

British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association

Minutes of 2014 Mid-Season
General Meeting







British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Minutes of 2014 Mid-Season General Meeting

In Attendance

BULSCA Committee

Chair: Adam Martin

Secretary: Andrew Bentley

Treasurer: Edward McCutcheon

Club Development: Rebecca Ewers

Data Officer: Oliver Coleman

Championships Co-Ordinator: Alexander Blandford

Welfare Officer – Rachael Chambers

Clubs

Loughborough University LC

Southampton University Lifesaving Club – Iona Doig and Robert Anderson

University of London Union –Jo O'Connor

University of Nottingham –Catherine Owles

Bristol University – Catherine Baldwin and Elle Mortensson

University of Sheffield – Helen Morris and Michael Kirkham

University of Warwick –Jamie Roberts & Samantha Bench

University of Birmingham – Rachel Chambers & Tania Pearson

Additionally

Nile Swimmers - Dom Robertson & Dan Graham

1. Welcome and Apologies

Adam (chair) welcomes everyone to the meeting.
Apologies were received from Nicola Keenan.

2. BULSCA Officer reports

2.1 Adam (chair)

Adam said he wished to talk about a matter on the agenda, namely the election of a new Social Media Officer. He said everyone on the committee cared about the success of BULSCA as an organisation, and therefore he deeply respected Nicola's decision that she did not have the time to commit to her role, and had therefore stood down. He said he hoped she would stay involved in BULSCA and had valued her input in the build up to this meeting.



2.2 Ed (Treasurer)

Ed stated that the main thing to report was the move of BULSCA Championships from Bath University's 50m pool to Hengrove, which had necessitated a re-budgeting, a grant application to Avon and North Wiltshire to cover the additional costs of the new venue, and getting permission from the Club Captains to use BULSCA's funds to support the Championships in the case of poor attendance.

He also said he had been involved in organising a Judges Course and was currently organising BULSCA conference, which if anyone wished to know more about they could come and ask him.

Finally he said BULSCA had brought a significant number of Polo Shirts, many of which had been sold.

2.4 Alex (Championship Co-ordinator)

Alex assured people he had been working hard organising BULSCA Championships, and confirmed it would be hosted at Hengrove pool in Bristol – a modern facility with ten lanes.

He reminded them that the entry deadline was the coming Thursday, and promised to release the price as quickly as possible after then, after which clubs would have 4 weeks to pay.

Finally he said he wanted to thank Avon and North Wiltshire Branch, who had awarded them a grant of £325 toward the Championships, and in return the committee had committed to running some sessions with local clubs and he encouraged wider members of BULSCA to help out if they wanted.

2.5 Oli (Data Officer)

Oli said he had provided data support to two competitions, Yorkshire Grand Prix and Crawley Open, and had been invited back to both next year.

Other than that the new scoring system had run smoothly so far and had not broken, yet.

3. Proposal A – Weighting of Extra Speed Events

Adam explains that the proposer Chris Harper, pointed out past comps could not be appealed due to time limit even though technically they could have been run wrong. He said the Committee agreed the rules needed tidying up, but there was some discussion that clubs should be able to set their own weightings for an event (i.e. triple weight SERCS in Brum comp).

Oli said clubs should run a competition how they want to, as competitions have very different events sometimes. He said while the league should be strongly dictated, he wondered if BULSCA should be dictating how competitions are organised and run? He believed allowing clubs to set their own weightings could help make competitions unique.

Sam OC asked for a clarification about whether the proposal was about the league or the individual competition. Adam clarified that the league is already defined, but the current wording means that any additional events in a competition should be weighted zero.



Adam said he disagrees with Oli, clubs could abuse having any weighting (i.e. 12 weighting in swim and tow), and triple weighted SERC could make it easy to lose comp due to one mistake.

Alex asked if club decided to do an extra SERC, under current proposal would it be single weighted? Adam clarified that the SERCs would be weighted 2, speeds automatically weighted 1 to comp and could not be changed.

Rachael proposed an amendment – *to change the wording of the proposal to “additional events could be weighted 1 or 0”*

Oli added amendment to amendment – *to change wording to “additional events could be weighted 2, 1 or 0”*

In Chris’s absence it was assumed the amendments were rejected.

Vote on Oli’s amendment:

2 For,

6 Against

Amendment was rejected

Vote on Rachael’s amendment:

7 For

1 Abstain

Amendment was accepted

Cathy asked whether clubs would have to stipulate the weighting of each event in?

