

What you vote for

Before moving on, I will briefly touch on what the voters actually get to vote on. As you'd imagine from part two, if the Board is charged with the management and governance of the organisation, putting motions on issues to members at general meetings or delegates at council meetings, is a thing of the past.

This is what voters vote on:

1. Election of the board;
2. A resolution put up at a general meeting;
3. A special resolution to change the constitution.

That's it. Three things. Only number one must happen and it's only once a year.

I wonder, when that finally sinks in across the state, whether most in the sport will question why all the fuss over clubs being the voters. I am quite keen to be told.

Clubs' "say" in the best management practice model

This is the most complex section of the series. I had hoped there would be some more feedback from the people who weren't clear on the principles and those who have issues with the model before I went any further. But we need to keep moving. There's at least one more section after this one where I have to look at some practical and implementation matters and Dave's other points.

You will have noticed that I didn't address the issue of clubs' "say" and "control" in the present regime except an oblique observation on the national scene where it's as good as none.

A club's "say", of course, is not necessarily the same thing as you having your "say" at a club meeting. Pardon ? Yes, I can hear RV and racer chortling away, he's lost it ... again ...

But I'm on pretty solid ground here because if you have your say at a club meeting but are outvoted, what the club's "say" is at the next level, is something you disagree with.

Ironically though, if more clubs take your view than do those clubs supporting your club's view, your view comes out ahead. If the original issue was a matter going to the NKC, your 'victory' may be short lived. If you could ever do it, just imagine the permutations of an NKC decision traced backwards to what numbers of karters voted in each of the clubs in each of the states. Could it be that the NKC actually makes wrong decisions because that's what the system dictates or a majority of karters get it wrong ?

But I digress. We all know how many people go to club meetings, almost none. We all basically know why, because we're told what's going on and we seem helpless to get anything done outside of club level. We are too remote from the level where the decisions are actually made. Wrong of course, as I demonstrated above. They are our decisions, we just don't know it. Go figure, it's beyond me.

There's another axis of evil operating here though and more so as it effects the state hierarchy, the zealots who sit on the management committees of some clubs that

bask in the glory and power. Sometimes, that has its place. Sometimes, it is just a delusion of what "control" they have. Sometimes, it is a mistaken belief they know best.

Whatever it might be, the club system as embodied in the State Karting Council system, has not produced more than maybe half a dozen strategic governance improvements in Queensland since I joined in 1991.

I suspect that it is the same in other states. If it's not, why have licence numbers slid so dramatically since their peak in 2000/2001 ? You can't blame the nationals entirely for that. What have we done in Queensland to arrest the slide ? Anything ?

So club 'say' doesn't work beyond the club's own level. Full stop. End of story. For mine, there is no place for a 'club' "say" in the best management practice regime of the state body.

In the best management practice model, where the clubs are voters, a club's "say" only differs in one respect to where karters are voters, the clubs also nominate the committee personnel. That's a "say" of sorts, I suppose, and a necessary one. Point back for the other side.

"Say" Per Se

So, you've been done out of any "say" you might have almost completely . Not so. There is quite a distinction between what "say" you have and what you can vote on. What "say" you have in one sense, won't change at all. If you want to have a say, you will have to correspond with the committee. It's not beyond the realms of possibility, that there will be forum for each committee on the AKAQ website. Maybe the committees will send issue to the clubs for discussion, maybe both or in the reverse, the karters will get the discussion paper the committee wants to address and the interested karters will raise the matter at their clubs meeting. There's no one or right way of doing these things. Some will be trial and error.

I said in one way, what say you have won't change, but there is another distinction. Your say in who is elected depends upon whether you support karters as voters or clubs as the voters. If the latter, you have no more say in the election of Board Directors than you do now in the case of management committee positions and I come back to what I said above as to how limited your say is now because you express your point of view at a club meeting but other members out vote you and therefore your club votes at the State Council meeting contrary to what you say, and if the majority of clubs adopt your clubs position then the State instructs its delegate to vote a certain way in the NKC meeting where our State delegate is just one of seven equal voters.

How does the old saying go? Its ten percent of two fifths of next to nothing.

Feedback I do have tells me handing over to a board is the part only the zealots have an issue with because they want to keep control. I think that means they'd like a Senate style review house. Sorry, apart from the fact that a Board wouldn't tolerate a big brother, the Council of Clubs has been an abject failure across Australia where governance is concerned.

That's enough for a day of rest. Next up, individual voting, proportional 'representation', under age options and a bit more.

And I'll reverse my request for feedback I think, and say **unless you have anything to say in the next 48 hours about parts one, two or three, I will assume you are understanding the discussion.**