

# British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association

Mid-Season General Meeting  
Minutes 2013





## British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association Mid-Season General Meeting Minutes 2013

### In Attendance

Chris Harper: BULSCA Chair  
Adam Martin: BULSCA Secretary  
Edward McCutcheon: BULSCA Treasurer  
Oliver Coleman: BULSCA Webmaster  
Alexander Blandford: BULSCA Championships Co-Ordinator  
Steve Tedds: BULSCA Judges Panel

Bristol: Catherine Baldwin & Alice Charteris  
Birmingham: Rebecca Park & Sam O'Connor  
Loughborough: Andy Gladders  
London: Joe Travers-Jones and Ellen Moore  
Nottingham: Mark McCorqudale & Irena Hůlová  
Oxbridge:  
Southampton: Hannah Robinson & Ed Wallis  
St Andrews: Hannah Callaghan

RLSS Representative: Lee Heard

### Meeting Called to Order at 10:04

Chris (Chair) asks if anybody has a problem with Adam (Secretary) recording the meeting. Mark (Nottingham) asks if he can raise an objection to see how Adam does. Chris says he could do, but that would make Adam work harder and that's not nice. All okay.

Chris asks if everyone has seen the contract we are about to make them sign? Ed raises that Southampton doesn't have to do this as they've already paid. Clubs are invited to come and collect their voting cards and sign contracts.

## 1. Welcome & Apologies

Chris welcomes everyone to the meeting. He then explains the meeting procedures to all in the meeting.

Apologies: Nicola Keenan – BULSCA Club Development Officer

## 2. Officer's Reports

**Chair:** We've done stuff and we've sent out a document with action points of all the things we've done. Asks if anyone would like me detail? Only Scott (Warwick) wishes for more. Chris says he will talk to him outside the meeting.



**Secretary:** If anybody wants to know what I've been up to read the meeting minutes or the RLSS magazine articles. Again Scott (Warwick) wishes for more information. Adam will discuss with Scott outside of the meeting.

**Treasurer:** Apologies for the contractual faff due to moving bank accounts. Aside from the website stuff he's been helping Oli with, has been organising a BULSCA conference with external speakers on things like sports nutrition and how to coach a club. Emails invites have gone out to potential speakers and more details will be sent out if we get any.

Mark asks if Ed expects the conference to be free? Ed says to be confirmed but Birmingham aren't charging for the room, and we aren't intending to pay for speakers. Though we may need to cover travel expenses for speaks and you may need to pay for your own lunch. In summary pretty cheap.

**Web Officer:** As you know we are moving website. Online entry is currently down because we are migrating. We've hit a slight hiccup as there is a part of our website that we don't own and the person who is doing it for us isn't very technical minded. She's a former BULSCA chair who is trying to resolve the issue. The website will move and look very much the same then at some point it will look slightly different. We've made a different coating for it and you'll see that when it happens. You'll log on one day and it will have changed. We may or may not tell you when the change occurs, it'll just happen.

Oli also adds the spreadsheet has changed and now uses pretty colours if anyone wants some training on how to use the pretty colours to inform your training come and see Oli after the meeting.

**Club Development Officer:** Chris explains that Nicola isn't here as she is now living in France. She will continue to serve as club development officer as she basically never has to be anywhere. Expect for maybe this meeting. Essentially she's not going to step down but obviously cannot present a report as she is not here. She's been doing stuff, it's all in the action points document mentioned earlier.

**Champs Co-Ordinator:** Champs is progressing well, we now have quite a lot of stuff booked. He's still struggling to get in contact with the RNLI. Has emailed Rory and Barry and neither have replied. Facebooked Rory and he hasn't got back. Hannah (Southampton) says she is on a group with him so can get in contact. Oli (Webmaster) suggested contacting Rory's personal email account. Alex says if Oli can let him know the personal address he will do that. Chris raises this conversation can happen outside this meeting.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Send Rory's Personal Email Address to Alex (Champs Co-Ordinator)	Oliver Coleman (BULSCA Webmaster)	ASAP

**Action: Oli (Webmaster) to send Alex (Champs Co-Ordinator) Rory's personal email address**

Champs entry forms are going online imminently. Just a couple of key changes, main one is that helpers rules have changes. If you enter Saturday you are required to bring one helper for the



day and one timekeeper per event (Timekeeper must be available for both Men & Womens version of that event. Can be a competitor or an extra. On Sunday per 4 man team you must bring 1 helper. Couple of other minor changes but that is the big one. Irena (Nottingham) asks if the rule applies to the Czech team. Alex says it does but if there are any problems get in touch and he'll see what he can do.