Adam said that would have to be an amendment

Cathy added amendment – *Competition Organisers have to advertise weighting of extra events 28 days before competition (same time frame as announcement of league event). Failure to do so would result in a fine.*

Vote on amendment

8 For

Amendment accepted.

Adam move to vote, Andy seconded

Vote on Proposal:

8 For

Proposal accepted

4. Proposal B – Mandating Fresher’s Speed Event

Sam OC said there was a short, hard run up to Fresher’s Competition hard. He said it was easier to teach them obstacle relay, and more fun for fresher’s. He asked why make lives harder, and potentially the first competition of the year more un-fun for new lifesavers?

Adam stated that the committee recommended rejecting the proposal. He said the Judges Panel had replied saying no competition should have the extra speed event mandated, they said manikin event was now easier due to the new rules, and the speed event was advertised well in advance of comp. They suggested advertising it in the Freshers’ Competition proposal.



Oli wondered if it truly was easier to teach? A lot of people who join lifesaving may not want to swim under obstacle – holding a manikin above water may be harder, but more accessible to weaker swimmers.

Alex said both Bristol Freshers found manikin easier than obs. He also said equipment needed was a factor – bobs are easy to get, but you need complete set of gates to run obs, so is limiting the clubs that can run a fresher's competition.

Jamie asked if any team got disqualified at Warwick competition that year?

Adam said only 1 (Bristol A), but everyone finished the race, and the disqualification was based on an illegible team not the ability to follow the rules of the event.

Rachael stated that she felt manikin carry took longer to teach than obstacles.

Sam OC responded to the opponents saying he didn't say they preferred it, but it was easier to teach. Also his point was not how long before the comp it was advertised, but how long they had to teach the Freshers running up to the competition. He also said many freshers may not get disqualified but could get a time penalty: this could be just as disappointing to them. He said with the current declining membership, why not try to make comps a more positive experience, especially for freshers.

Mike said having trained a whole club there wasn't that much difference from swim tow to manikin carry, but obstacle took slightly more teaching. Also he pointed out they didn't have any gates, so it was a lot harder to train. But in Sam's defence, he didn't have any members who couldn't do gates, but did have people who couldn't do manikin carry.

Adam said he thinks carrying a manikin is fundamental to Lifesaving, and doesn't know when you would see it at comps, if it wasn't run at freshers'.

Bobby submitted proposal saying - *"clubs vote for Fresher's Competition Extra Speed Event for the next season at the AGM"*

Rachael said this could cause difficulties with a club being mandated to run an event if you went for freshers' comp.

Chris phoned in to the meeting, he believed it was pointless, but accepted it on the grounds if it makes everyone happy. Amendment accepted.

Alex also said it still want against the ethos of the committee that clubs should be able to choose their extra event.

Samantha asked if you could withdraw the proposal for freshers after knowing what event is being mandated?

Oli said yes, pointing out that if only one club put forward a bid for the competition they could effectively say 'vote for this event or we withdraw'.

No more discussion, vote on amended proposal
1 for, 0 abstain, 7 against.

5. Proposal C - Simulating Burn Treatments



Bobby said at Southampton comp there was a burn treatment, it took time to reapply make-up and clean up, adding time to competition. His suggestion is to simulate treatment by using burn dressing in its packaging.

Adam stated that the committee recommendation was to accept with discussion. They agreed with the principle, but not the timing of implementation. The proposal mandates writing it into the Competition Manual by January 30th, but next one won't be published until next season. Adam said they could publish a supplement for the current rules. He also read out the Judges Panel opinion: They believed the items in a first aid kit should be able to be reused. If simulation is best way go, that should be accepted but wondered if there was another route that demonstrated the competitor fully understand the correct treatment.

Cathy asked whether burn dressings are in S&S?

Oli said no, but SERCs draw from all RLSS publications. The first aid kit was drawn up from HSE guidelines. Although Adam pointed out that they have removed scissors and eyewash.

Sam proposed amendment – *burn dressings can removed from packaging but replaced back in and reused at another competition.*

Adam made a point of information saying that Warwick once removed one and it went “skanky” and unusable.

Bobby rejected. There was no discussion on the amendment

Vote on amendment:

0 for

1 Abstain

7 Against

Amendment rejected

Alex proposed amendment - *remove burn dressing from first aid kit.*

Bobby reject saying he thinks they are useful in real life situation, so should be encouraged in competitions.

