

[Marc Bodian](#) created a poll.

[February 11 at 12:22 AM](#)

A SSCA Member Facebook Group, how important is it to you?



I'm a member, its important
Voters for this option



i'm a member, it's not important
Voters for this option



I'm not a member and wouldn't need one
Voters for this option



I'm not a member but I would want one
Voters for this option



[Tom Jeremiason](#) Your questions are poorly written and confusing... Are you asking if the SSCA FB Page is important based on Members and Non-Members Opinions?



[Marc Bodian](#) Sorry you are confused. I am getting data points however.



[Tom Jeremiason](#) Thanks for changing the wording.



[Daniel Roberts](#) I don't get it



[Monty VanderMay](#) After the way some of the board are treating the membership I doubt I will renew so it doesn't matter anymore.



[Craig Campbell](#) Do you mean an SSCA FB page that only members of the SSCA are allowed to access or a SSCA FB page that anyone can be a member of, regardless of they are a member of SSCA? I view the SSCA FB page as an important outreach that encourages SSCA membership. It contributed to my becoming a member of SSCA. I am not sure what restricting membership to the FB page to only paid members of the SSCA would accomplish. Or are you suggesting an additional FB that would be restricted to paid members, while leaving this one open to anyone.



[Marc Bodian](#) It would be in addition to. It is interesting that it is such a hot topic with many. Just looking at data points here.



[Craig Campbell](#) [Marc Bodian](#) thanks for the clarification. I guess I feel it is likely to dilute the value of the open FB page. Seems like we already have a venue for discussing member only issues. But, maybe you have data that suggest another platform for members is needed.



[Marc Bodian](#) [Craig Campbell](#) It is interesting, as seen by the remarks here that there are at least some strong feelings either way. Some people don't like the Forum, some think it's great. Some non members obviously don't want traffic moving off this page others might join if there is a members only group. The idea was to gather a bit of information and maybe see what other questions need to be asked.



[Thomas Braun](#) [Craig Campbell](#) I have to admit that I don't use the forum much at all.

The Facebook group is more convenient.

I think it's also an important recruiting tool as people can ask hard questions and receive answers from members who are literally sailing around the world as opposed to those only interested in sailing around the world. SSCA has always been about the doers and not just the talkers.

That said, having a place where members could put forth ideas and discuss association oriented topics that aren't of interest to non-members is an asset. This allows the public page to continue to be an excellent source of information from experienced cruisers.

Additionally, it has been frustrating to be having a robust discussion only to have it moderated or deleted. It also isn't fair to the moderators because they may be simply trying to keep a clean wake to attract those new members, but it comes off as if they're deleting threads critical of their efforts.

Censorship is never the right answer. So a members only page, moderated by members rather than the BoD is the best solution.

Getting there without feeling that one side has won or lost is the real challenge facing us.



[Jennifer Johnson](#) I was considering rejoining, but that's on hold. I'm confused as to what's going on, but both sides seem to be throwing rocks and I'm unimpressed. Not my type of organization, at least for now.



[Katrina Greenwood](#) All forms of social media are tools. As boaters, we need many different tools



[Skip Walter](#) Was a member from the beginning, quit 3 years ago, spotty magazine delivery, missed promotions, missed giveaways and contests. Poor backup, poor communication. Anyone want all the magazines from #1?



[Ed Kelly](#) We really are interested in any way to improve SSCA and our easy communication among members. I am a member of both SSCA AND FACEBOOK. We also have an SSCA TWITTER Account. I feel an open Facebook account limited to cruising related questions and info is essential, but feel a closed FB page limited to members of SSCA lacks value as we currently have a the General Forum on our SSCA .ORG website where members discuss topics of interest. To go to a medium not used by all may not be a wise choice. YMMV and I will be happy whatever is decided for SSCA going forward.



[Laura Johnson](#) The forum on the website is pretty useless to me. I am cruising. I don't want to have to waste data trying to figure out where things are, checking back to see if anyone replied, what the new question is, etc. The other problem having right now is that I haven't been able to log in for weeks and no one will respond to email sent from "need new password" link or the phone messages that I left. Being able to have an ongoing real-time discussion about SSCA business would be better.



[Marilyn Blitz-mcLaughlin](#) Agree



[Haydn Huntley](#) We're SSCA members, but the SSCA's Forum is poorly moderated and has very little useful information. As a result, we've both unsubscribed. What members need is something which the SSCA Board of Directors doesn't control/censor, so that all SSCA member...[See More](#)



[Kimberly Russo](#) [Laura Johnson](#) I'm sorry you haven't received a response. I just reset your password and you should receive an email. If you don't see it, please check your spam/junk folder. I will look into the cause of the problem with not receiving it previously. So that I can figure out what's happening to your messages, can you confirm what phone number you're calling?



