE FOLLOWING**

<b>Common Survey Comments</b>	<p>Clear Priorities and a Plan to express them Model indicates where such a plan and priorities might be generated ie via Member Forums and Coordinating Group</p> <p>Better Member Consultation &amp; Feedback Via CoG which includes staff, Accountability Group, Advisors, and all activity centers in addition to Member Forums</p>	<p>OWG recommends retention of Strategic Plan for the moment. With further thought as to inclusion of new material.</p> <p>OWG recommends a Members Forum in the Model Map with its roles indicated in the box. It envisages 4 per year as follows 1 x cover for AGM a forum to elect 6 Members to COG Report/Feedback 1 x General framing of Annual Work Priorities, Budget and policy development 1 x Activity and Project Idea exploration and Grants/Resourcing Information provision (targeted at Peak Grants Application times) 1 x Reflection, Review, Direction setting etc – Suggest perhaps a facilitated Weekend away</p>
-------------------------------	---	--

<p><b>Style and Culture needs as expressed in workshops</b></p>	<p>Flatter organization with more access. The Model allows for greater participation in decision making via the Coordination Group (CoG) which takes its direction from Members Forums. It allows for greater accessibility via open meetings and for members to follow their passions in self generated activity centers associated with the organization</p> <p>OWG notes that different culture can be introduced in the organization at any point in point whatever the model.</p> <p>Respectful, competent, Creative, Accessible, Diverse, Inclusive, Open, Transparent and OWG recommended further quality of “Effective” and “Safe”</p>	<p>2 OWG recommendations re cultural practices to improve Meetings are put forward to the COM.</p> <p><i>“We are an organization that recognizes the importance of gathering peoples’ energy and sharing that in a focused manner and deliberate manner – a mindfulness. Every meeting of MASG intends to start in this manner. Commencement of meeting “check in and grounding process – everyone is valued” To dissolve the tension and allow it to wash out allowing everyone’s minds to be as fully present as possible. The facilitation of this process is shared around the group so as to strengthen the practice and skills of the individuals and the group.”</i></p> <p><i>“People have a lot of pressures on their lives that they bring into MASG and meetings and work. MASG recognizes that an intrinsic part of our organization is to work in a way that develops skills in our members to work more openly, mindfully and collaboratively. Regular practices that they can then take into other aspects of their lives. To sustain the group we must sustain the person. The COG gets taken away twice a year for a reflective, restorative and developmental space.”</i></p> <p>OWG recommends that the qualities outlined in the workshops become part of the MASG Strategic Plan’s Values Section.</p>
<p><b>Strengths</b></p>	<p>Model allows for greater participation in all parts of the organization, via ‘passion pits’ or groups or spaces for people to bring their ideas for actions/projects to MASG, via membership of the decision making body the CoG, and via Member Forums.</p> <p>Model has a core operating sector via the two major staffed activity centers Administration and Campaigns and Community Engagement and potential for fixed term funded special projects generated via the passion pits or via the CoG.</p> <p>Model brings staff into whole of organizational decision making</p>	

	<p>Model avoids CoG being unable to function effectively due to lack of membership numbers through retention of 6 elected members</p> <p>Model allows for existing legal entity and settings to be retained and for a legally constituted group to take responsibility hence meeting external requirements by having 6 members elected to the Accountability Group by a Members Forum. This group will reside within the Coordination Group. Thus it avoids necessity for legal advice and time consuming tasks associated with changing them.</p>	
<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p>	<p>The model creates some potential pressure points</p> <p>It will rely heavily on the ongoing participation of people from each of the “passion pit activity groups” to ensure that the Coordination Group functions well. It places a heavy task on the CoG elected members unless this participation occurs.</p> <p>Staff participation in the CoG will need to be clearly explored articulated to ensure that tasks from this sector do not affect capacity to meet the requirements of their own positions. Eg. Will time involved be voluntary or paid?</p> <p>The expectation of ‘Passion Pits’ or self generating activity groups regarding administration may be more than can be provided.</p> <p>Communications between and across the various sectors of the model will need to be</p>	<p>Recommend further investigation into how these might manifest and be overcome.</p> <p>Recommend further investigation into what support the COG might need eg secretarial.</p> <p>Recommend analysis of how much time might be involved and resolution of whether this is paid or voluntary time.</p> <p>Recommend future investigation of what actual support can be provided to groups and costs for these to MASG.</p> <p>Recommend development of a communications system and training for all sectors in how to make it effective and so that</p>

	<p>excellent to ensure the model works well.</p> <p>To make the model really “hum” the OWG envisage that further staff positions would be needed and these are indicated on the model Given the spread out nature of the model, it may suffer from the lack of a designated “Go To” person within the organization as outlined in the suggested Coordinator potential position. This can be a problem for external bodies wishing to “speak with MASG” too, ie Who speaks for MASG not clear in flat model.</p>	<p>members know what is happening across MASG.</p> <p>The Capacity to generate funds to meet expectations both for suggested core staffing and self generating activity groups will need to be addressed. We recommend that the COM or COG when introduced, give thought to how to address this.</p>
<p><b>Does Model meet/clash with FFR Recommendations</b></p>	<p>All Actions indicated in the Summary Findings and Recommendations are shown as actions for the Committee of Management (COM) however the OWG Model recommended would see actions as a Coordination Group or COG role. The timing of such a transition up to COM</p> <p>OWG Model supports review findings re organizational structure and training suggestions include Meeting Facilitation, Consensus Decision Making, communications, Code of Responsibility</p> <p>Critical Friends group is indicated on the Model Map, OWG sees as largely advising/informing Member Forums.</p> <p>Evaluation possibilities are inferred as being the province of the COG and this is somewhat different to the suggestion of an internal group. Review and Reflection is suggested as one of the Member Forums and OWG discussed possibility of a weekend retreat type of gathering.</p>	<p>The recommended model from the Organisational Model Working Group is consistent with the findings of FFR.</p> <p>Recommend COM decide when and how COG replaces COM and whether it or the COG will undertake various implementation actions.</p> <p>OWG recommends that the COM read the Final Comments Paper provided from the group which outlines some queries and issues which will need to be considered in the move towards introduction of the new model.</p>