Ed made a Point of Information that eyewash was not in HSE first aid kit, only in travel first aid kit. He also said he believed burn dressing were useful in real life and behaved very differently from other bandages, so should be practised/simulated as close to reality as possible.

Alex said burn dressings are not in S&S, and the rules state that treatments outside of S&S can't be expected.

Oli countered saying that was only for spinal.

Andy said he believed burn dressing allowed further differentiation of lifesaving skill.

Sam proposed a move to vote, Rachael seconded:

Vote on amendment:

8 against

Amendment Rejected

Ed said competitors shouldn't be allowed to declare a bandage as burn dressing as that increase your amount of burn dressings. also burn dressings behave different from other bandages

Sam proposed amendment - *replace burn dressing with piece of card*

Ed Point of Information - card is hard, burn dressing is flexible.

Bobby didn't understand why this was needed.



Adam agreed asking why this was necessary
Sam said it would show they knew how to open burn dressing
Oli said that was not what the Judges Panel were looking for.
Bobby rejected amendment.

Alex proposed move to vote on amendment, Adam seconded.

Vote on Amendment:

1 For,

7 Against

Amendment rejected

Alex proposed move to vote, Andy seconded:

Adam clarified that this was to vote on the original proposal with no amendments; i.e. application of a burn dressing could be simulated by using the burn dressing in its packaging/sachet.

Vote on Proposal

7 For

1 against

Proposal Accepted

6. Proposal D -Judges Scoresheets

Bobby said during Southampton competition, the organisers regularly had to recheck with judges what the number was, slowing down the competition. He said making judges circle a number rather than write it would help with this issue

Adam stated an amendment from the committee had been accepted by bobby. Amendment was that the proposal would be an update to SERC Setters Guidelines. Also mark sheets should have a box to allow judges to make notes in. With these amendments the Committee supports this proposal.

Adam then read the Judges Panel opinion. They do not wish to overcrowd sheet, and felt score sheets should be kept consistent with higher up organisations. They feel the judges should be asked to write more clearly, and this would help the issue.

Oli said from a judges perspective he doesn't like it because it is a bit more work and working space is needed. But as a scorer, and for data integrity, going back to judges can be 50 minutes after the SERC, and sometimes they can't remember. He said it happens not just in BULSA but in RLSS nationals, and sometimes sounds as if they just make up a number and are not 100% sure of the answer, so data integrity starts to fall apart. He doesn't believe it would overcrowd sheet, and just because a higher up organisation does it, does not mean it is better - a number of people in other organisations also feel that it is an issue that needs sorting.

Adam said Dave Brown liked the idea, but often changes mind, so would not want to be committed to the first number he put down. However with new amendment this is no longer an issue, with room to make notes. Adam suggested giving it a go at nottingham comp, and seeing if it works.

Andy volunteered to create a template for Nottingham Competition

No more discussion:



Vote on Proposal:
8 For
Proposal Accepted

7. Proposal E - Circulating SERC briefings before event starts

Sam OC said he was aware it is poor proposal and gave an advantage to earlier teams. His issue is teams are expected to take in lots of information in short amount of time. Giving teams the briefs as early as possible, allows them to perform as best a possible as lifesavers.

Adam said the committee recommended rejected the proposal for various reasons. It was unclear how long before should give it out, with multiple times being quoted in the proposal. It wasn't in line with what RLSS currently do. The only bit that caught their eye was rescue 2014 circulating the brief before the event started - but that was due to multiple languages present. He said the Judges Panel was unsure of what it was aiming to do, saying the brief was only a paragraph or two in length, and the amount of time needed to read the brief is discussed. Very few points are needed to be remembered: other parts of it are just to help problem solving (i.e. it's a cold day).

Alex made a Point of information, saying that for the SERC he wrote for Southampton, the panel did not discuss amount of time for reading the brief with him.

Jo said you often know a lot of stuff in real life, that we are expected to be told and remember in a few seconds. Like we generally know what the weather is like or where you are.

Jamie, said if you forget brief you can often ask casualty for the location.
Samantha said she believed a SERC was also a test of how you react to a situation, not just first aid.