Oli makes a reminder that we he says entry will close around 6pm on RLSS speeds day he means the point at which he gets back from speeds it will just close. If they aren't in by the time he gets home they won't be in.

### 3. Approval of the EGM Minutes

Proposed by Oli, Seconded by Bristol

For: 8

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The minutes are approved.

### 4. Matters arising from the EGM Minutes

Chris says there shouldn't be any. We agreed some things. As you've heard the website is progressing nicely. The manikin carry rules have been enforced already and will continue to be enforced. That's what happened are they any questions? Non raised.

### 5. Matters Arising from the AGM Minutes

Adam explains there are none aside as all action points have been completed aside from the one where Ella was going to hold a skype meeting prior to the AGM and it's never going to be done. There's a document on the website which everyone has probably seen will all the action points from that meeting as well as the status of them. If you've any questions refer to that document and if you still have questions email us.

Mark raises that he has the inflatable to give to Adam. Adam says that was technically actioned to Nicola. Mark points out she is in France. Adam accepts that this is a problem. Alex asks where it is at the moment? Mark says in Nottingham but he is coming back to Warwick shortly if Adam is around. Adam says he isn't. Both agree to discuss it outside the meeting.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Discuss with Mark what to do about the BULSCA inflatable	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	ASAP



## 6. Proposals

### Proposal A: New Scoring System

Chris states the committee recommendation that it's accept without discussion but suspects there will be some discussion. Asks Oli to introduce it. Oli asks does anyone want to discuss it. Some people do. Oli says to sum up the new system is designed to compare results so where teams are very close together they get almost the same points and differences are then look it. It's better than saying a 10 second gap is equivalent to a 0.5 second gap, which is how it's currently done. The basis for how it is looked at comes from studying several multi discipline events, the decathlon, heptathlon and modern pentathlon amongst other events run but other organisations. For example there is a fitness challenge in the United States and various other events that look at comparative scoring. He's happy to take any questions.

Mark (Nottingham) basically in FAQs section it says this is producing a similar result to current competitions. If it is doing that then why do we need it when it is less accessible and more complicated? Oli emphasises that its similar, not identical. The reason it is better is that it is a fairer comparison of teams. For example rope throw has an overbearing influence on the results. If you get four in currently you have a big opportunity to pull yourself up in the league. He also disagrees it is less accessible as it tells you where you came in each event and the number of points scored. As an every day competitor its easy to know 1000 is top place and 100 is last and the rest is proportional. Does agree the method that generates the number is complicated but what people have to work with is very understandable and will make a better, fairer competition.

Catherine (Bristol) asks in the SERCs you get 1000 points but in the speeds its done to the best ever speed? Oli anticipates the question and says the score you are given is comparative to the student record so you can see how well you did. However when we calculate the competition result it is stretched in a linear fashion to keep the comparative percentages the same. So every event in between 1000 and 100, the student records comparison is just so you can see how you did.

Chris asks if there are any further questions. None raised so we move to a vote:

For: 8

Against: 1

Abstentions; 0

Motion Passes

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Continue to monitor the new scoring process to ensure its output is accurate.	Oliver Coleman (BULSCA Webmaster)	Dec 2013 – July 2014
Implement sections for non students.	Oliver Coleman (BULSCA Webmaster)	August 2014



Write section and amend for the 2014/15 competition manual	BULSCA Secretary in Association with the BULSCA Webmaster	August 2014
--	---	-------------

### **Paper B: Re-Allocation of the Web Officer's Role**

Chris says this is a proposal designed to reduce the amount of work the web officer has to do. Does anyone wish to discuss it? Nobody wishes to. Move straight to vote.

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion Carried

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Amend the Constitution with the new role	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	January 2014

### **Paper C: Updating the Swim Tow Rules**

Chris explains the proposal was withdrawn and a new proposal placed in.

### **Paper D: Accelerating the Release of Competition Results**

Chris explains that the proposal is essentially a double proposal where it offers two options. The committee's recommendation is split as Accept with discussion for 7 days and reject with discussion on 48 hours. We will take two votes but we will discuss the proposal as a whole.

