



# Agenda

Mid-Season Meeting  
University of London Union  
10 a.m., 10<sup>th</sup> December 2011

1. Apologies
2. Approval of AGM minutes
3. Matters arising from minutes
4. Officer reports
  - a. See paper A for treasurer's report
5. Method of voting on proposed items
6. Paper B: Swim and Tow Update
  - a. Committee recommendation: discuss without recommendation
7. Paper C: Competition Dates
  - a. Committee recommendation: discuss without recommendation
8. Paper D: Freshers' Competition SERC
  - a. Committee recommendation: accept with discussion
9. Paper E: Overall Individual Female and Male Speeds at BULSCA championships
  - a. Committee recommendation: accept without discussion
10. Paper F: Graduates in the BULSCA championships
  - a. Committee recommendation: discuss without recommendation
11. Any other business



## Paper A: Treasurer's report

BULSCA Finances as of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2011:

<b>INCOME</b>		<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	
Balance Brought Forward from 2010-11	£493.72	Committee & Judges' Polo Shirts	£321.00
Income from PayPal (Website Ad)	£212.64	Judges' Course - RLSS	£360.00
Membership - Aberystwyth		Judges' Course - Stu Ward	£38.00
Membership - Bath			
Membership - Birmingham	£30.00		
Membership - Bristol	£30.00		
Membership - Cambridge			
Membership - Exeter			
Membership - London	£30.00		
Membership - Loughborough	£30.00		
Membership - Nottingham	£30.00		
Membership - Oxford	£30.00		
Membership - Plymouth			
Membership - Southampton	£30.00		
Membership - St. Andrews	£30.00		
Membership - Swansea	£30.00		
Membership - Warwick	£30.00		
Judges' Course Fees (£33 each)	£396.00		
Official Polo Shirt - Old (£5 each)	£5.00		
Official Polo Shirt - New (£10 each)	£100.00		
Committee Polo Shirt (£15 each)	£90.00		
Penalty Fees - Southampton (£12)			
Penalty Fees - Warwick (£7)			
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£1,597.36</b>		<b>£719.00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£878.36</b>		

Suanne Wong  
BULSCA Treasurer 2011-12



## Paper B: Swim and Tow Update

### Proposer Name and Position

Stuart Ward - Judge

### Aim – What do you want to achieve?

BULSCA committee to investigate whether a change in competition structure around the swim and tow is worthwhile and if so what format would be workable. To then be given to clubs to make a decision either way.

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

The swim and tow relay has been banded around for a long time as an old event which should be updated/replaced with something new. Outside of the SERC it is the event which takes the most time to run through and with the removal of wrist tow has got even slower. While eventually there may be an increase in speed given the cyclical nature of Uni lifesaving and the cross section of ability this may not have much of an impact on our competitions. Now seems like a good time to review and revisit our competition structure. Obviously adding another event for example would have implications on the weightings of the events.

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

Until the RLSS remove the swim and tow it will need to stay in our competition in some format (and for the nationals should stay as it is currently). I do not believe it is my place to tell BULSCA what they should change to so should BULSCA agree it is worth looking into I would expect the BULSCA Committee (and anyone else who wants to) to look into various alternatives which would then be brought to the BULSCA to make a decision on whether they wanted the change or not for next year.

Below is an example idea:

- Split your team in 2. One half does a 2 man swim and tow relay other half do a torp relay.
- Put a time limit (9 minutes) on the swim and tow and rank similar to the rope throw.

### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

To increase competition in events, to possibly provide another strategic element to the competition.

### Timetable and Actions – What do we need to do?

Action	Deadline
BULSCA to discuss/decide whether they think it is a good idea.	London Meeting
BULSCA Committee to investigate and feed back outcome to clubs.	Pre Loughborough Meeting
If the Committee find an idea/idea's valid BULSCA to vote at AGM for bringing in for 2012/13 season (assuming still in line with RLSS)	Loughborough Meeting



## Paper C: Competition Dates

### Proposer Name and Position

Alexander Blandford – Club Development Officer

### Aim – What do you want to achieve?

The aim of this is to minimise the risk of having competitions on back to back weekends.

