

British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association

GM Minutes (02/12/2017)





British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association

GM Minutes (02/12/2017)

Attendees with speaking rights:

BULSCA Committee: Michael Kirkham (MK), Jared Wray (JW), Stephanie Panagi (SP) and Josh Hale (JH)

Birmingham: Patrick Mackie and Harry Withers

Bristol: Alex Turner and Christopher Brown

London: Ulrike Drahne

Loughborough: Sam Kirkland and Emily Goodwin

Sheffield: Ellie Simms and Lucy Harris

Southampton: Arthur Thirion and Bob Entwistle

Warwick: Andrew Scoones and Michael Ducker

Others: India Pollard

1. Welcome and apology

Meeting commenced at 09:18.

MK: Apologies received from Helen Morris (BULSCA Championships Co-ordinator), Holly Willing (BULSCA Communications) and Luke Peel (BULSCA Data). No apologies from absent clubs received.

2. Approval of minutes from the previous meeting

MK: Thinks the minutes from the AGM are inaccurate. Believes the amendment for Proposal E of AGM is incorrect. Amendment should read "Fresher's competition medals and overall medals at the first competition of the year, and overall medals and B league medals or certificates at all other competitions."

Sheffield: Concern that Sheffield members have been incorrectly quoted in 2017 AGM minutes. No corrections proposed.

MK: If no corrections and it doesn't affect the end result then it isn't problematic.

All present agree with amendment correction and move to vote on corrected minutes:

Accept: 6 Reject: 0 Abstain: 0

Minutes accepted.

3. Matters arising

No matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.



4. BULSCA Officer reports:

Chair – Michael Kirkham

I'd like to welcome you to this year's mid-season GM. So far, the committee have been holding regular meetings to ensure the smooth running of BULSCA and discuss our plans for the future. Three clubs have run very successful competitions so far this year and we look forward to another one today. So far this year we've worked with the mailing system so ensure all clubs and members are updated as to what's going on in BULSCA, produced safeguarding guidelines based on the RLSS policy, started a review of the paperwork that governs BULSCA's activity, published a feedback survey followed by our response, and moved to a new website. We're working on organising championships, trying to get more funding, looking at connecting clubs with their local branch and improving and updating the website. I won't go into more detail as the other committee members have their reports to come. I'd like to end by thanking them for their hard work so far, making my job a relatively easy one.

Secretary – Jared Wray

Since taking on the role of BULSCA Secretary, I have undertaken to review all major documents and policies that we have in order to ensure they are current, make sense, follow the will of previous GM's, and do not conflict with each other. This is quite a large task which will be presented at the AGM. I have also got BULSCA back in the RLSS UK's Lifesavers Magazine through writing a double-page article on our activity over the past year, with the aim to help keep BULSCA prominent in the wider lifesaving community and to act as good publicity for as many clubs as I could. I will continue to submit articles for inclusion in RLSS UK publications into the future. I have also gone through the RLSS UK Safeguarding policy (released in the second half of this year) and created a guidance document on specifically how this can be applied to BULSCA competitions which will be released soon. And, of course, I have minuted all of our committee meetings!

Treasurer – Stephanie Panagi

Finances:

BULSCA is in a reasonably healthy financial position. We can pay our Champs deposit without being in any financial difficulty. 10 clubs have paid membership to BULSCA. However, our account holds £1000 less than it did this time last year. A summary of the accounts so far will be distributed separately and sent round via email.

Champs:

Champs 2017 was loss-making. Helen and I have already begun to discuss how we plan on reducing this deficit without passing the costs onto competitors. This will be done mainly through sponsorship and the hire of a cheaper venue. I also plan on releasing a full financial report after Champs to improve transparency and accountability in BULSCA.



Website:

We have invested a larger than normal some of money into the new website though in the long run, the costs for website hosting should be lower than previous years.

Fines:

BULSCA has agreed to take a firmer stance on fines, including fines imposed for the late release of results so please follow rules.

