

# British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association

## Annual General Meeting Minutes 2016-17

29/04/2017





# British Universities Life Saving Clubs' Association

## Annual General Meeting Minutes 2016-17

Jamie Shone: BULSCA Chair  
Hannah Smallwood: BULSCA Secretary  
Rob Forster: BULSCA Treasurer  
Harry Withers: BULSCA Data Manager  
Luke Peel: BULSCA Championships Co-ordinator  
India Pollard: BULSCA Communications Officer  
Emily Goodwin: BULSCA Club Development Officer

Nottingham: Bradley Hague and Alex Collard  
Southampton: Charles Thomas and Andy Oakey  
Bristol: Christopher Brown and Sophie Priddis  
Birmingham: Dale Stroyde and Patrick Mackie  
Loughborough: Abbie Collins and Sam Kirkland  
Sheffield: Michael Kirkham and Ellie Simms  
London: Saw Ran Sing and Ziyun Poh  
Warwick: Rebecca Ewers and Mike Ducker  
Swansea: Josh Hale and Jonah Millar

Judges Panel: Alan Sutherland and Oliver Coleman

### 1. Welcome and Apologies

Jamie Shone (BULSCA Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting. Sheffield and Warwick are on their way.

### 2. Approval of AGM minutes

Holly Willing (Birmingham) proposed acceptance and Dale Stroyde (Birmingham) seconded.

Approve: 7      Reject: 0      Abstain: 1

### 3. Matters arising from previous minutes

Oliver Coleman (Judges Panel) said that the RLSS are keeping the tea towel rule for swim and tow and they have no wish to change it in the future. Michael Kirkham (Sheffield) said that we should try and follow the RLSS rules as much as possible, unless it is impractical. Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) said that the Union don't take the sport seriously anyway and using a tea towel may affect funding. Dale Stroyde (Birmingham) said he heard officials complaining at RLSS competitions. Harry Withers (BULSCA) said that it would make it harder to convince new Freshers if we tell them that we use a tea towel in one event. Josh Hale (Swansea) said that there is a danger to straying away from RLSS. It could be confusing for those who do other competitions. He doesn't necessarily agree here but in general we should do what the RLSS does. Holly Willing (Birmingham) said that BULSCA made up the event so we can change it if we like. Oliver Coleman (Judges Panel) pointed out that in 2004 the events were made up from RLSS Nationals events in a four-man form. Josh Hale (Swansea) suggested we trial it for a season. Cathy Owles (Nottingham) suggests we trial it at one competition where it is non-counting. Luke Peel (BULSCA) points out the problem is not a technical one, it is the image of the event that is the problem.

Vote:  
Accept: 1      Reject: 5      Abstain: 1



## 4. Officer Reports

**Jamie Shone (Chair):** Jamie has done lots of work in the background this year. There have been ups and downs but it has been a very good year. There has been good work from everyone involved. Jamie said thank you to the judges and volunteers for doing their best and he is very grateful. He said there is still work to do to improve BULSCA. We unfortunately lost Oxbridge this year but he would like to expand BULSCA. The leagues are very close and A league in particular will be decided today! He ended by wishing the next committee good luck.

**Rob Forster (Treasurer):** Rob has been situated in Belfast so has not been around in person as much as he would like. He has done a lot of work in the background including making the process of payment smoother which took a lot of time. He also updated the financial form. There are still a lot of clubs to pay for BULSCA Championships so the balance is not the final balance of the year.

Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) said that we would be bust in 18 months as the net spend is minus £1000 and we make an £800 loss on BULSCA Championships. Rob explained that it was because we bought the training pool and did not want to put the costs onto clubs. He could have increased the entry fee but didn't. £700 should sit in the champs account for the following year. Josh Hale (Swansea) said that the club could have got a 25% discount on the pool booking but this will not be available in future as they know it is for BULSCA. Rob also pointed out that 10 teams attended and only 9 have currently paid. He also said that London and Plymouth may not have paid their membership fee. Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) asked whether full accounts will be published. Rob said yes.

**Hannah Smallwood (Secretary):** Hannah said that she has found this year on committee challenging but also enjoyable having learnt a lot. Over the past year she said she has developed a much better understanding of how BULSCA runs. She hopes to be able to use what she has learnt to contribute to BULSCA in the future. She said she has had the pleasure of working with a great committee and the minutes from the meetings are all available online. Hannah wished good luck to the next committee and hope they enjoy it as much as she has.