[Laura Johnson](#) Haven't received it. I don't have a spam folder on my domain address..hmmm could be why my emails and phone message specified the email address to send to (don't know which one is on my profile...yes,I checked all three)



[Kimberly Russo](#) [Laura Johnson](#) I will PM you with the email address showing in your account.



[Mark Van Woerkom](#) With all the BS lately, I don't care. As soon as my membership comes due, I'm bailing out!



[Marc Bodian](#) Or you could help out, push through and be a part of it. Every organization I have belonged to or still am a part of has issues. In a lot of ways FB makes that worse.



[Ron Howell](#) I saw some totally unrelated boating thing the other day which is ridiculous



[Glenn On Tothill](#) The reason I like a SSCA Facebook Group is to put out urgent information on missing boats, etc. It's easy to include photographs which is important. I would keep it the way it is now and not limit it to SSCA members only. For members only we have the SSCA Forum. Of course the Group would have to be moderated like it is now to keep off inappropriate posts.



[Russell Frazer](#) [Glenn On Tothill](#) But the way I read the poll question above, your statement contradicts your vote in the poll (that a member only) Facebook page is important. Or maybe I'm miss reading the question. LOL As I voted that (member only) wasn't important as in just leave it the way it was. Use forum for member to member discussions. If we are confused by the above question than the poll results will be incorrect.



[Glenn On Tothill](#) [Russell Frazer](#) oops thanks for catching that Russell. I hope I can amend my vote



[David Luck](#) I do not believe it should be one or the other. I believe that both are valuable communication tools if properly used and moderated. The open page could be for general information that you want shared with non members while the member page could be used for communication from the BOD or member to member discussions, discounts, sales, etc.



[Simon Vials](#) Exclusively exclusive that's the way to build membership, not. Not many exclusive Facebook pages last in the long run, but some people like being exclusive as it gives an air of importance. Since SSCA went open on FB more sailors have contributed to the forum.



[Thomas Braun](#) [Simon Vials](#) I agree. There are some really informative posts on the open page and I think thats a great way to spread the word about SSCA and attract new members.

After a sailor decides they're going to become a member, maybe they would be interested in the debates regarding the nuts and bolts of running the association, and thats the type of discussions that should be directed to the members only group.

Of course there is the forum, but for me the facebook page is just easier to follow.



[Marilyn Blitz-mcLaughlin](#) Been a member for over 20 years. Find the current format a pain, and don't like all the complaining now. It's not fun to read any more.



[Mark Henry Sah](#) This whole thing is so childish and "soap opera" like. This is not what I was looking for from this organization. It is too bad that so many incredible cruisers / sailors have to put up with this crap. Lots of great things to read, share and hear about. Now it is mostly discussions like this. Resigning tomorrow.



[Marc Bodian](#) Interesting take. This was a poll for the benefit of decision making for something quite a few have expressed interest in. The purpose was to involve SSCA members as well as others in this group in that process. While the discussion has been happening, I thought it would be good for some outside the board thoughts. Careful what you ask for, right?



[Judson Gravel](#) I always liked the SSCA and the concept of a cruisers club of sorts, for over ten years in preparation to actually cruise I looked at the organization fondly. Then this page started putting personalities behind the names and it became lame very quickly. Cruisers are generally laid back adventurous people, it struck me that many involved were like high school vice principals, power hungry and very much about controlling the conversation. If I'm correct the whole issue about another page is members are tired of having the board over mod the current page. A second page wouldn't be needed if you could say more here.



[Thomas Braun](#) [Judson Gravel](#) I think the cruising and seamanship discussions should remain public. But the boring bits of running the association could be done in the members only area.



[Marc Bodian](#) The intent would be to have both if there is enough interest. There are problems with creating a true members site and maintaining it. There is also some concern on what effect it might have on the open group. It is interesting that merely gathering information appears to be controversial!



[Chuck Ritenour](#) Seeing as I will never be an actual world sailing valued full member because of medical issues - and knowing the Commodores really only see me as a revenue source opened my eyes years ago so I quit.

I joined the FB page solely to increase my information sources.

So far all I've learned is nothing has changed, 99% of sailors are red headed step children barely tolerated, and global sailors can't manage beyond their boats without squabbles.



