

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

CLUB MEMBERS

PRESENT: Leo Mayer (Club President)
Peter Flockart (Photographic Officer)
Merridy Cairn Duff (Publicity Officer)
Brian Colwell (1992-1993 Photographic Officer & 2nd Novice 1994)
Ron Mines (1992-1993 Club President & Photographer)
Jenny Mines (SPDC Member & Photographer)
Brent Hedges (SPD Member & Open Photographer)

VISITORS

PRESENT: David Fagan (5th Novice Photographer)
Tom Byron (Current Judge & ex SPD member)
Mark Spencer (3rd Open 1994 & ex Judge)
Kevin Deacon (Dive 2000 & Photo Journalist & ex Judge)

CORRESPONDENCE

FROM: Neil Vincent (ex SPD Photographic Officer)

Discussion on Novices

How to enter a photo.

Definition of what a novice photographer is.

1993 any entrant who has not received monetary remuneration (e.g. magazine) or any prize in any comp.

This year's rules 2nd and 3rd Novice and can re-enter as Novice.

If they've won a major national or international comp. - then excluded from Novice.

Peter F: Went through specific numbered rules from 1993 example.

Martin K: Ultimate discretion of SPD (eligibility in question if dispute and no correspondence entered into.

Brian C: SPD reserves the right to exclude any entry that does not think is fair competition.

Point 4 of 1993 rules change the word "may" to "will".

Countries: Why not Tonga ?

Martin K.: Definition of "Australasia".

Kevin D: Said there is massive amount of widely travelled Yanks who would love to enter this comp.

Discussion: USA not included - would overwhelm the competition.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

Peter F: Entrants 5 slides for portfolio.

Brian C: Asked if a person could enter both Novice and Open section ?

Merridy CD: To see how you rate.

Martin K: What if a Novice outscored the Open ?

Ron M: 2 entry fees if they want to enter both.
Each entrant may submit one set of slides.

Discussion - Chances of someone winning both sections is remote but it is possible.

Discussion of how judging done - you judge comp. in 2 sections. Does not make it complicated. Only enter one section.

Point 3: Should specify there must be one macro and define.

Mark S: Impression over years leaning of judges is diver and wide angle shot. Most slides are in that category and 1 close up. Demand a couple of diver interaction shots. Emphasis on natural history.

Martin K: Defining a macro was worked out in length over previous years.
1:6 macro will allow for a Nikonos close up kit to allow photographer to get into that distance. Martin said that you could enter 3-4 macro if you wanted to.

Kevin D: Macro needs to be talked about. Can't blame judges with the type of slides entered. Wide angle with diver is a seductive shot - competitors encouraged to do same.

Discussion re creative wide angle diver shots. Categorise macro. Wide angle - sea scape/interaction/marine life image. With old rules at least 1 token macro. 4 powerful diver wide angle shots.

Kevin D: Wildlife - marine life without diver in it. Scope for creative images.

Brian C: Idea of portfolio score - Old way does not show broad range of ability. Categorising each slide.

David F: Don't exclude people who specialise on one thing.

Brent H: Why limit to Novices for Individual. Why not also best individual shot for an Open. Specialise in Open. Bring back someone like George Moore.

Discussion: With Individual - up to photographer to categorise what slide they have.

Brent H: Macro, wildlife - not diver - other than macro. Wide angle - 3.

Martin K: More categories - you must stronger define specifics.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

Kevin D: 24 rules but only 1 about the slides itself.

Brent H: Not change basic parameters of portfolio of 5 slides but prove better than 4 strong wide angle and token macro.
Macro 1:6 or less and wildlife.

Martin K: 5 consistently high scores. Andy Belcher falls down on macro.

Peter F: Went over suggestions: Specifics -
Macro 1:6 or greater. Wide angle creative - not diver.
Wildlife - no diver - no macro.

Highest Scoring Slide - 90% of time gives away who the winner is.

