



Minutes of the Annual General Meeting

Thursday 3rd June 2021, 7:30 pm

Zoom Online

Attendance: Gareth Williamson, Mo Hadfield, Jane Greatorex, Nick Murrell, Derek Smith, Sue Tait, Nev Tait, Sue Fifer, Rose Guy, Mike Culnane, Andrew Dearn, David Davies, Margaret Gillham, Doug Thompson, Ian Johnson, Maggie O'Moore, Penny Reeves, Ray McMurray, Simon Shore, Sarah Irish, Jon Watkins, Mike Swain, Eleni Paliginis, Anita Lewis, Tim Ewbank, Anthony Clarke, Peter Halasovski, Simon Jelly, Sarah Johnson, Linda brown, Lee Taylor, (31)

Apologies for absence: Peter Bush, Tony Vernon-Smith, Gordon Fuller, Richard Harrison, David Mottram

2. Acceptance of the minutes of the AGM and EGM

The minutes of the AGM of 25/6/20 were accepted unanimously.

The minutes of the EGM of 10/12/20 were accepted unanimously.

Matters arising

There were no matters arising.

3. Correspondence – Doug/Andy

There was no outstanding correspondence.

4. Reports:

4.1. Finance

Simon Shore presented the financial report; please see attached. The club has 51 members and made a surplus of £719.69 due mainly to not paying rent to the Village College. The club now has a balance of £9325.03. Simon thanked the auditors, Mike Culnane and Anthony Clarke.

Simon presented the budget for next year. The assumption is that we will go back to physical meetings at the Village College from September and will be paying rent. The club will maintain subscription fees at the current low levels to reduce the surplus. The lower subscription fees will give a forecast loss of £1000, consuming most of the surplus from this year and last year.

Simon reported that the Committee had decided that, to reduce cash handling, both at the meetings and for accounting, a standard fee of £5 will be added to the subscription to cover the cost of teas & coffees. Teas, coffees and refreshments will

therefore be free at meetings. The subscription rates for next year will therefore be £55 per member and £45 for concessions.

4.1.1. **Vote to accept the financial report**

We voted to accept the financial report, the projected budget and the proposed membership fees. **Vote carried unanimously.**

4.2. **Programme**

Ray Mc Murray presented his report; please see attached.

Ray reminded us that this was his last season as Programme Secretary but emphasised that the role had been a great experience and that it has been a privilege to have served the club. He said that he accepted the job with little camera club experience and after only one season as a member. He said that he had no regrets about accepting the challenge of taking on the role and that he had benefitted from it enormously.

Despite Covid, we put on a summer programme in 2020 and had more Thursday meetings than usual during the season. In addition, we innovated special interest groups and critique evenings. And we had a brilliant online exhibition thanks to the work of Jon Watkins.

Ray thanked the Committee for its support and their work behind the scenes, especially the Presidents Richard and Simon, to provide their leadership and advice.

Ray concluded by asking the membership a question:

IF THE CLUB HOLDS FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS AT THE VILLAGE COLLEGE THAT ARE COVID-SECURE, DO YOU THINK YOU WILL ATTEND THEM?

The responses were:

YES, MOST OF THEM 76%

YES, SOME OF THEM, BUT NOT ALL 14%

NO, VERY FEW OR NONE 0%

I DON'T KNOW YET 10%

4.2.1. **Presentation to Ray** Simon Shore said we owed Ray a huge vote of thanks for his work to keep the club going. Simon presented a gift to Ray from the Club in thanks for the work he had done.

4.3. **Internal Competitions**

Ian Johnson presented his report; please see attached.

Ian was pleased that despite Covid, we have had our usual eight internal

competitions and managed to hold additional, less formal image discussion evenings with images titled 'Red' and 'Motion'. The lack of print competitions was a disappointment.

The new discussion nights became the forerunner of our critique evenings, which have proved to be very beneficial in advising members before competitions and has raised the standard of photography in the Club.

Ian thanked all of the judges who had helped us with advice and comments and marked our images.

Ian congratulated Lee Taylor and Penny Reeves for achieving Photographer of the Year in the Improvers and Experienced groups.

Penny Reeves thanked Ian on behalf of the Club and also thanked Sarah Johnson and Andy Dearne, our competition scorekeepers.