Sponsorship:

Due to the nature of my job, I have been unable to secure time to find general sponsorship. As a result, I will be taking a new approach to sponsorship. As of now, I will work with Helen to focus on sponsorships for Champs 2018 and will begin to seek sponsorship for the 2018/2019 year. I think getting a head start on next year makes more sense. Many large firms distribute sponsorship in June and July which is too soon after the handover period to create an adequate sponsorship pack. Furthermore, with our new website in progress, there may be an opportunity to gain sponsorship here too in the form of advertising.

Claims:

As a reminder, this year I shall not pay for any expenses until I have been provided with a claims form so please remember to have once completed.

Club Development – Josh Hale

Since being elected I have:

- Supported several committees through the summer handover
- In talks with Leeds Trinity Union about the creation of a new club
- Worked with Michael to produce the feedback questionnaire and report on findings and actions
- Wrote my first competition SERC
- Attended RLSS conference and qualified as a Lifesaving Instructor Tutor (Probationary)
- Attended RLSS Honours 2017
- Attended all BULSCA committee meetings

What I am currently working on:

- Trying to source a pool to host an instructor's course at (Any offers?)
- Drafting a procedure for recruitment and induction of new clubs
- Updating competition documents to ensure that all guides on how to run competitions and write SERCs are up to date and in an easy to read format.
- Working on reporting method so clubs can have feedback from judges at the end of competitions

What I'm working on next

- Scoping out the possibility of hosting training sessions for judges and SERC setters, online Boot Camp style so that everyone in BULSCA is targeted with development opportunities.
- Develop 2018 Boot Camp



- Plan feedback sessions with all clubs who want development support on the back of the feedback survey.

Data Manager – Luke Peel

Website: The new website has been launched and, according to the hit counters on each of the pages, it looks like you are all using it. Some of you have been asking for specific pages or information to be added to the site, which is fine – please keep letting me know what you think it needs! You can provide feedback or ask for features or content by visiting bulzca.co.uk/feedback

Competition Deadlines: A reminder to all that the deadlines for organising competitions and receiving the correct (fully-populated) documentation after the competition, are in the rules. We are watching deadlines closely and will be taking action where necessary. Please also note that delays may sometimes be inevitable on my part, due to my full-time job. Having said that, I do always try my best to publish on time, and respond to questions and requests in a timely manner.

Future Plans: There is still work to be done on the website, which will continue in the new year, including the Wiki site and other plans set out in my speech. I will send out communications as and when I have new information.

Thanks for everyone's cooperation so far, I look forward to the rest of the 2017-18 season.

Championship Co-ordinator – Helen Morris

The BULSCA Championships will be held at the University of Bath on 10th-11th March. The pool has been confirmed. The championships have previously been hosted at the University and it is likely that this seasons championships will follow a similar set up. The pool has been refurbished since BULSCA previously hosted Champs there. The reasoning behind Bath as the venue was twofold; availability and costs. Previously used venues, such as Swansea and Bristol, were unavailable this year.

Information regarding pricing and team entry will be released in December, with deadlines for this information in January. In order to maximise external/community entries it would be helpful if all clubs could follow the deadlines prescribed strictly. In addition, please can all clubs ensure that payments are made promptly this year, as some payments for Champ were not received until June last season.

I have approached businesses for sponsorship, but as of yet have had no success.

I am still actively seeking SERC setters for this event. If anyone is interested, please email championships@bulzca.co.uk. An email inviting officials to the event will be sent in December.

Looking ahead, I have emailed pools in order to make a provisional booking for the 2019 Championships, with the intention to have a date confirmed at the AGM.