**Emily Goodwin (Club Development Officer):** Emily said that she has run two judges courses and there is a boot camp for clubs tomorrow which 20 people are attending.

**Luke Peel (Championships Co-ordinator):** Luke said that BULSCA Championships was a big success even though there were a couple of issues. He has published a report which is on the website which people can read if they want to. Basic summary of the report follows. There were some complains as it was not in the most central of locations. However, he explained that he had two choices which were Swansea or Cardiff, and Swansea had a training pool and a club. The average travel times were detailed in the report, Swansea was a bit further but the pool was nicer so he stuck with the decision. Due to the pool being booked late it was more expensive and a discount from Swansea University Lifesaving Club could not have been used as it was a quick decision as there was a cancellation. Luke explained that he tried to keep all costs down and managed to get 20% off food. Luke said that he is still awaiting payment from some clubs which received dated invoices. Luke invited those at the meeting to read the feedback and he will always welcome more.

Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) suggested that it might be worth asking clubs to pay in advanced if there is a problem with people not paying. Luke then explained that he has started looking for a pool for next year but has not made a huge amount of contact yet. Ideally it would be booked on Monday. Josh Hale (Swansea) said that his club have to travel for every other competition so it does even out over all. Michael Jacklin (Loughborough) asked whether there was a date yet. Luke said the date would be decided based upon pool availability.



**Harry Withers (Data Manager):** Harry said he has found the year more challenging than he expected but it was also interesting. He will work closely with next year's Data Manager to ensure there is a smooth transition. He said that the online banking is not working so he is continuing to work on the assumption that clubs have paid.

## 5. Elections

### 5.1 Chair

**Richard Evans -** Richard was unable to attend the meeting but sent a speech to Jamie Shone (BULSCA Chair) to read out. The speech explained a bit about Richard and that he wanted to give back to BULSCA. He said he would like more judges feedback, was a good negotiator and has a new mystery for next year. A question and answer session had taken place on Facebook due to Richard's non-attendance.

**Josh Hale –** Josh explained that he has been in BULSCA for 8 years and he is still enjoying himself. He has been a trustee of a charity for 4 years and is good at getting money from pots which he would use to support BULSCA. He knows sports structures and support available for clubs. He has been Swansea's club captain. He hopes to support and grow new clubs and work to implement changes based upon feedback and make a BULSCA for everyone. Josh said that he has worked to further charity and drowning prevention work where there was in-fighting and is experienced at problem solving. He said there are 129 universities but only 10 university lifesaving clubs. He has a strategic plan to get lifesaving to be a BUCS sport.

Rob Forster (BULSCA) asked about sponsorship and what ideas he has regarding funding BULSCA. Josh said there are lots of pots of money and he knows lots of links to funding including community chests, comic relief and children in need. He would like to use money to set up new clubs and help existing ones. He said he would actively help find funding and people. Actively recruit new people and make new clubs. Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) said that there have been issues with joining BUCS before and BUCS are currently not accepting new sports. Josh said that he would talk to them and find out what we need to do. Oliver Coleman (Judges Panel) said that we needed 1.5 times more people at Champs and not even RLSS National Speeds have enough people. Josh said he was hoping to target universities, 10 who are very passionate about sport or lifesaving in the area such as Cardiff. Bradley Hague (Nottingham) asked what about him stands out against others. Josh replied by saying he is very particular with constitutions which has not been done today. He would like a shared calendar for committee and will make sure to get new clubs. Split development officer into two roles, for current and new clubs. Next year will be getting a job but he said he is passionate so will work on BULSCA in evenings and will have more free time.

**Michael Kirkham –** Michael explained that he was Warwick and is now Sheffield. He explains that he should be voted in because he has a lot of experience and has done university lifesaving since 2009, and has spent 14 years doing lifesaving. He was Warwick President and although he has not been on the BULSCA committee, he knows lots people who have been so when he doesn't have the answers he can find out. Michael said that he would like to improve communications by using emails and utilising the website fully. He would like to make it easier to check the website and read emails, and work with the committee to make this happen.