4.4. External Competitions

Penny Reeves presented her report; please see attached.

Penny also noted that the critique evenings had improved the quality of work we have available to choose entries for external competitions. Consequently, we have done very well in competitions, winning friendly competitions against our traditional adversaries and doing well in multi-club competitions. Penny noted those members whose images had scored particularly well in several competitions.

Looking forward, we already have several competitions on the calendar for the next season, including a friendly competition of less experienced photographers.

Simon thanked Penny and noted that many clubs similar to ours choose not to enter any external competitions; we are a small club that punches above our weight.

4.5. President's Report

Simon Shore delivered his President's report; please see attached.

Simon thanked the membership for sticking with the Club during this most extraordinary and challenging year. He said he was fearful at the start of the season that many would not sign up for this year, but his fears proved unfounded.

He also thanked the Committee and many members individually for their contributions this year. Simon also thanked Nick Murrell for organising the Pairs Competition.

In his closing remarks, Simon welcomed our very talented new members.

4.5.1. President's Trophy

Simon had special thanks to Jon Watkins for his work to build the online exhibition website so quickly from scratch. The exhibition attracted over 7,000 visitors and has left us with a template we can use in the future.

Special thanks are due also to Ray McMurray. He single-handedly worked out how to keep the Club going during the Covid crisis and worked so hard to deliver an innovative and widely varied programme throughout this challenging year.

Simon said that he had been unable to decide who should receive special recognition in being awarded the President's Trophy and had decided that it should be awarded to both Jon and Ray jointly.

The Meeting took a Break

5. Proposal to Amend Competition Scoring

5.1. Proposal

Mike Culnane presented his proposal; see attachment:

To amend the Themed Print Panel and Bamber Competitions scoring from a maximum of 20 points at present to 40 points with effect from the next season. The judge's score is to be doubled in the leader board, with the higher score taken in the event of two entries from the same author.

Mike said that a maximum of 40 points would more fairly reflect the work done to prepare for these competitions; receiving just a couple of points per image was not fair.

5.2. Counter Proposal

Maggie O'Moore and Ray McMurray presented a counterproposal; see attachment:

The existing way of scoring panel competitions is fair, reasonable and straightforward. Our current scoring system is in line with other camera clubs in the UK. Skewing or distortion of the leader board will occur if we use two different scoring systems.

Maggie said that we should not have two scoring methods; two competitions should not carry so much weight. It was not true that the panel competitions need disproportionately more work to prepare since members usually put in three or four images to standard competitions, involving nearly as much work as a panel. No other camera club I know has two scoring systems. We need consistency across the leader board.

5.3. Debate

The membership debated the topic for around 30 minutes.

Key points raised included:

In non-panel competitions, two images count, giving a possible maximum of 20 marks per image and 40 marks in total. In a panel competition, five images count but get a total of only 20 marks giving just four marks per image.

Your motivation is to keep your better images for the non-panel competition because they will score higher marks.

We are judging the image, not the effort put into it. The quality of the image is what counts.

We are effectively judging panels as a single image. If we could put in only a single image to other competitions, then your choice of which image to put in become critical to your success or not, depending on whether the judge liked the image. We need to accept that the panel competition is different from the others and accept it and play the game.

A print panel is expensive to produce. Compare a panel competition with a colour print competition; producing two colour prints can win 40 points, but a panel of five prints would win you only 20 marks.

A panel is a single piece of work and should be judged as such; it is not about the effort needed to produce it.

5.4. The Rules as Defined in the Handbook

Mike Culnane said that part of the reason why he proposed the motion was that the Handbook says that a member can put in two panel entries per competition, and if both were marked, they would get up to 40 points, as with other competitions. However, it has become practice to record only one panel mark for the leader board. This was the motivation for the proposal that as only one panel entry has its marks counted, then its marks should be doubled for the leader board.

Simon: I remember that we put this in the rules to stop people from putting in lots of images per competition and gaining points based on the numbers of submitted images being marked. Simon agreed that we need to revisit these rules to ensure consistency and clarity.

Sue: Offered the idea to have the Bamber & Panel Competitions separate from the other competitions so that they do not contribute to the leader board. Ian thought that it was an interesting idea.