[B.J. Porter](#) [Chuck Ritenour](#) weird, because most of the global sailors I hang with don't mix it up much on FB sailing pages. A few do. A few of us try to participate and offer helpful advice.

But the general sentiment around the cockpit is that most FB sailing groups - for cruisers or not for cruisers - have limited benefit for people far-actual out here doing it. Most of the people I've met in anchorages are NOT the ones squabbling on line.

I like to participate in them to encourage people, and share what I've learned doing it. Not everyone listens or agrees, but there is a lot of misinformation put out there every day, too. It's a lot to wade into and not always worth the effort.

But I think you are mistaken if you think what you see in these groups - even the SSCA - is representative of the global sailing community on the whole.



[Chuck Ritenour](#) [B.J.](#) I agree crowd sourced free information is generally worth what you pay, whether on fb or the online forums. Anchorages docks and mooring fields frequented by the 1% that actually left their home ports are far better sources.

I gave up on forums, and I generally scroll past fb groups unless it's a post from someone I've met or know to be a good source.



[Simon Vials](#) [Chuck](#), it's really no different from the old forum days. Those that give the information are shot at by the over read couch/basement/keyboard sailors. Sometimes it's just better to sit back and laugh.



[Chuck Ritenour](#) [Simon Vials](#) I find it more entertaining to tell them what I'm doing and why.



[Deborah Doyle](#) i am a member of the members only facebook group and find it very worthwhile. I am not a fan of the forum. Too clunky.



[Deborah Doyle](#) It is a matter of moderation. The public group is heavily moderated. There is no need for that intense moderation on a member only group. It would keep everyone from getting blasted with emails from the forum.



[Eddie Tohill](#) [Deborah Doyle](#) WWS is heavily moderated. No snarky remarks are permitted and it is one of the best. But it takes many volunteers!



[Deborah Doyle](#) [Eddie Tohill](#) i actually left that group because of that Eddie. One size does not fit all. Many of us moved on to For woman that sail and have a great group.



[Eddie Tohill](#) [Deborah Doyle](#) wow that is a surprise to me! But then again I am not up on Everything to know about FB. Everyone I know really has gotten much value in all that WWS does for cruising.



[Deborah Doyle](#) [Eddie Tohill](#) i am not speaking badly about them just not for me and many others. Unfortunately Charlotte got into the me-too movement and posted some stuff and allowed no descension or you were removed from group.



[Glenn On Tohill](#) [Deborah Doyle](#) HI Deb. I respectfully must disagree with you on this issue. The official SSCA FB Group has been very fairly moderated. Only the most outrageous posts are deleted. A renegade group not affiliated with the SSCA is not the answer. There are more than enough other Facebook Groups about Cruising with little to no moderation if that is your choice.



[Deborah Doyle](#) [Glenn On Tohill](#) but you do not support a members only page anyway. Is that not correct? Here is the problem: We can't even discuss this here without it getting deleted.



[Glenn On Tohill](#) [Deborah Doyle](#) Deb, I would be more than happy to share my private thoughts with you via email or messenger. My e-mail address is KPK@ssca.org. Thanks. Glenn



[Thomas Braun](#) [Glenn On Tohill](#) that's not completely accurate. I have seen posts stopped with only 7 comments because it was an unpleasant topic.

The moderator said it had been beaten like a dead horse. That was a week ago and we're still talking about it.

And that's why the BOD's shouldn't have to also moderate. They may be focused on keeping a clean wake to attract new membership, but if the topic involves the leadership of the SSCA, it simply comes off as Censorship.

That's not a good look, but by having the BoDs moderate, they're caught between the devil and deep blue sea.



[Lee Wittle](#) I'm a member. An open FB page will bring new wannabes and current activists as well as the old salts. For the juvenile stuff that's been going on, keep that crap closed. This was a formative organization for getting me cruising. I think the future ... [See More](#)



[Haydn Huntley](#) I'd like to have an SSCA members-only FB page, which is NOT moderated by the the SSCA board of directors to ensure its independence. This I agree with Deborah Doyle, and disagree with Lee Wittle.



[B.J. Porter](#) [Haydn Huntley](#) I'd like and SSCA members only group too. But I'd prefer it actually be affiliated with the SSCA, which is why I've not joined the current one.



[Karen Kennedy](#) [Haydn Huntley](#) if it's not moderated by SSCA, then it's not a SSCA group. To many people want to steal the SSCA name for their personal use.



[Thomas Braun](#) [Karen Kennedy](#) the SSCA shouldn't be asked to moderate the members only page.