Adam explains that this proposal comes around because at the moment the two week time frame to release your competition results generally means that there is potential for competition results to come out after the next competition. The time scales offer very little opportunity to train as according to the results you got at the last competition and improve your areas of weakness. He sat back and looked at this and offered the two options because at the end of the day it's the clubs who have to do these sheets and get them in in time and so his preference, against the committee's recommendation was instead of stripping the 14 days back down to 7 actually what we would do would be to accept the provisional results in the first 48 hours which would allow some analysis, admittedly not the maximum you'd be allowed to do with the SERC diagrams and everything else but would allow for some so you could at least influence your training.

The alternative is if you don't think that is useful enough then option 2 just to cut from 14 days down to 7, which on an average league year where competitions occur every two weeks then you'd get about a week with those results.



Oli raises a point of information: Because quite often it is a non specialist or a non lifesaver filling out the sheet he quite often gets sheets that do not have casualty categories clearly marked. If clubs think results are useful in that state fair enough.

Adam says his understanding was that the review process wasn't just to fill out the headers but to review the complete results and that is the bulk of the work required by the checking process. Actually to type though those results takes 10 – 15mins and Adam raises he did it the night before Warwick competition and it took about half an hour because he was typing out club names as well. Chris points out you aren't supposed to write it out the night before.

Mark (Nottingham) says doesn't this boil down to the discussion of previous years. Is it fair to enforce a really tight time limit on competition organisers when they've already been busy organising everything for the last couple of weeks. Is it really appropriate to force them to spend the next week checking the results. Especially when they are probably behind on their work already.

Scott (Warwick) raises that he'd say it only takes a couple of hours to check the results, especially if there is one of you reading stuff out while the other types. He doesn't see any reason why 7 days isn't workable.

Catherine (Bristol) Raises that they've all been out within a week this year. Do we need the rule when its already being done and coming out quickly. If people are working hard anyway do we need the rule.

Adam responds to Catherine by says if lots of clubs are making the effort is it fair on those clubs if one or two clubs aren't doing so. This way everyone is making an equal amount of effort. In response to Marks point Adam says when he did this for Warwick in January he couldn't understand why on earth competition results came out so slowly. It took him an hour and a half to review the whole sheet, he sent them to Oli and it just went up. He can't understand why something that doesn't take long isn't happening quickly.

Alex (Champs Co-Ordinator) says he completely understands both sides. If we want to make it shorter, which he kind of agrees with, he thinks its fairer to give people some point over a weekend to do it. Therefore he proposes an amendment.

**Proposed Amendment to 7 days option: The finalised spread sheet must be sent within 8 days of the end of the competition.**

**Proposer: Alexander Blandford (Champs Co-Ordinator)**

Alex explains his logic being that gives the organiser until the end of the following Sunday.

Adam accepts the amendment

Discussion resumes of the now amended proposal.

Samantha (Warwick) says the bit about results coming out in a week is great but if that's after you training slot then they are no use. Therefore it would still be beneficial for us to have access to provisional results.

Mark (Nottingham) raises it's all well and good that competition results only take a short amount of time to review but results have come out in previous years that still have errors. Do you want to rush people when you could have something more accurate?



Adam makes the point that the competition manual doesn't mandate that all the work has to be done by one individual it says the competition management committee. So while there tends to be one person who is in charge if clubs pin everything on them then they are all horrible people and there tends to be a support network in place. If a member of that support network or competition management committee as they are referred to in the manual then that is equally as good. Thinks there are work arounds for it to be achievable in that time frame.

Oliver (Webmaster) says as a point of note there is nothing in the rules that says they have to be published. There just have to be sent to the committee and as a point of pride they are published within 24 hours of hitting Oli's inbox. If Ofsted hit Oli's school we'd all be waiting four days and whoever takes over might not have the same drive. You may also want to mandate a timeframe for them to be published in. Chris states this isn't directly related to the proposal and is a separate issue.

Hannah (St Andrews) In their club the point of you have lots of people who can help out isn't necessarily true. They have a handful of people all in their final years with dissertations. They do like to be quick but don't have the some resources. Adam raises that they were quickest last year, he'd not even got home and the results were out.

Andy (Loughborough) thinks we skipped over the 48 hours thing. Can we keep it at 14 days and just send out provisional results. Oli says it's about the detail you get.

**Amendment to 48 Hours option: If it's to be published within 48 hours then that will include title headers for the SERCs.**

**Proposer: Mark McCorqudale (Nottingham)**

Scott (Warwick) asks Oli if its possible to add a button to the spreadsheet which automatically zips it up and sends it to Oli. Oli raises it would require knowledge of individual university's set ups.

Tim (Warwick) Doesn't understand with the errors that are happening why are spreadsheets set up and sent to competitions.