Ian: At some time in the past, we decided that only one panel would be judged. It would be impractical now to judge a large number of entries, given the numbers of members in the Club, if we allowed more than one panel per member.

Jane: At some time in the past, either in Committee or an AGM, we decided that two entries from standard competitions would count to the leader board and one entry from the panel

competitions would count.

Mike suggested that the rules in the Handbook be changed to read that the members can put two entries per competition except for the panel competitions where only one entry can be submitted; the score for that single panel entry will then be doubled.

Simon: we need to keep a focus on the proposals already tabled.

Ian: As already suggested by a committee member, perhaps we should limit the images to count per competition to just one each. Would that be the fairest, overall?

Derek: I disagree. If only one image scores marks, then someone producing several good images would have only one recognised on the leader board and would score the same as a weaker photographer who produces just one good image.

Penny: both scores would be recorded, but only one score would go on the leader board.

Ian: Two good photographers would each score 20.

Derek: I put more pictures in because I know that judges are variable in their preferences for different types of pictures.

Maggie: it's always down to the judge's opinion, likes and dislikes.

Ian: we are always in the hands of the judge's opinion.

Tim Ewbank: The current proposal would have a disproportionately large effect on a member missing a panel competition. It would be like skipping two competitions.

Simon Jelly: But isn't missing a panel competition like missing a standard competition with two entries of a possible 20 each?

Ian: clarifying, one image would count, but more than one image could be submitted.

Ian: I like to put in three images, two images to secure good midrange scores, plus a wildcard image that might do well or might not.

Ray: Needing clarification: Do we now have more proposals to vote on now?

Simon: No. We vote on the submitted proposals. The other ideas need to be brought forward into next year.

There is no correct answer. People have different perspectives on it.

Simon: Voting no to question two would enable us to change and clarify the rules next

year.

5.5. **Vote on the presented proposal**

Question one:

To amend the Themed Print Panel and Bamber Competitions scoring from a maximum of 20 points at present to 40 points with effect from the next season.

Yes 45%, No 52%, Don't know 3%

Question two:

We should not revisit this question of scoring panel competitions for at least three years.

Yes 31%, No 52%, Don't know 17%

Total votes: 29

Simon: We are keeping the current scoring system for panel competitions, but we can revisit this question in future years.

Andy: Clarifying what we have at present: the rule regarding having only one panel entry counting for the leader board is on the leader board page of the website and not in the Handbook. We need to copy the rule from the leader board to the Handbook.

The Committee will look at the Constitution and the statements on the website and ensure that they are consistent and reflect the agreed rules. **Action: Simon Shore.**

Andy: To remind us, we did change the scoring to double points for one season (David: at the 2017 AGM) but then changed it back to the current system at the next AGM (David: 2018 AGM) because it skewed the results.

Simon thanked everyone and declared the matter closed for one more year.

6. **Election of New Committee**

6.1. **Programme Secretary**

Simon was disappointed to report that no one had come forward to take over from Ray as Programme Secretary. We cannot function without a Programme Secretary, so the only way forward is for Penny and Simon Shore to jointly take on the programme secretary role and let the role of the external competition secretary suffer as a result.

Ian: Does anyone think they can shadow Penny in the season to come to take over in the future?

Penny: It would be a shame to lose the external competitions, especially the friendly competitions. Would anyone take on one of the friendly competitions?

6.2. **Treasurer**

Simon proposed Mike Culnane as Treasurer, seconded by Penny and Ray.

6.3. **Vice President**

Simon welcomed David Davies as our new Vice President.

6.4. **Continuing Committee Members**

Simon confirmed that the other existing Committee Members were willing to continue in their respective roles.

Vote on the new Committee

Accepted unanimously

David reminded us of what is at stake not doing external competitions.

Ian reminded us that the external secretary job is not a solitary job. A group of three people meet together to choose the entries.

Penny: It is interesting to see what other clubs are doing through attending external competitions; we would miss this.

Penny closed the discussion by asking if anyone was interested in the role of the external competitions secretary to email her.

7. **Subscriptions**

We covered this topic in the financial report.

