



British Universities Lifesaving Clubs' Association

Pre-AGM COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Date: 17/03/15

Time: 19:30

Location: Skype

Present : Adam Martin,
Andrew Bentley,
Edward McCutcheon,
Alex Blandford,
Oliver Coleman,
Emily Castle,
Scott Chamberlin-Wibbeke.
Rebecca Ewers

Agenda Item 1 – Review of Last Meeting's Minutes

Presenter: Adam Martin

Discussion	Adam asked people to email any corrections to Andy, so the minutes could be published as soon as possible.
------------	--

Conclusion	
------------	--

Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline
PA.1.1	Make changes to Meeting minutes.	Andrew Bentley	ASAP

Agenda Item 2 – Championships Review and Feedback

Presenter: Alex Blandford & Ed McCutcheon

Discussion	<p>Alex asked for feedback from the committee, so he could pass on to next champs co-ordinator He thought it went well overall, but hoped to get feedback from a range of view points</p> <p>Oli: Positives – being on poolside was a massive help to him, being able to get to the people he needed to. He wasn't interrupted by anyone through the weekend who didn't need to be there, which was really helpful in getting through things. Runners on Sunday were very good for the SERCs on Sunday. Negatives – No real negatives, but he would like to try something new; to borrow a friends plasma screen, put it on scaffolding and have it cycle through the scores. He wasn't sure if it was feasible through health and safety...</p> <p>Ed: Positives – thought the venue was great, would like to go back there again. He thought the price was reasonable. Marshalling was a bit of a hassle, but that was due to layout of the pool, but it still</p>
------------	--



worked.

Ewers: Enjoyed competing in the pool

Emily: Liked location, really enjoyed it.

Scott: Agreed with Oli. Felt the runners worked fantastically.

Alex summed up that it appeared everyone enjoyed the venue, and well briefed helpers were to key a successful competition. He encouraged everyone to come up with improvements, saying he was sure it hadn't been perfect.

Adam said he thought accommodation was at capacity, even with only three teams. Next year those back up houses still need to be available. However Adam said he thought it had been a really positive experience.

Finances:

Ed stated that the championships finished at £322 with grant, so without the grant it made a loss of £2.30. This could come out of the carry-forward, so essentially we have about a £130 surplus, plus the grant left over. He asked whether BULSCA should we keep grant?

Alex thought BULSCA should keep the money to ensure championships is held in Avon and North Wiltshire branch next year.

Ed wondered if BULSCA should ask the branch that?

Alex doesn't think the committee care, although pointed out a Championships write up for local newspapers need doing. He received a lot of positive feedback from Club Chairs in the branch about the competition, and he felt the branch were content with what they had received for their money.

Oli thinks it should stay within champs' budget, just not in the general BULSCA budget.

Alex thinks it should be used to ensure it happens within the branch. Adam thinks it most likely will anyway, thinks it should stay in champs' budget, and if it happens outside the branch the committee may give them a discount for entry. Ed & oli don't think that is needed.

Ed moved onto a breakdown of attendance from clubs, and predictions for next year. He said though Birmingham entered really well and should continue to enter at least 16 people next year, he's not sure about Bristol and London, Plymouth only brought 14 (said they would bring 20), St Andrews disbanded, Swansea and Warwick should stay about the same, and though there were no international teams this year some might come next year (Ewers commented that she was hopeful for Brno-Mestro, and had contacted another club who was interested). In his opinion he shouldn't rely on Brum to enter individuals as well as squads next year.

Adam thinks we're shooting in dark when it comes to estimates.

Ed said the next committee should be confident it can happen next year - £320 grant, £130 carry over, plus £2000 in reserve. However he feels they should be warned that they may not be as lucky with entries as this year.



Conclusion	Committee agreed Championship was very successful Everyone feels we were a bit lucky this year, but could still be a problem for next year and so next committee should be wary.		
Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline
PA.2.1	Write a report about Champs for Avon and North Wiltshire Branch	Andrew	21/03/2015

Agenda Item 3 – Proposal A : AGM/GM Minutes Summary			
Proposer: Mark McCorquodale Secunder: -			
Discussion	Adam asked if anyone has an issue with seven day summary? No – one Thoughts on 6 weeks? Alex thinks should be shorter, Andy pointed out that if matters arise a 6 week limit will not make the minutes happen any faster. Adam said there is no penalty if they aren't release on time.		
Committee Recommendation:	Accept without discussion.		
Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline

Agenda Item 4 – Proposal B: Renaming Bristol University to Bristol Universities			
Proposer: Alexander Blandford Secunder: Catherine Baldwin			
Discussion	Committee moved to vote		
Committee Recommendation:	Accept without Discussion		
Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline



Agenda Item 5 – Proposal C: Committee Officer Eligibility

Proposer: Oliver Coleman

Seconder: Adam Martin

Discussion	<p>Adam was casually browsing the constitution and discovered that one member of the committee should not have been elected this year, since they did not study at a member institution. He thinks this should be the case for chair, but felt that there was no need for this in other committee positions.</p> <p>Alex : Clarification – chair must be eligible to compete in the last 12 months? Alex – yes.</p> <p>Oli asked whether the committee preferred the second or first wording? Adam & ewer think second is simplest.</p> <p>Oli – first one allows members of BULSCA but who have not competed/joined institution (i.e. judged) to be an officer.</p> <p>Oli put forward new wording that was in line with the rest of the document: “...who has paid the appropriate Union or Athletic Union subscription.” Which was accepted by Adam.</p> <p>The second wording was accepted by the committee.</p> <p>Committee voted.</p>
------------	--

Committee Recommendation:	Accept without Discussion
---------------------------	---------------------------

Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline
PA.5.1	Update wording of proposal	Andy	20/03/15

Agenda Item 6 – ‘Proposal D’: Consistent substitution of a live actor for a CPR manikin

Proposer: Andrew Bentley

Seconder: -

Discussion	<p>Adam talked to Judges panel who has agreed to tiny rewording of the rule – adding in “adequate” before “breathing checks”. Since this was only a wording change it need not go to the AGM so the proposal was removed.</p> <p>Adam also stressed that casualties must be briefed properly to ensure no mistakes are made. He would be sending out a point of information to judges and clubs regarding this issue.</p> <p>Oli said if the rule stated adequate, judges must only be watching one casualty, and have a stopwatch. Ed hoped that he hoped must judges had a stopwatch anyway if they were judging CPR, and Alex said that should be in SERC guidelines.</p>
------------	--



	Adam said he would raise the issue with Judges Panel.		
Committee Recommendation:	Scrap proposal, replace with a wording change. Send out rule interpretation & ensure judges/casualties are briefed properly.		
Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline
PA.6.1	Raise timing/stopwatch issue with judges panel	Adam	28/03/2015
PA.6.2	Remove Proposal D from Agenda	Andrew	20/03/2015

Agenda Item 7 – Proposal D: Allowing prescription goggles to be worn in a SERC	
Presenter: Michael Kirkham	
Secunder	
Discussion	<p>Adam said he had talked to the Judges Panel who was against the proposal since it is not in line with RLSS, and wearing goggles in pool is a distinct advantage. He had also spoken to Elouiswho had said that in a pool that banned glasses from any part of the pool, the competitor would be allowed to wear on poolside but not in pool.</p> <p>Oli asked whether everyone would be allowed to wear goggles or just those who require it. Adam said it would be at discretion of head referee, whom competitors must approach at the beginning of he competition.</p> <p>Oli said that meant competitors could just claim bad eyesight, how where the Head Referees to judge? He also pointed out the proposal did not include what rules should change to enforce this.</p> <p>Relevant Rules from comparable organisations:</p> <p>Nationals rules 3.2 ii) In Initiatives/SERC competitors may wear corrective eyewear such as glasses/spectacles and contact lens. Loss of such eyewear shall not be grounds for protest. Corrective goggles or masks are not permitted.</p> <p>National Club SERC rules 1.1: vi) Competitors may wear corrective eyewear if the pool risk assessment allows. Loss of such eyewear shall not be grounds for protest or appeal. Neither goggles nor masks are permitted</p> <p>ILS rules section 6.1 j) No other personal be longings or equipment are permitted in the c ompetition arena (e.g., watches, phones or any other communication device, goggles, masks, fins). Competitors may be required to remove jewellery which might cause harm to the rescuer or victim</p>
Committee	Reject without Discussion



Recommendation:			
Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline

Agenda Item 8 – Competition Applications			
Presenter: Adam			
Discussion	<p>Oli said Loughborough are putting one in, but we are currently waiting on Plymouth. Alex and Oli pointed out most of the competitions were being held in the first term.</p> <p>Adam said he is intending to email London, Nottingham and Bristol saying it is easier to cancel a comp then not run one, and encourage them to put forward a proposition.</p> <p>Alex wondered if the recommended limit for team entry price could be raised to £40. Oli stated that would need to happen in January. Adam said he might mention the committee would be happy to accept a higher cost if it made the competition viable.</p> <p>The committee then discussed the two Fresher competition applications, deciding on what questions each club should be asked.</p>		
Conclusion	Actions carried forward to next meeting		
Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline
PA.8.1	Email clubs encouraging them to put in a competition proposal.	Adam	22/03/2015

Agenda Item 9 – Discussion of proposal submitted concerning Club recruitment which was subsequently withdrawn			
Presenter: Andrew Bentley			
Discussion	<p>A proposal had been submitted that looked to allow clubs to recruit from a wider area by removing the need for a competitor to be a student of that institution. This had been withdrawn in favour of an agenda item at the AGM to discuss club recruitment in general. Adam also reminded the committee of a rule in constitution stating universities can get written permission from chair to allow competitors from another university to compete for them. This would be in effect from receiving the written permission, but would then be presented yearly at AGM for review. He hoped this would encourage</p> <p>Oli said if clubs were to go round that route BULSCA should make them aware about insurance and funding from their athletics union, and how this might void such agreements or competitors from</p>		



	other universities might not be covered.		
Conclusion	Committee should clubs aware of current constitution, but warn them of possible consequences.		
Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline

AOB Item 10 – Late proposal from Ben Witz (proposal E)			
Presenter: Adam			
Discussion	<p>Adam thought it was a well thought out proposal, and agreed with the idea. Alex wondered why students in general couldn't get records? Oli pointed out this had been decided in 2009, that it was BULSCA records being recorded. Ed pointed out that 'University record' was the term being used.</p> <p>Adam said BULSCA was set up by a group of clubs, and therefore policy tends to reflect those clubs.</p> <p>Ed said the discussion came down to BULSCA records, or student records. He said it was politically more advantageous to run student records, since no one else in UK will do them.</p> <p>Oli maintained that wording at moment is for BULSCA records</p> <p>Adam also said student opens us up to GCSE students etc.</p> <p>Andy suggested BULSCA should record both student/university and a 'BULSCA Championships' record, stating most competitions he had been to had records for that specific competition. This idea was generally liked by the committee. However there was still some discussion about BULSCA should run a student records or a university records or not bother.</p> <p>Oli was strongly against running students records were they could compete for anyone, saying people should be encouraged to compete for their university. BULSCA should be encouraging University of competition.</p> <p>There was also some discussion over whether this change would be retrospective. Oli thought it would be too much hassle. Alex said it would merely be the competitors' prerogative to show they had competed at a recognised competition while being a student, the committee itself did not need to trawl back through records.</p> <p>Adam said it was obvious that the committee in general agreed with the proposal. However some of the committee wished to expand the proposal further, and ultimately it would be the clubs that would decide so should be delayed until then. At some point in the conversation he also made the comment "these are people who want to swim fast, I don't understand".</p>		
Conclusion	No recommendation		
Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline



PA:10:1	Take back committee ideas to Ben Witz.	Adam	27/03/2015
---------	--	------	------------

Next Meeting			
Presenter: Adam			
Discussion	See you AGM		
Conclusion			
Action Point	Action Description	Person Responsible	Deadline

Addendum
The committee undertook a discussion of Judges Panel Applications, however due to the personal nature of these discussions the minutes are classified. Please Contact Adam Martin or Andrew Bentley for more information.