Oli says that when spread sheet is titled manikin and the other is titled medley and then you type your results into medley and Oli has sent it with a weighting factor the manikin it all goes a bit wrong. London will find for this comp all the tabs expect the ones for the events they are running are hidden. So they are set up.

Alex (Champs Co-Ordinator) point of information: at the moment the SERC information is not released until isolation closes to anyone including the scorer. Steve says that doesn't stop scorers entering the information while waiting

Rebecca (Birmingham) raisies that 48 hours is a bit tight and if you want dodgy results then okay go for it but if you can't get upset if they change. Also this term you've had a lot of people hassling people for results, which is unfair on competition organisers. So maybe 14 days is too long. So 8 days is perhaps more reasonable.

Irena (Nottingham) raises how dodgy can the results be if they've already been announced. So for training purposes it is sufficient.



Ed (Treasurer) with regards to the headings there is time while the SERCs are being set up to type in the headers. Its raised by a couple of others that is already in the scoring guide and is when this should be done.

Helen says that in this case where you have London the week after Southampton you need the results in that time in order to look at them.

Chris asks does anyone have anything new?

Oli makes a pont of information there is a guide on how to fill out the heading.

Hannah raises with Southampton they had a shortage of helpers so the scorers weren't sat down waiting for the competition to start. Therefore it wasn't possible to type out headers.

No further points from clubs. Chris asks Adam if he has anything to round off with. Adam says he still prefers the 48 hours option. Says that changes to the provisional results tend to be single mark boxes on the SERCs or two boxes change. Alternatively non counting teams haven't been marked which only affects competition placings. The reason Adam wants this to happen is so that SERC marks can be seen. They are things that clubs have no idea about without results.

Alex asks if the clubs can accept both with the way we voting? Chris says yes they can. Adam says he wouldn't advise both.

**Vote for 48 hours including headers**

For: 6  
 Against: 3  
 Abstentions: 0

Motion Carries

**Vote on 8 days**

For: 7  
 Against 2  
 Abstentions: 0

Motion Carries

**Adam proposes that the recent rule change comes in straight away.**

Chris asks if anyone wishes to discuss. None do. We move straight to a vote.

For: 7  
 Against: 1  
 Abstentions: 1

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Amend the 2013/14 rules with the new timelines	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	January 2014



## **Paper E: Online Voting**

Chris says this has been online for a while, hopefully you've all read it and if you haven't he'll put his angry voice on.

Adam says as you're all aware we called a 4 minute EGM to discuss two proposals. Now there were a couple of issues with this meeting, The traffic situation meant that not all clubs could attend and actually we voting through only just on quorum of 5 voting clubs in the absence of clubs who were on their way. It also negatively impacted on clubs who were not attending that competition as because they already weren't sending anyone already they didn't send anyone for the sake of a 4 minute meeting. Especially St Andrews whom would have had to pay a fortune in travel.

Also at the moment if something comes in to us as a committee and we have to make a decision in two or three days because of a deadline we have no way of consulting clubs. We have to make an undemocratic decision based on our views, which is influenced by the fact his panel consists of 3 Warwick affiliates.

The idea was to bring in something that would allow us to call a vote on proposals mid season without the need to call an EGM. Adam wants to make it clear the idea of the proposal it to accept our limitation as an organisation that we have two general meetings a year which last about 3 hours. Often we can waste time discussing proposals where we go round in circles and everyone already agrees. The purpose is to allow us to call an online vote and to give us another option. There are a couple of different options depending on the proposal.

Chris says the committee recommendation on this one is to accept with discussion.

### **Ammendment:**

**1.2.6 The results should be tallied and the proposal moved to a general meeting if the following is recorded**

**1.2.6.1 One or more clubs are recorded as voting to postpone to the earliest General Meeting for further discssuion**

**1.2.6.2 Three or more clubs disagree with the majority**

**2.3.1 Voting on urgent proposals will occur as per sections 1.2.5 to 1.2.7 with the exclusion of 1.2.6.1**

**Proposer: Mark (Nottingham)**

**Adam accepts the amendment.**

Discussion resumes on the now amended proposal.

\_\_\_ Oxbridge states from their point of view they can barely make meetings as it is so this proposal is really useful.

Alex (Champs) Asks in terms of technicalities the idea of this is to get a quick decision what if you can't get a response. Chris says it's in the proposal. Adam says that in the same way the meeting has a quorum of five so does an online vote. Also in a normal vote the vote has to be



open for a certain period of time. Alex says his point was that in an AGM the proposals have to be put up within a certain number of days. Chris says its in the proposal.