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

At the moment there are no rules in place to govern the number of possible competition dates a club should submit at the AGM when bidding for a competition.

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

I would like to make it such that each team must submit as many possible competition dates as possible if they would like to host a competition in the subsequent season but as an absolute minimum 1 date in each of the first two terms. This should give enough flexibility to allocate those competitions voted for at the AGM so that they are not on back to back weekends.

The preferable situation would be for clubs to just submit a list of dates they cannot do. This does not preclude them from preferencing certain dates but does mean that should their preference not be viable/sensible they will have already liaised with their pools/universities and know if they can do another date the AGM members may suggest.

I believe there should be a clause, however, that says that at the Chair's discretion this rule can be waived as in rare cases this approach may not be viable.

### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

My motivation is to prevent the same situation as has happened with Southampton and Warwick for the past 2 seasons whereby due to only investigating dates around a small period of time (ie the end of October to the middle of November) each only presented one date which happened to be on consecutive weekends. This is bad as it means fewer teams attend these competitions, having a financial impact on those clubs as well as potentially a league impact.



## Paper D: Freshers' Comp SERCs

### Proposer Name and Position

Alexander Blandford – Club Development Officer

### Aim – What do you want to achieve?

The aim of this proposal is to ensure that Fresher's Comp SERCs are accessible to Freshers and are 'easier' than other SERCs throughout the year.

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

At the moment no such rule is in force. This resulted in there being what was felt this year to be a very hard Wet SERC at Southampton (Note: This is not saying it was an inappropriate SERC, just that it was at the wrong time in the calendar).

Currently there are differences in how the Fresher's Comp is run (Draw/Speed Order) to any other competition

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

My proposal is threefold. The three should be discussed independently:

1. Casualty types: That the types of casualties in the SERC are limited to those mentioned in Life Support and Bronze Medallion (Note: This is more than is examined in Bronze Medallion). Specifically for the Dry SERC:
  - a. Unconscious Non Breathing (Adult, Child and Baby)
  - b. Unconscious Breathing
  - c. Choking
  - d. Bleeding (Both with or without an object in the wound)
  - e. Shock
  - f. Hypothermia (Whilst this does not appear in Life Support it does in Bronze Medallion)And additionally for the Wet SERC:
  - g. Non Swimmer
  - h. Weak Swimmer
  - i. Injured Swimmer
  - j. Unconscious Swimmer
2. Aids: If required to rescue a specific casualty the aid(s) for that casualty should be obvious and accessible as in a Bronze Medallion Exam. For example if there is a non-swimmer in the middle of the pool there should be an appropriate large floating aid either on the side or in the pool that the casualty will take. This aid would be obvious and clearly visible in the middle of poolside or in the pool.
3. Team Positioning: The incidents should be laid out in such a way that communication between the team and the captain is not impaired by artificial or physical means (such as the team being on the opposite side of the pool or the captain entering the SERC at a different time to the team). For the wet this would mean that the captain must be able to walk to any part of poolside available for landing casualties.

### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

My motivation for these proposals is to ensure Fresher's:

- From a positive point of view – feel they have been able to put into practice the training they have received
- From a negative point of view – are not put off further involvement with Lifesaving due



to feeling they did not contribute anything to the SERC  
My reasons for the three separate parts are outlined below:

