

At the AGM, on September 13th, your Committee will ask you to ratify some changes to the Society's Governing Document. As it is only two years since the last revision we thought that a word or two of explanation was in order.

Three principal issues are addressed by the proposed changes:

1. adjusting the composition of the committee to rebalance responsibility and workload
2. formalising the role of President
3. expanding the scope of business that may be transacted at a General Meeting rather than at the Annual General Meeting.

Adjusting the composition of the committee

It is proposed that responsibility and workload should be rebalanced across four Officers rather than three. Currently, our Secretary is responsible for the administration of all of the Society's affairs. We propose that:

- the Secretary should be responsible for the operational management of the Society
- the Events Manager should be responsible for organising concerts, workshops and other events.

The roles of Chairman and Treasurer should remain essentially unchanged. It is proposed that written job descriptions be agreed with each Officer and published to members.

Formalising the role of President

Although there is a clear tradition, the concept and role of President is currently neither defined nor documented. The proposed change would correct this oversight.

Expanding the scope of business that may be transacted at a General Meeting

According to our current rules, certain classes of business can only be conducted during an Annual General Meeting, not a General Meeting. As this restriction applies to the ratification of Officer appointments and changes to the Governing Document it is, to say the least, inconvenient.

The threat of closure, the urgent need to rebalance workload and the resignation of our past-Secretary in July have caused us to circumvent current rules by bringing forward the next AGM such that we can conduct essential business and then adjourn to a more usual date for the consideration of other matters.

The proposed changes would remove the need for such a parliamentary interpretation of our rules in the future.