

Discussion of some SRP 2020 Report recommendations

Non-website communications

(Anthony Hall, David Powell, Andrew Short, Mike Wilkinson)

| Recommendation | Priority | Discussion | Action |
|---|-----------------|---|---|
| 16 Branch secretaries to be sent a regular 'what's on' | Low | Lot of work. Maybe better to produce a list of new content added to the website e.g. concerts, music, events etc and send out quarterly to ALL members with email (asking people to print off and pass to non-email/web members). Timed to go out between magazine issues so there are 8 communications a year rather than 4 from "central" SRP | Mike Wilkinson to trial |
| 19 (page 14) . Effective communication should be made to all members, explaining our charitable objectives in non-technical terms. | High | Some sort of membership joiners pack telling new members what SRP is about, NYRO, Festivals, how to get involved, magazine is given at much reduced rate etc. Something summary for existing members (pack only going to new joiners). Sent out from central rather than left to branches to do? | Mike Wilkinson to draft something and ask for contribution as needed from others |
| 21 (page 16) . There should be a mechanism whereby branches share information about how they operate | High | Website forums useful for discussing gift aid, what works within branches, what doesn't etc. Possibility for problem solving sessions at conference? | |
| 22 (page 16) . Branches should be made aware of the potential benefits of a regular (possibly anonymous) survey of their members | Low | Feedback to central is interesting but queries over the use of the data and level of admin / load on branches. Using membership data can watch for signs of problems (wild membership variation) and offer support as necessary? | Mike Wilkinson to keep watching brief on membership, report at February meetings? |

| | | | |
|--|------|---|---|
| 27 (page 18). The system of renewal of membership at branch level should be reviewed, so that those people who have not renewed are followed up | | Offer of Country and Overseas to leavers but should this come from branches to non-returners or from central committee/membership (problem of not knowing why someone has left?) | |
| 28 (page 19). In addition to the regular analysis of branch strength, there should be regular analysis of joiners and leavers at each branch | | A branch issue but like recommendation 22, committee keep watching brief and support as necessary? | As Recommendation 22 |
| 30 (page 20). The SRP should carry out a regular survey of people who have left, to learn more about why they left. | Low | Easy to identify who has left but not why left. Could be burdensome to try and gain reasons on branch membership returns (though knowing dead could prevent unnecessary embarrassment?). Periodic (every x years) emails out to leavers from membership secretary could be interesting but not sure if overkill | |
| 31 (page 21). COS membership should be promoted to people who are about to leave | | | As Recommendation 27 |
| 32 The SRP should make an annual review of branch health, using simple statistics | Med | | As Recommendation 22 regarding watching brief on membership fluctuation |
| 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58. The Magazine | | Can't please everyone! SRP sections: lacks images and style of contributions reflect branch activity. | |
| 63 (page 41). The content of the booklet of pastoral visitors (or, to use the official title | High | Some consistency on content, conductors to state any particular specialism or types of music they prefer to conduct. To state clearly if they charge | |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--|--|
| <p>'Panel of Visiting Conductors') should be reviewed.</p> | | <p>e.g. a £ sign next to name (not actual rate) so branches can make informed decision and no embarrassment when an invoice suddenly lands. In discussion, with whole group, thought guidance to visiting conductors on what is felt to be a reasonable rate for ½ day or full day may be useful?? Queries over DP implications of putting this on website – unclear as to what DP issues are. [If someone identified what these were, let David Powell know and he'll look into it as a qualified Data Protection Officer!]</p> | |
| <p>64 (page 42). Branches should be made aware of the potential benefit of wider use of their branch libraries.</p> | <p>Low/Med</p> | <p>Not a priority but encourage catalogues to be shared via website. Anecdotally, lots of collections require weeding (antiquated editions, photocopies etc) and mixed use amongst branches depending on membership, MDs own access to music and storage problems.</p> | |
| <p>66 (page 43). As the festival is held annually in different parts of the country, it should be used as an opportunity to showcase to members the wider side of the SRP's work.</p> | <p>Low/Med</p> | <p>Possibility of some fixed "SRP" pop-up banners that could be loaned out discussed / fixed display boards showing charitable activity suggested. Storage issue.</p> | |
| <p>68 (page 44). The SRP should make branches aware of the facility for borrowing the larger instruments held by NYRO, outside the summer residential course period.</p> | | | <p>NYRO email orchestra to offer currently. Could include in branch handbook</p> |
| <p>72 (page 50). The SRP should clearly specify the minimum expectations of an SRP branch - for example the</p> | | <p>Branch handbook (see above) could help but not to be dictatorial – a problem solving tool and reminder of our charitable aims?</p> | <p>Draft branch handbook</p> |

| | | | |
|--|-----|---|--------------------------|
| holding of regular branch meetings, open to visitors (both players and non-players). | | | |
| 83. Branch handbook | Med | General advice on various common issues e.g. visitors to branches, annual processes, proforma accounts and spreadsheets, COS options for leavers, advertising that can be customised and guidance on what has worked in other branches (web forums?!) | Mike Wilkinson to draft? |