British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association

General Meeting Minutes
Sunday 2nd May 2010
Room JJ018, Ann Packer Building, Loughborough University

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting

In attendance:

Lucy Bamber	Loughborough Universities
Jason Bell	University of Birmingham
David Brown	University of St. Andrews
Tom Chamberlain	University of Southampton
Rhys Clements	University of Southampton
Oli Coleman	BULSCA Webmaster
Paul Cowx	Loughborough Universities
Simon Creasey	BULSCA Chair (Chairperson)
Miles Johansen	University of Plymouth
Tamsin Jones	University of London
Iain Long	BULSCA Secretary (Clerk)
Martin May	BULSCA Treasurer
Luke Norton	University of Nottingham
Lydia Roe	University of Bath
Rich Rowe	BULSCA Club Development Officer
Kathryn Shaw	University of Nottingham
Rebecca Sindall	University of Birmingham
Kathryn Somers	University of Bath
Tom Strachen	BULSCA Sport Development Officer
Giles Strong	University of Plymouth
Stuart Vagg	University of Warwick
Stephanie Wilson	University of London

Observers:

Helen Bugg (University of Plymouth); Simmone Bristow (University of Southampton); Felix Ng (Loughborough Universities); Luke Peel (University of Birmingham); Suanne Wong (University of London).

Unless otherwise stated, all actions should be completed in time for the next general meeting.

Simon called the meeting to order at 10.44.

1. Apologies for Absence:

University of Aberdeen; University of Cambridge; Dorota Bortel.

2. Approval of Minutes from the Last Meeting:

Simon went through the minutes. No errors were found.

Motion 2.1: Iain proposed accepting the minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting. Simon seconded the motion.

For: 9
Against: 0
Abstaining: 0

The proposal was accepted.

3. Matters Arising from the Minutes:

Action 5.1: Iain has not updated the BULSCA Competitions Manual regarding SERC rules.

> *Action 3.1:* Iain to make the necessary amendments to the BULSCA Competitions Manual.

Action 7.1: Iain has not updated the BULSCA Competitions Manual regarding SERC equipment.

> *Action 3.2:* Iain to make the necessary amendments to the BULSCA Competitions Manual.

Action 13.1: Simon did not inform Aberdeen of the General Meeting's decision regarding their competition. They found out at Nottingham. Southampton asked how the conversation went. Simon stated that he not been present.

4. BULSCA Officer Reports:

4.1 Chair:

Simon gave an oral report of his activities. He stated that BULSCA had ticked over this year. He noted that there were more competitions than ever before. BULSCA Championships were held at a new venue, and the feedback was generally positive. RLSS were introducing a competitive start award. All competitors would need to hold this award in time for the following season. Finally, he noted that in was still preparing proposals on how SERCs are run, and the role of the BULSCA Judges' Panel.

There were no questions for the Chair.

4.2 Secretary:

Iain presented his report, **Paper B**, as tabled.

There were no questions for the Secretary.

4.3 Treasurer:

Martin presented his report, **Paper C**. He noted that several transactions had not occurred, particularly relating to the pool hire for BULSCA Nationals. However, he stated that his report was as accurate as he could manage at the time of the AGM.

There were no questions for the Treasurer.

4.4 Club Development Officer:

Rich presented his report, **Paper D**, as tabled.

There were no questions for the Club Development Officer.

4.5 Sport Development Officer:
Tom presented his report, **Paper E**. He noted that BULSCA records were going online this week, although there were issues relating to the mixed obstacles relay. He also stated that there was no precedent regarding eligibility for the records. If a student at a British university without a BULSCA club broke a record, it was unclear whether they would be eligible to hold the record. He noted that this required further discussion, which was postponed to any other business.

There were no questions for the Sport Development Officer.

4.6 Webmaster:
Oli presented his report, **Paper F**. He stated that several spreadsheet problems had been resolved, and the new email system was working well. He had had difficulties with the championships seeding, but assured the General Meeting that it had been resolved. He then gave detailed statistics regarding the number of hits on the website.

Oli drew the General Meeting's attention to his opinions on the working of the BULSCA committee. He recommended that the incoming committee to resolve to find a better way to meet.

There were no questions for the Webmaster.

4.7 Championship Coordinator:
Iain stated that he had received no report. Dorota was not present to provide an oral report.

5. Ammendment to Rule 5.3.1.2:
Simon, in Stu Ward's absence, presented **Paper G** on amendments to the SERC time limits. He stated that pool time was often at a premium, and that this would resolve the issue.

London asked whether the same logic would be applied to SERC time limits in smaller pools. Simon stated that it would not. London responded by asking why 50m SERCs were being singled out. Simon stated that the aim was to promote differences between the teams. In three minutes, teams were often difficult to distinguish.