Bradley Hague (Nottingham) asked what makes Michael stand out. He said that he has been in BULSCA for a long time so knows many people involved. He also won't be doing exams and is in charge of his own schedule as will be going into his final year of his PhD. Harry Withers (BULSCA)



asked how Michael will extend the reach of BULSCA. Michael said that he will be the face and representative of members. He will also help the rest of the committee. Michael Jacklin (Loughborough) asked how Michael intends to bring BULSCA closer to the RLSS. Michael said that in lifesaving sport some clubs forget about Survive and Save, and other awards. He would make sure clubs are doing awards and would also keep in contact with the RLSS using his contacts.

Michael Kirkham was voted in as Chair

## 5.2 Secretary

**Jared Wray** – Jared was absent but sent a speech. He said he would be attending later to cheer everyone on. Jared said that he had done lifesaving since a very young age and has done university lifesaving for two years, and has been president of his university club for the past year. He has taken the training sessions for Bristol and delivered a number of courses to the club, with lifesaving being a massive part of his life. He says that he works hard and has a drive to develop skills to a high standard. He would like to get BULSCA back into the RLSS magazine and will ensure minutes are precise.

Harry Withers (BULSCA) asked whether Jared had good attendance. His club (Bristol) said he had very good attendance.

Jared Wray was voted in as Secretary.

## 5.3 Treasurer

**Stéphanie Panagi** – Steph explained that she is going into chartered accountancy and will facilitate everyone and make sure everything is viable. She hates lateness and is very proactive and organised. She is also good at maths. She has been the Treasurer for Bristol and has received sponsorship and equipment offers.

Rob Forster (Treasurer) said that lateness is a formality of the role and how will she deal with this. Stephanie said that persistence is key. In her second year tracked down a pair of tracksuit bottoms for her club. Sarah Falconer (Sheffield) said that BULSCA has made a loss this year and asked how she plans to make this back. Stephanie said that she will look over the accounts in July and come up with ideas. Michael Jacklin (Loughborough) asked whether there is anything other than funding that she thinks would help clubs and BULSCA to make money. She said she would encourage collaboration between clubs to see how different clubs make money. Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) asked whether she would fine clubs for late payments, she said if rules are written down they should be enforced unless special circumstances.

Stéphanie Panagi was voted in as Treasurer.

## 5.4 Club Development Officer

**Josh Hale** – His drive is development-based, working with clubs and helping set up new ones. He helped achieve a £700 profit in Swansea. He will look at where clubs can develop and where they can go in order to identify areas to assist them. Target courses in areas required. He will work with branches and ambassadors to help support new clubs. He wants to run boot camp and seminars, as well as online boot camps too (filmed).





- Q: (Nottingham): Ideas to transition from doing judges course to coming to judge?
- A: Fund their space, and enforce them to judge. Target the right people for the course.
- Q: (Loughborough): How do you support people wanting to set up a club?
- A: Support them from local people. Online resources. Find people in RLSS to help. Train as Lifesaving Instructor. Set them up with tips for funding.

**Hannah Smallwood and Bradley Hague** - Bradley - Been in lifesaving for four years, and has been President and Treasurer for Nottingham. He helped build the club from 6 to 30 members. They intend to use Skype workshops, look at captains' needs, and establish where to grow. Nottingham has RLSS contacts for boot camps and instructors courses which they are able to utilise. They would like to create a 'Training ideas' folder to help clubs. Broaden signups for RLSS competitions to get people involved in external competitions. They are looking to involve alumni more, using their expertise, and entering old boy teams. They will work with the clubs' feedback and are willing to travel around the country for free!

- Q: (Loughborough): Clubs struggle with kit and funding, what would you do to help clubs afford more kit?
- A: Help to find funding, help with contacts to RLSS to borrow or buy kit. Local coaches could be contacted to help with training.
- Q: (Loughborough): Are you interested in helping to create new clubs?
- A: Yes, we know what they need to put in place.
- Q: Alan Sutherland (Judges Panel): How do you propose to keep alumni involved?
- A: Judging, old boy teams, put them in contact with RLSS so they have a club to go to other than their university club.
- Q: (Nottingham): Are you prepared to go to old clubs and get them back up and running?
- A: Yes, will be able to use the boot camp to help them. And will be able to travel and help them on location.