That's a place where difficult discussions could take place, including those critical of the SSCA leadership. Everyone needs well thought out criticism, it's how we all get ... [See More](#)



[Karen Kennedy](#) [Thomas Braun](#) i completely disagree! A SSCA group is only so, if it is run by those in charge of SSCA.



[Thomas Braun](#) [Karen Kennedy](#) then how would you address the issue of censorship?



[Karen Kennedy](#) [Thomas Braun](#) when you join an organization, they set the rules. Like it or leave it.



[Haydn Huntley](#) [Karen Kennedy](#) Is the SSCA what the members say or what the board of directors says? This is a fundamental question. A similar question might be, is the SSCA a democracy or a dictatorship?



[Thomas Braun](#) [Karen Kennedy](#) I'm unconvinced that any organization created by human beings is perfect for all time. As time moves on changes in the world will require the organization to adapt.

We can all understand that the reason the board meetings are set up to be phoned into is so that we can all be aware of what the BoDs are facing and how they are preparing to tackle the problems.

The reason that all of our information is available to each other is so that we can reach out and communicate, including communicating to the BoD.

The purpose of this communication is to receive feedback, ideas, and heads up notices about how this changing world is presenting new problems to the leadership.

It's not fair to those members of the BoD to assume they have to do it all on their own, with no

guidance or help from active members. They're only volunteers!!!

A members only site would allow easier communication with everyone. Personally I've only used the forum two times, and the first was a mistake where I only emailed Marc! Oops!

Facebook, for me anyway, represents an easier point of exchange for notices and information.

The conundrum we've asked the board to solve with the public page is that we want a clean wake to show off the knowledge and experience of our SSCA members. I think its a fantastic way to highlight the depth of knowledge available with membership. But when discussions result in a disagreement between members the thread is moderated or deleted. This cleans the wake for membership recruitment, but if the conversation also included critique of the BoD, it looks like Censorship.

So they can leave it up and show the neighborhood our laundry, or take it down and look like they're silencing criticism. Thats the source for much of the hard feelings that brought all of this about.

That's not fair. Its not fair to the BoD. Its not fair to the active members who are trying to be of help the SSCA.

We all want the same thing. To help the SSCA do better.

This is one burden we can agree that the BoD can't solve alone. In fact, it's impossible for them to solve. They need an independent moderator, disconnected to the BoD, but still an active member of the SSCA.

In fact, active members have a tendency to rotate through positions of greater responsibilities within the Association. If whoever moderates the Members Only Group should become a Board Member, they should resign their moderating duties on the Members Only page.

This removes any hint of self service and leaves the cleanest wake.



[Karen Kennedy](#) [Thomas Braun](#) You don't think that this "independent" individual promotes self service? An independent individual does not guarantee a clean wake.



[Thomas Braun](#) [Karen Kennedy](#) there is certainly some baggage with Wally!

I would hope that he could see that if he were to remain as a major moderator, the same conflicts could arise. And barring that, I would hope he could see it as a gesture of good will.

Its a good point and worthy of further discussion!



[Karen Kennedy](#) [Thomas Braun](#) some baggage is an understatement. You have no clue.



[Thomas Braun](#) [Karen Kennedy](#) I do. But leading with the nuclear option doesn't build bridges! Lol!!! And its too easy to do of social media. I think we've all had too much of that!!



[Eileen Kruger](#) Would like to be a member but keep putting it off till our boat is back in the water. Hopefully you all will sort out the bickering by next summer when we are ready to cruise. Might have to look for a different organization otherwise.



[Anne Lloyd](#) Formed by ssa and board after democratic decision.

I think a members only page which can be moderated with a light touch would be a good addition.

The open page should continue without big arguments about what the board is or is not doing.

The decision about the page is not related to what the board does about Wally and his activities. I do know that a lot has been said and done behind the scenes that we are not aware of. I am happy to leave the elected board in charge of how to proceed re Wally and Dave .



[Deborah Doyle](#) [Anne Lloyd](#) i do not agree. I do not have a problem with board making peace and sanctioning the existing facebook page. Wally Moran has been a valued member of the SSCA for a long time. This is something he does very well. Sailing and Cruising is a funnel of over 40,000 members to the SSCA. Make peace, prosperity and move on.



[Deborah Doyle](#) [Anne Lloyd](#) feel free to converse with me outside this public forum



[Karen Kennedy](#) [Anne Lloyd](#) I agree. I want no part of Dave and Wally in SSCA. I feel it is SSCAs duty, not choice, to prosecute to the full extent of the law.



[Deborah Doyle](#) is the moderator going to delete this?