Discussion re dead marine life photos.
Discussion re swimming pool shots rule.

Martin K: Suggested re-wording to "swimming pools, fish tanks, aquarium *and the like*". Natural rock pool shots should be OK.

Discussion: Special effect - in camera. Must be accompanied by note describing it.

Discussion: Some shots repeated from last year. Similar shots from same roll of film submitted as last year's shots.

Discussion: Video section: Keep to VHS. If shot of VHS super - must be converted over to VHS format. Ease of judging. Very few Super VHS video players around. Only complicates judging of videos due to lack of Super VHS players.

Discussion: Date of A/V, close off date, judging.
Corporate Theatre's would work in well with presentation night for early August. Lead in times were worked out with a calendar. Close off date say 25 May and judging say 17 June 1995.

Discussion: Conditions of entry - so many entries without a stamped self addressed return envelope. Cost to club to return slides. Tell them in conditions to have stamped/self addressed envelope (preferably padded) or not returned.

Discussion: Judges and Photographic Officer's decision are final.

Leo M: Brought up about recent problem with Cathie Holloway and Australian Camera Magazine publishing Michael Cufer's winning photos from the comp.

Discussion: Cathie Holloway/Australian Camera magazine:

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

Leo M: Showed the 2 magazines and how Cathie has published the winning portfolio. Barry Andrewartha had paid \$1,000 for exclusive publishing rights for the winning comp photos for Sportdiving magazine.

Wording: "all slides or duplicates of same".

How do we change the rules to cover this happening again ?

Peter F: "All slides/videos remain in the possession of SPDC until after the presentation night - no exceptions.

Discussion: Re who should be judges to avoid the problem with rival publishers/editors from magazines. Decision agreed that avoid the problem by excluding all magazines from judging - internal rule - not publicised. Exclude all editors from judging - no bias to photographs that a publisher would want to print.

Discussion about the rules was then finished.

Round table discussion about the competition and slides generally was discussed. Starting with Ron Mines, then Brent, etc.

Ron M: Consider validity of what we are doing here today with Rules. Is it OK ?

Leo M: After this meeting, bring it back to members.

Discussed: Return to traditional styles - rules and competition. Maintain same tradition as far as rules and how we open competition up.

Middle ground - amend rules slightly.

More radical - e.g. Masters - vs opening competition.

Discussion: Masters segregated photographers too much. Open category was then not competitive if so called 'master' photographers excluded.

Ron M: Personally feel we're going middle ground not radical.

Discussion: Change is inevitable. Maintain prestige. Ensure income from competition. Improves our status.

Brent H: Starting with concept that members must approve and time constraints. Down the track what is the Australasian Underwater Photographer of the Year ? Situation in past of people like Gary Bell, Michael Cufer - gone in - entered some slides - and named AUPotY. Some shots - diver - not come across a nude diver (A. Belcher 1992). Whether comp. gone too far from traditional concepts - promoted by SPDC - not a club promoted by a magazine. Did not agree to concept of a Masters - if best have been excluded then *no competition*. Going out to win it - someone with good skills all round.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

Merridy CD: Agree with Brent. Changes made today have assisted that concept.

Leo M: Members concerns why have outsiders discuss our comp rules.

Brent H: Logically go to experts.

Merridy CD: Definition of macro - not diver but an actual sea creature. Macro - marine creature. Agree with 2 categories don't show a human. Other balance diver interaction.

Discussion: Limit it too much - limit creativity. Does not have to be a marine creature.

Brent H: Could use it as your one of other 3 slides. Make reference to marine creatures excluding people.

Mark S: Purposes of wide angle.

Martin K: What about hand with sea spider - is nothing without the hand.

Brent H: Taken spider and put it on the hand - could go in 3 other shots. What about spider on featherstar ? Macro without diver - marine creature - no diver.

David F: Exclude diver from 2 out of 5 shots generally.