Sam OC responded saying Birmingham has people from different languages, and he felt the Judges Panel was not clear: was brief important or isn't it? If it isn't why not give it out in advance? He said we all know where we are right now and what the weather is like, but if you're pretending you're outside and it's a cold day, you're relying on remembering it from the brief.

Oli stated that in 5 years of lifesaving he never went out of bounds, and believed it was very obvious. If a club could provide an Ed Psych report for competitor, with a specific educational need, who has having difficulty reading we could provide longer reading times. But if you are going to a British University they should have a standard of english that is suitable for a SERC. He also said he believes bringing a dictionary to help translate the brief would be allowed.

Rachael said second guessing a SERC could cause some teams to do better or worse than they should.

Cathy said at Bristol most teams read the wet brief in 20 seconds, and spent rest of the minute talking. She felt the were enough time being given to read the briefs.

Sam OC congratulated Oli for not going out of bounds, asking him if he wanted a medal? He said people have done it. He said second guessing a SERC should never be attempted, and the proposal was not trying to encourage it.



Adam said this proposal and discussion certainly suggested he should go back Judges Panel and say briefs/out of bounds need to be clearer. He said he felt a 3 page brief like Southampton is not needed.

Jamie asked template for Serc Briefs could be created. But Oli felt it was too prescribing

Rachael proposed a move to a vote, Samantha seconded.

Vote on moving to a vote on proposal:
8 For

Vote on Proposal
1 For
7 Against
Proposal Rejected

8. Proposal F – Renaming of University of Sheffield

Accepted by Online Voting.

9. Proposal G – Limiting Size of First Aid Kits

Adam said he had seen a couple of SERCs where the first aid kit could not fit in a bag. He did not have an issue with full size first aid kit, but felt a travel sized one should be able to fit inside a bag with other stuff. He said he had been generous with the size, and would be enforced by making a box the kit must fit into, similar to hand luggage. He said it was not coming into effect until next season.

Helen asked what if you find out you can't use your kit on the day?

Adam said he will make sure to bring some boxes along to competitions this year to allow clubs to prepare, and they could use a carrier bag on the day.

Vote on Proposal:
7 For
1 Against
Proposal Accepted

10. Proposal H – Demonstration of Live Communication Devices

Kyle said he feels it is unfair for captains to be penalised for failing to use a communication device they have never seen before. He said it has happened numerous times in the last season. He thinks it should be shown to captains so if they do find the communication device it can be properly used.

Adam said the committee discussion unanimously disliked this proposal, as it defeated idea of emergency situation – you could come across an unknown communication device in real life. He said the Judges Panel felt similarly, they said the devices are generally simple to use, often with pictorial instructions. They said competitors should look at device more carefully, although they



admit they often do not know what actual device will be since it is supplied by the competition's organizers so may not be seen by Judges or Serc setter until on the day. Adam noted the last complicated device was a phone with a pre dialled number - this was shown to competitors before the SERC, and then given to them before they entered.

Oli made a point of information saying radio communications devices are in NPLQ, NBLQ and Rookie Lifeguard, and Sercs can pull from all literature.

Bobby pointed out a radio was demonstrated to competitors at burm comp last year.

Alex said the proposal mandates it be held at captains briefing, but nowhere in the rules does it mandate a captain must make the emergency call.

Jo said although we try to make it like real life, we only have 2 minutes, and working out how to use that could use up a large portion of that time, in real life would have more time to work out how to use a radio.

Emily said she has judged a number of radio calls in SERCs, most teams have time to get at least two casualties down the radio before end of SERC.

Kyle said in the heat of the moment, and under a lot of pressure, you may not think to look for way to use it, or waste time during a SERC. He said he realises its simulating real life, but need to retain competitive integrity and ensure best team wins, making one mistake on phone call, or it not working, can often cost a team the competition.

Adam said that if you think it is easier to operate an unknown device when someone is in a real danger then it is in a SERC then you are wrong.

Andy said he disagrees that the proposal is the way to solve this issue, but points out that making one mistake can make a team lose 60+ points, and could disproportionately hurt them.

Oli pointed out that a team could lose 60 points by going to the wrong priority. He also gave examples of new equipment that could be in a SERC (STA Torpedo Buoy) that wouldn't be demonstrated to you.

Adam said the phone call is worth enough marks to spend time in the SERC working out how to use it.