Josh Hale was voted in as Club Development officer

## 5.5 Data Manager

**Luke Peel** – Luke said that he would do a knowledge share with Oliver Coleman (Judges Panel) as they have a good relationship to get the website sorted. He is also interested in creating a wiki page, one private and one public. The private would be for the committee. He would also like to sort out the spam in the emails. He is a software engineer by day.

Luke Peel was voted in as Data Manager.

## 5.6 Championship Coordinator

**Frankie Bale** – Frankie said that she is in her second year of lifesaving but has thrown herself into it. She has organised past events and has organised Loughborough competition today. She has a



lot of knowledge as has bodied, competed and judged and has worked with lots of different people. She studies mechanical engineering and has good time management and is a forward thinker. She would like the timing for the Sunday of BULSCA Championships to be better and will be doing an internship in Cambridge next year.

She was asked about finance and said that she has not looked into it yet but would work with the Treasurer.

Josh Hale (Swansea) asked how she would ensure that a loss wasn't made without passing it onto clubs. Frankie said that she would invite more community teams to make more money. Oliver Coleman (Judges Panel) asked whether she would be willing to use a 25m pool if that was the only viable option. She said yes, if it was the only viable option.

**Helen Morris** - Helen said that she has been in BULSCA for 4 years and has really enjoyed the BULSCA Championships. She helped organise Sheffield's first competition last year and has organised multiple society events. She is a good negotiator with pools and venues. She has been Treasurer of BULSCA and is on sports committee now. She will prioritise sponsorship and different options such as £30 for a name and publishing with RLSS. Also make a Junior Committee Shield.

Josh Hale (Swansea) asked how she would ensure a loss wasn't made without passing it onto clubs. Helen said that she would provide a discount if more teams were entered to increase participation. Oliver Coleman (Judges Panel) asked whether she would be willing to use a 25m pool if that was the only viable option. Helen said that the 50m pool was a massive element of the competition.

Helen Morris was voted in as Championship Co-ordinator

## **5.7 Communications Officer**

**Hannah Smallwood** – Hannah said she is an experience of BULSCA committee. She has had experience using social media through Nottingham. She will take photos from every competition and post on Facebook. She will utilise Snapchat, use BULSCA website and spread word to other clubs too. She has experience of all social media. She would like an official competition report from each competition, written by different clubs.

Q: (Sheffield): Have any plans for specific content on the website?

A: No specific plan, but will work with Luke Peel (BULSCA). Will ensure all details are online.

Q: (Sheffield): What can you do to ensure communications go out to everyone, not just captains.

A: Use the email system, not just to Captains. Make sure more people know about it. Possibly create a Facebook group for clubs?

Q: (Nottingham): Any plans to send things to people who are not club, such to judges?

A: Send an email out to the judges specifically to make them feel like they are more involved. Sent by the email system.

Q: (Sheffield): How regularly will you use the Snapchat filters.



- A: Want to use at every competition, encourage clubs to take over snapchat for their training session for a day.

**Holly Willing** – Holly has been in BULSCA for five years and has been part of Bovey Tracey which is a community club. She really values where BULSCA sits in the RLSS and how they perceive us. She will use Facebook, mailing lists and the website. When she was 14 years old she was approached by Oliver Coleman (Judges Panel), so has had connections within BULSCA for a long time. She feels it is important to have constant communication. She will try to be at RLSS Nationals to promote BULSCA to a wider community.

- Q: (Nottingham): What about the issues some clubs face where not all opportunities are available?

- A: There will be other opportunities available. Will make people aware, but can't necessarily help you solve the issue.

- Q: (Sheffield): What non-competition website content would go up?

- A: A wide variety of non-competition material from lots of different people. If she can use it, others will be able to too.

- Q: (Sheffield): What can you do to ensure communications go out to everyone, not just club Captains?

- A: Make sure minutes are up on website. Do a weekly or monthly email. If she doesn't know, no one else knows it.

Holly Willing was voted in as Communications Officer

## **6. Competition allocations**

### **6.1. Allocation of Freshers' Competition**

**Nottingham** – Bradley Hague (Nottingham) explained that the application is based upon last years' competition. The pool is 8 lanes and seating is available. The event will be medley. SU social space is available but they are also looking into other options. Food is likely to be Dominos again and accommodation at a community centre. He is currently in negotiations with the pool to ensure the competition is financially viable. Currently forecasting a loss based on 80% but are in negotiations with the pool and that is based upon £30 entry.

