

Leith Chooses Meeting Notes, 15 July 2026

Present: Abigail, Bruce, Don, Jack, Lisa, Rachel, Susan, Sally

Apologies: Jason, Naomi, Tremaine

1 Boost vote

See current drafts at [Final Boost Vote Changes LeithChooses Sample Application Form 2026-27 15.07.26.docx](#) and [Final Boost Vote Changes Guidance Document LeithChooses 15.07.26.docx](#). These drafts had the following aims:

- To simplify explanations on the actual application form, by moving some material from there to the guidance notes and/or the LC website and relevant communications.
- Hence the main footnote would be smaller, and omit images.
- There was discussion of potential need for evidence of partnership with ethnic minorities. The subgroup decide against a minimum time period for such partnerships for projects to be boost-eligible.
- It would have been possible for the boost vote to have its own, separate application form, but this was felt to be too burdensome for both applicants and CEC officers.
- Hence added two tick-box questions are added to the current draft application form:
 - Are the majority of the organisation's people from ethnic minorities?
 - Is the project's main purpose supporting ethnic minorities?
- Then then there will be the option to apply for the boost vote if the organisation wishes to. (The 'not sure – want to speak with the steering group' option has been removed.)

1.1 Discussion

The boost vote guidance was originally part of the part of the application form because:

- There is concern that no-one reads the separate guidance notes.
- There is concern that there are too many guidance documents (i.e. one from the steering group, another from CEC).
- It was suggested that most organisations know whether or not they are eligible. (There will be a link from the AF to the guidance.)
- It was suggested that a relevant organisation should test this draft (perhaps AUGB and/or ELREC and/or Sikh Sanjog)
 - Action: Sally to ask Trishna of SS to do this.
- There was discussion of whether there might now be too much simplification of the explanations. For example, an organisation might not of itself be focussed on supporting ethnic minorities but its project may be boost-eligible. Organisations will still need to provide evidence of their boost-eligibility. (The steering group can ask for more evidence when making eligibility decisions.) It was suggested that evidence-provision might be problematic.
- The draft introduced at the start of the meeting might also exclude projects aimed at bringing different ethnic minorities together.
 - Action: Abby to implement a wording change that was suggested to cover this.
- It was suggested that the language was extended from just 'ethnic minorities' to 'different groups'. (This would be in the detailed in the guidance notes.)
- There was concern that 'white charities' are doing things **to** ethnic minorities, rather than minorities doing things for themselves.
- It was suggested that CEC ethnic minority items complicate the application form, and so should be minimised or removed, if this is allowed.
 - Action: Jack/Susan to request CEC explains the purpose of these questions.
- Conclusion: the steering group is in general happy with the draft, subject to a few wee to the wording to improve clarity, while avoiding double-barrelled questions.
- Action: subgroup to implement all of this.

2 Terms of reference sign-off

- Agreed as-is
- Action: Bruce to put the terms of reference on the LC website, add mini biographies etc.

3 Support sessions sign-up

3.1 Support sessions

- Action: Rachel to collate responses so for.
- Action: Bruce, Abby, Tremaine to do 10 to 11 on 30 July.
- There is confusion on dates.
 - Action: Rachel to work with Naomi to collate all dates, in order, into a single document, then circulate this.

- Some in-person dates would be needed in this list. Action: Jack to see if Broughton St Mary's is available on 24 August/7 September.

3.2 Other engagement

- Action: Bruce to meet with Fiona Banatvala of NTBCC.

4 **Guidance notes update**

Jack's suggested changes were

- Updating the dates, the theme, help-session dates
- Numbering the sections, so it is easy to refer to them
- Changing the wording to make it clear that each person gets only one set of votes.
- Making it clear that applicant organisations must have organisational bank accounts.
- Making it clear that end-of-project reports are needed for organisations to be eligible
- Simplifying the partnership sentence
- Finding the right place for boost-vote material, following on from item 1, point 1 above.
- There was concern over the timing requirement for end-of-project reports with regard to making organisations ineligible if they do not report. For example, if a project was funded from March 2026 to March 2027, it does not need to report until at least March 2027. (It may also take further time for a satisfactory version of the report to be submitted.) By this time, the 2027 vote would have happened (and possibly money disbursed), and it would be well-nigh impossible to retrospectively disqualify an organisation and reclaim any money.
 - Action: Jack to engage with Tremaine over this.
 - A wording change for the guidance notes was suggested. Action: Jack to check this with Tremaine, then implement this if possible.
 - Action: SG to consider next week whether ineligibility would be for one year or ongoing.

5 **WhatsApp group**

This was suggested because of the type and number of emails. An instant messaging system would help minimise this.

- Action: everyone to supply Jack with their relevant cellphone numbers.

6 **Topics for next week**

- Potential for ineligibility due to lack of end-of-project reports
- Final decisions on application form and guidance notes
- Registration forms for support sessions