8. **Reclassifications.**

Lee Taylor will be moved to Experienced Group. **Action: Ian Johnston**

9. **Set subjects for next season**

The membership had suggested the topics for next year's set subjects, and the most popular suggestions from a vote of the membership were:

Blue

Metal

Fairy Tales Myths and Legends.

10. **Any Other Business**

10.1. **Camera Club BBQ**

Simon proposed to hold a camera club BBQ on Saturday 14th August with Simon Shore and Nev & Sue Tait as hosts.

10.2. **Annual Dinner at the Meridian Golf Club**

We propose to have our annual dinner next year at the Meridian Golf Club. Maggie will organise this.

10.3. **Vote of thanks to Simon Shore**

Penny thanked Simon Shore for stepping in as Acting President at short notice and keeping the club going. In reply, Simon said he loved this club and thanked everyone for all their support.

11. Summary of Actions

11.1. To action the Committee to ensure that statements on the website and the Constitution reflect the current competition rules and are consistent. **Simon Shore**

11.2. To move Lee Taylor to the Experienced Group. **Ian Johnson**

11.3. To organise the annual dinner at the Meridian Golf Club. **Maggie O'Moore**

David Davies, June 2021

Financial report: Simon Shore Treasurer 2021

We currently have a healthy membership of 51 (the previous year was 54), which has maintained the club in good order despite a significant reduction in the membership fee for this season.

The pandemic has meant that we have lost some other sources of income, particularly refreshments (both at meetings and at the exhibition) and exhibition sponsorship. However, costs have also been reduced - programme costs are lower as we have reduced speakers/judges expenses and we have had no exhibition costs. A significant saving for this year has been no room rent which is our single most significant expense.

All in all, these have balanced themselves out, and we have balanced the books with a healthy £719.69 surplus. See the summary at the end of this report.

Many thanks to Mike Culnane and Anthony Clarke for auditing the books.

I have attempted a forecast for next year. The forecast is based on the assumption that we will be going back to physical meetings at SVC and will therefore, our costs will include the rent.

MEMBERSHIP SUBSCRIPTIONS.

We currently finish the year with money of £9325.03 having made a combined surplus of approx £1200 over the last two seasons.

We substantially reduced membership fees last year, anticipating the reduced costs, especially in the room rent. However, if, as anticipated, we return to regular physical meetings, the rent will then have to be paid.

We are also likely to have to replace a laptop in the near future. The projector and other hardware should be fine for some time yet.

It is not the club's policy to hoard members' money, so the Committee has considered a proposal from Jon Watkins: we do not charge for tea/coffee and biscuits on meeting nights but pay a fixed amount added to the membership fee. Not charging for refreshments on the night will simplify the running of meeting nights and the accounting. We currently make a profit of only about £5 per head per year on refreshments, so we propose to add that £5 to the membership fees in future.

I propose to continue with the reduced membership fees for the next year of £50 full and £40 (concession). If you look at the forecast, this would then lead to approx £1000 loss which would wipe out most of the surplus from these two pandemic years. If we then add £5 for all refreshments for the year, this results in proposed membership fees **of £55 full membership and £45 concession**. After that, we would probably have to restore the more usual membership fees of £63 and £50, respectively, two years ago before the pandemic. In consideration of the programme that we get, I think this represents excellent value for money.

Summary 2020-2021

£

Programme

Membership Fees	2,235.00
Visitor Fees	60.00
Programme	-991.93
Rent	-
EAF	-10.00
Insurances	-205.81
Trophies & Engraving	-
Website (incl 2020/21)	-97.59
Postage & Printing	-
Interclub Competitions	-35.00
Gifts	-60.51
Net Surplus	<u>894.16</u>

Event

Ticket Sales	-
Speaker	-30.00
Net Surplus	<u>-30.00</u>

Exhibition

Sponsorship	-
Refreshment Sales	-
Card Sales	489.00
Donation to Arthur Rank Hospice	-489.00
Costs	-50.00
Net Surplus	<u>-50.00</u>

Refreshments

Sales	-
Costs	-
Net Surplus	<u>-</u>
<u>Annual Dinner 2021</u>	-

Tickets	-
Costs	-

Net Cost (1 meal for speaker + £100 deposit for 2020) -

Annual BBQ 2021

Tickets	-
Costs	-
Net Surplus	<u>-</u>

Bank Interest -

Miscellaneous

Spyder, Zoom subscriptions and gloves -193.88

Donation 99.41
Net Cost -94.47
Total Year End Surplus

719.69

Programme Secretary's Report: Ray McMurray

This report is my last as Programme Secretary. The last four years in this role have been a great experience, and it has been a privilege to have served the club. Every season has had its highlights and challenges, but every year has been highly rewarding. I took the job on with little experience of this club or any camera clubs, after only one season of membership. I have no regrets about doing this, and I have benefitted from it enormously.