5. Discussion of proposals:

Proposal A – Club Recruitment Officer:

JH: Has been part of BULSCA since 2009. Since then, BULSCA have lost more clubs than have been gained. One club has been gained compared to the three clubs lost, and we are declining rather than growing. The BULSCA committee wants to have someone supporting new clubs to form and grow over the first two years. The proposal is to introduce the new role of Club Recruitment Officer from next academic year for a trial period of 3 years. The duties of this officer are: facilitate the induction of new clubs into BULSCA; develop and maintain recruitment documents and procedures; actively seek to support the creation of new BULSCA clubs; and to support new clubs in their first two years. There are over 100 universities in the UK and we only have a very small number of them involved in university lifesaving. If we lose more clubs we risk having less than 10 clubs in BULSCA. This role would be introduced at the 2018 AGM and reviewed at the 2020 GM.

MK: Point of information - this proposal requires a two-thirds majority of any vote as it amends the constitution.

Loughborough: Raises concerns that more clubs in BULSCA means larger clubs will be able to enter fewer teams, and gaining spaces for teams currently at competitions is an issue.

JH: The running of competitions is down to individual clubs. Bookings are made based on expected numbers, and as more teams are expected clubs will book more pool time to accommodate. If reaching vast numbers in several years' time, the competitions could be regionalised however that is a long way off. Not expecting many new clubs to be recruited at once so only a few more teams would be at competitions.

India Pollard: To grow BULSCA we need more clubs, Birmingham and Loughborough bring more teams but we need to grow.

JH: Already gain community clubs. New clubs are more diverse competitions and there are more diverse ways of dealing with things, new clubs.

Bristol: Led to believe there were two development officers in the past, why was there a change?

MK: Point of information - Sport Development Officer was responsible for managing the competition manual and developing sport. Club Development Officer has been kept with mainly its previous roles. Sport Development Officer was removed as it was barely filled and we had other parts of BULSCA to fulfil the roles duties such as the BULSCA Judges Panel.

Sheffield: How many universities have approached BULSCA to join to warrant a whole new position being created?

JH: Contacted by two universities, although one university has contacted before. The role needs to be proactive rather than reactive, and we can have documents created by the role to help support new clubs into the future.

Sheffield: What questions do they need to ask?

JH: Questions they may ask are similar to those you would know from previous knowledge of how university lifesaving and running a club work which was passed on via handovers or



questions you ask the previous Chair. New clubs don't have anyone to talk to or ask these questions, no matter how small.

Sheffield: Would guidance documents be better?

JH: Part of role is developing documents to help . Not saying that an individual would know every answer to development problems but a member of the BULSCA committee would be better placed to ask others for help. It is better to ask questions face to face and have a personal touch.

Birmingham: What would the club development role lose due to the split?

JH: Recruitment not the primary focus of the Club Development Officer role, so would not consider it a split at all. There is lots to do in the role already without recruiting new clubs as well. Guidance documents do not have clear procedure for clubs joining and it would be good to have these developed properly.

Birmingham: Has a concern that every single one of the committee positions could be split due to the amount of work in each, but then you bloat the committee. Worried about splitting this role as where does it stop?

JH: It is down to number of people on the committee who we feel are relevant. If there is too much to do on a role then one person shouldn't have to struggle through a role. Skills are not as developed as they could be given everyone is generally at university or only recently graduated, but if people need help then help is needed. If there were any new roles after this then they would be voted through on a case by case basis, and there is also the idea of supporting roles who are not on the committee.

Moved to vote on Proposal A:

Accept: 5 Reject: 0 Abstain: 1

Proposal A is accepted.

Proposal B: Competition profits

SP: As an accountant coming from economist background, can see that BULSCA has inefficiencies in finances starting with competition profits. Happy for amendments to the proposal as this is mainly just a few of many options to make the competition profits system better. The £100 profit rule is a restrictive rule by not allowing clubs to make more than £100 profit. It is not being implemented anyway and is complicated to distribute if it was needed to be. Aiming to reduce costs makes savings to clubs just as high as returning the money. Currently the baseline is where competitors have to pay (the competition costs they actually pay to the host) £16.75 and host clubs aim to make a £100 profit. If they are able to reduce the charge per competitor then they should be able to gain further profit. There are many ways in which competition costs can be reduced, for instance by offering pasta salad to judges and helpers to reduce competition costs, and the focus isn't to necessarily reduce the larger costs which clubs have little control over such as pool hire costs.

