

Questions for the Discussion Forum received so far by the Organiser from Conference Delegates.

Why are so many conclusions reached in the 'The Society's Future' document quite simply false?

An independent analysis of the actual responses is now needed. Why? Consider:

Quote: "There is a widespread call for change and improvement"

Not so. In fact the circulated document shows that only 1 in 5 are seeking a new direction.

A huge majority of 4 in 5 (80%) are not seeking any new direction. Where is the widespread call?

Quote: "This is especially so amongst the younger half of the membership"

Not so. In fact a majority (60%) of those aged 40-50 do not seek change and (75%) of those aged in their 60s do not seek change. Please therefore explain why we should embark on change?

Quote: "This is particularly striking in regard to our website"

Not so. In fact the document shows that an equal number of respondents are either 'satisfied' or 'unsatisfied' though even amongst the 'unsatisfied' there is no distinction made between outright criticism (unfit for purpose) and constructive suggestions for growth and added features. Furthermore the selective exclusion of 'over-80' votes ' (because of submission of responses by paper) is not only blatantly wrong but it is also quite insulting. The document makes it clear that members returning paper copies are spread across **all** age groups and they outnumber those using electronic means by nearly 2 to 1.

Quote: "We are in the midst of a continuing and accelerating digital revolution. We have not kept pace with it" and "Above all the survey confirms our website to be our weakest link"

Why then is our web site the most popular sundial website in the world - see information in the wallets? 2012 is the tenth anniversary of the Society's first venture into electronic publishing. It is seven years since we published our first electronic Register. We use Facebook and PayPal and have the world's most popular sundial web site. What examples of not keeping pace are there to be corrected?

Quote: "1 in 6 wishes to see additional Events"

That means that 5 in 6 (83%) are satisfied with the present programme of events. Keyword counting and counts of the incidence of certain words cannot be indicators of support or criticism because they are taken out of their context.

Quote: "Opinion on Management is split down the middle"

Not so: The document makes it clear that 3 out of 4 (75%) are satisfied or have no criticism of management. It is statistically wrong for any analysis to attribute a 'no answer' to dissatisfaction in a voluntarily submitted return.

Quote: "Opinion on Communication is split down the middle"

Not so: The document actually makes it clear that those who are satisfied with the Society's communications outnumber those who are not satisfied by 2 to 1.

The lack of significant offers of New Help is the single most important and sobering result in the whole survey. Our

President drew attention to this last night. This should be the entire focus for any discussion of the future of the BSS. Without member participation the Society will cease to function whether it has (or even needs) a 'strategic direction' or not.

In view of these serious flaws no members can now be confident that this analysis has been conducted impartially.

Members should now be given full visibility of the actual returns - with anonymity respected of course - so that the quality of the published initial interpretation can be reviewed by anyone. With only a 1 in 6 response, the published survey results cannot be used to justify radical changes to the direction of the Society unless and until all the survey responses (64 total) are made available on line or to an independent sub committee of ordinary members for neutral re-analysis.

We should be told which of the present Trustees have actually signed up to this extraordinary and faulted document.

When will the individual responses to the Questionnaire be placed on the web site?