Michael Kirkham (Sheffield) pointed out that medley is not usually the event for a Freshers' Competition due to training and fin availability. Nottingham asked whether other clubs were able to bring equipment for the event as they don't had enough. Warwick, Birmingham and Loughborough offered to bring manikins. Bradley Hague (Nottingham) also said that they had a social venue guaranteed but were also looking at other options such as venues in town.

An amendment was put forward to change the event to manikin and was accepted.

Clubs voted.

Accept: 9 Reject: 0 Abstain: 0





## 6.2. Allocation of league competitions

**Birmingham** – Birmingham explained that it would be held at their new sports centre and would be 25m of a 50m pool. Event would be medley but would try and run all three events. Would like February depending on the BUCS calendar.

**Bristol** – Bristol said that the accommodation would be houses. Event would be obstacles. Social in the SU as normal. Hopefully they will not have the pool cancelled so should run smoothly.

It was noticed that a loss would be made so Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) suggested they could put their fees up to £37.50.

**Loughborough** – Loughborough said that the competition would probably be at the leisure centre but don't know about the pool until September. Same food as usual. Held in April, not in holidays.

**Sheffield** – Sheffield said that all the dates offered are provisionally booked. League event would be medley, food would be burgers, and accommodation would be members houses. They may ensure that they break even by holding a raffle.

**Warwick** – Warwick said their event would be obstacles and the competition would be in November or December. Social would be in the Copper Room. Food would be Dominos, and accommodation would be in a centre with a 9am kick out time. It was discussed that the costs were not neutral and they are expecting to make a profit so the bid should not have been accepted.

**Southampton** – Southampton said that they had a few issues last year. They will use a different isolation venue and accommodation. The university pool will be used again. The only date they can do is the 17<sup>th</sup> February. Food will be burgers, event will be obstacles.

## 7. Proposals

### Proposal A -Appointing of Head Referee's

Mark McCorquodale (Proposer – Nottingham) explained that the judging process is perceived fairly. He gave the example that he had judged last year and has been competing for A team this year so could be a Head Referee at a competition and could penalise unfairly. He said there is currently no way to stop a Head Referee at a home club.

Judges Panel said that bias could be an issue but the committee can stop a referee if they think there could be bias. Also, having a home referee might be advantageous for the pool or staff discussions. Mark McCorquodale (Proposer – Nottingham) said that he proposed a clearer system so there would be more transparency if rejected. Harry Withers (BULSCA) said it would be worth having something written down but bias is bias. India Pollard (BULSCA) said that Warwick and Birmingham are the same branch but their bias would not necessarily branch based. India proposed that 'branch' was removed from the proposal, this was accepted. Michael Jacklin (Loughborough) said there was perceived bias because of training because clubs work differently but the individuals are generally unbiased and that the Head Referee is fair throughout as is not judging. Cathy Owles (Seconder – Nottingham) said if the judging appears transparent and fair it will avoid grumblings and gossip. Josh Hale (Swansea) said that Swansea has less judges so feel more bias. Sheffield said that smaller clubs have less judges and it does not make life too hard.



Julia Whitworth (Birmingham) said that this is creating more of a problem than a solution, either trust judges or don't but is putting idea of bias in heads.

Amendment: Amend "the head referee shall be independent from the host university and host branch" to "the head referee shall be independent from the host university"

Vote:

Accept: 4      Reject: 4      Abstain: 1

Proposal rejected by Jamie Shone (BULSCA Chair).

## **Proposal B - Allocation of judges to SERCs**

Mark McCorquodale (Proposer – Nottingham) said that there should be at least one non-host club judge per SERC. He said that the judges should be split as evenly as possible as if lots of affiliation there will be a slight preference and slight advantage.