Merridy CD: Sacrifice in wide angle or macro.

Martin K: Have to have it ratified by the club.

Merridy CD: Give equal recognition to Open and Novice. In publication of photos - bias towards Open slides. Should be equal attention to Novice. Magazine photos mainly of open.

Leo M.: Next issue of Sportdiving should feature some of the Novice winners.

Kevin D: Said it was a pleasure to be here. Club is changing, times change around the club, move with the times. Major bias of diver type photos. Listen to competitors. Getting diver out of shot - marine life interaction. Concept of categories been around a long time. South Pacific only one without categories. Wide photography across wider front - dragging chain in this area.

Competitors confused as to what they should shoot a year ahead - "arty farty".

Discussion: Promote environment - promote diver interaction and macro.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

- Martin K: Talked about the club's "peanut gallery" - no matter how beneficial - someone knocks it. Encapsulate why we're doing this. Suggest before we put this to club. Summarise this. This rule is because of
- This is what rule change is - hopefully stop the "peanut gallery". No matter how beneficial - someone knocks it. encapsulate why we're doing this. Suggest before we put this to club. Summarise this. Propose this and this is why - and this is what rule change is and hopefully stop the "peanut gallery". Steamroll it through - e.g. deadlines have to be met and done.
- Discussed: Deadline not reason should happen because of,, etc.
 Have vote -fair minded people.
 Put it in to Barry with discussed changes.
 Majority don't care - only minority dictate.
- Committee is there to make decisions on behalf of members - to guide the club.
- David F: Open section - encourage those not entering to now enter. Get back previous winners.
- Peter F: Masters - shifted emphasis.
- Martin K: Masters would have been a "Clayton's win".
- David F: Selection of judges - careful to pick those perceived to be fair. Criteria for judging. So they know what types of things the judges look for.
- Martin K: Perception of judges - Looked at people who had diving experience and were photographers and knew basically how to take a photo. Some judge would pick photos that were not even in focus.
- Discussion: Do judges have to be underwater photographers ?
- Martin K: Greg White was a good judge.
- Leo M: Greg did not want to be a judge this year - he'd rather help in the background.
- Suggestions: Alan Lord - Vision Graphics.
 Steven Parish.
- Martin K: Not someone who is inconsistent.
- Brian C: Land photographers get blown away by the colours.
- Tom B: A good judge does not get side tracked by colours.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

- Martin K: Should have 6 judges - evens out standard and personal bias.
What if 5 judges give a 8 and 1 judge gives a 1 ? Difference between winning it and being in top placings.
As long as the judges are consistent.
- Leo M: This year Martin's criteria given to judges on the day.
- Merridy CD: Someone who does not dive does not know how much trouble it is to take a shot.
- Martin K: Judge what you see on screen, judged by not how long it took or where or effort.
- Mark S: Two points:
- A. Does support idea of having 1 or 2 non diving photo judges - its an art form, predominant number be underwater judges.
 - B. Re judging itself - Mark was a judge once. A few times asked to judge in club comp. In end put slides on light box numerically then subjectively changed order.
- Proposing with judging as well as numerical get portfolios of top 5 on light boxes.
- That group of 5 slides looks best and shows abilities of divers.
Judge all under same conditions.
- Brian C: Brought up over years about judging and rejudging - was against it over years. Slides judged individually. Needs discussion - aim to try and get the best when looking at individual slides. Won race once and that person is the winner. To judge and rejudge - against it.
- Discussion: Initial projection - judges see is the whole portfolio.
Do all as portfolio - all 5.
- Shorter event - 5 slides - one will over power the other - too much to take into at once. Looking at the overall.
- Kevin D: Likes 5 slide concept. In real world selected by portfolio. Uncomfortable number system.
- Look at 5 elements of slide. Why do you like it ? Bracket down and analyse it.
- Tom B: Judging of slides done one at a time.
- Martin K: You have to judge individual slides.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

Brian C: You only worry about one at top - the placegetters. You only need Top 10.

Tom B: Discussion re MC - professional like Reg Lipson ?

Ron M: Cost factor. Investigated costs last year - minimum \$2,000 for professional speaker.

Discussion: Steve Cross was good. Best so far.

Reg Lipson - airfares and accommodation (at Rick's) + \$200 = \$600
Advance purchase airfare. Can hold an audience.

David F: Portfolio comes up and winners names comes up - anti climatic this year.

Discussion:

Tom B:/

Leo M: We advertise this as a portfolio, why not judge this as a portfolio ?

Total score - range of abilities - depends on number of judges.

Brian C: Judging one score per slide or just one total score ?

Discussion:

Tom B:/

Leo M: One factor to consider - the judging day is very tiring - fresher judges.
Judging competition on basis of portfolio.

Discussion:

Peter F: Why not comments - only idea ?

Brian C: No.

Tom B: Entrants have never got feedback in the last 10 years.
Photographers - should better yourself.

Martin K: Guys who puts individual slide in will be judged more critically.

Ron M: Will be given what is a macro.

Brian C: Who do you determine the score for a portfolio ? e.g. 32 out of 50 ?

Tom B: When you have score - score individual slides and then a group number.

Discussion continued re judging as a portfolio.

Martin K: Personal bias ?

Brent H: How would you do it ?

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

Kevin D: Tom encapsulated - know they're a portfolio - deserved on basis as compared when a portfolio.

Tom B: Score across the 5 slides.

Peter F: Score individually and put score together.

Merridy CD: Is there a sheet to guide judges ?

Tom B: Special score sheet.
Score against various items.

Discussion continued.

Mark S: Careful judges - judges them say colour.

Kevin D: No impact.

Brian C: Give each slide a score out of 10. A judge sits there 1 slide in front of him.

Martin K: 5 elements to consider in slide.

Brian C: Slides individually weren't good enough.

Discussion on portfolio scores and placings in 1994 competition.

Peter F: Would like to see portfolio only. If it does not work then it's on his head.

Mark S: Impact could be low.

Peter F: Putting in a portfolio. Individual slide only for individual section.

His point of view - prefer a portfolio score. One slide breaking it down.
Overall portfolio.

Brian C: Judge once, get top 10, look at portfolios and say yes that's the portfolio I want to win ?

Peter F: Long enough day anyway.

Tom B: Would like to see it changed. Do judging only on portfolio.

Brent H: 3 judges present saying the same thing - as a portfolio.

Martin K: Only do one or the other.
How are you going to judge each individual slide ?

Mark S: Judge whole 5 together.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD SUNDAY 23 OCTOBER, 1994
AT 123 ASHBY AVENUE, YAGOONA COMMENCING AT 3.00 P.M.

Martin K: Individually judges rate 1,2,3,4,5 per slide.

Tom B: 5 slide scores then total portfolio score.

General consensus that for this year's competition - judge all entries as portfolio.
That is, have Corporate Theatre use 5 projectors at once. 5 slides up on screen at same time.

Therefore, logistically - each entrant multiplied by 5 carosels - each then multiplied by the number of entries.

Leo M:/

Peter F: Up to the Photographic Officer how to do the judging.
Getting advice and that's the main thing.

MEETING CALLED TO AN END.

GENERAL

Tom B: Will we be writing to the editor of Asia Diver magazine ?

Ron M: Had approached them at Scuba Expo.

Leo M: David Strike has offered club could be charted at lowest advertising rate.

Brian C: Said certain sponsors were upset with the A/V night. Still want to leave their brochures on the tables.

Audio visual of sponsors slides as much as possible.

Leo M:/ Thanked everybody - well worth it.

Peter F: Thanked everybody coming and 3 judges.

Brent H: Congratulations to Leo M. for taking these steps - it was long over due.

MEETING CLOSED AT 6.45 P.M.