Oli (Webmaster) raises that since 2008 when we had accept without discussion vote that theres only bee about 4 proposals that have actually gone through without discussion across all of those general meetings. Chris raises that there were 2 at the EGM. Mark (Nottingham) makes a point of information that there were at least 4 proposals that went through without discussion at the Loughborough AGM this year.

Chris asks if anyone else has anything to discuss? No one does. Chris asks Alex if having read it he has anything to add. Alex doesn't but still doesn't like the proposal.

Moved to a vote:

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion Carries

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Add Online Voting Procedures v1.0 as a standing document	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	January 2014
Amend the Constitution & General Meeting Procedures to Reflect the Presence of the Document Online Voting Procedures	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	January 2014
Creation of the Online Voting System	Oliver Coleman (BULSCA Webmaster)	April 2014
Trial using online voting prior to a General Meeting at the AGM with results approved by the meeting.	BULSCA Secretary & Webmaster	May 2014
Implement the policy in full	BULSCA Secretary	June 2014

Chris briefly adjourns the meeting for a break at 11:00

Meeting called back to order at 11:10

## Paper F: Composite Teams

Chris explains that this proposal is for where clubs would like to submit teams made up from multiple clubs. Arranged for instance by Andy Bentley at Birmingham and say London and



Nottingham also wish to go. They want to enter a team a BULSCA A but our current rules don't let them do that. Instead they have to enter as a strange name. This is unnecessary and messy.

Whenever this has been discussed in the past two issues come out. One that we want the best people representing BULSCA and two what if they do bad stuff. To which his answer is he's written them into the proposal.

He thinks representing BULSCA at big competitions then fine we want out best team. But at things like the Czech grand prix and the rescue cup in Germany potentially the Crawley open if it weren't today having a strongest swimmers doesn't necessarily matter. What he'd like more so is the good will we get from people as a result of competing and it gets our name out there. He thinks we gain a huge amount from this. Chris doesn't think we have reputational harm if we don't do well. He thinks there are competitions where that is relevant and he's written them into the proposal because if we send a bad team to world championships then that reflects badly on us.

Second thing is what is people are bad. That's always a risk with any of our competitors and it's never something that's bothered Chris. First we have a disciplinary that deals with that. Second he doesn't think that organisation is made up of people like that but if they do we can deal with it. What we lost is the benefit when people go out and do good things. Even if someone goes out and says a swear word in front of kids at 1 out of 20 competitions what we loose is in fact the 19 times where it does our reputation good.

The committee decided that there wasn't a consensus on this one so it's in as Debate with no Recommendation. Some of the committee were all right with the fixes in the proposal. Some where not.

Chris asks for questions.

Mark (Nottingham) asks do we have concerns where competitors literally have no idea at all about what they are doing.

Chris says he trusts that our training officers won't send teams to competitions without giving them some help. If it was a concern, i.e. a team of fresher's were being sent, then the committee has the power to reserve a competition to prevent it. He doesn't think it's enough of an issue.

Oli says that with something like the Czech Grand Prix you are only ever going to get someone of a reasonable standard entering because of the costs associated with it. Mark disagrees with this. Oli says that if you had a team enter in this country then the team could be rubbish. Chris says the committee doesn't necessarily endorse the term rubbish to refer to our competitors.

Adam raises that he thinks if your going to pay a significant amount of money to go to a competition, even if you are not at the right standard when you apply, by the time you get to the competition he'd expect you to be of a reasonable standard.

Scott (Warwick) asks does a BULSCA A team going out and doing badly affect us as an organisation?

Sam (Birmingham) says not as much damage as not getting behind people. He says at speeds before he was at uni a team was entered that were representing BULSCA but under a name that was essentially a swear word. Sam wasn't at university at this point but was well aware that they



were university lifesavers. That did far more damage than the BULSCA name being out there and that team doing well.

Steve (BJP) says he hasn't read it but previously it's not been put through because where competitions only allowed on team they couldn't decide how to deal with team selection. So if you can only enter one BULSCA team who decides which people get to go.

Chris says the proposal doesn't set out a mechanism for team selection. It does put limits on a competition organiser choosing from one club. Steve asks how do you do it then? Chris says he'd trust to organiser and the disciplinary policy and equality policy can be used if there is a complaint.

Steve (BJP) asks if two organisers want to go and only one BULSCA team can be entered then who gets to go? Chris says he is not in the proposal, his answer would be that it would either be given to the club development officer to organise or we'd reserve the competition.