Vote on Proposal

1 For

7 Against

Proposal Rejected

11. Proposal I – Disqualification of Competitors performing Abdominal Thrusts

Alex said Abdominal Thrusts are not allowed to be performed on live casualties, but that happened during Southampton, however it would appear there is no stated consequence of breaking this rule. As such he has put forward this proposal but added in an amendment that says entire team is disqualified from SERC (after consulting with Judges Panel); this is the same



severe penalty as for doing CPR on live person. He said such a severe penalty due to how severe the act is – as it can cause massive bodily harm.

Rachael said she was poorly lifted out during Warwick Competition, why does that not have the same punishment?

Oli said the severity of injury is lower, normally, from a bad lift out.

Ed made a Point of Information saying judges will stop 1 man lift outs.

Samantha asked about fresher who have only gone to 1 training session, and may not have been told. They have no intention to harm, and the punishment seems very harsh..

Alex replied saying that is exactly what they are trying to prevent. Teaching your freshers not to do abdominal thrusts. or cpr on live person is the most important thing you should be telling them before they do a SERC.

Oli pointed out that when you submit a team you are saying those competitors can follow the rules laid out. A number of people diving this year have not been up to standard, and those team managers should have made sure they were able to/have a paper trail to prove they are up to standard.

Adam said you should never get to abdominal thrusts in a serc anyway if they have been trained properly.

Emily –also said you should not teach abdominal thrusts without saying never do this on a live person unless they are actually choking.

Vote on Proposal

8 For

Proposal Accepted

12. Proposal J (late entry) – Mandating Fresher's Speed Event

Rachael said this was Chris's original proposal to allow more discussion on his original idea.

Andy said saying all freshers at Warwick could cope with manikin was positive bias, since freshers who could not compete would probably not turn up.

Alex said the same bias could be said for obstacle relay.

Bobby proposed amendment - *Freshers Bids have to announce which event you want to run.*
Rachael accepted.

Jamie asked what would happens if no bid is voted for at the AGM?

Adam said there would be no 'freshers' competition, and you go straight to the main competitions.

Ed pointed out this allows a club with the only fresher bid to force an event anyway.

Vote on Proposal:

6 For,

1 Abstain

1 Against

Proposal Accepted



13. Proposal K (late entry) - Move BULSCA Membership to Avon and North Wiltshire branch

Ed said BULSCA is currently a member of Wessex Branch, however due to Avon and North Wiltshire's support in helping BULSCA run the Student National Championships He believes it would be suitable to move the BULSCA membership to Avon and North Wiltshire.

Cathy said as Chair of Avon and North Wiltshire she believes it is a good idea and would be supported by the Branch Committee.

Vote for Proposal:

For 8

Proposal Accepted

14. Election of Social Media Officer

Emily Castle nominated herself.

Emily believes she can increase traffic to the BULSCA Facebook, Twitter and Instagram pages. There is a programme she uses that can set up scheduled tweets. She wants to take more videos and photos at competitions.

Cathy asked if BULSCA could get snap chat.

Oli and Emily said that was unfortunately not possible.

Emily also said she wanted to get more competition reports on the website, with input from all the clubs.

Vote on Candidate

8 For Emily

Emily appointed as Social Media Officer

15. Nile Swimmers update report

Chocolate was provided by the Nile Swimmer Representatives.

DAN:

Couple of things they've been up to; 3 weeks ago we went out to Uganda with Lifeguards without Borders and ISLA, worked for a week with a number of Ugandan Organisations to help them work out how solve the issue of drowning together. Getting on the ground is invaluable as it allows us to see what sort of facilities are available etc. Lifeguards without Borders are looking to recruit people to go on projects to Peru and other countries, mostly Beach Lifeguards, if anyone is interested.

RLSS Commonwealth - 4/5th November – are doing some youth specific events around that time. Got some funding for that, UK wants to send some people. Might clash with European Resuscitation Council. Focussed on Youth Leadership, if you're interested, talk to Becky Sindall.



Alex: What big projects do you have coming up before May?

DAN:

We've got a partially funded trip to Sudan to teach locals to become CPR trainers. A group of guys are going over to teach some locals how to teach CPR and beach lifeguard.

We've Put in a number of large bids to fund the programmes:

50% is already funded- £15,000; Male participants only. Looking for funding for other 50% to allow female staff to do the same.

Application for £300,000 put in to allow project to run for 3 years.

16. Close of Meeting

Adam closed meeting, saying the AGM would most likely be held on the morning of Loughborough Competition.