

2022 Rowing SA SGM
28/02/2022, 6:30pm
Woodville West Torrens FC Function Centre

1. Meeting Open – Chair (PP – Philip Paterson)

PP welcomes all to meeting.

Acknowledges passing of member of the Rowing Community – Ann Southcott

- Apologies
David & Anne Ellis, Leanne Sandow, Peter Hodson,
David Martin, George Jeffrey
Penny & John Halliday
Nicole Walker
- Declaration of conflicts of interest
PP acknowledges some may perceive board has a conflict of interest but legal advice says this is not so.

We are voting yes or no tonight, the time to debate content opened 1st of December and closed 4th of Feb.

This evening is supported by RSA Staff, Volunteers, Board Members, representatives from Grant Thornton who will be auditing, and Hamish Archibald our legal advisor engaged for the Constitution.

PP addresses group – joined board 2015 to help resolve governance issues and became first appointed director. Solved many endemic issues with conflicts of interest, gender inequities. Had nothing to gain when joining the board and nothing to gain now.

In 2016 led board to review constitution and material changes, only 1 board member here today that was on the board then. In this time all that have come on have supported changes. Changes then stalled at 11th hour by stalwarts that threatened to use the Constitution to defeat the changes if the board did not back off. In 2016 the board's response was to retreat. In 2018 board proposed housekeeping changes which were passed at an SGM. Now the board revisits the issues from 2016, in order to progress and advance the sport of rowing for the members to come. Believes the sport has been halted by resistance to change.

In the lead up to this SGM PP made a promise to Phillip Mangelsdorf to hold 3 yearly meetings with clubs and schools to provide feedback to board on competition and participation. Board will hold these meetings regardless of the outcome of tonight's meeting.

PP discusses slides:

Why changing?

Democratic – has a more functional voting structure, contemporary – one of very few state sports associations with this old Constitution model, and will assist in bringing clubs and schools closer together.

Consultation Process:

PP runs through consultation process and format that has occurred.

Feedback has been overwhelmingly positive:

Most common question is regarding the logic behind the voting structure. Answer is that it is a more representative of our actual membership. Does not hand control to one group but requires both to agree for a change to occur.

PP - Runs through voting structure.

PP - Draws attention to the motion and where members can find the wording on their voting slip.

PP - now opens the meeting.

Is there a proposer and a seconder?

D Clayton – can PP vote? No. Therefore he can't move a motion.

Someone moves motion (Greg Keene)

Comments from the floor:

Rob Cheeseman (in objection) - Foundation Life Member cost in 1970's equals approx. \$10,000 now. Believes this has been overlooked. Does not believe assets belong to the schools or the clubs but to the members. Currently clubs and club members contribute more to the assets and the maintenance of RSA. Asks how this change fits with the Strategic Plan of Rowing Australia and meets their governance requirements. Support everyone to vote against this change, not because it isn't necessary but because its justification is not substantiated.

Jo Malcolm (in support) – questions where 69% of financial contribution mentioned by Rob comes from. Membership costs might be lower per individual but total amount contributed from schools significantly outweighs clubs. Believes as a member of a club and school that this is the right change to benefit the future of the sport.

Bill Othams (in objection) – Port Pirie voting on behalf of club, which will be voting against. Believes there are plenty of things wrong with the current Constitution, but does not believe this model is correct as it does not allow clubs to split their vote.

Will Raven (in support) – brings us into line with the majority of other sports and associations. 1 vote per school is not appropriate, current Constitution not at all representative of school athletes.

Hamish Archibald (Lawyers) – there is nothing explicit saying that you can or can not raise amendments, but needs to come back and look at the intent of the Constitution and that is members are entitled to 21 days' notice to consider resolutions – resolution was to replace constitution A with constitution B. Not to debate this – this was handled in the consultation. Practical issue – logistically difficult to have meeting of amendment and counter amendment which would lead to drafting a Constitution on the run. Therefore, correct legal and practical advice is that amendments can not be proposed.

Lou Crotti (in support) – long relationship with the association, and long legal career with focus on constitution. Few points – amendments must be given to the members with notice so they may prepare and debate.

Disappointed that debate has come down to clubs v schools. Common practice for members to go to clubs to vote and then that club votes on behalf of those members.

Individual members don't put in much to the maintenance of asset.

Tina Lowe (in support) – consultation has been ongoing for 6 years so there is no reason to claim there has not been enough consultation. Bord comprised of volunteers voted in by the members, and two appointed directors appointed by those elected directors. Believes all should consider issue independently and fairly rather than be swayed by those few individuals trying to derail this process.

Greg Keene (in support) – two things not considered yet – to tidy up matters that affect the administration of the sport, and secondly, does not believe change negatively impacts the clubs. Currently schools have unrepresentatively small portion of the vote, and this would go some way to address this.

Alison Smith (in objection) – knows how hard Constitutional changes are and commends work done, disconcerting how members are counted – after non-competitive members removed very small club for voting purposes.

Phillip Mangelsdorf (in objection) – likes concept that registered members 18 years or older can vote which is one reason he is against this model.

Dean Clayton (in objection) – many emotional speeches tonight but this is a smokescreen, issue is simple, at the moment the votes rest with the individuals rather than the clubs. Believes issue is a simple one, do we want individuals or clubs to have the votes.

PP calls a vote:

Members complete their ballots. Ballot boxes taken to members to collect.

Results:

Justin (Grant Thornton) not enough votes to reach 75% required for change.

Some members request results of vote.

Justin does not have specific vote count but says outcome was just short of 60% in favour.

Meeting closed – 7:40am