MK: Clarifies that there are several options offered within the proposal, and this should be specified when discussing to make it clear which one is being focused on.

SP: Which teams rely on profits? Do people like to be restricted to £100?



MK: Votes will reveal the answers.

Sheffield: Option B allows for making more than £100 whilst still charging helpers. Not great option as even if it is helpers only being charged £3 they may still be charged transport which can lead to even larger costs for them giving up their time to help.

SP: Against people charging helpers.

JH: Proposed amendment as another option – “Option D: All profits in excess of £100 to go to BULSCA towards Championships.” Looking to avoid earning money from clubs which may be equally struggling based on how much their fixed costs may be. Anything above £100 to go to Championships budget.

SP: As proposer rejects the amendment as some teams will not benefit as much as others.

MK: As proposer rejects the amendment, a discussion and vote is required around amendment.

Warwick: Some clubs cannot redistribute money to teams, so this affects every proposal. Would have to lie about what it was which isn't recommended.

Birmingham: Big issue for teams in BULSCA is getting judges and helpers to attend. Likes proposal about making sure that there are reduced costs to helpers and judges. Highlights that costs for these can be pushed onto competitors as they will attend anyway and ultimately benefit and enjoy the competition.

Moved to vote on amendment to Proposal B:

Accept: 0 Reject: 6 Abstain: 0

Amendment is rejected.

Amendment received from Bristol:

“There's an average charge per competitor for a BULSCA competition which is £16.75, with this you can make £100 profit. This is the baseline that everyone can aim towards. If in your competition you manage to make savings so that your competition is cheaper per competitor you can make profit more than this baseline. This amount of profit is directly proportional to the amount of savings made per competitor. This is the charge per competitor which is less. For example, you can same £1 per competitor so that it is £15.75 per person. You can make £1 profit per competitor on top of your £100. If you have 20 competitors you can make £220 profit. Another example, if your costings are £14.75 per competitor you save £2 per competitor. If you have 100 competitors you can therefore make £300 profit. A third example, your costings are £15.25 per competitor so you save £1.50 per competitor. Where you have 150 competitors you can therefore make £325 profit. The formula is where charge = C, average charge = A (16.75) and number of competitors = N, the maximum amount of total profit = $100 + (A - C) \times N$. Don't charge bodies & judges for anything if you make a profit of over £100.”

SP: Accepts amendment and withdraws all other options. A baseline figure with a charge of £16.75 per competitor to work out how much profit clubs can make. Cost to competitor can be made through savings made, and if this is done before the competition (as most major costs are already known a few days before) then entry, social and food costs can be altered on the day of the competition so there is no need to redistribute profits.



Maximum profit = 100 + (16.75 - Cost per competitor) x Number of competitors

MK: Queries how the cost per competitor was calculated.

SP: It is the average of a quarter of the competition team entry fee, plus food plus social across last year. It is not quite exact as it could be more if hosts over the last year charged helpers or judges, or changed any costs on the day (such as food).

Sheffield: This encourages clubs in financial difficulty to run a competition as a way to make some money. It risks encouraging clubs to cut corners such as reduced pool hire in order to try and make a larger profit and could risk of making competitions worse.

SP: Clubs vote on competition dates the following year, so could give competitions which did this the last pick of competition date the next year. Looking at teams finding cheaper options for food and social which is an easy place to make changes where clubs may just be doing the same option they always have.

Bristol: As it currently stands here is no incentive to reduce costs to the rest of BULSCA. With this amended proposal if you are able to reduce costs overall then you are rewarded.

Sheffield: Not against profit limit increasing but shouldn't encourage reducing costs in areas where they cannot be.