Michael Jacklin (Loughborough) said that the different parts of the country that come into BULSCA is a separate issue. Branches should be split evenly. Sam O'Connor (Former BULSCA Chair) said that judges are judged on experience and other factors like SERC setters already, but adding in another thing would make things better. This would mean greater effort would be made to make it more balance but would be at the discretion of the committee who could waver it. Josh Hale (Swansea) said that two training officers train the same so judge based on own training. Holly Willing (Birmingham) said she has noticed there are problems but it should be resolved with a different proposal. Harry Withers (BULSCA) said that there might be club bias but not branch bias however it was pointed out that branches might have the same training assessor. The Judges Panel said that they recommend it is rejected as this year some SERCs were confirmed a day before which is a problem in itself. Possible suggestion was that Judges Panel decide which judges are allocated to the SERCs. It was agreed that the Judges Panel would check the judge's allocation.

Vote:

Accept: 3      Reject: 5      Abstain: 1

## **Proposal D - Simplify Casualty Specifications**

Holly Willing (Proposer – Birmingham) explained that she had noticed that treatments are not the same across all publications but SERCs could be written with casualties from any RLSS publications. She is proposing that casualties are written from the Survive and Save only which includes Life Support. It would also include Survive and Save Beach strand for those who do Surf Lifesaving. This would provide a clear list of casualties and treatment

Judges Panel said that it was a great idea and backed it. It would result in one or two casualties being removed but principle is better. Michael Jacklin (Loughborough) said that there are many publications and it would reduce the number of casualties including spinal. Sarah Falconer (Sheffield) said that it would be clearer but Survive and Save is limiting. There are set documents



on the website. She said it would be too severe a cut and the quality of the SERC was dependent on the SERC setter. Alan Sutherland (Judges Panel) said that this year officials were not sure what they were judging, and if they don't know beach lifeguarding it could cause conflict with the way casualties are marked. RLSS judges need to have done the Survive and Save Instructors course. Judging was effected by judges' experience. Jonah Millar (Swansea) said that he is an Pool Lifeguard TA and doesn't know Survive and Save. Michael Kirkham (Sheffield) said that that it would encourage judges to know Survive and Save, and would be judging from same page. Oliver Coleman (Judges Panel) pointed out it also brings us in line with RLSS club SERCs.

Vote:

Accept: 6      Reject: 1      Abstain: 1

### **Proposal C - SERC Casualty Recommendations**

Holly Willing (Proposer – Birmingham) says that to be a judge they must prove they can complete a lifesaving course and a list of those who have done course is updated by committee every year. To be a branch RLSS SERC Official you must be a Survive and Save Instructor. She would like to introduce guidelines to be used where possible if there are enough judges. Basically an RLSS Branch Official would be qualified to judge a BULSCA competition. Others would be restricted to overall judge, CPR (as Life Support 3 is required to do the course) and phone.

Judges Panel recommend it is rejected because overall judge may require Survive and Save Instructor course too based on what she said. If they know the skills toolbox knowledge then can judge. This would not sustainable currently. Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) said he sees where she is coming from but it may affect the number of judges as being the phone judge is often boring if not found. Holly Willing (Proposer – Birmingham) said she would rather have a judge who was comfortable judging a casualty than one who was uncomfortable, if their knowledge is not up to date for example. Cathy Owles (Nottingham) said that people volunteer to judge so can deem themselves whether they are suitable for judging particular casualties. She said that as a competitor she would like to know that she is being judged fairly. Michael Kirkham (Sheffield) wanted to clarify that the only difference between RLSS and BULSCA judges currently is that the RLSS judges are also Survive and Save Instructors. Jonah Millar (Swansea) said that he was less likely to judge because he is an Pool Lifeguard TA but does not have the Survive and Save Instructor qualification. Sheffield pointed out that to be a full judge it could cost £100, so it would make it harder for people to be full judges as they understand the pressures many have anyway. Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) pointed out that if RLSS qualification lapses then only basics such as phone could be done which would increase confidence. Michael Jacklin (Loughborough) said that Pool Lifeguard TA is £600 but same treatment knowledge for first aid and therefore should count.

Vote:

Accept: 3      Reject: 5      Abstain: 1



## **Proposal E - League Competition Medals**

Abbie Collins (Proposer - Loughborough) explained that at the moment only the top three teams get medals and she would like to introduce more medals to recognise the achievements of B teams. This would benefit those teams that do well in their league but don't come in the top three teams. She said that this was particularly important for Freshers' Competition.