Over these four seasons, the Club has provided a wide range of speakers on topics that span many genres and levels of ability. We have done so within our budget, and with few changes to the programmes we set out at the start of each season.

As we all know, this season has been like no other before it. All camera clubs have faced the same challenges and similar choices about how to proceed. There are still more questions and challenges to face, but these are all manageable provided our members continue to enjoy their photography and want to continue to learn, compete and be creative.

Not only did we put on a summer programme, but we had more Thursday meetings than normal during the season. On top of that, we innovated special interest groups and critique evenings. And we had a brilliant online exhibition thanks to the work of Jon.

I would like to thank the Committee for its support and work behind the scenes, especially the Presidents, Richard and Simon, for providing their leadership and advice.

We have all had to learn how to use Zoom, and it feels like we are all old hands at it now. I have been impressed with how everyone has embraced it and made use of it, with screen sharing, breakout rooms and the hardest skill of all, remembering to mute your microphone!

Next season we may be having hybrid meetings with both live attendance and video recordings.

If we put on live meetings again next season, will you be likely to attend? Assuming they are safe and covid measures are in place to the requirements of the college. We are in discussion with the college, but as yet, we haven't had any firm guidance on the questions we would like to be clear about. I realise that the Zoom way of doing things may not suit everyone

I am going to put a poll question on your screen, and I would like you to indicate what you would be likely to do if we resume face to face meetings at the college next season – will you come along?

You will see a panel with the question, and you will need to use your mouse or touchscreen to give your answer. Once you have answered, the screen will disappear. After about a minute I will give the result. This vote is not anonymous, but your details will only be available to the Committee to help to plan for next season.

The question is:

IF THE CLUB HOLDS FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS AT THE VILLAGE COLLEGE THAT ARE COVID-SECURE, DO YOU THINK YOU WILL ATTEND THEM?

YES, MOST OF THEM

YES, SOME OF THEM, BUT NOT ALL

NO, VERY FEW OR NONE

I DON'T KNOW YET

Does anyone have any questions?

[Polling]

Concluding comments.

Ray

Other polling questions

DO YOU AGREE THAT ALL PANEL COMPETITIONS SHOULD BE MARKED OUT OF 40 POINTS FOR A SINGLE ENTRY?

DO YOU AGREE THAT THE RESULT OF THIS POLL SHOULD BE BINDING FOR THE NEXT THREE SEASONS?

Internal Competition Secretary's Report: Ian Johnson

Despite the global pandemic over the past season, we have had our usual eight internal competitions (16 if you include both groups). Yes, the lack of print competitions was a big disappointment but necessary in view of the Covid-19 situation. On the plus side, though, we have managed to squeeze in three more nights of competitiveness courtesy of our RED and MOTION discussion nights, which became the forerunner of our critique evenings, and of course, last week's Pairs Competition.

I believe the critique nights have benefitted everyone who has attended and has raised the overall standard of photography within the club. As a judge, I am aware of sometimes stating the obvious. So obvious the authors themselves cannot see it. If we can cut out that element of our work, then we should gain higher marks as a result.

In addition to thanking everyone at the club who entered the competitions, I would like to thank all the judges who have given their advice and time: Lee Sutton, Cherry Larcombe, Steve Walton, Carole McNiven-Young, Nick Akers, Colin Westgate, Colin Strong, Iñaki Hernández-Lasa and last but not least, Jim Bennett.

I have provided every judge this season with an anonymous copy of all images entered in their respective competitions so they can be viewed in close detail and be prepared ahead of the evening.

