



Overall Survey Summary

Introduction

The purpose of the survey is to “gauge the temperature” of how clubs and club members feel about CGI and the way we operate. Feedback received will always contain polarized views (positive and negative). We can learn best from consistent themes and messages that come through from the feedback, particularly from those that convey their comments in a factual and constructive manner.

Below is a summary of consistent themes and messages from all three parts of the survey.

The Role of Canterbury Golf

The primary role of Canterbury Golf is to provide a management structure for golf in Canterbury.

Communication

There is a disconnect between CGI and club members, primarily due to poor communication flow of district information through the clubs’ and onto club members’.

Possible action: Work with clubs to improve information flow, and emphasis the importance of their part in communicating important information to club members.

There is a lack of understanding on how decisions are made in CGI, and therefore transparency and decision-making processes are questioned.

Possible action: Put required information on the website and memo to clubs and club members.

How CGI is perceived

There is a lack of profile for CGI and the value it adds to golf in Canterbury. Many comments were made questioning what we do, and what people get for their levy.

Possible action: Information brochure circulated to clubs and club members that outlines the services CGI provides, and what club members get for their levy.

There is a lack of understanding how the Management Committee and Board function/coexist and their roles. There is a perception of (at times) duplication and exceeding authority.

Possible action: Put required information on the website and memo to clubs and club members.

Structure of Canterbury Golf

Opinions were divided as to the success of the amalgamation in progressing the provision of both men's and women's golf. Some thought more structural changes were required, while others preferred what we had before.

Events & Competitions

There was a lot of feedback and discontentment regarding the changes to the Blank and Simon Cups, and before that, the Woodward Cup. However, most negative feedback focused around the process used, rather than the actual issues at hand.

Possible action: ensure that consultation and review processes are fair, robust, transparent and widely publicized.

Provision of CGI tournaments

Whilst most respondents thought they were satisfactorily provided, many commented on the poor promotion, quality and delivery of these tournaments.

Similar comments were made about the junior tournaments.

Possible action: engagement of a Tournament Director to improve quality, accountability and standard of delivery.

CGI Calendar of Events

Many comments, but clearly most respondents wanted:

- The calendar to be put out early to help clubs set their dates, with as little date changes later on as possible.
- Most tournaments and interclub played in the warmer months.

- A robust annual review process to assess if any changes are required for the following year.

Possible action: incorporate above into compiling of calendar.

Volunteer Coaching Courses

Nearly all respondents thought these were beneficial to train club members how to coach, particularly juniors. Volunteer coaches should complement what is provided by professional coaches.

Rep Team Selectors

There was wide and varied opinion on what attributes a selector should have and how they should be appointed. Appointment processes ranged from having the club's vote to using a sub-committee. There was some perceived favouritism to certain players mainly due to lack of transparency in selection processes. A rep playing background was seen as a necessary attribute to be a selector.

Rep Team Managers

Comments focused on having the right attributes such as good people management, being able to motivate, organisational skills, a good listener, and past experience in pressure situations.

Rep Team Selection Criteria

Comments tended towards people being selected based on their current form rather than past experience, along with attributes such as commitment, teamwork, good demeanour and fitness.

Possible action: ensure selection criteria for all rep teams is fair, robust, transparent and widely publicized, along with a comprehensive review process.

Give Golf a Go Days

Were seen as beneficial to clubs but needed to be promoted right to maximize attendance at clubs. A standard formula didn't work for all clubs, so promotion needs to be tailored for each club. Good club buy-in was seen as essential.

Possible action: CGI to implement application process for funding assistance to club GGAG days, with funding provided based on merit of programme being provided.

CGI support of clubs

Significantly, 29% of respondents thought we were poor at this. However, comments suggest a lack of knowledge of what CGI provides to clubs.

Two thirds of respondents thought a reactive/responsive approach to supporting clubs worked well, and some suggested that clubs' need to be more proactive in using CGI services.

Possible action: regular consultation with clubs' to ensure their needs are being met.

Key areas that CGI can support clubs

- Junior support
- Promotion of events and competitions
- Growing membership
- Management and financial advice

Promoting golf in Canterbury

Significantly, 33% of respondents thought we were poor at this, although comments didn't provide many reasons why. One comment suggested that the only promotion of golf in Canterbury was via the CGI website.

The main suggestions for promoting golf centered around advertising media – TV, newspapers etc. Also going to schools, golf expos and bringing clubs together on interclub days.

When asked what you would first spend a \$1000 on to promote golf, most comments focused around advertising, with a strong message that golf should be promoted as a game for everyone. However there were some classic answers from a couple of people who didn't quite understand the question:

“\$1000 – that's right, keeping thinking small!” and “\$1000 will get you nowhere!”

Summary

There is a clearly a lot of things we can do to improve the delivery of the game in Canterbury and the standard of service we provide. This summary has clearly focused around the “what we can do better” comments, and in most surveys, people are more likely to respond when they have a criticism or a suggestion to make things better.

Given this, there were also many positive comments about what we are doing and the services we provide, and all ratings were clear that we were performing satisfactorily or better.