



British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association

General Meeting Papers

Saturday 12th December 2009

Upper Hall, University of London Union, Malet Street, London, WC2A 2AE

Agenda

1. Apologies for absence
2. Approval of minutes from the last meeting (**Paper A**, page 3)
3. Matters arising from the minutes
4. BULSCA officer reports
5. SERC rules amendments (**Paper B**, page 25)
Proposed: Stu Richardson, BULSCA Judges Panel member
Seconded: Iain Long, BULSCA Secretary
Recommendation: TBC
6. Diving with a torpedo buoy (**Paper C**, page 26)
Proposed: Tom Strachan, BULSCA Sport Development Officer
Seconded: Rich Rowe, BULSCA Club Development Officer
Recommendation: TBC
7. Equipment in SERCs (**Paper D**, page 27)
Proposed: Tamsin Jones, University of London
Seconded: Martin May, BULSCA Treasurer
Recommendation: TBC
8. Reforming BULSCA general meetings (**Paper E**, page 28)
Proposed: Iain Long, BULSCA Secretary
Seconded: Martin May, BULSCA Treasurer
Recommendation: TBC



9. Responsibility for the Competitions Manual (**Paper F**, page 30)
Proposed: Martin May, BULSCA Treasurer
Seconded: Iain Long, BULSCA Secretary
Recommendation: TBC

10. Competition Proposals (**Paper G**, separate attachment)
Proposed: Simon Creasey, BULSCA Chair
Seconded: TBC
Recommendation: TBC

11. Abolishing the cap on competition fees (**Paper H**, page 31)
Proposed: Iain Long, BULSCA Secretary
Seconded: Martin May, BULSCA Treasurer
Recommendation: TBC

12. Increased cooperation with the RLSS (**Paper I**, page 33)
Proposed: Alan Sutherland
Seconded: TBC
Recommendation: TBC

13. Aberdeen Competition¹ (**Paper J**, to be tabled at the meeting)
Proposed: Simon Creasey, BULSCA Chair
Seconded: TBC
Recommendation: TBC

14. Any other business

**Please send comments or apologies to
Iain Long (secretary@bulzca.co.uk)**

¹ Several clubs have raised questions about the Aberdeen competition. The BULSCA Committee are investigating, and will report back to clubs at the general meeting.



Paper A: Minutes of the Last General Meeting

Sunday 3rd May 2009
Loughborough University

Meeting commenced at 09:56 am.



1. Present: - From BULSCA Committee: Alan Sutherland, Dom Robertson, Helen Killingley, Lauren Dyson, Oliver Coleman, and Steve Tedds. Representatives from Aberdeen (Ewan MacTaggart and Stacey McAllister), Bath (Rich Rowe and Tom Strachan), Birmingham (Jason Bell and Laura Thompson), Bristol (Joe Hepworth and Robin Eames), London (Jedidiah Lee, Gayan Jayathilake, Iain Long, Martin May and Tamsin Jones), Loughborough (Amy Jennings), Nottingham (Kathryn Shaw and Rachel Evans), Plymouth (Adele Gordon, Emily Hardman and Jess Savage), Southampton (Christian Wood, Dorota Bortel, and Tom Chamberlain), Swansea (Rhiannon Burrige), and Warwick (Elizabeth Underwood, Kate Vlaeminke, Rob Cockerill and Simon Creasey). There were also individuals present representing BULSCA Judges (Emily Stass, Kate Wade, Rachel Bigwood, Stuart Richardson, and Stuart Ward).

Apologies: - From BULSCA Committee: Nick Farmer. Representatives from Oxford (Sarah Cousins).



2. Starring of the Agenda and approval of the Committee's Recommendations
From the final BULSCA AGM Agenda (last updated 25th April 2009), the following points were starred at this point in the meeting:

- 5.1 Eligibility
- 6.4.2 BULSCA Judges
- 6.5.1 Entry Policy
- 6.5.3 League Scoring

The remaining unstarred items were voted on.

Following Committee recommendation	10
Rejecting Committee recommendation	0
Abstention	1

Therefore, the following points will follow the recommendation of the BULSCA Committee:

- 6.3.1 Swim Hats
- 6.4.1 BULSCA Judges Panel
- 6.5.2 Seeding by Swim and Tow Entry Times
- 6.5.5 Medals



3. Minutes of previous meeting accepted as accurate and correct.

The minutes for both the mid-season general meeting in London and the minutes from the previous AGM were voted on.



Proposed: Dom Robertson (BULSCA Committee) Seconded: Lauren Dyson (BULSCA Committee)

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0



4. Summary of year review:

4.1. Chair (*Dom Robertson*)

Dom Robertson described his review of BULSCA through the 2008/2009 season. This can be found in the accompanying document 'Chair's Review 08-09'.

4.2. Treasurer (*Alan Sutherland*)

Alan Sutherland summarised the finances of BULSCA through the 2008/2009 season. The details of which can be found in the "Year End Financial Report 2008-2009" as distributed to all BULSCA club's on Friday 24th April 2009 via email.



4.3. Club Development Officer (*Lauren Dyson*)

Lauren Dyson summarised BULSCA's Club Development through the 2008/2009 season. The details of which can be found in the "Club Development Review 08-09". Lauren Dyson also explained that she has been working on other material to help the development of BULSCA clubs by creating the following documents:

- Welcome to BULSCA,
- Setting up a Club,
- Competition Checklist, and
- Awards.
-

4.4. Sports Development Officer (*Nick Farmer*)

Due to Nick Farmer's absence, Dom Robertson summarised the BULSCA's Sport Development through the 2008/2009 season.



5. Constitutional changes

★5.1. Eligibility (*Nick Farmer*)

Committee Recommendation – APPROVAL

Iain Long raised that the new eligibility changes did not include postgraduate students under 5.2.2.2 (of the constitutional proposal), however, it was point out that in 5.2.2.3 (of the constitutional proposal), they were in fact covered and eligible to compete.

Proposed: Nick Farmer (BULSCA Committee) Seconded: Steve Tedds (BULSCA Committee)

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0





5.2. Individual Membership (Lauren Dyson)

Committee Recommendation – NO RECOMMENDATION

This was raised to combat the issue of students at universities where there is currently no lifesaving club, but wanted to compete within BULSCA.

Helen Killingley asked for clarification over being actively involved in the first point in the old boy's membership. Lauren Dyson stated that it meant that whilst being a current student you were part of a lifesaving club, participated and was 'involved'.

Simon Creasey asked what the benefit was of being a 'old boy member' of BULSCA. Dom Robertson stated that at the moment it was for information, with certain old boy's feeling like it was difficult to still be involved once graduated.

Emily Stass asked whether old boy members would have the same benefits as current students, giving an example of Bournemouth Beach Weekend. Dom Robertson responded that he believed that that would be the case.

Christian Wood asked whether an 'old boy's representative' could be a better approach, whereby all emails (and hence information) would be sent to them and they could selectively send out the relevant emails to the old boy's. This was suggested as some old boy's have stated that they get annoyed receiving all BULSCA emails.

Stuart Richardson raised the point of insurance. Are BULSCA old boy's covered by BULSCA or the host club if they are to get injured (or cause injury) during a BULSCA competition. Is an old boy membership a way of allowing them to be covered by BULSCA.

Kate Wade added that membership for old boy's is a great way for old boy's to 'choose' to receive information (i.e. by signing up), and if they choose not remain involved then they do not have to.