[Skip Gundlach](#) [Deborah Doyle](#) Not yet, anyway 😊

As a board member, I think I can share without running afoul of confidentiality:

There are MANY internet-based ways to communicate. Mailing lists (OLD school, but effective and not bandwidth intensive), Forums (I detest anything requiring logging in almost as much as I'd prefer not to need web-interface activities, such as Cruisers Forum, SSCA and others), Twitter (I have never even seen let alone used a tweet in RL) and here (FB, of which I'm a mod or admin on a variety of sites which I rarely visit, due to bandwidth, particularly when I'm cruising), and probably several others I've missed or don't even know exist.

Our (the Board; if you don't like our decisions, stand for and be elected to the BOD, where you'll become part of the solution, rather than part of the problem) purpose here is to determine if there is sufficient interest in FB as a means of open, frank, discussion without the dilution and, frankly, potshotting, of (as is the case here, a minimum of 5/ and more likely 20-or-higher/) umpty/1 ratio of non-members with varying agendas, none of which are invested in the outcome (as a member, you would be invested in the outcome; otherwise, you're just rabble, pardon the expression).

It's akin to holding a US presidential election, and allowing a huge majority of the voters to be non-citizens...

So, while it's far from a done deal, we're investigating the interest level in a members-only group, where only those invested in the outcome can vent or make suggestions or merely enjoy others' thoughts...



[Deborah Doyle](#) [Skip Gundlach](#) wow that attitude is the problem. I see no change here and no reason to stick around. Keep posts that suit you and delete others



[Skip Gundlach](#) [Deborah Doyle](#), so you want, e.g., the next POTUS election to be decided by a vast majority of non-citizen votes?

That's what making SSCA policy decisions in a place like this (where even if ALL of the current membership were members of this page, it would be a minimum 5/1 disparity) is akin to.

We of the BOD watch this information and opinion transfer. But we don't make policy decisions based on those desires of non-members. YMMV, and apparently, has.



[Deborah Doyle](#) [Skip Gundlach](#) actually I am a member but I just quit. This organization did not meet expectations with all the attitudes. Another member gone.



[Skip Gundlach](#) [Deborah Doyle](#), respectfully, you have proven my point. You're a member (or were), but the huge majority here are not. If you want to take the opinions (and demands, in many cases) of non members as instructive, what's the point of being a member (of anything)?



[Skip Gundlach](#) [Deborah Doyle](#), as this is an open site, you can still see this, even if your forum post resulted in instant (it didn't/wouldn't) removal from the rolls preventing you from access to the [SSCA.org](#) forum.

However, once you are actually no longer a member, you won't see any of the forum articles, regardless of content or origin, nor will you be able to comment on them.

If you want to influence any organization, you should expect to be part of it. Disagreement is nearly a given, but being disagreeable isn't. You can choose which way you swing, but you catch more flies (if that's your objective) with honey than vinegar. As above as to membership 😊

Should the BOD find it prudent and effective to make a members-only Facebook page, arguments (see above about disagreeable) are expected. But if you aren't a member, you won't have a voice. It's that simple.

I trust that wasn't disagreeable, though I sense you don't agree with it...



[Greg Groome](#) Wow! Another “part of the solution not part of the problem comment” you can't make this up!



[Anne Lloyd](#) The way to influence the future of SSCA is to stand for election, assist running events and make contributions via electronic media consistent with the clean wake tradition of the club. Disagreements are to be expected. We can remain polite, even when we disagree.



[Skip Gundlach](#) [Greg Groome](#) so, I presume you're not a member? Are you a member of anything? If so, may I come outside your organization with pitchforks and torches and throw rotten tomatoes, despite my (and perhaps exactly because) having no interest in joining?

I trust you get the point, but your comment suggests otherwise.



[Skip Gundlach](#) [Anne Lloyd](#) thank you. You don't like how your town is run, you stand for election for the local whatever-it's-called, or work to get the one you DO want elected. Otherwise it's just sour grapes.



[Greg Groome](#) Yes I am a member thank you. Members can make constructive comments without hearing management calling them part of the problem. Once this BoD stops accepting constructive ideas they become “ part of the problem”

I've had two exchanges with you and each has resulted in a contentious exchange....too bad.



[Alison Phillips Nichols](#) I think any successful FB group needs active moderators. Thanks to the Board for their many hours of volunteer work to keep the organization going!



[Skip Gundlach](#) [Alison Phillips Nichols](#), thanks for that. You have NO idea, unless you were one of the previous BOD members.