I have asked judges when marking the competition to give a wide range of marks as possible. Some judges have even managed to do this! I have also asked our judges to give as many 20s as they see fit. This has resulted in 32 images in total to choose from next week when we all decide which image is our "Image of the year".

After each competition, I print and distribute the results of the competitions. As such, the tables shouldn't produce any surprises. However, it is right and proper these are recorded officially.

At this point, I would like to thank my scorers - Andy Dearn and Sarah Johnson, so when things (quite often) go wrong electronically, we have two paper and pen backups.

Congratulations to both Lee and Penny in becoming the Improver and Experienced Photographers of the Year and to all those who have picked up Silverware, Woodware and Perspexware as well.

May I end with a little dig? Later on tonight, you will be given the Set Subjects for next season. The "Fixed" competitions are already known. So that's nine months to get your images to me. So why cannot I get odds at Ladbrokes that someone will not send me four images at 11:59 before the closing time/date of the last competition?

Ian Johnson
Internal Competition Secretary
Swavesey Camera Club

External Competition Secretary's Report: Penny Reeves

As everyone is all too aware, the 2020/21 season was very different from any that we've experienced before. The restrictions put in place as a result of the COVID 19 pandemic meant that, like most other clubs, we held no face-to-face meetings, and as a result, we neither ran nor entered any print competitions, with the external competition season focusing on PDI competitions run via Zoom.

The critique evenings we've been running this year seem to really be paying off — the standard of images available for selection for external competitions was impressive, as was demonstrated by our victory over St Ives in November in our 'friendly' competition, with a score of 352 to 346, a nail-biter to the end. Derek Smith's 'Tree in the lake' scored a 20, with Maggie O'Moore's 'Northern Gannet' and Nick Murrall's 'Port of Felixstowe' also scoring well.

Our first non-friendly external of the season was the Melbourn Trophy in December. This is a knock-out competition, and unfortunately, we were knocked out by Bishop's Stortford with a score of 399 to our 372. Andy Dearn was the only Swavesey member to score a 20 with 'Red Cherry'.

In February, we entered six images into the St. Ives Interprint, which for obvious reasons, was not run as a print competition this year. Twenty clubs entered this season. Chelmsford won with 113 points, and we scored 103, equal with Peterborough and Kings Lynn (and higher than Ely or St Ives). Richard Harrison achieved our highest score (19) with 'The strange case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde'.

At the end of March, we participated in a strong and very enjoyable friendly competition against St Neots. It was made all the more enjoyable (of course) because we won 361–340. Congratulations to Andy Dearn ('Red cherry'), Anita Lewis ('Queen Sofia Palace of the Arts'), Derek Smith ('Tree in the lake'), Eleni Paliginis ('Clematis') and Nick Murrall ('Port of Felixstowe') for all scoring 20s.

On the same night, a number of Swavesey members also competed in the Bill Dunn Memorial Competition, a competition for creative images organised by Peterborough. As a club, we did well, with Commended awards for Richard Harrison ('Polaroid Selfie') and Penny Reeves ('The Jungle Book'), two Highly Commended awards for Doug Thompson ('Room with a view' and 'Where's the film?') and second place overall for Richard Harrison with 'Robin Hood'.

Our final external competition of the season was the Brotherhoods Cup in April. We did quite well in a very strong field, coming sixth out of 11 clubs. PICO won with a score of 151 to our 137, and we were awarded no 20s, although Penny Reeves' 'The Jungle Book', Anita Lewis's 'Queen Sofia Palace of the Arts' and Lee Taylor's 'Sunrise by the sea' all scored highly.

Looking forward to the 2021/22 season: we're drawn against Ware in the first round of the Melbourn Trophy in November. We have a friendly competition organised with St Ives and another proposed to St Neots, and Ely has invited us to participate in a friendly competition to showcase the work of our Improvers and less-experienced members.

The big questions remaining are whether or not these external competitions will be run as face-to-face events – and if they are, how many of them will have a print component, given how few clubs will have prints from internal print competitions this season to select from. (Fair warning to anyone who had a judge comment that "that would make a good print" – I may be calling on you...)

In conclusion, it has been quite a good year on the external competitions front, despite continuing COVID restriction challenges. The critique evenings appear to be having a positive effect on the quality of the images we're producing as a club, and so I hope (and recommend) that we continue with these next season.