Christian Wood raised the BULSCA Constitution whereby it states that individuals can become "honorary members or officers at the discretion of the BULSCA Committee. These members shall be bound to act in accordance with the principle and policies of BULSCA. A list of these members shall be held by the Secretary".

Christian Wood went on to say that there is not list of requirements that accompanies this.

Going on to point number two of the proposal, Simon Creasey asked whether being a member of a Life Saving body needed to be a requirement of an old boy (to be an individual member). Steve Tedds said that this could be a requirement in order to provide personal liability insurance. Stuart Richardson went on to ask whether individuals are covered at BULSCA competitions through BULSCA's affiliation to the RLSS, or do the RLSS require individual membership to the RLSS (for insurance purposes). Dom Robertson stated that he believed that individuals were not directly covered, instead if individuals were to 'say fall over and hurt themselves and sue either a Life Saving Club or BULSCA, then they would be covered against the law suit due to their affiliation to the RLSS'.

Oliver Coleman said that he would be writing a mailing list system to work for clubs, judges, old boy's etc over the summer to be in place by the start of the new BULSCA season.

It was again (as in mid-season general meeting) that the individual membership for both old boy's and current students to be accepted, with the specific details to be looked into by the new BULSCA Committee (i.e. the new Committee are to 'go away and come back' with a proposal with definitive guidelines of what the membership will include (or not include) and the benefits that will accompany the membership).



Proposed: Dom Robertson (BULSCA Committee) Seconded: Christian Wood (Southampton)

For	10
Against	0
Abstention	1



6. Competitions – 2009/10

★ 6.1. Competition Calendar

★ 6.1.1. Fresher's Competition proposals

Only Southampton and supplied a proposal to host the Fresher's Competition, Christian Wood gave very brief summary of the proposal. The competition would run in the same venue (Fleming Park) format as in 2008, and confirmed that they could run competition on the date asked by the BULSCA Committee of Saturday 24th October (i.e. the week before the RLSS NLSC Finals).

Proposed: Dom Robertson (BULSCA Committee) Seconded: Christian Wood (Southampton)

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

6.1.2. Other BULSCA League Competitions

Steve Tedds stated that everyone that had competitions this year (2008/2009) had responded to his email request for notification of a wish to run a BULSCA Competition in the 2009/2010 season. Steve Tedds also stated that through Dom Robertson, Plymouth had also expressed interest.

At this point Bristol and Swansea also expressed an interest to host a competition in the new BULSCA season.

Dom Robertson expressed the problem that the competition was "already too full", but that he did not want to put off Bristol, Plymouth or Swansea.

Dom Robertson gave some possible options:

- The prospect of having 'throw away competitions', whereby there are say 10 competitions, but only 8 would count towards the league, or
- Have every club write proposals for hosting a competition and those proposals are then voted on. Unfortunately this option wasn't feasible for this AGM.
- Reject the applications from Bristol and Swansea, considering they failed to supply notification/application to host a competition when they were asked to do so by Steve Tedds before the end of March.
- Move some of the competitions outside of the 'typical' term time.

At this point Steve Tedds read out the clubs that had returned their notification/application to host a competition: Southampton, Warwick, Aberdeen, London, Nottingham, Birmingham, Bath, Plymouth and Loughborough (listed in order of preferred dates).



Tamsin Jones expressed that holding competitions outside of term time put universities at a disadvantage, she noted international student who would be going home at those times.

Jess Savage explained Plymouth's thoughts on hosting a competition in the Easter holidays (on either the first or last weekend), with possible additional beach training on the Sunday for those that wanted it. Helen Killingley added that the 2010 BULSCA Championships had already been booked for the 21st/22nd March 2010, which is close to end of term for several universities.

Martin May made another statement that the majority of club will have already submitted budgets for the following season, and those would probably not be able to afford to attend an additional (compared to 2008/2009) three competitions, though one extra could be possible.

Kate Wade raised throw away competitions again, and this was then discussed again, with additional possibility of 'core competitions', which could be rotated around clubs yearly.

Rich Rowe added a new idea, that clubs that were close together (for example Bath and Bristol, Loughborough and Nottingham) could hold 'say a speed competition at one a Saturday and SERC competition on the Sunday', this obviously brings about a different format to the current BULSCA competitions.

Kate Wade added that this would put added pressure on Judges and Helpers to give up their time over a weekend, this point was ratified by Stuart

Richardson, who stated that already many Judges are 'close to giving up' due to too many competitions and therefore additional competitions may not attract the volunteers required. Kathryn Shaw added that a split competition might not attract the same number of competitors as a 'normal' competition therefore didn't believe that they could afford to host a split competition, as Nottingham already made a loss in 2009 with the normal format.

Christian Wood asked whether clubs could open up their competitions to non-BULSCA clubs to avoid potential problems with being a 'throw-away' competition. Dom Robertson answered, saying that would be fine, however it would be down to the hosting club to advertise their competition and then potentially turn away non-BULSCA clubs if the maximum number of entrants is received (barring in mind that BULSCA clubs still get priority).

Tom Strachan added whether core competition idea could work, whereby, clubs that do not get a 'core' competition in one year are guaranteed a 'core' competition in the following year.

Steve Tedds asked whether this point could be wrapped up by stating that both Bristol and Swansea had missed the deadline for this year but welcomed them to submit an application for a competition next year. Dom Robertson continued and said that for the AGM in 2010 every single club would need to submit a proposal prior to the AGM, then every competition would be voted on (i.e. there would be no guaranteed competitions). Proposals are to include things like, dates, budget, plans for food, social and accommodation.

The above proposal was then voted on.

Proposed: Dom Robertson (BULSCA Committee) Seconded: Christian Wood (Southampton)

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0



The following dates were then set:

- University of Southampton (Fresher's) - 24th October 2009
- University of Nottingham – 30th January 2010
- University of Birmingham – 20th February 2010
- University of Bath – 6th March 2010
- Loughborough University – 1st May 2010

The University of Warwick were asked to investigate the possibility of holding their competition on 16th January (*Since the meeting they have stated they cannot*).

The University of Plymouth were asked to investigate the possibility of holding their competition on 7th November (*Since the meeting they have stated they can*).

The University of London Union were asked to investigate the possibility of holding their competition on 28th November (*Since the meeting they have been asked to investigate holding their competition on the 16th January*).

Since the meeting, i.e. not discussed at the meeting:

The University of Warwick stated they cannot hold their competition on the 16th January. The University of Plymouth stated they can hold their competition on the 7th November.

- University of Plymouth – 7th November 2009
- University of Warwick – 21st November 2009
- University of Aberdeen – 28th November 2009

At the time of writing the minutes for the BULSCA AGM, a date for the University of London Union Competition was still to be set.

The meeting closed for a break at 11:28 am.

The meeting reconvened at 11:46 am. Up to 1: 54

★ 6.2. Championships

6.2.1. Feedback 2009 (*Helen Killingley*)

Helen Killingley stated that she felt she had had a good year and, which she enjoyed. The Judges gave some really good feedback, so noted and taken forward for next year. She thanked the Judges for their support. Helen Killingley received little feedback from competitors and clubs; but had generally received positive comments.

Helen Killingley commended the RNLI who thought the event was fantastic, and enjoyed it. Helen Killingley has booked them for 2010 already. They are in the process of using our press release and photos for an article. No negative comments were received from Olympos, Burgess Hill and thanked us for using them again. Helen Killingley hasn't told them about 2010 but they are going private from 1st July so costs will be higher again.

Photos up on the BULSCA website and if anyone wants them in larger format contact championships@bulzca.co.uk. The BULSCA Universities photo will be available to purchase if you're interested.

★ 6.2.2. Current plans for 2010 (*Helen Killingley*)

Helen Killingley informed us that she wanted to push BULSCA Championships further, and back into a 50m pool. With availability being



difficult she felt it needed to be booked early and so has booked Millfield's pool for the 21st/22nd March 2010. This also allows the new Championships Co-ordinator more time to organise the event rather than spend a lot of time finding an booking a venue. Alan Sutherland and Helen Killingley visited the venue and already sent various locations for an incident to the RNLI who are again keen to participate.

Costs would look to be £20-£25/person with food and accommodation on top of this. There are food and accommodation options which will be explored in more detail by the new Championships Co-ordinator.

6.2.3. Non-Student Eligibility for Competing in BULSCA Championships (Southampton)

Helen Killingley started off by detailing BULSCA's aims for the 2009 Championships, which were to raise awareness to 16-18 year olds thinking about going to University. This unfortunately didn't quite work exactly to plan, but two non-BULSCA clubs (Colwick Park LSC and Crawley Town LSC) were both involved, both of which enjoyed the event.

Southampton raised the comment that weren't keen on this as takes the lane seedings and medal chances away from University (student) competitors. Helen Killingley raised that BULSCA clubs always had priority entry first, and noted that in terms of seeding for speeds events non-BULSCA competitors would be equal with BULSCA competitors. With regards medals, non-BULSCA competitors could receive individual or team speed certificates for each event, but would not be included for overall Speeds, overall Nationals or overall Championships results.

Discussion was had as whether BULSCA should continue to attract 'grassroots' 16-18 year olds; and whether BULSCA old boys should be allowed to enter as individual entrants in the speeds events.

After discussions the General Committee agreed to allow 16-18 year olds to enter after BULSCA Clubs have entered. Ensure their ages are checked, and they are clear which areas they count for in the results. Old boys can enter but will only be accepted if there are 'spare' places to fill a heat, i.e. a new heat will not be created to accept them and they will be entered without seeding, i.e. they will be placed in to the first heat.

Proposed: Helen Killingley (BULSCA Committee) Seconded: Oliver Coleman (BULSCA Committee)

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

6.3. Rules Changes

6.3.1. Swim Hats (Steve Tedds)

Committee Recommendation - APPROVAL

This remained an unstarred item and therefore was voted on under section 2 of the AGM.





6.4. BULSCA Judges

6.4.1. Judges Panel (Dom Robertson)

Committee Recommendation – APPROVAL

This remained an unstarred item and therefore was voted on under section 2 of the AGM.

★6.4.2. BULSCA Judges (Southampton & BULSCA)

Committee Recommendation – APPROVAL

Dom Robertson started with a brief explanation of what a Judge is, and that the proposal states that for new judges there are to be deemed 'probationary' before later becoming a fully recognised BULSCA Judge. Christian Wood explained that he wanted to define judges as they have had couple of experiences in competitions whereby decisions have been made by officials in line with out-of-date rules and that if there were to be any remediation for Judges (see 6.4.3 BULSCA Judge Remediation), they BULSCA Judges would first need to be defined and set to a 'benchmark'. Christian Wood went to say that the proposal had been submitted after lengthy conversations with Steve Tedds and set to be quite loose. The proposal includes three levels:

- the Probationary level (which new judges would be at first),
- the Judge level (which all current BULSCA Judges would be at), and then
- Senior Judges (who would be deemed to have relevant experience by the BULSCA Committee).

Stuart Richardson (who starred the item) expressed that he wasn't against the proposal in principle, however, had concerns over the lack of judges, and the current proposal is 'quite' descriptive, and that for Senior BULSCA Judges was it necessary to include the RLSS Level 2 Judges course, which as we understand, merely comes from attending the same course for a second time.

Kate Wade expressed that the RLSS Judges system might be changing. Dom Robertson added that the RLSS would like the Judges course to be UKCC (UK Coaching Certificate) recognised. Alan Sutherland added further that discussions had begun to update the current RLSS Judges system. This being a reason why the RLSS Level 2 Judges course remained on the criteria for being a BULSCA Senior Judge.

Discussion was provided by several people present about the criteria for a Senior Judge. The General Committee thought that maybe an 'and/or' needed to be interjected between the third and fourth points of the proposal for Senior Judges. This was not voted on. Instead Dom Robertson proposed that the proposal in its current format became a set of guidelines for the new BULSCA Committee to work on and appoint Senior Judges for the next year.

Proposed: Dom Robertson (BULSCA Committee) Seconded: (The opportunity was not offered)

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0



★6.4.3. BULSCA Judge Remediation (Southampton)
Committee Recommendation – NO RECOMMENDATION

Christian Wood explained a problem that Southampton had encountered where competitors had been told to leave the pool, before penalties had been given. Christian found a rule in RLSS and ILSF (no year was given for reference), that stated if a mistake of a competitor is followed by a mistake of an official, the mistake of the competitor may be expunged. Steve Tedds found the rule in question (ILSF Competition Manual 2007) and then quoted the following from the Competition Manual:

“Competitors shall be notified of their disqualification from an event by the referee or appropriate judge, at the completion of the race. Competitors shall not leave the designated competition area until dismissed by the referee.

If an error by an official follows a fault by a competitor, the fault by the competitor may be expunged, at the referee’s discretion.”

Kate Wade commented to say that Elaine Lewis clarified this rule at the Team Meeting at the RLSS Speeds: if the official’s mistake penalised a competitor that shouldn’t have been penalised the ‘mistake’ of the competitors can be expunged, however, if the mistake of the competitor was genuine then any disqualifications awarded (regardless of mistakes by officials) would remain.

Dom Robertson brought discussions back to BULSCA Judge remediation rather than rules about mistakes and disqualifications, and went on to say that there have been errors made regardless of size or consequence. He went to say that when competitors make a mistake they get penalised, however, when an official makes a mistake, nothing happens. Kate Wade asked whether the remediation was necessary, given the new way in which people will become BULSCA Judges, which will hopefully lead to a better standard and fewer mistakes. Rachel Bigwood asked whether consistent issues could be brought to future debrief meetings so that they could be prevented, rather than any remediation.

Stuart Richardson appreciated the reasons behind this proposal, however, asked people to understand the negative tone of the proposal. Stu Richardson thought that issues that were occurring were to do with the Head Referee, rather than Judges and indicated that he had sent an amendment to this proposal to the Secretary, but which had not been included in the Agenda, and went on to explain his amendment.

“Instead of having the host club select the Head Judge [Referee], they select the Judges, and then BULSCA from that list of Judges, say who they would like to be the Head Judge [Referee] at that competition. This can then tie back in to the Senior Judge status (that is in the previous point [proposal]), and hopefully you will then have some Head Judges [Referees] who BULSCA are happy and so ok with the rules that the little mistakes that are causing problems at the moment won’t happen, and then hopefully the number of times that this rule is brought in to effect would be greatly decreased.”



Christian Wood explained that from experience, problems were not always as a result of the Head Referee, but also from Judges, giving an instance from Aberdeen (during the 4 x 12 m Line Throw Relay) as an example. Tom Strachan explained that with the above amendment, the process of choosing the Head Referee needed to be monitored somehow so that the same people were not be continuously selected. He mentioned that BULSCA would need to check whether Judges were happy to be the Head Referee before selecting them.

Stu Ward asked for the reasons why a mistake would be deemed necessary to follow the remediation process to be more descriptive.

Kate Wade also asked how BULSCA would go about remediating RLSS Judges at BULSCA Competitions. Dom Robertson said that any remediation for RLSS Judges would need to be referred to the RLSS.

Christian Wood accepted the negative tone of the proposal and asked whether someone else would re-write the proposal in a more diplomatic way, so that three 'definite' issues worth being remediated against would be dealt with by consequences of the proposal. He then proposed that this be done by the new BULSCA Committee (or person of their choosing).

Proposed: Christian Wood (Southampton) Seconded: (This proposal was seconded by a member of the BULSCA General Committee, however, their name was not read out and so could not be minuted.)

For	10
Against	0
Abstention	1

The proposal was clarified to include the amendment made by Stuart Richardson.



6.5. Competitions

★6.5.1. Entry Policy (Steve Tedds)

Committee Recommendation – APPROVAL

Simon Creasey indicated that he didn't understand how the recommendation to include 'Late Entry Penalties' encouraged involvement in the sport, which is stated in the policy.

Dom Robertson clarified that the late entry fee encourages clubs to enter by the deadline, however, the late entry acceptance encourages the host institutions to accept late entries.

Christian Wood also wanted to clarify that after the deadline, the host club could then offer vacant places to 'open' teams (rather than BULSCA teams). This was agreed to be the case.

Dom Robertson stated that if host universities were to wish to include late entry fees on the invitations to the competition and then wished to enforce them, BULSCA would 'back-up' the late entry penalty, and the reason for this policy being written was due to a request from a club at the mid-season General Meeting (2008).



Proposed: Steve Tedds (BULSC A Committee) Seconded: (The opportunity was not offered)

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

6.5.2. Seeding by Swim and Tow Entry Times (Oli Coleman)

Committee Recommendation – APPROVAL

This remained an unstarred item and therefore was voted on under section 2 of the AGM.

★6.5.3. League Scoring (Steve Tedds)

Committee Recommendation – APPROVAL

Simon Creasey indicated that he didn't understand the wording of the proposal. Steve Tedds indicated that the terminology used is the same as is in the current BULSCA Competition Manual (v4.1).

Oliver Coleman clarified that the teams would be counted in the events and therefore the results list (as per the League Places tab in the BULSCA Scoresheet), but would then be simply removed and effectively 'squashing' the results together. This would be done one for A-teams and then again for the highest placed non-A-teams.

Simon Creasey proposed that the words 'results list' be changed to the 'results from the League Places (as in the BULSCA Scoresheet)' .

Proposed: Simon Creasey (University of Warwick)
(University of London Union)

Seconded: Tamsin Jones

For	10
Against	0
Abstention	1

★6.5.4. Social, Food and Accommodation (Bath)

Committee Recommendation – REJECTION - (BULSCA Committee viewpoint available)

Tom Strachan, explained that Bath made a loss on their competition in 2009, mainly due to having ordered food based on the number of people entered and then didn't receive an income meeting the overall cost of the food due to people/teams pulling out. He went on to explain one proposal where there would be one deadline for entering teams and where there would be a second deadline to order food. At this point the clubs will be committed to paying the cost for number of food portions ordered, leaving the clubs (that enter) to either make a loss on the food ordered, or claim the costs incurred from the individual members that requested food (this was proposal 3 as set out in the Agenda).



Christian wood raised that this would make it necessary to inform clubs exactly what the food would be so that those with special dietary requirements would know before ordering food.

Kate Wade asked whether the numbers for bodies and helpers would also be needed at the same time. Tom Strachan answered that that would be the ideal outcome.

On a second point, Tom Strachan explained that even if Bath has got the numbers right then they would still have made a loss on their food, social and accommodation due to the £8 cap and asked whether this could be raised to £10 (this was proposal 1 as set out in the Agenda). He continued to explain proposal 2 as set out in the agenda, detailing a system whereby the cost would differ depending whether you paid in advance or on the day.

Christian Wood asked whether there could be a system where if a hosting club was struggling to meet costs of a competition they could contact BULSCA for help. Dom Robertson explained that this system was already in place and has been since the beginning of the 2008/2009 season.

Rob Cockerill and Rachel Bigwood both raised that if their competition budget indicated that they would make a loss or that could make a loss if the number entries was low, then they could contact BULSCA for support.

Martin May commented that this argument would probably only be valid for one more season, as due to the outcome of the Competitions (as discussed in section 6.1.2) at the AGM 2010, the BULSCA General Committee would vote on which competitions they wished to have for the following season, a vote that would be based on budgets, including food and social costs.

Stuart Richardson mentioned that this had been previously discussed at the Rules Meeting in December 2005, where they decided to on at least one week's notice for food numbers.

Tom Strachan made the following proposal. The host club request the final food numbers by a certain date set by themselves (potentially the entry deadline). The cost for this number of portions of food would then be the minimum cost of food charged to the club. Lauren Dyson clarified that the cap would not be raised as a part of this proposal. Social and Accommodation numbers were not part of the proposal.

Proposed: Tom Strachan (University of Bath)
offered)

Seconded: (The opportunity was not

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

Oliver Coleman asked a question to the floor. Did clubs want the quantity for food and social numbers to become 'locked' at the point of this new deadline, or remain open to be changed?

Tom Strachan asked for the numbers as of the new deadline to be logged, but where a second box would appear enabling a change to be made.

6.5.5. Medals (London)

Committee Recommendation – REJECTION - (BULSCA Committee viewpoint available)

This remained an unstarred item and therefore was voted on under section 2 of the AGM.



★6.5.6. SERC Scoring Guidelines (*Simon Creasey*)
Committee Recommendation – NO RECOMMENDATION

Simon Creasey explained that he had sent out some guidelines in to setting SERCs. He stated that he had handed out some updated copies in at the competition on Saturday (2nd May, at Loughborough University). He said that one of reasons behind writing the guidelines is that many of the Judges wanted to encourage people to write SERCs. It includes details of many of the points that cause problems at Competition, in a hope that they can be avoided in the future. Simon Creasey went on to say that another point would be thorough briefing of casualties, including: "what to do if..."; i.e. if the competitor comes and does 'A B C', this is the response I would like you (the casualty) to do. This can also apply to Judge that are perhaps less qualified than other (including the SERC setter).

Simon Creasey explained that the second part of the document was about mark schemes and how mark could/should be proportioned throughout the SERC.

Simon Creasey also asked for input, views and opinions for the document.

*New item not on the agenda.

Stuart Ricardson raised an item that wasn't on the agenda. He proposed whether BULSCA amend the general procedure for how SERC setters are chosen. Instead of the host club selecting who they wish to write SERCs people could nominate themselves to write SERCs and let the host club choose from list of people that have nominated themselves. He added that perhaps the BULSCA Committee should have some influence to ensure that the same people were not be selected at every competition (or at least not continually writing the wet or continually writing the dry).

The BULSCA General Committee voted on a new guideline being written by Stuart Richardson along the line of his verbal proposal (above). This guideline concerning the procedure for SERC setters being selected to write SERCs at BULSCA competitions would be then be attached as a cover to Simon Creasey's SERC guidelines which would be placed on the BULSCA website.

Proposed: Stuart Richardson (BULSCA Judge)
(BULSCA Committee)

Seconded: Lauren Dyson

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

★6.5.7. Competition Manual amendments (*Stuart Ward*)
Committee Recommendation – NO RECOMMENDATION

Stuart Ward explained that he wanted to 'cut down' the size of the competition manual. He began by stating that the List of Amendments, didn't need to be included, but could be simply kept in a separate Appendix. This was voted on.



Proposed: Stuart Ward (BULSCA Judge)
offered)

Seconded: (The opportunity was not

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

Stuart Ward made a second proposal regarding Doping Control. He stated that this could also be added to a separate Appendix and simply referenced from the competition manual. This was voted on.

Proposed: Stuart Ward (BULSCA Judge)
offered)

Seconded: (The opportunity was not

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

Stuart Ward explained that there were several rules (particularly around 'starting') that were all the same, but listed for each event, and asked whether these could be moved to 'general relay rules'. Stuart proposed that someone should go through the rules and move all duplicated rules in general sections . this was then voted on.

Proposed: Stuart Ward (BULSCA Judge)
and can be identified from the recording, and so could not be minuted.) (The opportunity was not offered)

Seconded: (This proposal was seconded
by a member of the BULSCA General Committee, however, their name was not read out,

For	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

Oliver Coleman asked whether the BULSCA General Committee would be happy for the all of the 'speed' event rules (i.e. 4 x 25 m Manikin Carry Relay, 4 x 50 m Obstacle Relay and the 4 x 50 m Medley Relay), be removed from the competition manual, and instead refer the RLSS (long and short course) rules as of the 30th September and taken for the duration of the BULSCA season) .

Proposed: Oliver Coleman (BULSCA Committee)
(University of Southampton)

Seconded: Christian Wood

For	10
Against	0
Abstention	1



7. Elections

New Committee:

7.1. Chair

As no nominations had been received prior to the meeting Dom Robertson asked the floor whether anyone would like to run for the position of Chair. Simon Creasey nominated himself.

Simon Creasey (*University of Warwick*) stood up and gave a short speech as to why he would like to be Chair of BULSCA.

Re-Open Nominations was also available to be voted for.

For Simon Creasey	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

7.2. Treasurer

One nomination had been previously received:

Martin May (*University of London Union*)

Martin referred to his short statement (available in the agenda) during a very brief speech.

Re-Open Nominations was also available to be voted for.

For Martin May	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

7.3. Secretary



One nomination had been previously received:

Iain Long (*University of London Union*)

Iain gave brief details of his background during his speech, and explained that he had also just been secretary for his club.

Re-Open Nominations was also available to be voted for.

For Iain Long	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

7.4. Club Development Officer

One nomination had been previously received:

Richard Rowe (*University of Bath*)

Richard gave brief details of his background during his speech, and explained that he wanted to get more involved in BULSCA.

Re-Open Nominations was also available to be voted for.



For Richard Rowe	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

7.5. Sport Development Officer

As no nominations had been received prior to the meeting Dom Robertson asked the floor whether anyone would like to run for the position of Chair. Tom Strachan nominated himself.

Tom Strachan (*University of Bath*) stood up and gave a short speech as to why he would like to be Sport Development Officer.

Re-Open Nominations was also available to be voted for.

For Tom Strachan	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

7.6. Webmaster

One nomination had been previously received:

Oliver Coleman (*University of Birmingham*)

Oliver gave brief details of his work as Webmaster for BULSCA in the last 12 months, and explained some things (including the mailing list and scoring) that would be on his 'to do' list in the next 12 months.

Re-Open Nominations was also available to be voted for.

For Oliver Coleman	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

7.7. Championships Co-ordinator

One nomination had been previously received:

Dorota Bortel (*University of Southampton*)

Dorota explained that organising events was part of her degree (Sports Management) and that she would use her experience with that to help with the BULSCA position.

Re-Open Nominations was also available to be voted for.

For Dorota Bortel	11
Against	0
Abstention	0

Representatives from Aberdeen (Ewan MacTaggart and Stacey McAllister) left at 13:50 pm. In any votes hereafter, Aberdeen vote will be taken as abstention.



8. Updates & Clarifications 3.57...

8.1. Child Protection (*Alan Sutherland*)

All University Clubs affiliated to BULSCA, and especially those that are affiliated to the Royal Life Saving Society (RLSS), should be familiar with the RLSS's Safeguarding Children Policy. This is available online at:

[http://www.lifesavers.org.uk/cms/script/news_upload/Tech_20Downloads_20_2d_20Lifesaving_2edb.Child%20Protection%20\(LR\).pdf](http://www.lifesavers.org.uk/cms/script/news_upload/Tech_20Downloads_20_2d_20Lifesaving_2edb.Child%20Protection%20(LR).pdf) – copies can be obtained from the Child Welfare Protection Officer, Jo Illefe, at River House. Each RLSS affiliated Club should have a Child Welfare Protection Officer, however a Branch Welfare Officer is always available. The Policy concerns all person under the age of 18 doing any lifesaving activity including competitions. It is strongly recommended that people dealing with those under 18 should be CRB checked, however no-one should be left alone with anyone under 18 by themselves. For BULSCA, the main concerns are ensuring that under 18 competitors are not left in a situation where they could be abused and that any photography at events is correctly recorded. The Policy provided guidelines to use if photographs are being taken. BULSCA also strongly recommends that parents should be fully aware that they will be with over 18's during an activity, by getting the parent to signing a parental consent form and for the under 18 team to provide a chaperone for the activity. Questions should be directed to BULSCA who will confer with the RLSS when required to provide a consistent message to university Clubs.

8.2. Rule 5.2.10 (*Bath & BULSCA Committee*)

After consultation with both the latest FINA and ASA rules regarding pace making for competitors, the BULSCA Committee have agreed to redefine rule 5.2.10:

“5.2.10 Pace making shall not be permitted, nor may any device be used or plan adopted which has that effect nor shall information regarding the position of competitors from teams other than your own, be given to the swimmer after the start of the event.”

This rule effectively means that spectators, team mates, etc, may actively show encouragement to the current competitor. However, they may not give them in instructions or information on the relative position of other competitors. Competitors should be encouraged to swim to the best of their ability regardless of how far behind (or in front) they may be.

Example 1 (allowed)

In the swim an tow, informing the Competitor #2, who is waiting to be towed, that Competitor #1 , is 5 m from the wall.

Example 2 (not allowed)

During any race, teams pointing out (to the competitor) the position of rival teams that cannot be seen by the competitor.

Oliver Coleman also read out the rule as it currently stood for clarification.



Proposed: Steve Tedds (BULSCA Committee)
(University of Warwick)

Seconded: Rob Cockerill

For	9
Against	0
Abstention	2



8.3. Choking in SERCs (*London & BULSCA Committee*)

Martin May explained that as he understood, actual backslaps should not be performed, but instead should be simulated. He continued to say that a member of his clubs had been a casualty at a competition this season and been told that a if an actual back slap was not performed then that 'didn't count'. Clarification was given that no harm should be brought towards casualties and that Judges had the power to mark competitors zero and stop the incident if they felt it necessary.

Judges just wanted to see that competitors knew how to perform back slaps by demonstrating the position of the hand.

Simon Creasey stated that this should be covered in the SERC guidelines.

8.4. Rule 5.4.10.3 (*Stuart Richardson & BULSCA Committee*)

Stuart Richardson asked for clarification as to when a throw line is within the competitors lane or in the next lane with regard to 'being on the lane rope'. Steve Tedds explained that the BULSCA Committee do not believe that taking the throw line off the lane rope is within the appropriate lane as the rules state.

"5.4.10.3 may only grab the their throw line from within their own lane, this does not include from off the lane rope."

Proposed: Steve Tedds (BULSCA Committee)
(University of Southampton)

Seconded: Christian Wood

For	9
Against	1
Abstention	1

Tom Chamberlain asked whether the 'spinning' of the lane would be allowed in order to retrieve a throw line. It was concluded by Simon Creasey that this would be unfair as teams in the outer lane (on either side) would be able to give themselves the same advantage as they cannot "spin the pool side".

The topic moved on to that of the 'free hand'. Tom Strachan asked what the ILSF rule was. Steve Tedds replied by reading out the following, from the ILS Competition Manual 2007:

"Fair throw: Victims may grasp the throw line only if it falls within their lane and within their reach without releasing their grasp on the designated spot on the crossbar. The lane marker is not "within the lane". Victims may not submerge to retrieve the throw line."



Tom Strachan went to ask whether we wanted to go along the lines of the ILS or the RLSS with our rules. Stuart Richardson countered the question by saying that our 4 x 12 Line Throw Relay was not an ILS event (it was an RLSS event), otherwise the rules would allow for 'head down and kicking'. Tom Chamberlain clarified that this would mean that there would be different rules for the 'Speeds' Line Throw event and for the 'traditional' Line Throw event. This was confirmed.

A quick debate was also had of the word 'grasp' in the ILS rules and whether that should be interpreted and being 'by the hand' as someone cannot grasp a throw line with any part of the body other than their hand.

Dom Robertson called for a vote on adopting the RLSS stand on the taking a three line with 'their free hand'. Making a new rule:

"5.4.10.5 may only grab the line with their free hand."

Proposed: Christian Wood (University of Southampton)
(BULSCA Committee)

Seconded: Steve Tedds

For	7
Against	2
Abstention	2

8.5. Rule 5.2.8.2 and Penalties (*Stuart Ward & BULSCA Committee*)

Stuart Ward asked for clarification over whether clubs were happy for Judges to enforce penalties for leaving the water at the end of a race without being told to do so by the Head Referee. He asked for clubs to comment on what they thought would be an appropriate penalty before suggesting one himself. His suggestion was that the penalty be that that came with the event, i.e. 15 seconds for the 4 x 50m Swim and 50 m Tow Relay, and docked one person in the 4 x 12 m Line Throw Relay, this would then however be a straight disqualification in Speed events.

Oliver Coleman said that it should in fact be a straight disqualification for all events and compared the instance to false start. He continued to justify his reasons by saying that climbing out of the water without being told to do so was complete disregard to the rule.

A clarification was asked for with respect to who has the power to give instructions to leave the water. Dom Robertson replied by stating that only the Head Referee has that power.

Stuart Richardson also clarified that if competitors were to become 'ill' at the end of a race then they would not be penalised.

The proposal from Oliver Coleman was then voted on.

Proposed: Oliver Coleman (BULSCA Committee)
(BULSCA Committee)

Seconded: Lauren Dyson

For	10
Against	0
Abstention	1



8.6. Appeals (*Stu Ward & BULSCA Committee*)

Stuart Ward raised frivolous appeals whereby clubs had been not been appealing against the reason why they had been given penalties, but instead appealing against the action in which the penalty was awarded in an attempt to have the penalty removed despite not actually appealing against the penalty itself. He gave an example from Bath whereby several clubs appealed against the officials, as they had not given the at the correct time, i.e. at the end of the heat; rather than appealing against their apparent action that obtained them the penalty. In that instance the appeal was upheld (so the appeal fee was returned), however, the appeals committee decided that the teams in question had still contravened the rules and so the penalties had remained in place.

Stuart Ward continued to say that future appeals that are to be made which appeal against officials not giving penalties/disqualifications at the appropriate time will be upheld but the penalties/disqualifications will still stand. He asked clubs therefore to not waste the time of the Appeals Convenor (and who they convene on to the Appeals Committee).

Dom Robertson explained that if this happens in future the competitors/clubs involved should write to the BULSCA Sports Development Officer with the exact details of what happened.

Lauren Dyson and Stuart Ward stated that any appeals needed to be relevant to the penalty that was awarded.



9. AOB

9.1. BULSCA Old Boy's Reunion (*Steve Tedds on behalf of BULSCA Old Boy's*)

Steve Tedds asked whether some old boys would like to hold a reunion. He stated that it wouldn't have to be every year or event involve life saving. Rachel Bigwood added that it wouldn't have be just for old boys, current students would obviously be welcome.

Kate Wade and Emily Stass expressed their interest in helping to organise such an event. Rachel Bigwood stated that she would investigate some possibilities.

Christian Wood added that maybe it should be done on the anniversaries of BULSCA rather than every year. As BULSCA began in 2002, Christian said that maybe we could start with a 8 year anniversary and then move to 10 years, 15 years, etc.



9.2. AGM timing (*London*)

Martin May explained that this year's AGM was in many of London's exam period, which wasn't a deal, with people having to take time out of revision to attend.

Martin May also said that whilst he understood the reasons why the AGM was placed after a competition (to encourage attendance). It meant that members of their club had to 'wait around' until the end of the meeting for them to travel back together.

Martin May asked whether we could go back to holding the AGM over the Easter Holidays.

Stuart Richardson explained that it was in fact he (when Chair), that moved it after the last competition of the season (then Southampton), solely because only people from the larger clubs attended, as the smaller clubs simply didn't/don't have the resources to send people to meetings.

Martin May asked whether it could be moved after another competition. Lauren Dyson replied stating that it needed to be at the end of the year and so that was unlikely. A short debate was had over when the best time to have the AGM would



be. Including after London's exam period, unfortunately, then most other university's will have their exam periods start. Lauren Dyson stated that if you leave it too late then you will lose a lot of time in the summer, when in fact the new BULSCA committee do a lot of work.

9.3. Rescue 2010 (*Steve Tedds on behalf of Abi Hoyle*)

Steve Tedds read out an email that he had received from Abi Hoyle:

"If you get time could you discuss at the AGM altering the 2009/2010 season to allow optimal preparation for a worlds in October 2010. i.e. putting events as late as possible in the academic season, or having summer events. also perhaps allowing single sex relay teams to compete, though that may be a bit awkward.

Christian Wood stated that they could move the Oliva trip to help with preparations to Rescue 2010.

Martin May asked whether that would provide an opportunity for 'new' clubs to host a competition. Dom Robertson explained that they would probably find it difficult as they don't have as many resources. Dom Robertson went on to say that any additional events are likely to be organised by BULSCA.

Dom Robertson said that down on the South coast there were several competitions where people could gain experience and practise events, for example, the Twilight competitions in Bournemouth and the SLSA Surf Series and that the affiliation fee to SLSGB was only about £10.

Dom Robertson also stated that he had asked the SLSA whether they would be interested in holding an event at one of the lakes further up north (around the midlands), but said that they were unwilling to put in resources to an event that they didn't know would be successful. However, they did say that if BULSCA put one on they would help out by providing some officials and most of the equipment.

Kate Wade expressed an idea to have next year's Speed's training day in summer, so that it could be used for preparation. The training day could also have some sort of 'mini' competition at the end of the day for practise. Dom Robertson appealed to clubs like Swansea and Bristol to apply to run event like that in the summer, as they have many members around to help out in those months.

Jess Savage explained that Plymouth could be interested in running an event but lack the experience to organise it. However, if BULSCA took on a large amount of the organising then Plymouth could hold an event.

Lauren Dyson also stated that she could run a beach competition if people wanted one.

Stuart Richardson raised a slightly different point about Rescue 2010. He explained that many BULSCA Judges like to compete together, couldn't do so anywhere other than in BULSCA Competitions, as they would not be recognised as a club. However, as of last year, BULSCA had affiliated to the RLSS as a separate entity and so asked whether he could be given the responsibility to organise and select a 'BULSCA Judges' team to enter in the Inter Clubs for Rescue 2010, under the 'BULSCA' name.

Christian Wood raised that if they were to compete for BULSCA then they would need to be individual members, and affiliated to BULSCA.



Problems arose over representation and selection policy. Oliver Coleman said other people at the worlds might assume that a team under the BULSCA name would be the best British University Life Saving Students rather than BULSCA Judges. Steve Tedds said that he was happy with people going under the BULSCA name but wanted the BULSCA committee to have control over selection.

Dom Roberton stated that if people wanted to go to the worlds that were not part of a club they could just pay the RLSS affiliation fee (around £49), and go to the World's under that name.

The discussion was concluded with an opinion that a BULSCA team at the Worlds would be good, however, it couldn't be selected by any individual.

9.4. TA Courses (*Robert Cockerill*)

Robert Cockerill explained that they were looking at running a TA course in September 2009 before term starts; and asked whether there was any interest from clubs. Birmingham, London and Loughborough expressed interest and were asked to email Rob with numbers.

The meeting was closed at 14:40 pm.

Notes

Starring of the Agenda and approval of the Committee's Recommendations

- Any item that is starred will be discussed in the meeting.
- Any item that is "unstarred" will be put to a single vote to pass all remaining "unstarred" items on the agenda.
- Any decisions that are required will therefore be passed as per BULSCA Committee recommendations.
- Any item passed by this vote cannot then be discussed in this BULSCA Meeting.
- If all items in a section are starred this will be indicated by a star next to that section number and by one single star in the middle of the section.
- If at least one item is unstarred then individual stars will be placed by each section.
- At the beginning of this section, the Chair will invite amendments to the starring. At this point, please star any items on the agenda you wish to discuss by stating the item's number on the order paper.

Committee's Recommendations

The BULSCA Committee will discuss and recommend the BULSCA General Committee to proceed with their decision. A BULSCA Committee recommendation will be seen to be one of the following:

- **Pending** – The BULSCA Committee is yet to come to a decision.
- **Approval** – The BULSCA Committee recommend approval without discussion.
- **Rejection** – The BULSCA Committee recommend rejection without discussion.
- **No Recommendation** – The BULSCA Committee does have a recommendation; therefore, a discussion is thought to be required.

The BULSCA Committee recommendations (BCR) will be shown underneath items that will require a vote by the BULSCA General Committee, for example "Committee Recommendation – PENDING.



Paper B: SERC Rules Amendments

BULSCA Committee Recommendation

TBC

Proposed by (Name and position)

Stu Richardson, BULSCA Judges Panel

Seconded by (Name and position)

Iain Long, BULSCA Secretary

Aim

Minor corrections to SERC Rules

Background

- CPR Protocols changed in 2006.
- The RLSS UK SERC guidelines are intended for Wet SERCs only.

Proposal Details

- Remove rule 5.3.7.5 from the rulebook. This references EAV which is no longer on the RLSS syllabuses.
- Also rewrite 5.3.7.4.1 to say:

“...if a competitor attempts to perform cardio pulmonary resuscitation on a human actor a judge will immediately terminate the action and they will instantly...”

- Attach a note that says that rules 5.3.8.7 and 5.3.8.8 are rewritten in reference to Wet SERCs, and may not be directly transferable into a Dry SERC context.

Motivation

- To remove confusion and enable judges to act for the safety of casualties during incidents.
- Following a query from another judge as to the implied priority orders in Dry SERCs.

Timetable and Actions

Action

Modify the rules manual.

Deadline

Non-urgent but by Nottingham makes sense.



Paper C: Diving with Torpedo Buoys

BULSCA Committee Recommendation

TBC

Proposed by (Name and position)

Tom Strachan, BULSCA Sport Development Officer

Seconded by (Name and position)

Rich Rowe, BULSCA Club Development Officer

Aim

To enable competitors in BULSCA competitions to dive whilst wearing a rescue tube and fins

Background

Following an accident in 2007, diving with a rescue tube and fin was banned by the RLSS. In response to criticism of this reaction from many quarters, the RLSS have been reviewing how the practice could be readopted, with addition measures to guard against further accidents.

Proposal Details

We want to adopt the new RLSS guidelines on diving with a rescue tube and fins – that competitors are allowed to do so, providing that the individuals involved have been certified to prove that they can do so safely. Certification can be issued by club coaches and TAs

Motivation

To allow people to dive with a rescue tube and fins

Timetable and Actions – What do we need to do?

Action

Deadline

Pass rule at London GM

December 2009

Diving first allowed at Nottingham competition 2010

January 2010



Paper D: Equipment in SERCs

BULSCA Committee Recommendation

TBC

Proposed by (Name and position)

Tamsin Jones, University of London

Seconded by (Name and position)

Martin May, BULSCA Treasurer

Aim – What do you want to achieve?

To allow clubs to travel lighter to competitions.

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

Clubs often travel long distances to competitions with large amounts of kit that may not be needed at a particular competition. Competitors have also been known to be unprepared for events when isolation closes due to a lack of information.

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

Include the following in the BULSCA Rules Manual (in section 1.0):-

- The hosting university must inform all competitors if they require first aid kits or outdoor clothing and footwear no less than forty eight (48) hours before the competition.

Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

This will potentially allow clubs to reduce the amount of kit they are carrying to competitions (particularly bulky items on public transport). It could also prevent unnecessary kit cluttering up the host club's poolside. If competitors are aware of an indoor/outdoor SERC prior to the competition, they are able to come more prepared (particularly during especially hot or cold months).



Paper E: Reforming BULSCA General Meetings

BULSCA Committee Recommendation

TBC

Proposed by (Name and position)

Iain Long, BULSCA Secretary

Seconded by (Name and position)

Martin May, BULSCA Treasurer

Aim

To streamline the proceedings of the BULSCA general meetings.

Background

BULSCA general meetings currently operate in a similar style to a club committee. There are no procedures in place for their operation.

The procedures laid out below are similar to those used by several students' union councils, which are in turn based upon those used by the House of Commons.

Proposal Details

I propose instigating a major change to the general meetings, bringing them more in line with a students' union council style of meeting. In particular, I propose:

- All proposals should be submitted in writing, complete with a cover sheet.
- At the general meeting:
 1. Proposers will have two minutes to talk to their proposal.
 2. An offer will be made for someone to talk against the proposal. If someone accepts the offer:
 - They will have two minutes to talk against the proposal.
 - The proposers will have two further minutes to respond to any speeches against the proposal.
 3. The floor may then:
 - Ask questions of the proposers.
 - Provide points of information (state facts, rather than share opinions).
 - Propose amendments (in writing, submitted to the Chair):
 - Amendments may be accepted by the proposer.
 - If an amendment is rejected, move back to 1. where the amender talks for the amendment, and the proposer talks against it. The amendment is then voted on.
 - Ask to move to a vote: the floor should then vote on moving to a vote, or continuing the discussion.
 4. There is then a vote on the (possibly amended) proposal.
- Each club will be given two seats at the table, and one voting card. When voting, each club must raise its voting card. This ensures that no club votes twice. Members of the judges panel will have seats to represent the views of the judges.
- Observers will be allowed in the meeting. They will not, however, be allowed to sit at the table, or have speaking rights.
 - Speaking rights may be granted by the Chair upon request *prior* to the commencement of the meeting.



Motivation

BULSCA is changing:

BULSCA has expanded rapidly. As a result, I do not think the current procedures (such as we have) are sufficient. BULSCA general meetings have a tendency to drag on, with people sharing opinions which are, quite often, only tangentially related to the proposal being discussed. Most of the discussion lacks focus, and does not result in any substantive changes. I feel something needs to change.

Tried and tested system:

I accept that this procedure seems quite complicated. However, the structure allows for useful comments and suggested amendments. It also gives the Chair more power to move the discussion on. As stated above, these procedures are similar to those used by students' union councils, which I believe have more similarities with BULSCA general meetings than club committees.

Timetable and Actions

Action	Deadline
Pass the proposal at the London general meeting	December
Roll the proposal out at the annual general meeting.	May

Supplementary Documents (Attached)

General Meeting Procedures



Paper F: Responsibility for the BULSCA Competitions Manual

BULSCA Committee Recommendation

TBC

Proposed by (Name and position)

Martin May, BULSCA Treasurer

Seconded by (Name and position)

Iain Long, BULSCA Secretary

Aim

To move discussion of the Competitions Manual away from BULSCA General Meetings to a more appropriate forum.

Background

When the BULSCA Competitions Manual was first introduced it needed regular updating and this was done at the mid-year Rules Meeting and at the AGM. Over the years this has evolved into prolonged discussions of the rules at the General Meetings over minor points. These discussions tend to involve very few members of the meeting, and have very little impact on the majority, but take up a considerable amount of time.

Proposal Details

I propose that rules are removed from the table at BULSCA General Meetings, and instead are put under the control of the Judges Panel. I would suggest that anyone wishing a change in the rules submit a request to the Judges Panel, who consider it and give a reasoned response. Furthermore I would suggest limiting changes to the rules to the Summer break, between seasons. At which point the Judges Panel should submit any amendments to the Competitions Manual to the BULSCA Committee for approval before the end of August. After this any changes can be announced to Clubs before the start of the new season.

Should the Judges Panel choose to reject outright any rules change proposed by a club, they will provide an explanation to the proposer. Should the proposer disagree with the reason, they may then forward their request to the BULSCA Committee, who will also deliberate. Should the BULSCA Committee also reject the request, the proposer may then bring it to the BULSCA General Meeting for a final decision.

Motivation

I am proposing this because I feel that the rules should be under the purview of those people who have to enforce them, the Judges. The Judges are much better qualified to decide whether there are problems with rules than the membership as a whole, because for the most part they are the people who see how well they are working.



Paper H: Abolishing the Cap on Competition Fees

BULSCA Committee Recommendation

TBC

Proposed by (Name and position)

Iain Long, BULSCA Secretary

Seconded by (Name and position)

Martin May, BULSCA Treasurer

Aim

To abolish the cap on competition, social and accommodation fees.

Background

BULSCA currently caps competition fees at £30 per team, and £10 per person for social and accommodation. Some clubs are unable to break even at this price. Moreover, some smaller clubs find attending competitions prohibitively expensive.

BULSCA is moving onto a proposal and vote system as of the 2010-2011 season.

Proposal Details

I propose abolishing all caps on fees. Instead, clubs wishing to host a competition should set out their costs in their proposals. They should then announce their prices based upon breaking even. Any club who announces a price that will lead to profits in excess of £100 (insurance against team withdrawal etc.) will have their proposal withdrawn by the BULSCA committee. Any club charging more than the usual £30 would be expected to explain why.

Each proposal shall then be voted on by the BULSCA general meeting using a single transferable voting system. The clubs will be able to take the price of the competition into account when deciding.

Motivation

Competitions run at cost benefit the majority:

By running competitions at cost, competition fees may be reduced for all teams. Many clubs, particularly those who are just starting up, have very limited budgets. By reducing the price of entering, we are likely to encourage many of these smaller and/or newer clubs from entering the competitions. I admit that some of the bigger clubs may lose out on profits from their competition, but lower competitions fees would be more equitable and more efficient.

The current system has severe failings:

Some clubs (notably Bath) fail to break even under the current system. These tend to be the clubs with the best facilities. It would be a real loss to BULSCA if such clubs decide against putting in a proposal for a competition due to costs. Similarly, some clubs are prevented from running exciting socials that cost a bit more (e.g. London could run socials in West End clubs).

What do you have to lose?

At the end of the day, we will all be voting for the competitions we want to see. If a competition is too expensive, don't vote for it. Conversely, if you do not have to pay as much to enter, you save money.



Timetable and Actions

Action	Deadline
Pass the proposal at the London general meeting	December
Roll the proposal out at the annual general meeting.	May

Supplementary Documents (Attached)

Competition Application Procedures



Paper I: Increased Cooperation with the RLSS

BULSCA Committee Recommendation

TBC

Proposed by (Name and position)

Alan Sutherland, University of Bath

Seconded by (Name and position)

Aim

An increased co-operation between the RLSS and BULSCA.

Background

The RLSS is running a pilot scheme within the West Region (Avon and North Wiltshire, Gloucestershire and Somerset) about how the RLSS should run in the future. The pilot is working on the support and development of Lifesaving activity within the Region. The RLSS have paid for the scheme and have employed a Regional Manager to develop the West Region and help setup new clubs and develop those that exist as well as liaising with local organisations. Both Bristol and Bath Universities' are covered under this pilot scheme and Bath University has been heavily involved with the scheme since it launched. The university has helped in booking rooms and pools for courses and providing resources as well as help on the courses that have run. The RLSS has provided us with numerous courses including a judges and a TA course and has helped with the development of our Club.

Personally, I am part of the Avon and North Wiltshire Branch and West Region Management Committee's and Chairman of the newly formed West Region Sport Working Group.

Proposal Details

I am proposing that BULSCA works more closely with the RLSS. By doing so the RLSS can see what we are doing and suggest & support with new practices to improve our experiences or use our good practices to help Clubs nationally. Equally BULSCA will potentially receive more assistance and more of a voice within the RLSS.

I propose in order to make this happen that there is a member of River House staff that acts as a liaison officer who can feedback to staff what we are doing but also feedback to us what the RLSS are doing and how we could help and potentially explain some of the decisions.

I have spoken to Ellen Moore, the West Regional Manager, who is very interested in helping and has offered to be the aforementioned liaison officer. Contact with E Greenwood would still continue.

Motivation

I really want BULSCA and the RLSS to work closer together as both organisations can learn from each other and both assist each other given we have similar aims. It seems pointless for two groups to work separately in order to get to a similar place.

Timetable and Actions

Action	Deadline
Discuss the above proposal and decide whether BULSCA wishes this to take place	End of London GM
Contact Ellen Moore to ask if she is happy to be the liaison – Action by BULSCA Committee	Before Christmas 2009
Invite Ellen Moore (or other liaison if someone else is selected) to the next BULSCA meetings	ASAP