1. Casualty types – Most Universities only have 3 weeks in order to train for the Fresher's Competition. Within that time period teaching everything currently needed for BULSCA SERCs is rarely possible and when it is achieved each treatment is generally of a poorer standard than it should be. By focussing on fewer casualties the Fresher's can feel more prepared for the SERC and the quality of the rescues should be higher. By selecting only those in Life Support and Bronze Medallion this will also support those clubs who are simultaneously teaching for awards.
2. Aids – In Life Saving personal safety is the highest priority. Relevant aids should be obviously available for the freshers to use as they have been trained to. The fresher's comp should be a competition testing more what the teams have learnt than using their initiative. At later competitions in the season once the rescues have been learnt initiative tests can come.
3. Team Positioning – Freshers teams may well not be used to a SERC environment and very much rely on the captain for advice and guidance in the SERC. The captain should be able to easily communicate with them and be near them to reassure them. This will prevent them from being in a position where they are isolated and don't know what to do, thus exposing them to a feeling of embarrassment and decreasing their likelihood of continuing with Life Saving.



## Paper E: Overall Individual Speeds Male/Female Competition into the BULSCA Championships

### Proposer Name and Position

Proposer: Joe Scurrah (Southampton Graduate)

Seconder: Oliver Coleman (Web Officer 2007-Present, Birmingham Graduate)

### Aim – What do you want to achieve?

To increase the appeal of the BULSCA championships to competitors beyond those currently reached, including Old Boys / Girls, students from non-BULSCA / smaller BULSCA clubs.

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

My proposal has two parts:

- 1) To introduce two further trophies into the BULSCA Championships; for the top scoring individual male / female from all the individual Saturday speeds events.

Every registered championships competitor will be eligible. Competitors will gain points towards the overall individual trophy for each individual event (including rope throw).

A high scoring points system would be used, based 20pts for a first down to 1pt for 20<sup>th</sup> place (DNF, DNS & DSQ will earn 0pts).

This could be integrated into the current scoring spreadsheet; therefore the extra requirements upon the competition organisers would be minimal. (To be included as a trial into the 2012 event)

### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

An increasing number of “old boys” are wishing to compete and as BULSCA puts on one of the best Speed competitions going it would be a shame to see them miss out. Gives individual from clubs or other to have a prize to aim at.

### Timetable and Actions – What do we need to do?

Action	Deadline
Acceptance at the London rules meeting	Dec-11
Purchase and engraving of 2no. Trophies	Mar-12
Run as a trial in the 2012 Championships	Mar-12
Vote at AGM to confirm the format worked	May-12



## Paper F: Graduates in the BULSCA Championships

### Proposer Name and Position

Proposer: Joe Scurrah (Southampton Graduate)

### Aim – What do you want to achieve?

Ring fence the primary purpose of the Championships as the Student Nationals.

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

Why should non-student have the right to take certificates and achievement away from the student at the student championships.

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

- 2) Non-students should be made ineligible for the individual event titles. This would require the following change of rules to the BULSCA competition manual. (To be included for the 2013 event). Rule 2.10 of the Championships Rules V.4.1 needs to be modified as such (or similar):

*Non-BULSCA affiliated squads and **individuals** can be invited to compete in the Championships but will not contribute to the scoring of the Student Championships, although their position will be calculated for their reference. ~~They are eligible to receive prize for all the individual and team event however.~~ **Only qualifying students will be eligible to receive the individual and team event prizes, however all competitors will be entered into the overall individual competition.***

It would be made a requirement within the rules that any competitor, who has competed on the Saturday who is not part of a Squad provides their services for the Sunday competition, where the requirements for bodies ect are greater.

### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

I firmly believe that “old boys” should not be eligible to win individual medals in events, the event is the student nationals non-students should be seen as guests and not eligible to win student titles.

I am aware this is conflict with my other proposal, but I feel the two complement each other and could work together.

### Timetable and Actions – What do we need to do?

Action	Deadline
Acceptance at the London rules meeting	Dec-11
Purchase and engraving of 2no. Trophies	Mar-12
Run as a trial in the 2012 Championships (Part 1 only)	Mar-12
Include the changes within the Championship manual for the 2012-13 session	Aug-12
Rules to run	Mar-13