[Alison Phillips Nichols](#) I've served on Boards, fortunately before the internet got so crazy, so have an inkling. You're all appreciated!



[Dean W. Martin](#) Moderated by BOD appointed or approved administrators



[Marc Bodian](#) The spread of interest is close to what I thought although there is actually a bit more interest by non members than I would have thought. That was actually the purpose here,

see what folks thought and I certainly haven't been disappointed. I didn't think it would be as contentious as it is (not sure why that is) but it obviously does need some more consideration. The big issues seem to be moderating and possibly pulling interest away from this page. A pretty big technical issue is maintaining the 'member only' status. In a small group it isn't too difficult but once it gets large enough, that will be a bigger task.



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Marc Bodian](#) The OCC has a member only page, maybe reach out to them about how they keep it solely to members only.



[Anne Lloyd](#) Marc

They do. I think the administrator FranciscRennie just looks up people who ask to join . They are pretty strict too. Eg if husband is occ member wife cannot join fb page unless she is also a paying member. (guess that is not an issue for ssca) .



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Anne Lloyd](#) were members and it's a family thing and not an individual thing. We are both on the OCC page, with only one fee...



[Anne Lloyd](#) [Paul Mckissick](#) odd

I invited jane Eslinger to occ page and she was not allowed as not a member. Are you sure you don't pay the reduced second fee for spouse
I think 85£ for two



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Anne Lloyd](#) Maybe.... that fee looks right we paid about \$140 ish, About double of the SSCA



[Anne Lloyd](#) [Paul Mckissick](#) I have just asked Frances about it.



[Anne Lloyd](#) Anyway ssca adds spouse for free



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Anne Lloyd](#) and it's only \$65



[Anne Lloyd](#) [Paul Mckissick](#) yes just shows what a bargain ssca is!!!!



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Anne Lloyd](#) That's why we joined..



[Don Preuss](#) If there is to be a member's only page, then I would want to be sure it is truly member's only. That means someone needs to monitor membership and check against requests, as well as remove those who are no longer members. That seems like a good bit of additional effort, rather than the open page.



[Alex Tarlecky](#) How will you determine who is a member and who is not and then manage it? I'm not sure what the member roll is but it would be a full time job to reconcile the facebook group list with the member roll list.



[Don Preuss](#) [Alex Tarlecky](#) correct. That's one of the details of having a member's only Facebook page that's tricky as opposed to putting up a page and calling it members only. Otherwise, it's an ssca page with people that might or might not be members. (I guess people self certify as members and remove themselves?) It shouldn't be a full time job, since we don't have that many people joining or leaving, but it is a task someone needs to be on top of if we're to trust it's members only.



[Skip Gundlach](#) [Don Preuss](#) Indeed, that is one of the challenges. We (the BOD) MAY be able to figure that out, IF there is sufficient interest to warrant doing all that's needed to make it a functional place to be 😊



[Diana Borja SV Joy](#) The old man likes the forum, hates Facebook. The “googler” onboard who finds all the solutions not in the manuals, loves Facebook, Google, etc



[Kris Self](#) I just want communication to come from one source. The forums on the website are great. It is easy to organize threads and search archives.



[Christopher Knapp](#) The FB group is most important. And, I'd prefer the paper magazine be available as a pdf download. No idea why, but all of my numerous requests to discontinue mailing me the paper magazine have fallen on deaf ears.



[Skip Gundlach](#) Really!?! Mailed subscriptions come at an added cost...



[Christopher Knapp](#) [Skip Gundlach](#) Not sure why. Gave up asking. Now all paper mailings just go to my mail forwarder and get recycled.



[Paul Mckissick](#) My thoughts are if you can get all the info you need from an open source, including attending gams, webinars etc... Then membership seems undervalued... If the only benefit remaining is discounts that in it self doesn't give the SSCA a real value... A good pole, would be the conversion rate in past years of people joining because of an open forum or event verse people attending and not signing up. Honestly non members pay just a little more per an event... 11,000 FB members but just how many are actual members? A private FB page isn't going to solve issues, if people complain now, they will just complain about something else later. People complain about the SSCA logo being red, white and blue... “it's to America for them” unfortunately some people will never be happy!

We chose to join OCC for the information, knowing each full member had successfully completed an ocean passage. Which to me, provides value...

I say redefine the vision, and goals of whatever the SSCA is suppose to be, and promote just that....

Here's a question?????

What makes the SSCA valuable to both its members, and soon to be members. (please don't mention discounts)



[Skip Gundlach](#) You've come to a GAM; you know at least one of them (yes, you can pay more and still come to GAMs as a non-member, as you did).

