

Winchester Photographic Society

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting on 22nd May 2012
7:30pm, Winchester Discovery Centre

Note: Individual reports are available on request from the secretary



1. **Apologies:** Stephen Hewitt, Janette Lloyd, Andrew Golden, Joe Kaplonek, Les Nicholson, Winifred Harwood, Colin Chase, Michael White, Bernice Hill
2. **Minutes of AGM held 24th May 2011 and EGM on 13 Sept Accepted.**
Proposed David Taylor, Ron Foulkes.
3. **Matters Arising** Martin explained the three-year tenure for many committee positions and it was generally agreed. We should check the constitution does not need changing.
4. **Treasurer's Report** See separate report. A fair deal has been struck for the next 3 years tenure of the performance hall.

An increase of fees was agreed to £60 single £105 double, £10 student
Proposal from Mervyn Edwards Seconded by Rafe Pascual

A vote of thanks to Annelis Brophy was agreed for reviewing the accounts

5. **Secretary's Report**

May I make my annual request everyone to let the treasurer and I know if you change your email address, otherwise you will not get any notices. I often get one or two delivery failures for each email I send, but they vary. The SPF has requested that clubs use generic titles, such as secretary@winphotosoc.org.uk to make it easier to keep their records up to date, and we are trying to do that for the president, webmaster, competition secretary, digital competition secretary and secretary, with their agreement.

Photographic magazines are still available and you are welcome to take them home and keep them if they are more than 12 months old. We have a new cupboard available in the IT room to store these and other items.

6. **Exhibition Coordinator's Report.** See separate report. A free-standing banner was suggested to advertise the exhibition in the Discovery centre and once appointed the new Coordinator will be asked to consider that

7. **Programme Secretary's Report** See separate report Rafe Pascual would like to see more about the detail of how pictures were taken and processed. Also, the selection of judges and the comments received from them were briefly discussed. The SPF have a training programme for judges and these new judges will be mentored, so we should consider using them.

8. **Competition Secretary's Report – including external competitions.** See separate report

9. Reports from other officers. Workshops (Chris Lillywhite) These were held every month on a variety of topics which seemed to work quite well. Next year we are going to aim more workshops at beginners. Thanks to those members who helped with giving workshops.

10. Other reports; webmaster's Report See separate report.

Panels: From Anne Ruffell – see separate report

A/V Report (from George Walsh) – see separate report

11. President's Report – see separate report

12. Election of officers The nominated committee were elected unanimously. While a Exhibition Coordinator has not yet been elected, meanwhile Louise is organising a sub-committee to keep the exhibition going.

Results of committee election

Position	Officer	Proposer	Seconder
President**	Barbara Lambert**	Martin Farrow	Tony Smith
Vice President	David McKibbin	Anne Ruffell	Martin Farrow
Secretary*	<i>Keith Taylor</i>		
Treasurer	Graham Barber	Keith Taylor	Philip George
Programme Secretary*	<i>Tony Smith</i>		
Exhibition Coordinator	See above		
Publicity Officer*	<i>Adrian Brophy</i>		
Competition Secretary*	<i>Philip George</i>		
Digital Projected Image Secretary	Brian Jones	Eric Blake	Louise Brown
Workshop Secretary*	<i>Chris Lillywhite</i>		
Member	Colin Chase	D Biddlecombe	Simon Harwood
Member	Joy Auty	Mervyn Edwards	Keith Taylor
Member	Roger Clark	Keith Taylor	Martin Farrow

* These posts are not for re-election this year

** Following the resignation of Joe Kaplonek, Barbara Lambert (who was president a few years ago) agreed to be nominated for this role.

13. Appointment of independent financial examiner: Annelis Brophy has agreed to continue

14. Any Other Business

a) Gordon Brown: Exhibition principles

The exhibition has a lot of work and cost associated with it. Joe, Christine, Louise and Gordon are on a sub-committee looking into it and have had one meeting. Should the Exhibition be members only or not, judged or not judged? Joe has run a survey.

Anne Ruffell suggested we keep the format the same with a new team running it. Tony Smith noted that the cost is approximately balanced by the income. What is the objective of the exhibition? Accrediting BPE was suggested.

Ron Foulkes proposed the following motion : “The committee preserve the exhibition generally as it is.” This was voted on and carried, with 30 in favour and 7 against; the motion was carried.

The committee and the Exhibition sub-committee will now take that decision forward for the planning and preparation for next year’s exhibition.

Adrian Brophy pointed out that the whole debate on exhibition format (including from a beginners’ perspective) didn't seem to have been explained to the membership. Failure to do so would make the committee seem rather foolish for having a pointless and confusing debate.

Roger Buchanan pointed out that the City Council wants the best exhibition possible to attract visitors to their space (which is under threat).

AOB item b) Bernice Hill : Keeping the beginners group for beginners – see note from Phil George :

Thank you for your email about the Beginners Competitions!

I am fully aware there is now a problem with this and we are looking at ways to make the Beginners section very much a Beginners section.

Unfortunately, the competitions have evolved rather unexpectedly due to a number of major changes over the last ten years, particularly the demise of the slides league, and the introduction of an Intermediate league for all classes in 2006.

Before 2006 we had a Beginners and Advanced Class for all categories, and we introduced an Intermediate class so Beginners, who maybe won the league or a major trophy, wouldn't be forced straight into the Advanced League. At more or less the same time, the Slides leagues came to an end, and members who were Advanced in the Slides found that they were no longer able to compete in the digital world, and so asked to be demoted to Intermediate.

We have also had a situation whereby new photographers can start off and, because of access to many images and tutorials on the Internet, can actually become Advanced in a very short space of time, indeed, there are some Advanced members who have only been doing photography for just a few years, and could easily class themselves as Beginners not very long ago. Before the digital age, it would often take an amateur photographer years and years to learn how to print to a high standard and compete with the best.

So you can see our dilemma?

I am looking at ways of assessing new members when they join the Society to try and determine which class they should compete in, but it is very difficult when a new member joins and says he or she is a complete Beginner, and in no time at all, produces work which is "up there with the best"!

I am even looking to "shake up" the classes and promote a lot of members from the Beginners to the Intermediate or even Advanced where we see fit.

Best regards,
Phil

Phil explained the intention to review member's current categories, in terms of capabilities and competition performance then, in consultation with the relevant members, re-align abilities with categories as best as possible.
Simon Mann suggested adding a fourth category, which would precede Beginners, but Martin explained the practical problems that this would cause.

Any further AOB items were curtailed, and the meeting was closed at **10.25pm**