Looking forward to seeing what we can achieve in 2012/22!

Penny Reeves
External Competitions Secretary

Presidents Report: Simon Shore.

As I am sure we have all said umpteen times over the last year, this has been the most extraordinary year for all of us and certainly for this club.

The first thing I must do is to thank the membership for sticking with us during this period. I was fearful at the start of the season that many would not sign up for this year, but my fears proved totally unfounded so thank you all for your continued support.

I would like to thank all the members of the Committee who have worked so very hard this year on our behalf.

Thanks to Ian and Andy for making the competition night still possible and to Andy for so diligently maintaining our website. I think most, if not all, of our new members, have found us through the website, so this seems to be working well for us.

I must also thank Maggie here, who has used her time to raise the club's profile on Facebook and in the local press.

Thank you, Doug, for setting up our first transatlantic Meeting- that seemed to go down well, and I think we are hoping to repeat that next year.

Thank you also to David for keeping meticulous minutes of our meetings.

Thank you also to Penny as our newest recruit to the Committee for managing our external and friendly competitions again in such a difficult environment.

Thank you also to Anita, our outings secretary- I know this has been a frustrating time for you, but I think we are now seeing the light at the end of the tunnel, and I hope we will be able to meet this summer.

I think I must make a special mention of two committee members who have gone the extra mile this year. One is Jon Watkins, who, as the exhibition secretary, could easily have sat back and said we could not do it. Instead, he worked very hard to build an online exhibition from scratch for us, which, according to the visitor numbers, has been tremendously successful.

The other person is Ray, our Programme Secretary who, almost single-handed, worked out how to continue an active programme for us by setting up Zoom meetings and using the new flexibility to get speakers from far away places like Ireland and Romania and two joint meetings with Otley.

We have had a hugely diverse series of presentations covering myriad aspects of modern photography. These have been so successful that we currently plan to maintain our Zoom subscription to use for virtual meetings when we cannot access the college (school holidays, half terms and parents nights/performance nights).

I have been unable to decide between Jon and Ray for the President's trophy this year, which is awarded to anyone that we think has gone above and beyond so, in this exceptional year, I would like to award this jointly to Ray and Jon.

Despite all, we have welcomed several new and very talented members to the club this year, and I hope you have enjoyed yourselves. We have certainly enjoyed having you in the club and hope you will stay with us. Apart from anything else, I think we are all curious to see what you look like in real life.

Simon Shore Acting President 2021

Proposal to Amend Competition Scoring

To amend the scoring of the Themed Print Panel and Bamber Competitions from a maximum of 20 points at present to 40 with effect from the next season. The judge's score is to be doubled in the leaderboard, with the higher score taken in the event of two entries from the same author.

Reason for Change:

1. Convention has dictated that whilst rules allow members to submit up to four entries to most internal competitions, (other than to the Themed Print Panel and the Bamber Trophy), a maximum of two entries for judging has been the norm due to popularity and logistics. Rules state that each entry can attract up to 20 points and therefore there is a maximum of 40 points available per competition. When the amount of work required for each entry for these competitions is examined the rules are 20 points awarded for each (new) print/image for the Monochrome, Projected image, Joe Sipos and Set Subjects competitions. (If entries of previous competitions are used for these competitions the effort is obviously much less and 40 points potentially could be awarded for two old previously used images for which limited work has been required.)
2. At present, the Themed Print Panel and Bamber Competitions both require five new or three new and two previously used images. These two competitions only merit 20 points, irrespective of whether one or two entries are judged. So if you chose to submit two entries, the work to produce each new image for each entry is equivalent to two points (10 new images for 20 points maximum). After judging, the effort is (only) four points per image (five new images per entry) if full marks are awarded. If you incorporate the maximum of two previously used images in each entry, the points only increase to 6.7 per image entry maximum.
3. So it is evident that there is a great disparity between effort and available maximum points for the Themed Print Panel and Bamber Competitions compared to all the other competitions. The Themed Print Panel and Bamber Competitions unreasonably and unfairly attract a weighting of only 20% of the points available for each image prepared compared to the other competitions; that is four points versus 20 points per image.
4. To remedy this anomaly and unfairness in the simplest way, I would suggest that from next year both the Themed Print Panel and Bamber Competitions are judged out of 20 maximum and points awarded by the judge are doubled in the leaderboard. If a member has two entries that have been submitted for judging, then the one with the higher marks is counted.