Southampton asked whether this would disadvantage slower teams. Simon stated that the time limit was left to the discretion of the SERC setter.

Amendment 5.1: Rich proposed that the time limit for the SERC should be announced prior to the competition. Simon accepted the amendment on Stu Ward's behalf.

London noted that the proposal stated that the time limit should be up to three minutes. However, much of the discussion had focussed on a time limit of two or three minutes. They asked for clarification. Oli stated that the wording in the written proposal was correct.

Southampton asked that the discussion move to a vote.

Amendment 5.2: Martin proposed amending the proposal to state that the time limit for a SERC in a 50m pool should be either 120, 150 or 180 seconds. Simon rejected the amendment on Stu Ward's behalf. The amendment was put to a vote. Iain seconded the amendment.

For:	9
Against:	0
Abstaining:	0

The amendment was accepted.

The General Meeting then moved to vote on the amended proposal:

Motion 5.1: In Stu Ward's absence, <u>Simon</u> proposed accepting the proposal outlined in **Paper G**, subject to the amendments *5.1* and *5.2*. <u>Southampton</u> seconded the proposal

For:	8
Against:	0
Abstaining:	1

The proposal was accepted.

Action 5.1: <u>Iain</u> to make the necessary amendments to the BULSCA Competitions Manual.

6. Support for Clubs:
<u>David Brown</u> (St. Andrews) presented **Paper H**, on supporting clubs. He noted that, moving from a large to a small club, he was acutely aware of the different problems smaller clubs faced. He stated that the aim of the proposal was to highlight the plight of smaller clubs, and to make easier for the BULSCA committee to encourage new clubs to form. The proposal he is presented is not finalised, but he requests a vote on the principle.

<u>Birmingham</u> noted that this would create a more level playing field. He was worried that, by helping their competitors, his Club would have its funding cut. Improvements in other Clubs would damage Birmingham's results. Dave responded by saying that he was not expecting clubs to give away all their trade secrets, just provide a set of basic training techniques.

<u>London</u> asked whether this was a restatement of the Club Development Officer's role. Rich stated that it was.

<u>London</u> suggested developing a forum for clubs to share ideas on training. David agreed with this. Martin noted that this was similar to some of the workshops BULSCA had run in previous years.

<u>Oli</u> stated that there was already provision for BULSCA to provide funding to clubs. Moreover, a bank of training plans had already been started several years ago. Whilst the Webmaster could set this up, it was up to the Club Development Officer to provide content. With regard to scratch teams, Oli felt that using the existing email system would be more cost effective.

<u>Plymouth</u> stated that they would like access to funding, as they received none from their university.

<u>Southampton</u> asked what funding was available for clubs. Martin stated that, for all practical purposes, BULSCA did not have sufficient money to provide funding for clubs. He noted that this would require a significant increase in membership fees, or a new source of revenue to be secured.

<u>Southampton</u> suggested contacting the RLSS regarding funding. Simon was uncertain as to how this would be received at River House, but that it was worth the discussion.

<u>Plymouth</u> asked whether it would be possible for other clubs to provide money up front. Iain stated that this was impossible, as clubs tend to have to submit detailed funding applications to their unions, and that money for other clubs would never be approved.

Amendment 6.1: <u>Birmingham</u> proposed amending the proposal to remove bullet point four, relating to funding. <u>David</u> rejected the amendment. The amendment was put to a vote. <u>Loughborough</u> seconded the amendment.

For: 4
Against: 2
Abstaining: 3

The amendment was accepted.

<u>Southampton</u> noted that the proposal suggested investigating a northern league.

Action 6.1: <u>BULSCA committee</u> to investigate.

Motion 6.1: <u>David</u> proposed accepting the proposal outlined in **Paper H**, subject to amendment **6.1**. <u>Southampton</u> seconded the proposal

For: 8
Against: 0
Abstaining: 1

The proposal was accepted.

Action 6.2: <u>Rich</u> to implement the recommendations of the proposal.

7. Competition Calendar 2010-2011:
<u>Simon</u> apologised for the difficulties clubs had in submitting their competition proposals. Apparently, emails went awry. He had received eight proposals, and felt that this was a good number of events for a season. However, he warned that in future years a single transferrable voting system may need to be implemented.

Action 7.1: <u>Simon</u> to prepare a proposal on single transferrable voting for the competition calendar.

<u>Simon</u> observed that there were two proposals to hold the freshers' competition, from Bath and Southampton. He suggested deciding upon this, before moving on to each competition.

<u>Southampton</u> asked how spread out the competitions were. Oli stated that the competitions fell at the usual times.