The rubbing shoulders with those who have BTDT, particularly for new cruisers, or even those merely wanting to get real-life commentary from, along with the ability to ask questions of, those out there doing it now, or who have done it before, is invaluable.

The information exchange, personal relationships which develop aside, via (e.g. in the maybe-members-only FB group), is like going to grad school for cruising.



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Skip Gundlach](#) That's my point... The SSCA should focus on what they are.... Regardless of what format is used for communication someone isn't going to be happy!



[Skip Gundlach](#) And in a members-only FB page, you'd be there, and those resigning would not



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Skip Gundlach](#) Sometimes pruning is a good thing!



[Thomas Braun](#) [Paul Mckissick](#) apologies Paul as I've just responded to another post of yours somewhere down this thread. I've been at sea for a bit and am trying to catch up!

Can pruning of membership be a good thing? Perhaps. I can see if someone was focused on trailer sailing and found that the threads on heavy weather tactics are completely irrelevant to the way they sail. Then sure, their departure is likely better for them and us.

But the types of members leaving are the ones who are feeling frustrated that their input isn't being listened to.

To expand on an analogy from above, if someone moves into a new town, they don't typically run for city council. But isn't it a promising sign they go to the meetings??? They Care about the topics discussed and are willing to stand up and add their own ideas.

That's called being an active citizen (member in our case).

Do you know what happens to active members??? They eventually get more experience with the

group and volunteer for positions of greater responsibility.

The very members we're "pruning" are the life blood, the future leaders of the SSCA. They're the people that aren't just sitting lurking on facebook. They're commenting, taking some knocks, but putting in that effort.

The association ignores and frustrates them at the very peril of the organization's future.

We can and must do better. And the people best positioned are the BoDs. Marc's pole is a huge positive sign, but there are still frustrations that are showing through in some comments, and with everyone being a bit touchy right now, it's too easy to prune all the way back to the trunk instead of the branch.



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Thomas Braun](#) And some are just whining. How does someone of only 2 weeks feel rejected to a point of posting on a different FB page. Just saying!!! Some people will never be happy



[Thomas Braun](#) Paul Mckissick I don't want to speak for [Deborah Doyle](#) but I think she had offered on several occasions to volunteer for things and become more active, but some was allowed to fall through the cracks.

She has deleted her other post by the way.

But the point of your question, which was how does she feel rejected is an excellent one, and I hope she can take the time to answer it!



[Deborah Doyle](#) Board please cancel my membership and provide a refund



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Deborah Doyle](#) A refund??? maybe you should email the board....



[Thomas Braun](#) [Deborah Doyle](#) I would hope that you sleep on your decision to leave.

There are still some sore feelings and some of the responses are touching on those tender spots. But [Marc Bodian](#) posted this pole to seek out information.

That is a direct action that shows open mindedness. But the SSCA isn't Marc's to run, he has to work within a framework. And inside that frame work are some people who have been upset for too long. It's going to take time for reason and foresight to once again become the dominant theme.

But reading through this thread, I can see BoD members who are trying! And I hope thats enough of a first step for you to stick it out so we can all benefit from your opinions and creative ideas!

But just like repairs to boats... it ALWAYS takes longer than it should!!!!



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Thomas Braun](#) she left and blasted the SSCA on S&C... Probably better that she is gone!



[Thomas Braun](#) [Paul Mckissick](#) I understand that it may be easier with Debrah out of the association, but she wasn't your average member who pays their dues and reads the bulletin.

She was interested in being an active volunteer and willing to add her own energy into making SSCA better. We can't simply offer platitudes when a member like that leaves.

I hope we can all ask why members feel so frustrated. I'm hoping they see that the BoD is moving in new directions. They are opening up lines of communication such as Marc's survey.

But we all have to remember that this is a volunteer organization and many of us have our other responsibilities to attend to, with the result that nothing happens quickly.

I hope Deborah will see that after a bit of time. Additionally, I hope the other BoD's can acknowledge there are some frustrations and bad feelings on both sides requiring interactions be given more forethought and care so they don't devolve into more of this.

Eventually we'll all get our thicker skins back and let some of the minor arrows bounce off without even commenting, but for now all of these interactions must start with active and focused listening. Before responses are typed, effort must be expended to make certain that the points being responded to are understood. Not to say they have to be agreed to, but the other members should always feel that they have at least been listened to and understood.



