



# British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association

MINUTES

Date: 28/11/13

Time: 19:30

Location: Skype

Present Chris H, Alex B, Adam M, Nicola K, Oliver C, Edward M

Apologies n/a

| <b>Agenda Item 1 - Review EGM Minutes</b>   |  |          |
|---|--|----------|
| Presenter: n/a  |  |          |
| Discussion  | All good however the proposal for the rule change says that we are going to follow the RLSS National Championships Rule book not the RLSS Speeds Rule Book. All agreed that clubs knew what they were voting for so the minutes just need to be corrected. |          |
| Conclusion  | Paper A needs correcting   |          |
| Action Items  | Person Responsible   | Deadline |
| Correct Paper A   | Adam M   | ASAP     |
| <b>Agenda Item 2 - Club Corner</b>  |  |          |
| Presenter: n/a  |  |          |
| Discussion  | Adam apologises for mucking up and forgetting to send out the email so nothing to report this meeting.   |          |
| Conclusion  | Nothing to discuss   |          |
| Action Items  | Person Responsible   | Deadline |
|   |  |          |
| <b>Agenda Item 3 - GM Proposals (Accelerating the Release of Competition Results)</b> |  |          |
| Presenter: Adam M   |  |          |



|               |  |          |
|---------------|--|----------|
| Discussion    | <p>Adam presents his idea as detailed in the proposal paper. Essentially wants to ensure that SERC marks are released sooner than they currently are. Oli raises that the proposal gives two options where as it should only give one. Adam says the reason for this is he wants clubs to choose as its them who would have to meet whatever new deadline was set.</p> <p>Oli gives another alternative option of putting a teams SERC marks at the end of the spreadsheet we hand out after competitions. Though he's not sure it would fit. Ed disagrees with this as an option because we have a comparative scoring system and therefore you need to see other teams marks in order to look at how well you did. Adam agrees with this.</p> <p>Oli says he prefers the 7 days options over the 48 hour provisional option due to the fact that the results spreadsheet wouldn't be in a fit state as the headers above the marks aren't always filled in. I.e. you would have Judge 1 marking criteria 1, 2, 3 etc. but no descriptions. There would also be no SERC diagrams. Alex points out that the marks without SERC diagrams aren't very useful. Adam agrees they aren't as useful but certainly think that they are better than nothing. Points out that in order for the 48 hours to work the Judge descriptions would have to be a requirement but that might be a tall order when clubs might not have copies of the SERCS.</p> <p>After a discussion on how best to provide our recommendation given there are two points. Oli suggests we vote on each independently. We decide to go along with this.</p> <p>48 hours option: Reject with Discussion<br/>7 Days option: Accept with Discussion</p> |          |
| Conclusion    | Recommend Accept with Discussion for 7 Days  |          |
| Action Items  | Person Responsible   | Deadline |
| Add to Agenda | Adam M   | 30/11/13 |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Agenda Item 4 - GM Proposals (Online Voting)</b> |
| Presenter: Adam M                                   |



|            |  |
|------------|--|
| Discussion | <p>Chris says it generally reflects what Adam has said in the past over Facebook, is everyone happy? Some haven't read it. Adam explains as best he can while others read it.</p> <p>Oli says currently he is a reject without discussion because the opportunities of abuse are too great. He thinks that it should require unanimous committee approval and without that he thinks its a little bit dangerous. Chris thinks that it could be abused but it would take a lot of effort and he doesn't see the motivation. Many things in our current system could be abused. Adam raises that theoretically he could call the mid season general meeting in Ireland if he fancied it, there has to be some trust. Oli points out that if Adam did that he'd never achieve quorum.</p> <p>Adam says that the point is it is more democratic, at the moment in the event a decision was required on short notice we have no way of consulting the membership. Ed thinks that the relevant point is that there is currently no system to deal with an urgent proposal and that this does offer an alternative.</p> <p>Alex dislikes the proposal, he thinks that in order to make a decision you need to get the feeling of the room. He also thinks that this will mean clubs that don't attend general meetings could influence the vote, raising eligibility to vote as an issue.</p> <p>Adam says he doesn't think that eligibility is relevant to the proposal as to change that would require a separate proposal and discussion. He also says that in order for online voting to go through and be successful it requires a super majority. If 3 or more clubs disagree with the majority then it is automatically taken for discussion at a general meeting. The logic being that 3 clubs is the number which it takes to call an EGM.</p> <p>It's also raised that this is beneficial as opposed to calling an EGM as for some clubs it's expensive to travel to these meetings, especially if they weren't attending a competition. So in the case at the Bristol EGM St Andrews would have been able to vote. It will also allow us to resolve "easy" general meeting proposals prior to the meeting, leaving more time to focus on issues that require discussion.</p> <p>Oli thinks that the time scales are too short, especially the time the committee has to get together and discuss the proposal. Adam disagrees, he wanted the procedures to be quicker than calling an EGM otherwise the benefit of them is lessened. However others on the committee agree that 14 days is more reasonable. Oli asks if Adam would change it which Adam agrees to.</p> <p>Committee then gives its recommendation:</p> <p>Accept without Discussion: 2<br/>Accept with Discussion: 2</p> |
|------------|--|



|               |  |          |
|---------------|--|----------|
|               | <p>Alex decides to change his vote to accept with discussion as he feels that is better than accept without.</p> <p>Therefore the committee recommendation is accept with discussion</p> |          |
| Conclusion    | Accept with Discussion for Online Voting   |          |
| Action Items  | Person Responsible   | Deadline |
| Add to Agenda | Adam M   | 30/11/13 |

### Agenda Item 5 - GM Proposals (Scoring Method)

Presenter: Oli

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| Discussion | <p>Oli hasn't had anybody ask any further questions. Nicola asks how its looking currently with the current season. Oli says the same as it has for previous competitions. Alex says that he is happy but he doesn't understand why Oli isn't proposing any changes for the league. Oli says he agrees it needs to be looked at but the data hasn't be done to research and check how it would work. Adam asks if Oli intends to bring it to the AGM. Oli says he would like to wait to see how it plays out for a year before bringing that before a General Meeting so intends not to bring it forward until the AGM the year after next.</p> <p>Chris asks if anyone has anything else to add? No one does. Then we vote on the recommendation</p> <p>The committee votes to recommend Accept without Discussion</p> |
|------------|---|

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| Conclusion | Accept without Discussion for Scoring Methion |
|------------|---|

|               |                    |          |
|---------------|--------------------|----------|
| Action Items  | Person Responsible | Deadline |
| Add to Agenda | Adam M             | 30/11/13 |

### Agenda Item 6 - Composite Teams

Presenter: Chris H



|               |   |          |
|---------------|---|----------|
| Discussion    | <p>Chris says the proposal is in response to Andy wanting to enter a competition abroad as BULSCA. He likes to think that this proposal deals with the major concerns that have been raised with us doing it previously. Alex raises that there is no appeals process for this proposal if somebody had a problem with team selection. Oli says it would go through the disciplinary policy so it is covered.</p> <p>Alex says he doesn't like the proposal, he's worried that if you enter a BULSCA A team then you are saying that the team is the best BULSCA can offer when it often isn't. Adam strongly disagrees with this, he thinks this idea that only the top competitors can compete under our name is elitist and not fair. Alex raises that you wouldn't just be able to enter as RLSS A. Adam thinks that's not relevant as the RLSS has a team of people appointed to get teams together to compete for the RLSS where as we do not. He also thinks that if the RLSS wanted to take a team of 4 to a competition and only 4 signed up then the RLSS would take them regardless of their standard.</p> <p>Alex still thinks that this issue hasn't been addressed. Adam says that until we appoint somebody to take clubs to away competitions and organise things like this then this proposal should go through as its fairer.</p> <p>Nicola agrees with Alex on the issue. Chris thinks that their concerns are relevant but he feels the proposal prevents you entering the competitions where this would be an issue such as RLSS Speeds, ILS competitions etc.</p> <p>Chris asks if anyone else has anything further to add, nobody does. Move to vote of recommendation.</p> <p>Accept without discussion: 2<br/> Accept with discussion: 1<br/> Debate with no recommendation: 1<br/> Reject with discussion: 2</p> <p>Committee agrees that we are split so we will recommend Debate with no Recommendation</p> |          |
| Conclusion    | Debate with no Recommendation   |          |
| Action Items  | Person Responsible  | Deadline |
| Add to Agenda | Adam M  | 30/11/13 |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Agenda Item 7 - GM (Change to Committee Positions)</b> |
| Presenter: Oli C  |



|               |   |          |
|---------------|---|----------|
| Discussion    | <p>Essentially facebook and twitter don't get the attention it should as well as other content. Equally other stuff such as conditional formatting would be useful. Chris asks Oli if he thinks the communication officer will need to be technical or social network orientated. Oli says social savvy would probably be good but theres no requirement for technical knowledge. Alex asks if its moving stuff away from Secretary? Oli says its only moving management of the mailing lists away which the Secretary doesn't really have a lot do with anyway. Adam confirms this is the case.</p> <p>Chris raises that as long as the Secretary and the Communication Officer talk that the issues should just resolve themselves. All agree.</p> <p>Committee deliberate on our recommendation. Unanimously agree to Accept without Discussion.</p> |          |
| Conclusion    | Accept without Discussion for Change to Committee Positions   |          |
| Action Items  | Person Responsible  | Deadline |
| Add to Agenda | Adam M  | 30/11/13 |

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Agenda Item 8 - Champs Stuff</b> |   |
| Presenter: Alex                     |   |
| Discussion                          | <p>Asks for feedback on the champs advert from last year. Adam says his only point is limit the size of the advert to make room for the main article. Especially now we only get one page of the magazine. Oli says that year after year the advert isn't produced at high enough resolution so asks Alex to do his best.</p> <p>Alex says if anyone wants to have a go at doing it they can as he doesn't have much time. Otherwise send him ideas and he'll put something together by next weekend.</p> <p>Alex's other point is the entry packs are coming out shortly, He says that the costs from last year are £31.50 and we haven't increased costs of individual entries which are £16 / £23. Oli says they have been raised once in the past but apart from that accepts Alex's point. Alex says last year there was no formal charge for a team just for Sunday. Him and David Brown just came up with what they thought was reasonable and decided on £10 per head so £40 per team. Alex says that this feels a little unbalanced and does the balance need to be redressed? Discussion ensues but ultimately it's decided we will leave as it is.</p> |
| Conclusion                          | Send champs advert thoughts to Alex, Pricing Structure for Champs to remain the same.   |



| Action Items          | Person(s) Responsible | Deadline |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Produce Champs Advert | Alex B                | 04/12/13 |

### Agenda Item 9 - SERC Writing

Presenter: Adam M

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| Discussion | <p>A member BJP has asked the committee to consider whether we should allow multiple SERC writers to work together on an incident for a competition. Alex says he has written a SERC with 3 people before and it does work. Oli's opinion is that he prefers one SERC writer as he thinks multiple leads to finer details of the SERC becoming confused or missed. Though he does think two should be allowed, especially for newer SERC writers. It's also raised that if you have two SERC setters from different universities that can have an impact on who you can use to write the other SERC.</p> <p>It's pointed out that this is more a question of practicality, its difficult to have a 3/ 4 way conversation between SERC writers and BJP. Its suggested there should be one person appointed to deal with BJP who has ultimate responsibility. The committee agree this is a good option but ultimately it should be what BJP are prepared to deal with. Adam asks Chris if he forwards the email he received would Chris respond with our suggestion to the BJP and see if they are happy. In which case it can be added to the SERC setters guidelines.</p> |
| Conclusion | No limit on numbers but there should be a lead writer. Providing BJP agree.  |

| Action Items | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| Email to BJP | Chris H            | ASAP     |

### Agenda Item 10 - London Competition

Presenter: Chris



|              |   |          |
|--------------|---|----------|
| Discussion   | <p>James &amp; Sarah want to pre shadow before their Judges course so that they are available to Judge at St Andrews. Committee agrees that while they are experienced this would defeat the point of doing the course. Adam also says that given London's bodying situation this is a mute point as any shadow Judges would be made into bodies.</p> <p>Chris says this leads nicely into his next point London cannot currently run its competition. Its 3 Judges short and has only 1 body. Alex says they have their club members so can just disband the teams. Chris says even if they do that they still don't have enough and theres also an issue where a team member says he will not body if his team is disbanded.</p> <p>Both SERC setters apparently cannot reduce the required number of Judges. Oli says if needed he can drop a Judge and a Casualty as he is writing the wet. Chris also says we can use a Judge Body to reduce the demand for bodies. Ed says that he can now Judge at London so combined with Oli hopefully removing a Judge that removes the Judges problem.</p> <p>Alex suggest we could talk to our own clubs / work our contacts to try and get more bodies. Chris raises that the main issue is that usually there are spaces in cars / minibuses that don't cost anything where as teams tend to get the train to London.</p> <p>Chris says we may need to have a conversation on funding bodies as opposed to cancelling the competition. Alex asks to have this discussion now. All committee are against this as it sets a dangerous precedent. Adam points out that if this was happening to St Andrews we couldn't afford to do it and therefore can't do it here.</p> <p>Its also raised that we could restrict all universities to just an A and a B team then run the wet and dry separately which would remove the issue.</p> <p>Chris says this should be a last option but agrees its better than cancellation. In the meantime we will work contacts but if the situation doesn't improve we will email out in the middle of next week to make it clear how desperate the situation is.</p> |          |
| Conclusion   | Pre-shadowing isn't allowed, Need to help London find Bodies as best as we can.   |          |
| Action Items | Person(s) Responsible   | Deadline |
| Find bodies  | BULSCA Committee  | ASAP     |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Agenda Item 11: Judges Course Payments</b> |
| Presenter: Adam M                             |





|                                   |  |          |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------|
| Discussion                        | Adam went to the bank today and our account isn't set up still. This causes problems with taking judges course payments. Ed wishes Adam had told him sooner, Adam says he couldn't as he only found out today. |          |
|                                   | Alex doesn't see why this is an issue. We are protected by the switching guarantee so can just pay into the old account. All agree this is the way forward.  |          |
| Conclusion                        | Use existing Bank Details for Judges Course Payments   |          |
| Action Items                      | Person(s) Responsible  | Deadline |
| Inform Candidates of Bank Details | Adam M   | ASAP     |
|                                   |  |          |

### Agenda Item 12: Sunday Meeting

Presenter: Chris H

|              |   |          |
|--------------|---|----------|
| Discussion   | Reminder of our meeting with the RLSS in London after the Judges course. It will be us and lee and it should last a couple of hours. Ed would love it if we could all have lunch together afterwards. We agree this is likely going to happen so we can discuss more stuff. |          |
| Conclusion   | Meeting Sunday after London   |          |
| Action Items | Person(s) Responsible   | Deadline |
|              |   |          |

### Agenda Item 13: BULSCA Affiliations

Presenter: Ed M

|            |  |  |
|------------|--|--|
| Discussion | <p>We currently haven't sent out invoices for membership. This has implications for the London General Meeting. Either we require clubs to pay within 7 days or we have to take clubs on their word they are going to pay. All agree the second option isn't an option.</p> <p>Chris says there are no alternatives. Alex says at this point, given that they'd not been sent out we have to allow votes. Oli says realistically they are going to pay and always have paid.</p> <p>Edward suggested that by accepting a voting card, clubs could be treated as having used their membership and then be invoiced for it, in the same way companies are for goods</p> <p>Adam suggests those that hadn't paid could be asked to sign a contract type thing agreeing that by taking the voting card they agree to pay membership. Chris really likes this idea, all are in agreement.</p> |  |
|------------|--|--|



|   |  |          |
|---|--|----------|
| Conclusion                                      | Contract to agree to payment in order to vote.   |          |
| Action Items                                    | Person(s) Responsible  | Deadline |
| Produce Contracts to bring to the GM            | Adam M   | 07/12/13 |
| <b>Agenda Item 14: BULSCA Conference</b>        |  |          |
| Presenter: Ed M                                 |  |          |
| Discussion                                      | Invites have been sent out, no responses yet. There are other considerations but given the length of the meeting so far Ed asks if we can discuss them at London. All agreed.  |          |
| Conclusion                                      | Discuss at London  |          |
| Action Items                                    | Person(s) Responsible  | Deadline |
|   |  |          |
| <b>Agenda Item 15: New Website &amp; Domain</b> |  |          |
| Presenter: Oli C                                |  |          |
| Discussion                                      | <p>We've started the process of moving to the new domain as the existing one wasn't capable of what we needed. Online entry will be down for 5 - 7 days after London when the move over is completed. Once its done we will reopen it and it will look identical to how it looks at the minute.</p> <p>The new site is pretty much imported and it's nearly there. Final checks need doing such as checking links. There are currently some issues related to the speed of the website but Oli and Ed will discuss separately. All sorted.</p> |          |
| Conclusion                                      | Website progress is good.  |          |
| Action Items                                    | Person(s) Responsible  | Deadline |
|   |  |          |
| <b>Agenda Item 16: Entries</b>                  |  |          |
| Presenter: Alex B                               |  |          |



|                             |  |          |
|-----------------------------|--|----------|
| Discussion                  | Who is a member needs to be discussed, especially due to online voting and BULSCA Conference places. Currently universities like Leeds where only one competitor comes down are given full BULSCA membership for free. Whereas it would be better if we could just treat them as members purely for Champs. Adam makes several enquires about the current system which is explained. After some discussion its agreed we cannot do anything this year but we should put something together for the AGM at Loughborough as this is a recurring issue. |          |
| Conclusion                  | Bring to the AGM   |          |
| Action Items                | Person(s) Responsible  | Deadline |
| Bring a Proposal to the AGM | TBC  | May      |

### Agenda Item 17: Swim & Tow Stroke Rule

Presenter: Adam M

|                    |   |          |
|--------------------|---|----------|
| Discussion         | <p>Adam wishes to bring changing the swim tow stroke rule to the GM but hasn't had time to write the proposal. The proposal will be to change to the RLSS rule which allows any Lifesaving Stroke in the Survive and Save manual not just Sidestroke and Lifesaving Backstroke. It also means that we would adopt an RLSS interpretation of the rule which is not as strict as the interpretation of our own rule.</p> <p>Committee are happy that providing we are changing a rule inline with the RLSS then this can be made into a proposal and put in with the recommendation of accept without discussion. Providing nothing else is in the proposal. Adam is happy with this.</p> |          |
| Conclusion         |   |          |
| Action Items       | Person(s) Responsible   | Deadline |
| Write the Proposal | Adam  | 29/11/13 |
| Add to the Agenda  | Adam  | 30/11/13 |