Birmingham: This encourages clubs to cut corners so bodies, helpers and judges have a worse time rather than have a great time and come back. Would rather extra profits go towards a better experience for judges, helpers and bodies.

JH: Rejects the idea that voting on competitions would keep clubs in check, as clubs generally always give clubs another chance as it is a new committee even if there was a really bad experience the previous year. Reducing costs and sharing best practices that help reduce costs is beneficial for everyone as teams will still have to pay at other club's competitions.

Southampton: Looks to clarify whether the current £100 profit limit would be less if clubs couldn't charge less than £16.75 per competitor.

SP: £100 would be the minimum profit limit. Helpers and judges are important, cost is minimal for these as it is generally £50 for lunches and then evening food. Would look at trying to reduce major costs such as pool hire.

Birmingham: Bigger costs are harder to reduce and are often fixed. It is smaller costs that are easier to change and reduce such as lunches.

Bristol: Clarifies that amendment doesn't allow charging judges, helpers or bodies for anything if the host club is making over £100 profit.

"Amendment to amendment received: Profits exceeding £250 to be given to BULSCA."

"Maximum competition profit=£100 ≤ 100+(16.75-Cost per competitor)x100 ≤ £250, where cost per competitor is less than £16.75."

SP: As proposer accepts the amendment.



JH: As competition entry closes a week before, clubs can reduce the cost of the competition in the week up to the competition. Clubs shouldn't be getting close to the £100, it shouldn't be something to aim for.

Warwick: Queries whether the "cost per competitor" vale will change year on year.

SP: The "cost per competitor" will be reviewed year on year, and would look to use average of competition cost per competitor for the year to encourage cost reduction into the future.

MK: The current proposal doesn't state how it will be implemented and doesn't specify that the Treasurer will organise.

Southampton: The last cost to be taken are food and social. If you know how many teams will be there and you know what profits you are making, food and social can be cut to be within this target.

Birmingham: Food and social is the only thing that judges, helpers and bodies get out of competitions, so would be concerned about devaluing what is one of the few perks offered to judges, helpers and bodies.

JH: Proposed moving to a vote. Seconded by Warwick.

MK: Voting for the proposal from Bristol which has been amended several times. In summary:

"Maximum competition profit (£) = $100 \leq 100 + ((\alpha - \mu) \times \beta) \leq 250$, where α is the average competition entry cost per competitor (1/4 team entry fee + food + social) for the past competition year (reviewed and published by the BULSCA Treasurer), μ is the cost per competitor charged at an individual competition (1/4 team entry fee + food + social), and β is the number of competitors at the competition. Maximum profit is restricted to £100 unless judges, helpers and bodies receive free food and social at the competition."

Moved to vote on amended Proposal B:

Accept: 5 Reject: 2 Abstain: 0

Proposal B (amended) has been accepted.

Proposal C:

Warwick: Whenever you have a casualty in a SERC that changes state mid-way through, there is an ambiguity in SERCs. In Bristol Dry there was the potential to get a better mark for not giving an asthmatic casualty an inhaler and then putting them in the recovery position when they became unconscious after a minute. A similar situation could have occurred in Birmingham in 2014, to give another example, where you could treat a diabetic casualty by giving them a chocolate bar which caused anaphylaxis and then treating the anaphylaxis. The proposal is basically to bring the problem to people's attention. Suggests two treatment routes, with limits on each depending on treatment or having full marks for a state change if first treatment prevents that change in state. The appropriate treatment initially should get better marks than treating a casualty which deteriorates due to not treating the casualty correctly initially.

Sheffield: Point of information - workings out incorrect in proposal. It cannot be identified from the score sheet as to which teams allowed the asthmatic casualty to go unconscious.



JH: Judges don't see weighting before competition. Lots of new judges at the moment. As the SERC setter in question, if more experienced would know to be clear and the same with judges. If you look at the actual weighting, it benefited the people who treated asthmatic.