Proceeding in alphabetical order, <u>Bath</u> were given two minutes in which to state their case for holding the freshers' competition. They said that the date they provided was the only one available to them, as their pool was being used by the British Paralympic Team in the run up to the London 2012 Olympics. They had a new student centre, providing better food, and allowing the social to be on campus. They noted that they had the only 50m pool in BULSCA, and it would be a shame to lose it. Moreover, accommodation was easy.

<u>Southampton</u> were then given two minutes to state their case for holding the freshers' competition. They had managed to secure the SU Sports Centre. This would enable them to keep the entire event – competition, social and accommodation – within a small area of the Southampton campus. They noted that they had held several successful freshers' competitions over the last few years, and had other options if the pool was too expensive for the clubs.

<u>Simon</u> then allowed questions.

Oli asked Bath whether their accommodation would accommodate the number of competitors expected at the freshers' competition. Bath replied, stating that there was another hut available, which was ten minutes away by bus. Oli also noted that the beer had been quite expensive at previous Bath competitions. Bath said that, given the larger numbers, drinks deals were more likely.

Simon suggested that Bath's proposed date – 23rd October – was very early. Most clubs would only have seen their freshers for one or two sessions. He asked whether other dates were available. Bath reiterated that the British Paralympic Team were training in the pool, and other dates were not available.

Southampton noted that £32 was expensive for a freshers' competition. Bath said that this was due to the 50m pool.

Simon pondered whether a 50m was scary.

Birmingham asked whether Bath could bring their social price down to £5, as they felt it was rather expensive for a freshers' competition. Bath stated that this would not be possible.

Motion 7.1: Simon asked clubs to vote for their preferred freshers' competition.

Bath:	2
Southampton:	7
Abstaining:	0

Southampton will host the 2010 freshers' competition.

Before voting on other competitions, Simon asked Birmingham and Plymouth how much they were going to charge for their competitions. They both stated that they would charge £30 per team.

Simon suggested a block vote on all competitions. Afterwards, dates could be decided.

Plymouth noted that their speeds would take place in a 25m, six lane pool.

Southampton noted that no money would be received from clubs' own teams. There was no provision for this in the spreadsheet. They thought that, in particular, this might affect Loughborough.

Action 7.2: Oli to include an own teams cell on next year's spreadsheet.

Motion 7.2: Simon proposed accepting the remaining bids. Southampton seconded the motion.

For:	9
Against:	0
Abstaining:	0

The proposal was accepted.

The following calendar was discussed and agreed:

Date	University	Notes
30/10/2010	Southampton	Freshers' competition.
06/11/2010	Warwick	Should be flexible regarding the entry deadline, as this is the weekend after the freshers' competition.
20/11/2010	Plymouth	
11/12/2010	London	
29/01/2010	Nottingham	
12/02/2010	Birmingham	
30/04/2010	Loughborough	

Southampton asked whether a bid from Bath would be accepted at a later date. Simon said that it would.

London asked, in light on the previous question, whether other clubs would be able to bid for more competitions. Oli said that they would, as there was a window in the Lent term.

Tom asked whether clubs would be willing to pay £40 per team for a Bath competition. Birmingham said that this was not affordable. However, Simon noted that other competitions were charging much less, allowing more funds spare to go to Bath. Oli suggested that Bath look into leisure centres.

8. Election of New Officers in Constitutional Order:

8.1 Chair:
No nominations had been received. Simon asked whether anyone wished to stand.

Giles Johansen (Plymouth) stood. He was given two minutes to make a speech.

Simon asked whether there were any questions. Oli asked which position Giles had held at Plymouth. Giles stated that he had been Competitions Secretary.

Vote 8.1: Simon asked clubs to vote for their preferred candidate for BULSCA Chair.

Giles Johansen:	7
Reopen Nominations:	1
Abstaining:	1

Giles Johansen was duly elected BULSCA Chair.

8.2 Secretary:
No nominations had been received. Simon asked whether anyone wished to stand.

Rhys Clements (Southampton) stood. He was given two minutes to make a speech.

Simon asked whether there were any questions. There were none.

Vote 8.2: Simon asked clubs to vote for their preferred candidate for BULSCA Secretary.

Rhys Clements:	5
Reopen Nominations:	3
Abstaining:	1

Rhys Clements was duly elected BULSCA Secretary.

8.3 Treasurer:
No nominations had been received. Simon asked whether anyone wished to stand.

Suanne Wong (London) stood. She was given two minutes to make a speech.

Simon asked whether there were any questions. There were none.

Vote 8.3: Simon asked clubs to vote for their preferred candidate for BULSCA Treasurer.