Mark (Nottingham) basically says you could end up with lots of disciplinary procedures per year because of this. Is this something the committee wants to deal with?

Joe (London) says that this isn't something that's going to happen regularly. Doesn't think inexperienced people are going to want to go. The other issue of who gets to go that's an external competition. Especially a big one.

**Amendment: If team selection would be required by the numbers that apply then the competition becomes reserved.**

**Proposer: Oliver Coleman (Webmaster)**

**Chris rejects the amendment because if 9 people apply and then there are 8 spaces the competition becomes reserved. He doesn't think that's fair.**

**No further discussion is requested on the amendment. Vote called**

For: 0

Against: 3

Abstentions: 6

Discussion continues as no consensus has been reached

Irena says she this proposal doesn't have to be used, teams can still just go as themselves or composites of themselves without using the BULSCA name, Chris says that is correct there's nothing in the proposal that restricts that.

Tim (Warwick) asks what does a reserved competition mean selection is done centrally? Chris says currently it would just mean you can't use the BULSCA name as we don't yet have a procedure for doing team selection as BULSCA it's something that could be done.

Adam thinks the current situation is utter madness. If we had an alternative proposal whereby this going to a competition abroad was organised centrally by BULSCA then there wouldn't be a need for this proposal. We don't have the facility to do that then why are we not supporting our members. In the case Sam spoke of you've got a club that are very clearly BULSCA affiliates going to a competition which translates as a BULSCA team dedicated enough to organise and



go to a competition themselves are getting BULSCA support. I think its silly and makes us look bad as an organisation.

Adam also thinks that this point of if we don't submit the best team we possibly can it looks bad and its makes us look elitist . It's us saying the only people who can compete in lifesaving are those that are good at the sport. Nobody else has the right to compete. One point raised at our committee meeting was that the RLSS wouldn't send a poor quality team to a competition to which my response was that if the RLSS only had 4 people sign up for a competition the RLSS would take those 4 people regardless of their standard under their name. As long as selection if done fairly there's no reason for this not to go through unless somebody wants to write an 8 pages document where the Club Development Officer organises people going to away competitions At the moment this isn't really possible with the size of the organisation as we'd have to organise centralised trials and we just don't have the resources to do that.

Oli has a point of information: The team that Sam was referring to could not have entered as BULSCA regardless because BULSCA was not a member of the RLSS.

Alex starts to question insurance, Chris interprets stating its in the proposal.

Chris realises that the amendment has not yet been dealt with. Another vote is called:

For: 0  
 Against: 8  
 Abstentions: 1

Mark (Nottingham) says this is all very well and good but there is still no way of guaranteeing a fair team selection process.

Scott (Warwick) Raises that without this proposal this can still happen, just not under BULSCA's name.

Hannah (St Andrews) Thinks this is a very negative view, and that we can all just trust each other.

Sam (Birmingham) Says we have meetings twice a year, if this starts to get out of hand we can just reverse it.

Or Adam raises that you can call an urgent online vote.

Chris asks if there are any other questions? None so move to a vote:

For: 9  
 Against: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

Motion Carries

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Finalise Composite Teams Document	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	January 2014



Publish Composite Teams Document	Oliver Coleman (BULSCA Webmaster)	January 2014
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------

Miles raised that there is a rule regarding if you can enter an ILS competition having been affiliated with someone else. They are looking into it and will get back to us.

## **Paper G – Officiating Pathway**

Chris says this one came out very late as we were going to bring it forward at Loughborough but due to a request it was brought forward.

Chris says this is a proposal motivated by the fact whereby there is an unofficial policy of new Judges has to shadow at competitions before they go off on their own. However this is not written down anywhere. It's applied as best as people keen but invariably has not been applied consistently as it's not written down anywhere. It came to an AGM in 2009 and was rejected because the restrictions were too tight. The proposal that Chris has written gives people seniority relatively quickly. He has put it together as an absolute minimum. It means that you can be a senior judge after a certain number of competitions. Not necessarily that you should.

Ed makes a point of information, overall Judge refers to the person who Judges captancy. The head referee is the person who gives disqualifications and oversees the whole competition.

Mark (Nottingham) raises that had this been strictly enforced Nottingham last year would not have run due to not having enough experienced Judges. Chris says the proposal deals with this. Alex makes a point of information that in a case where Judges are acting in a higher category they are usually given things like "phone judge" as it's very objective. Chris says the proposal also states this. The Judge allowed to do this would still have to do their shadowing at a separate competition.