Proposed and prepared by Mike Culnane

Joint Counter Proposal - Competition scoring - Ray McMurray & Maggie O'Moore

Statement

There is no good reason to change our scoring system, and there are several good reasons why it would not be a good idea. The existing way of scoring panel competitions is fair, simple and reasonable. Our current scoring system is in line with other camera clubs in the UK. Skewing or distortion of the leaderboard can occur due to two "different" scoring systems being used.

Why our present scoring system is fair and reasonable.

The panel and Bamber competitions are the only ones that count the score of only one of your entries; all the others count two. The reason why counting two entries rather than one entry is simple: to overcome judging bias. Even the best judge will favour one style or genre over another or miss an important quality of the photograph. For the other six competitions we have three or sometimes four "chances" or "bites of the cherry" to achieve a good score. You only have one chance in the Bamber and Panel competitions. Sometimes the results are down to what the judges like or enjoy.

As competitors, we can have more confidence that our scores reflect the quality of our work if we have two images counted in our totals. Over the season, any blips (as we see them) in the scoring are more likely to be evened out if we have two scores in each competition. That makes it reasonably fair. It would be fairer still if we were allowed two entries in each panel competition to be scored, but the time and work needed for that make it unreasonable.

The current scoring system gives a suitable and fair assessment of the quality of our photography over the whole season. It prevents Skewing or Distortion of the leaderboard.

Do we need to change this?

There is no good reason to change this. The club has operated this way for many years in line with other camera clubs in the UK. All members understand it, and the results at the end of the season are perfectly clear. It has been previously tried for one season to double up the marks. This was reverted back to the current rule voted for by a substantial number of members.

The problem with the proposal is that it would not only doubly penalise lower-scoring competitors, but it would amplify, not reduce, judging bias. With forty points at stake and only one bite at the cherry, anyone other than the top scorers would have grounds to feel that the competition would have treated them unfairly by doubling their distance to the next person in the rank order, and especially so if they felt the judge had treated them harshly in their assessment.

We all know that one photo may get a winning 20/20 in one competition, and then the same photo in a different competition by a different judge may only get 12/20. So a member who is doing well in the leaderboard may get perhaps a low score of 12/20 for the Panel or Bamber competition. Possibly a member much lower down in the leaderboard may get a high score, e.g. 20/20. If the score is doubled up, it could result in a

large difference of perhaps 16 points in one competition result. This difference is extremely unlikely to happen in the other six competitions, where we have at least two or more chances to receive a decent score. This could lead to a member who has performed in a mediocre way in the previous six competitions being "Propelled" up the leaderboard by just one competition result.

Current Scoring System

The current points system is one way, not the only way of differentiating one competitor from another in order to get a final rank order and an overall winner. This system has performed well from one season to the next. There are enough points awarded over the season to allow a single champion in each category, Experienced and Improvers. We don't need any more points in the system. One entry - one score out of twenty. It works well as it is.

Effort?

The proposer seems to be saying that because an entrant has to assemble five images and arrange them into a panel, and there is more effort required, therefore more points should be awarded. 'Forty points' is chosen to match the single-image competitions, asserting that this would be fairer. But this is wrong. If you say that every winning image should be scored out of 20 points, in the interests of fairness and to recognise effort, logically, each panel should be scored out of 100 points!

This shows the fallacy behind the proposal when it talks of 'effort'. What does it even mean? When we invite a judge to score our competition, we don't ask them to score on the basis of the photographer's effort. And why not? Because it would make no sense to them, and rightly so. Where would they even begin? So why introduce this vague and irrelevant principle into two of our major competitions? The proposer ends up in an arid analysis of points per image measured against some supposed effort, which is overly complex and has little to do with why we enter competitions - to learn and to have fun!

Finally

There is no need to even up the scoring maximums across our competitions. They work fine for us as they are. **One entry-one score out of twenty. It is logical, understandable and delivers fair results over the season. The proposal fails on each of these counts and so should be rejected once again.**