Rhys Clements:	9
Reopen Nominations:	0
Abstaining:	0

Suanne Wong was duly elected BULSCA Treasurer.

8.4 Club Development Officer:
No nominations had been received. Simon asked whether anyone wished to stand.

Edward Woodhouse (St. Andrews) stood via video. He was given two minutes to make a speech.

There was no opportunity for questions, as Edward was not present.

Vote 8.4: Simon asked clubs to vote for their preferred candidate for BULSCA Club Development Officer.

Edward Woodhouse:	9
Reopen Nominations:	0
Abstaining:	0

Edward Woodhouse was duly elected BULSCA Club Development Officer.

8.5 Sport Development Officer:
No nominations had been received. Simon asked whether anyone wished to stand.

Stephanie Wilson (London) stood. She was given two minutes to make a speech.

Simon asked whether there were any questions. There were none

Vote 8.5: Simon asked clubs to vote for their preferred candidate for BULSCA Sport Development Officer.

Stephanie Wilson:	9
Reopen Nominations:	0
Abstaining:	0

Rhys Clements was duly elected BULSCA Sport Development Officer.

8.6 Webmaster:
Oli Coleman (Birmingham) stood. He was given two minutes to make a speech.

Simon asked whether there were any questions. There were none

Vote 8.6: <u>Simon</u> asked clubs to vote for their preferred candidate for BULSCA Webmaster.

Oli Coleman:	9
Reopen Nominations:	0
Abstaining:	0

Oli Coleman was duly elected BULSCA Webmaster.

8.7 Championships Coordinator:
No nominations had been received. <u>Simon</u> asked whether anyone wished to stand.

Nobody stood. <u>Simon</u> duly reopened nominations. New elections will be held at the start of the next academic year.

9. Any Other Business:
<u>Tom</u> asked whether clubs felt it necessary to be a member of a BULSCA club to hold a student record.

<u>St. Andrews</u> asked whether the records were BULSCA records or British student records. Simon confirmed that they were BULSCA records.

<u>Southampton</u> stated that they felt individuals should be members of BULSCA, or of BULSCA clubs. They asked whether it would be possible to pay retrospectively. Tom suggested that paying retrospectively should not be allowed, but agreed that membership of BULSCA, or of a BULSCA club should be required.

<u>Birmingham</u> agreed with Southampton, namely that individuals should be members of BULSCA or BULSCA affiliated clubs.

<u>Loughborough</u> asked about affiliates/associate members of clubs. Simon explained that they were members of a BULSCA club.

<u>Oli</u> noted that this approach excluded people.

Motion 9.1: <u>Tom</u> proposed that all records should be held by individual BULSCA student members, or student members of BULSCA affiliated university clubs. <u>London</u> seconded the motion.

For:	8
Against:	1
Abstaining:	0

The proposal was accepted.

Action 9.1: <u>Tom</u> to publicise this decision.

<u>Southampton</u> asked whether non-students should be barred from competing at BULSCA Nationals. Simon responded, saying that they provided an important source of revenue. Simmone (Southampton and Crawley Town) added that non-student competitors enjoy the opportunity to compete. They are relatively unconcerned about medals.

<u>Southampton</u> asked whether it would be possible to take splits on the line relay, to get more accurate rankings. Oli noted that better stopwatches would be required, needing a significant outlay on the part

of the host clubs. St. Andrews added that timers would get in the way of the competitors. Simon stated that it was infeasible.

Simon highlighted some issues relating to judges. Many competitions are struggling to get enough judges to participate. It is expensive for judges to attend, and the rewards are relatively small. He wondered whether host clubs would be willing to pay for judges travel. Birmingham suggested that judges try to hitch lifts with competing clubs. Oli noted that this was already done in some cases. Simon also stated that there was a need for a judges course. Martin said that he was intending to organise one in London.

Motion 9.2: Oli proposed that BULSCA appoint a judging tutor, to run BULSCA judges course. St. Andrews seconded the motion.

For: 7
Against: 0
Abstaining: 2

The proposal was accepted.

Action 9.2: BULSCA Sport Development Officer to organise.

Simon noted that work on judges remediation was in progress. However, the system of shadowing more experienced judges seemed to be working well.

Simon stated that he was going to prepare a SERC document over the summer.

Simon has been thinking about ways in which BULSCA could fundraise. Previously, training weekends and judges course had worked well. He asked whether anyone present had any other ideas. Oli disagreed with the principle. Clubs fundraise for themselves. BULSCA has only been a guiding force, and should not require a large budget. Iain agreed with Oli. In addition, Iain thought that offering coach tutoring etc may be a way for BULSCA to raise money. Oli noted that RLSS branches had funds which clubs could apply for.

Simon closed the meeting at 12.50.