Sam O'Connor (Former BULSCA Chair) said that he thinks the idea is good but it should be up to the organisers to do own medals for winning and A league is often the same as overall. Josh Hale (Swansea) said that there should be two sets of medals as well as overall. Sarah Falconer (Sheffield) said that there should just be B league and overall medals as A league and overall are often the same. Josh Hale (Swansea) suggested presenting certificates or medals to the A and B leagues but medals at Freshers' Competition. Alan Sutherland (Judges Panel) asked where this would fit in in the rules and regulations in manual. It would go in the manual in relevant section.

Amendment: Freshers' Competition – top three Freshers teams must get medals. All other comps – Top three A and B teams in leagues presented with medals or certificates.

Accept: 4      Reject: 4      Abstain: 1

Accepted by the Jamie Shone (BULSCA Chair).

## **Proposal F - HELP Sheets for SERCs**

Michael Jacklin (Proposer – Loughborough) said that he would like to provide sheets for judges to describe signs, symptoms, history and treatment for casualties. It would not be a marking guideline just as help, particularly for new judges to make them feel comfortable. It will be there if you want to use it.

Mark McCorquodale (Nottingham) asked specifically how it would be done. Michael Jacklin (Proposer – Loughborough) said printed pages from lifesaving manual rather than own sheets. He said he trialled at Nottingham competition and took sheets from NPLQ PowerPoints, but it would be the same for Survive and Save. Alan Sutherland (Judges Panel) said it worked at Nottingham and thinks pages can be taken from directly from Survive and Save. Michael Jacklin (Proposer – Loughborough) said he would suggest a bullet point list that is copied so visually easy but has not stated how in proposal. Oliver Coleman (Judges Panel) said it should be a copy of the Survive and Save manual for each casualty so there is no dispute. Michael Jacklin (Proposer – Loughborough) agreed and a PDF is available online of the manual. Luke Peel (BULSCA) said that the manual can be accessed without paying and it was designed that way. Judges Panel agree but would check with RLSS that that was alright. Michael Jacklin (Proposer – Loughborough) accepted Sheffield's amendment.

Amendment: Instead of 'Help Sheet' – 'Copy of relevant pages from Survive and Save manual'.

Vote:

Accept: 9      Reject: 0      Abstain: 0

## **Proposal G – Tied league**

Online vote: Accepted



## **8. Approval of 2017-18 calendar**

28<sup>th</sup> October 2017 – Nottingham Freshers' Competition

4<sup>th</sup> November 2017 – Bristol Competition

18<sup>th</sup> November 2017 – Sheffield Competition

2<sup>nd</sup> December 2017 – Warwick Competition

3<sup>rd</sup> February 2018 – Birmingham Competition

17<sup>th</sup> February 2018 – Southampton Competition

28<sup>th</sup> April 2018 – Loughborough Competition

Vote:

Accept: 7      Reject:1      Abstain: 1

## **9. Any Other Business**

No other business declared.

Jamie Shone (BULSCA Chair) calls the meeting to a close.





## Appendix 1 – Proposals

### Proposal A -Appointing of Head Referee's

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

General Meeting

**Proposer Name and Position**

Mark McCorquodale (Former Uni of Notts Committee (various), former Bulsca Secretary, Judge)

**Seconder Name and Position**

Catherine Owles (Former Uni of Notts President, Judge)

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

Ensure the judging process in BULSCA competitions is as open and transparent as possible.

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

Notes from internal BULSCA guidance documents regarding judge allocation:

“Judges are sent an invitation to officiate at a competition via the Judges mailing list. From these replies the host club will select the officials they require. The host club will nominate a referee. If BULSCA committee feel that the appointed person is not experienced enough to take on this role or this individual was used too recently at another competition. Then the BULSCA committee will re-appointed the head referee. Anyone can raise concerns to the BULSCA chair and committee over the selection of any Referee. Every effort should be made to rotate referees and people should not referee back to back competitions, unless there is no other alternative. If the host club has a particular desire to see someone Head Referee their competition, they should make this known to BULSCA as early as possible. So that should shadowing of a referee at another competition can be arranged if required.”

Process by which judges allocate penalties in competitions:

- ) A minimum of 2 judges must spot the same rule infraction
- ) The infraction is reported to the head referee
- ) