

Surrey Chess



SCCA Survey on ECF Membership Fees - Status Report 14th March 2019

Thank You! We have had a very good response!

As of 14 March 2019 a total of 49 individual responses had been received. A very pleasing response compared to the old norm of between 0-2 responses on ECF matters. This season there have been 285 active players in SCCA competitions, indicating a roughly 17% response rate.

The response rate is respectable and in line with industry experience (General public response rate to non-incentivised [no prizes for entering - sorry!] surveys is typically between 1-20%. Source: PracticalSurveys.com)

Our response rate indicates a 95% confidence level that the question results are +/- 12% (at worst) of representing the entire population. (Source: SurveySystems.com)

We have also had responses from individuals (where they have identified themselves) from 13 different chess clubs, so we have heard from a diverse set of people from within Surrey.

Conclusion: The results are representative as well as being easily the highest and most diverse set of responses SCCA Board have received in recent history on an ECF matter.

Note: the survey will remain open online until 31 March. However, because the responses have essentially dried up, to give ECF the maximum time to consider what are large majority Surrey opinions on all issues we are choosing to send ECF a communication mid-March. The communication will be posted on the SCCA website.

Results

71% agree that they are content for SCCA Board to represent them. 10% are not content.

53% agree that the SCCA Board have fairly represented the ECF proposals. 8% disagree. Quite a few (39%) neither agreed nor disagreed. Presumably the latter did not look through all of the ECF papers that the cover letter referenced in order to form an opinion on this question. So one has to look at the difference between those who agree and those who do not to get the message (+45% in favour of agree)

Conclusion: It would appear that the SCCA Board are trusted by the majority to represent them and can take a mandate from the responses.

77% care about how much their ECF membership fee costs. 6% don't care.

Conclusion: It tells the SCCA Board that it is supported in properly scrutinising the ECF Membership Fees proposals.

90% agree that extra costs for new initiatives should be supported by quantified targets.

86% agree that extra costs relying on analysis should only be committed once that analysis has been reviewed and agreed.

Conclusion: These messages need to go to ECF.

Surrey Chess



63% disagree that International Chess should be funded without limit. 8% agree that it should be.

Conclusion: It seems clear that the majority support the concept of a limit on funding of international chess. The challenge is in defining that limit. That has prompted more work from the SCCA Board to formulate a message for ECF.

There was not really much of a pattern in the free format comments section, which attracted 15 comments from the 49 respondents (many skipped this section). There were more comments, either directly or indirectly, indicating support for restraining Fees growth (8 comments) than those in favour of supporting Fees growth (2 comments). One query that does not appear to be covered in the ECF papers in a manner that would allow SCCA Board to explain it to its constituents was "What has caused the additional admin burden in the Office?" There is mention in the ECF papers of increased work from International and Juniors but that does not explain why that is the case and also there is no mention of the new Membership Fees payment system, which was expected to save admin time.

Conclusion: Add the additional question re: admin burden to the messages to ECF

3 respondents gave either mild, moderate or substantial criticism respectively either of one or other of the survey questions or, in one case, SCCA Board's entire approach. However they were in a small minority as evidenced by the aforementioned figures regarding contentment for the SCCA Board to represent Surrey participation and the fairness of the characterisation of the ECF proposals.

Observation

There is a minority (5-10%) who either don't care about how much ECF charge them and/or are supportive of increased International Chess costs without limit. Whilst they are clearly a small minority and so can't be at the centre of how SCCA represents the majority of its constituents they do, potentially, hold the key to solving some of the financing issues.

If just 2.5% of ECF members (assuming similar views across all regions in UK) upgraded their memberships to Platinum that would raise at least £9k per annum.

Conclusion: If you are one of the people holding the views described in this section then we suggest you upgrade your ECF membership to Platinum, which would be consistent with your responses.

Paul Shepherd - SCCA President - on behalf of the SCCA Board

For reference, here is a [link](#) to our original communication soliciting the survey feedback.