

## PRESIDENT’S REPORT FOR JUNE MEETING

### LOGO

This matter was deferred from May.

The reason we are considering our Logo is so that our image reflects our accepted strategy, *Engaging Glebe*. This emphasises the integration of Heritage, Environment and Community. None stands alone. This is consistent with our intention to engage the community broadly including young professionals. Our current Logo seems to signify heritage as built environment, though we know that TGS does not operate that way. Thus any Logo we eventually choose must meet this criterion.

The process of direct communication has been intrinsically successful for the enthusiastic involvement of members has been impressive. In the following table I have set out total responses, unqualified responses, qualified responses, criticisms and commendations. Remember I asked members to vote their preferences so I cannot know whether unqualified responses liked the Logos but I know that qualified responses do not. This group made comments such as, “I don’t like any of them but nevertheless these are my choices.” Criticisms were those who did not believe any of the Logos were suitable and some of these made constructive critiques. Commendations were those who specifically praised the logos and process. I have replied to members who made comments explaining that I would complete this analysis, continue the process and keep the membership involved<sup>1</sup>.

| Total responses | Unqualified votes | Qualified votes | Commendation votes | Criticisms without votes |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 67              | 41                | 4               | 6                  | 16                       |

I took first choice as the most preferred and the last as least preferred and discarded other third choices. As some voters made only one choice the least preferred column totals less than 50.. There were 40 respondents who did not qualify their responses in any manner. There were 4 who did not like the options supplied but voted. These added to the 6 commendation votes bring the tally to 51.

| Design       | Most preferred | Least preferred |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1            | 17             | 8               |
| 2            | 7              | 13              |
| 3            | 13             | 9               |
| 4            | 14             | 8               |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>51</b>      | Not applicable  |

It is more important to get this right than get it done quickly. The level of involvement demands no less.

Technically the Logos were critiqued for their corporate nature, currently fashionable design, use of transparency and colour. It was noted that the colours “did not speak of old Glebe” like the ‘dirty red’ used by Glebe sporting teams. Concerns about using the designs in grey scale were made. One respondent most helpfully ‘mocked up’ the

---

<sup>1</sup> I retain copies of all emails for continuing analysis as required.

designs in black and white against a Bulletin background. A recurring comment was that the designs did not produce identity without words.

The current Logo was chiefly designed by Christine Stewart<sup>2</sup> about 1990. Most critics said that TGS should consider an updated version of this. Some options included removing the words, opening the door, changing the colour, incorporating steps by our name.

It seems to me that options 1 and 4 are the most preferred of the designs and there is an equally strong response for the current logo (updated). Options 2 and 3 are less preferred. The membership showed a distinct interest in the discursive process and we must ensure that is appropriately continued. Their comments were direct and insightful (see comments below).

I believe we should:

1. prepare an article for the Bulletin and the President's Page in terms of the above;
2. take into consideration the overall comments and adjust the most preferred options 1 and 4, to overcome perceived deficiencies;
3. bearing in mind advice from members and **Engaging Glebe** re-design the current Logo;
4. write to all members with email addresses and ask them to choose one of these three;
5. re-consider the matter at a subsequent meeting.

## COMMUNITY REMINDERS AND INVOLVEMENT

Recently to a Glebe resident said to me, "The Glebe Society should have done more about Harold Park." I replied, "The reason we are criticised is because we do act, whereas most sit on their hands and criticise later." TGS has a very proud record on Harold Park, the Dry Boat Storage Facility and the Super Yacht Marina (to name the obvious contemporary matters). We act for all our members and the community. Inevitably some group or another may wish for more but my answer is "Get involved.... early."

Now is a good time for each committee member to consider what message we can get to the community and how. There is an extant ideology that causes the withdrawal of public funding and services to communities. In such a context the duty and opportunity of community groups such as TGS rises. The recent successes of the Environment Subcommittee show that direct community involvement works. Janice Challinor, Community Development Coordinator and others are attempting such projects right now. Are you?

## UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY PROJECT

I am disappointed at the lack of action from the University on this matter. Although the Faculty of Education and Social Work committed to the Community Development Project it has not yet arranged the meeting of Deans which it agreed to do. I have written to the University of Sydney and will commence discussions with University of Technology Sydney whilst I await its reply.

## SUPER YACHT MARINA

I have written to the Managing Director, Mr James and TGS letter is included in significant correspondence. I have also written to TGS members in the *Glebe Update* and uploaded the letter to the TGS site.

---

<sup>2</sup> I have corresponded with Christine Stewart.

## SOME COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS ABOUT LOGOS

But that said - I think all are more than acceptable. They are fresh and contemporary and capture the essence of (TGS) rationale. Good work!

Thank you for the opportunity to have an opinion. I think it's great that the society is modernising in this way.

Congratulations , well done. This is a very difficult thing to undertake!

I'm voting in favour of none of them as I feel each is 'corporate' in vibe and unrepresentative of The Glebe Society as a whole.

In my opinion the designs retain little of the heritage values of the Society, nor do they protect the respectability of the Society's reputation.... the colouring is not representative of Glebe, the design is corporate...

(do) not necessarily .. keep (existing) but .. have one that reflects the old Glebe.

A logo that has to be explained with a footnote doesn't work. The current logo is immediately recognisable; if a change is needed I'd prefer a variant of that -- maybe an open door, or heritage window for a squarer image.

The new Logos don't reflect or build on the existing logo (24 years old) which is recognised across & beyond Glebe and quite beloved by GS members & others.

Number 1 looks like Harold Park<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> And it was also pointed out that 4 seemed to have numbers within it.