MK: Point of information - SERC setters can give guidelines (such as times to first compression). A more experienced SERC setter could consider capping marks on the sheet.

MK: Point of information – BULSCA Judges Panel response to proposal:

“We as a panel feel the proposal should be rejected. Whilst there has been created an artificial situation here there is no evidence of this happening in Bristol. The top scoring teams for Conscious treatment scored 10 from the judge on unconscious. This would be common application for many judges unless mark scheme offered a box to mark otherwise. Capping marks is restricting upon a judge as would not allow for the relative marking that SERC's require. This is not an assessment it is not a tick box exercise and skill can be shown to lessor or greater extent or exceeding expectation. Judges must have the professional freedom to explore this. It would be good and common practise for judges to ask the setter or serc lead how to make a box if it was unclear. We think extra lays of paperwork are not required. We are available to phone into the meeting to answer questions. In addition we raise in the Additional information Sheffield B as they quote does not match the mark sheets and the weighting are not correct.”

Sheffield: More of an issues with guidance rather than judges being given a rule.

Warwick: Wants a consistent judging experience across competitions rather than differences.

Bristol: Judges mark it the same way so it doesn't matter.

India Pollard: Doesn't feel it was marked the same.

JH: SERC setters cannot implement any further guidance on how to deal with the mark sheet after the SERCs have started. Happy to ensure it is clarified in the guidance existing guidance.

Birmingham: As clubs we have to rely on judges marking well and marking well. If it is an issue with judges marking incorrectly then that is unfair as they shouldn't be marking teams wrongly.

JH: As part of Club Development Officer role looking at providing help and support for judges, so they can ask questions and be given answers. Even more experienced judges can make errors.

MK: No mention in the proposal of where to implement the rule.

India Pollard: Doesn't need to be a rule, rather thought that this was best way to bring to attention of BULSCA Judges Panel and SERC setters.

JH: BULSCA Judges Panel just need to be aware of this so it can be made clear to judges on the day. Only SERC setters know weighting so it isn't as easy to manage as it could be thought. Not many experienced judges at the GM today.

Sheffield: Potential issue could have been clarified by setter.

India Pollard: Want to make it clearer and more transparent in the score sheets. Not sure about the idea of getting marks for treatments not performed.

Loughborough: Judges shouldn't be expected to ask for clarification on the day.



Birmingham: Judges not knowing the weightings means that they need to be weighted to avoid any potential issues.

Sheffield: Guidance already in place for SERC setters.

Loughborough: Although guidance may be in place it hasn't been followed.

Moved to vote on Proposal C, that "Where a mark scheme has two rows to allow separate marking for the treatment of a casualty who changes states, where the casualty has been prevented from deteriorating the team will get full marks for the treatment of the state which they have prevented occurring."

Accept: 4 Reject: 3 Abstain: 0

Proposal C has been accepted.

6. Any other business

Warwick: Looking to run a Lifesaving Instructor course in January 2018. Will contact BULSCA to advertise once information on the course has been finalised.

Loughborough: Have 10 spaces available on a coach from Loughborough to Glasgow in March 2018 for RLSS UK Speeds. Contact Emily Goodwin if interested.

SP: Any teams who have been fined or have lost an appeal, please contact the BULSCA Treasurer to get an invoice/receipt.

7. Date of next meeting

MK: The next general meeting will be the AGM, which will take place in the morning of Loughborough competition on 28/04/2018.

Meeting closed at 11:03



Appendix 1 – Discussed Proposals

Proposal A - Club Recruitment Officer

Is this an Online Voting Proposal or a General Meeting Proposal?

General Meeting

Proposer Name and Position

Joshua Hale – BULSCA Club Development

Seconder Name and Position

BULSCA Committee

Aim – What do you want to achieve?

Support the recruitment and induction of new clubs

Background – What do we need to know to consider the proposal?

Since 2009 we have lost, Aberdeen, St Andrews, Bath and in their place only recruited Sheffield.

Proposal Details – What, specifically, do you want to do?

Introduce a new committee position, Club Recruitment Officer. Starting from the 2018/19 academic year on a trial basis of 3 years to see how the role works.

Duties

- Facilitate the induction of new clubs in to BULSCA
- Develop and maintain recruitment documents and procedures
- Actively seek to support the creation of new BULSCA clubs
- Support new clubs in their first 2 years

The role can be evaluated by the BULSCA Committee and clubs at the 2020 BULSCA General Meeting.



The constitution would be amended to create this new role as below:

4.9 Club Recruitment Officer

4.9.1 The Recruitment Officer Shall

4.9.1.1 Facilitate the induction of new clubs in to BULSCA

4.9.1.2 Develop and maintain recruitment documents and procedures

4.9.1.3 Actively seek to support the creation on new BULSCA clubs

4.9.1.4 Support new clubs in their first 2 years

4.9.1.5 Undertake other tasks as directed by the needs of the job.

Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

We are losing clubs faster than we are recruiting them. BULSCA needs to have an individual dedicated to the task of supporting the creation and recruitment of new clubs. This will provide better competition and an expansion for student lifesaving. We currently have had 10 clubs compete this year and there are over 100 universities in the UK. We currently reach less than a 10th of Universities and need to recruit more or face the possibility of dissolving in the years to come. Student lifesaving teams also bring a lot to drowning prevention and our expansion will only positively benefit the cause that is close to all members.

Timetable and Actions – What do we need to do?

Action	Deadline
Write role into the constitution	AGM
Ensure basic documents are updated for new started	AGM
Review of role with the aim of keeping or dissolving role	2020 GM



Proposal B - Competition Profits

Is this an Online Voting Proposal or a General Meeting Proposal?

General Meeting

Proposer Name and Position

Stephanie Panagi (Bristol affiliate)

Seconder Name and Position

Gaby Bush (Bristol Secretary)

Aim – What do you want to achieve?

Change rules on competitor profits to promote cost efficiency where it exists but is not being used and to promote transparency.

Background – What do we need to know to consider the proposal?

Competition application pack: “should your competition make more than £100 you will be required to redistribute your profits proportionally to the clubs that attended your competition.”

Proposal Details – What, specifically, do you want to do?

Competition expenses: To be sent to the BULSCA treasurer; full breakdown of expenses and income, copy of invoice for pool hire, invoice for any other venue hire and all grant applications submitted relevant to the competition. This must be submitted within 6 weeks from the day of the competition. The BULSCA treasurer has the right to demand proof of any other competition expenses.

Competition profits:

charge per competitor = social + food + ¼ of team entry.

Options based on previous years' competition applications. The typical charge was £16.75 per competitor. The actual average is likely to be higher as team tended to be optimistic on food costs.

Judges are expected to receive free food and social.

Option A:

Profit	If: Charge per competitor	And if: charge to helpers
≤ £100	$X > £15$	> £2
≤ £200	$£11 < X \leq £14$	≤ £2
≤ £350	$£0 < X \leq £11$	All free

Option B:

≤ £100	$X > £16$	> £3
< £180	$£14 < X \leq £16$	≤ £3
< £250. Excess profits given to BUSCA	$£0 < X \leq £14$	All free

Option C: no change

Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

- The current rule worded to sound like a threat. The change would be an incentive scheme.
- Promote efficiency in competition costs. It's easy to rely on past actions and ignore opportunities to make the competition cheaper.
- NOT to penalise clubs that can't reduce costs but reward those that can be more efficient and take steps to do so.
- Club who have limited funding can seek extra income this way.



- All clubs benefit. Clubs benefit from cheaper entry fees which reduces competition expenses. Clubs gaining a profit can use that to attend other league competitions and Champs (maybe even enter more teams than usual)
- We have a club development officer who can help clubs seek funding for competitions to help minimise costs.
- Promotes transparency in competition application packs rather than forcing the figures to fit within the £100 limit.
- The options are given based on the assumptions
 - On average, 30 teams attend therefore there are 120 competitors
 - Total savings made based on £16.75 as the typical competitor charge.
 - Profits allowed must be lower than total saving made
 - E.g. total savings at £14 = $(£16.75 - 14) * 120 = £330$. Profits must be below £330.
 - Exception: options B, max profits ≤ 100 . Profits are higher than savings though this has a similar outcome to the rule currently in place.

Timetable and Actions – What do we need to do?

Action	Deadline
Applicable to 2018/19 competitor applications	2017/18 AGM
Enforced for 2018/19 year	September 2018

Income – Will your proposal provide fundraising opportunities for the club?

Income source (with break even)	Quantity	Price	Income
Yes, but will differ from each club			
Total Income:			



Proposal C - A clear scoring system for casualties who change state in reaction to the wrong treatment

Is this an Online Voting Proposal or a General Meeting Proposal?

General Meeting

Proposer Name and Position

Andrew Scoones (UWLSC SERC Training Officer)

Secunder Name and Position

Mike Ducker (UWLSC President)

Aim – What do you want to achieve?

Fair and clear scoring for when a casualty changes state mid-way through the SERC if administered the wrong treatment by competitor.

A clarification for judges in how to award points in this situation.

Background – What do we need to know to consider the proposal?

Reference: Bristol Dry 2017

- Casualty E at Bristol Dry SERC was given the brief: “If you do not receive your inhaler within 60s you will go to unconscious breathing”.
- Bristol Dry SERC weightings gave 0.8 to treating if unconscious and 2.5 for treatments before unconscious.
- Judges marksheet awarded points for both, regardless of whether casualty actually went unconscious.

Issue: When a casualty changes state dependent on competitor actions, the mark sheet should advise judges’ how to award points in order to promote transparency for when competitors read the marksheet. Without this, judges are unsure of how to award points if competitors prevent the casualty from changing state and teams that do not prevent a change of state could score higher than those who give a lesser quality of treatment.

Secondary Reference: Birmingham Dry 2014

- Casualty was a diabetic with a peanut allergy, if competitors gave them a snickers bar they would begin to have an allergic reaction.

Issue: If a team correctly treated the casualty for anaphylaxis and then treated them for hypoglycaemia they could be awarded the same points for treatment as a team who questioned adequately and never gave the casualty peanuts.

Proposal Details – What, specifically, do you want to do?

When a SERC contains a casualty whose state changes part way through the SERC dependent on competitor’s actions, then the mark scheme will have two rows for points for treatment after and before change of state. If competitors prevent the casualty from



deteriorating as per the brief they will be given maximum points for treatment after change of state. This will be clearly stated on the marksheet and the judge's brief.

Identification and Assessment	1.0	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Treatment – Before going unconscious	2.5	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Treatment – After going unconscious ***if competitors prevent change of state and stop casualty going unconscious, award 10 points for treatment after unconscious***	0.8	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Aftercare, including regular reassessment	1.0	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Identification and Assessment	1.0	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Treatment – no allergic reaction	2.5	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Treatment – allergic reaction ***if competitors prevent change of state do not give casualty peanuts, award 10 points for treatment for allergic reaction**	0.8	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Aftercare, including regular reassessment	1.0	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

At Bristol Comp 2017 there was some misunderstanding from the judge as to how many points a team could receive for a treatment score if they never treated the casualty post unconsciousness as they prevented the casualty from going unconscious.

We want to prevent teams losing out on points for giving better treatment.

Timetable and Actions – What do we need to do?

Action	Deadline
Introduce this rule for writing marksheets and weightings	Start of next season

Supplementary Documents (Attached)

Attached is the full thought process relating to this proposal, including an alternate solution to this issue.

This attached document also includes a comparison of how points could be incorrectly awarded using the current system.