Sam (Birmingham) raises does this not instantly raise that Judges mark's into disrepute. Chris says he had this question already. His answer was less so than cancelling the competition. Sam says he just thinks that is very dangerous.

Adam says he things at the moment without the proposal Sam could raise it anyway. Sam agrees with this but when its put on paper it gives more grounds for appeal. Alex says if there was a Judge doing this it would be the most objective thing they judges. They certainly wouldn't be allowed to do overall Judge for example.

Ed says that if Sam was sufficiently worried by this, we'd know by the start of the competition and be able to inform you at captains briefing that was happened. Teams could then agree to compete under that standing.

Steve (BJP) says that you can appeal against a mark but you can appeal under the legitimacy of the Judge. Steve says under what rule?

Sam raises can clubs be informed prior to the competition so they are informed when judges have been bumped. Steve says in a situation where this happens and the choice is to compete or not what would Sam do. Sam says he'd compete no question, just things people need to be informed.



Alex says that if it isn't in the rules potentially there should be a rule saying that all officials at a BULSCA competition should be a minimum of a BULSCA Judge on that list. The proposal implies that through saying that shadow judges can judge that gives the minimum standard.

Hannah (Southampton) asks if she did the course and judged at RLSS but not BULSCA. Chris explains how the proposal deals with this.

**Amendment: Add rule 7.2.1 Competitors must be informed prior to the start of events if an official is going to act as an official of a higher category.**

**Proposer: Adam (Secretary)**

**Chris accepts the amendment**

Discussion resumes on the amended proposal.

Mark (Nottingham) Asks how it is going to be checked that officials have the right category. Chris explains that officials let the Secretary know who can check it. In addition shadowing must be signed off by an email to the secretary.

Ed adds that he thinks its easier for competition management committees that a lot get an email from a Judge and they accept them with no validation that the Judge has even done a Judges course. They just hope to recognise the name.

Alex says in the rules we expect all judges to hold Life Support 3. Chris says this has changed now. The document says Life Support 3 or have demonstrated their skills to the satisfaction of the serving BULSCA committee. Alex asks if they need to know that why don't they need to know survive and save. Chris says because not all of our Judges have access to pools. It something that can be discussed later but for the time being its Life Support 3.

Adam says on this note increasingly we are seeing that increasing we are seeing people coming onto the Judges course have a survive and save qualification as it is much more accessible that the previous TA course. On the course we are running 8 out of 9 have indicated that they already hold or are going to hold Survive and Save Instructor by the end of the year. Where as previously a lot less have held TA.

Mark (Nottingham) Carrying on from Alex's point what happens when a very senior judge disappears for two years, comes back and no-one remembers him. How will the committee know they are suitably experienced. Chris says he wanted to mandate Life Support 3 but it was pointed out that was Judges incurring extra expenses. Essentially they'd have to do an LS3 assessment but would not have to pay to do the award.

Alex asks who will run the assessment? Chris says someone in BULSCA.

Oli comes back to Adam's point believes that clubs are generating S & S instructors because finals years are still Lifesaving TAs and therefore are Instructor Tutors. Within one or two years clubs will be made up of instructors. Chris says RLSS are working on how to train Instructor Tutors. At the moment when the tutors graduate they won't be able to make instructors.

Adam counters by asking clubs how many have run internal instructor tutor courses. Only Warwick indicate that they have.



Irena asks why this proposal is being rushed through, can't we wait for the AGM. She thinks that no one has properly read it. Chris says it's was supposed to have be done but it wasn't. Therefore we were going to wait until Loughborough. However the BJP asked it to be brought forward for a different reason entirely.

Chris asks if Steve wishes to add anything. Steve states he can't remember why he asked for it to be brought forward. Adam says it was as a result of his comment regarding the swim tow rule being judged inconsistently and Steve saying that was an error inside the shadowing process.

Alex says that anyone doing the Judges course tomorrow it's currently informal and we don't have a formal process.

Scott (Warwick) Proposes moving to a vote

For: 8

Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

Move to a vote

For: 8

Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

Motion Carries

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Formalise the Officiating Pathway Document	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	January 2014
Publish the Officiating Pathway Document	Oliver Coleman (BULSCA Webmaster)	January 2014
Create the database with existing Judges being categorised	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	January 2014

## Paper H – Swim Tow Rules

Chris says this has been a topic of discussion for essentially half the season and therefore Adam has written a proposal to deal with it.