[Deborah Doyle](#) [Thomas Braun](#) I have deleted the post. I do have friends i. This org and and do not wish harm



[Joseph Abbott](#) The question poised in this survey is most likely a result of the recent initiation of the non-sanctioned Facebook Group but does not focus on the issue that was the root cause of it, but the question is a non-partisan step in the right direction. The root cause was the perceived issue of excessive censorship, suppression of controversial subjects, and secretive privileged leadership discussions which is really not in line with the original founding tenets of the association - open friendly cockpit discussions amongst friends.

If the original concept of the association was based on the singular idea of cruising members freely sharing ideas and experiences and open friendly cockpit discussions, every effort should be made to adhere to these noble concepts. The association discussions should be as transparent as possible and all issues should be freely discussed out in the open. I favored the current open Facebook page instead of a closed door policy.

As to censorship and suppression, if folks can focus on the issue and not the personality this should be possible. Besides didn't everyone here agree to embrace the Clean Wake Cruising policy of high standards of conduct that members treat others with respect and deep regard, be courteous and respectful without compromising personal standards.



[Chuck Ritenour](#) [Joseph Abbott](#), exactly. Do they check membership status in those cockpit conversations?



[Joseph Abbott](#) Chuck Ritenour No they didn't! The price of admission to the conversation was simply boat ownership with the goal of live aboard adventures with experiences to be shared amongst friends.



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Joseph Abbott](#) But as an organization some business is only for the board to deal with, and some business is for only members to hear. An open FB page where let's say 5000 people are not members and which have no say, yet put in their 2 cents anyway isn't good! Open discussion on boating, cruising and what size anchors... I agree open with very little moderation! But when we're talking about business it should be private and only to members. Unfortunately a lot of this crap/drama is only from a few people. If a person is so bent over being moderated on a FB page, apparently that person has nothing else to do, but complain!



[Joseph Abbott](#) [Paul Mckissick](#) The original tenets of this organization reflected an aversion for bureaucracy, politics, titles, and officialdom. It would be a worthwhile conversation to attempt to bring current association rules, by laws, and leadership structure more back in line with original concepts. Regrettably, I agree that a few organization business issues (legalize and personnel) must be "closed" but they should be the exception not the norm. In most cases if an issue cannot

stand the light of day and be openly shared with the membership which is the source of all authority, the issue does not belong in the association. The leadership serves the membership, not the other way around. The leadership is also part of the membership, not above it.

The opinions (2 cents) of all have merit and should be welcomed. Nonmembers cannot decide or vote so their opinions should not be feared – but looked upon as potential out-of-the-box ideas that might have value. I believe if the organization valued all opinions that sets a positive example and tone that might just entice nonmembers to become members.



[Greg Groome](#) [Joseph Abbott](#) nice well laid out comment!



[Anne Lloyd](#) Back to how to control who is on a member only group
In occ, the moderator consults membership directory as people apply to join it.
She then reviews once a year to delete people who have left the club/ not renewed/ died etc.
A big task for SSCA given size of the club and the churn



[Jackie Krugman-Moore](#) Educational and imformative



[Michael Rouse](#) I think the forum could use improvement. Something like what Cruiser Forum is using.



[Anne Lloyd](#) [Michael Rouse](#) is it only me, do you have to start at last page 3 and work backwards to read the forum in date order? Very odd



[Richard Boren](#) Uggg...it's not only you [Anne Lloyd](#) The Forum..... It's a plug in template through the Club Express Website and I will be the first to admit that I'm not a big fan of the layout either. As an avid reader and poster on Cruisers Forum that site is much easier to use and follow. The problem is we are limited to the forum template and just don't have the financial resources to change it. Given the clunky almost 1997 CompuServe feel of the Members Only Forum I can see the argument to have a Members Only FB Page.



[Anne Lloyd](#) Understood financial difficulties at present. Thought I was doing something wrong?!



[Eric Stanley](#) That it something I can certainly agree with. The forums don't get very much traffic in part because they are not very well done. Just use vBulletin and set them up like CF and you're good to go.



[Graham Openshaw](#) We have CF, Sailnet, OCC. You have to ask the question “why have another forum?”. This scattering and dilution of knowledge is already a pain. Scuba diving has one mega-forum [scubaboard.com](#) and it is an amazing one stop shop for any information about diving. We are all over the place.

scubaboard.com

[ScubaBoard - The World's Largest Scuba Diving...](#)



[Paul Mckissick](#) [Michael Rouse](#) Someone mentioned using noon site as a way to provide SSCA information at a very low cost. I would think keeping the website forum for member info only. Like when the question was asked about re-branding the SSCA.