



British Universities Lifesaving Clubs' Association

Meeting 9

Date: 21/04/2017

Time: 19.00

Location: Skype

Present: Hannah Smallwood, Emily Goodwin, Luke Peel, Rob Forster

Apologies: Jamie Shone, India Pollard Harry Withers

Agenda Item 1: Proposal 1 – Tied League

Presenter: Hannah

Discussion	The committee members present agreed that the proposal should be put to an online vote which should be accepted without debate.
------------	---

Committee recommendation	Accept without debate
--------------------------	-----------------------

Agenda Item 2: Proposal 2 - Appointing of Head Referee's

Presenter: Hannah

Discussion	Emily said that the individual would still be judging anyway. Luke pointed out that the head referee is the only person who can give DQ's. Luke asked whether there were any other rules where club affiliations are mentioned – committee could only think of SERC setters. All agreed that we could not see how stopping someone affiliated to the host competition from being head referee would make a difference as they can still be head referee at another competition and not be transparent and open. If the head referee has a different affiliation they could still show bias towards a team. Luke said that he felt that it was an issue that should have been dealt with at the time. The committee could see why this proposal had been submitted but felt that ultimately this was not a proposal.
------------	--

Committee recommendation	Reject without debate
--------------------------	-----------------------

Agenda Item 3: Proposal 3 - Allocation of judges to SERCs

Presenter: Hannah

Discussion	Emily first said that she felt it was more club affiliation that was important rather than the branch a judge was from. Luke said that he felt that the rule could be worded differently, for example, to state that the decision is at the discretion of the BULSCA committee rather than the chair alone which was agreed by the rest of the committee.
------------	---



	It was also pointed out that the point regarding the affiliation of judges after they leave a university may be a separate issue and is not directly related to this proposal. A separate proposal could be made regarding club affiliation after leaving the club. The committee was happy with the proposal as a whole but felt there were some changes that should be made.
Committee recommendation	Accept with debate

Agenda Item 4: Proposal 4 - SERC Casualty Recommendations	
Presenter: Hannah	
Discussion	Luke said that the CPR and phone just are more objective and impartial than the other judges', however the overall is more tricky but does not require knowledge of first aid. Hannah said that if an individual wanted to be a judge of casualties they would have to go on both the judges and Survive and Save instructor courses which would cost them almost £100 which could put people off. It was also said that less people might want to do the judges course if they can only judge these three areas. The committee considered whether holding a Survive and Save might be enough to qualify to judge all casualties. The committee agreed that although the aim of this proposal was good the proposal might not be the best solution.
Committee recommendation	Reject with debate

Agenda Item 5: Proposal 5 - Simplify Casualty Specifications	
Presenter: Hannah	
Discussion	The committee said that very few casualties would change in practice and that most clubs teach survive and save anyway so the proposal seemed reasonable.
Committee recommendation	Accept without debate



Agenda Item 6: Proposal 6 - League Competition Medals	
Presenter: Hannah	
Discussion	All present at the meeting agreed that it was a good idea to acknowledge the A and B league results at comps. Hannah suggested that the proposal could be amended so that the host clubs could decide whether to award certificates or medals. This was in case the cost of medals would result in a financial loss for the club. All agreed this sounded reasonable.
Committee recommendation	Accept with debate

Agenda Item 7: Other items for the AGM	
Presenter: Hannah	
Discussion	<p>Hannah said that Nottingham are the only club who have put a bid in for freshers comp. She also said that three clubs want to host their competition in November. Currently only one application for committee has been received. Emily said she would post on Facebook to try and get more interest in the roles.</p> <p>Hannah then went through the actions that had been made since the GM. The SportsSys has been purchased and used very successfully at BULSCA National Championships. Champs rules were updated and used at the BULSCA national Championships. Rob pointed out that although Champs made a loss it was because we invested heavily in the successful running of the comp and aimed to keep costs down for participants. Travel allowance was updated; Rob confirmed that it has not been used yet. The finance policy needs updating but will be uploaded for the AGM. Hannah said that clubs had been reminded that when they present their bid they can also prove that they have evidence to show that a provisional booking of the pool can be brought to the competition to support the bid.</p>
Conclusion	



Agenda Item 5: AOB	
Presenter:	
Discussion	Emily said that 10 people have signed up to do the judges course after Loughborough competition. The committee also agreed we should try and make sure the discussion at the AGM does not go off track due to the short amount of time we have.
Conclusion	