Adam says that those who have spoken to him about it will know he is fed up to high heaven with this rule. Across his 4 years in university lifesaving in his first year was applied how the RLSS apply it then it was brought up for review at Warwick Comp 2011 when 8 or 9 time penalties we awarded for incorrect towing stroke. At which point a clarification went out from Miles that said the leg kick was irrelevant to towing stroke and therefore these time penalties stopped until it was reviewed again at Warwick where a load of warnings where handed out.



Then the head Judge of Bristol sent the rule to BJP for review. They came back with an interpretation of the rule which is in the proposal. The key thing was that time penalties should only be awarded if the Judge deems a competitive advantage has been gained.

Since that interpretation we've had two competitions, Bristol and Southampton of which both head Judges are here today. Adam thinks the head Judge of Bristol will attest that he handed out quite a lot of warnings where as the head Judge of Southampton will probably attest that he gave very little time penalties. Therefore this rule has already not been applied consistently despite the clarification. To sum up the wording of this rule has barely changed over the last couple of years but has been applied differently.

Adam thinks the main issue is what Judges deem a competitive advantage. For him the main one is that it is a competitive advantage to do sidestroke arm with breast stroke legs. Adam thinks this is ridiculous, he thinks that is an inefficient stroke and actually slows you down. Where as if you are doing the proper stroke you will be more efficient which is essential to any swimming and therefore you'll go quicker. So we do not need to penalise people who are already penalising themselves.

This alongside the fact the RLSS does not interpret the rule the way we do Adam has basically written a rule which he believes is in the spirit of the RLSS interpretation is but doesn't copy their wording as their wording is very similar to our own current rule and doesn't reflect their interpretation.

**Amendment: To adopt the interpretation of the rule but only make the rule change at the end of the season.**

**Proposer Oliver Coleman (Webmaster)**

Oli explains the logic that we have standardised our rules to rather than versions competitive years to make life easier for Judges. Oli believes this addresses the issue without causing problems.

Sam (Birmingham) says that this is lovely but if we are doing it why not just put it in the book.

Steve (BJP) says the point of this is that Judges are coming to comps with the wrong manual and there are loads of versions out there and we don't know which one we are using. The idea was to make it consistency.

Adam accepts the amendment

Discussion on the amended proposal resumes

Hannah asks for clarification is asked for over how we will know what interpretation to work to? Chris says an email will go out explaining the interpretation to all clubs. The rule will then come in later.

Samantha (Warwick) asks how Judges will be informed? Chris replies via email, the head judge for today will be informed if it passes.

Adam says he will personally ensure that every head Judge is sent an email with this interpretation.



Mark (Nottingham) asks basically what we are saying is we will have an official interpretation that's not officially recorded in any documents. Mark asks how it will work. Chris says GM minutes and it is an agreed interpretation. Adam remarks that Mark could ask the question of the RLSS.

Steve (BJP) says that this is a more relaxed interpretation.

Alex says that his point has been dealt with but wants to ensure head Judges are informed prior to competitions. Adam assures him it will be.

Nothing further so vote called

For: 8

Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

Motion Carried

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Interpretation sent out to Clubs & Judges	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	January 2014
Rule change implemented for the 2014/15 season	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	August 2014
Email sent to the Head Referee of every competition with the new Interpretation	Adam Martin (BULSCA Secretary)	Feb 2014 – May 2014

## 7. A.O.B

Alex raises that it has come to light that the most recent edition of RLSS short course rules we can find is the 2009 rules. The committee groans but accepts it needs to be discussed. Alex says in that set of rules there is nothing to prevent you tumbling on leg 4 of medley. Though people have not done it for the last couple of years. Alex and the rest of the committee think this is dangerous and should not be allowed.

Chris says we are going to speak to the head Judge of London and ask if she agrees we should ban it as a safety issue. Then review it with the RLSS.

Mark (Nottingham) says we've been issuing disqualifications for this for the last couple of years. Chris remarks that it is lucky the appeal period has expired for those competitions.

Chris says we are going to get an RLSS clarification and if that is not forthcoming we will write a rule, which will go to online vote.



Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Clarification from the RLSS of their rule sought and feedback sent to clubs	Chris Harper (BULSCA Chair)	January 2014
If required a rule written and presented to clubs via an online vote	Chris Harper (BULSCA Chair) in association with other Committee Members	January 2014

### **8. Confirming the Date of the Next Meeting**

Chris says next meeting will be the morning of Loughborough providing they are still happy to host. They are.

**Meeting Closes at 12:00**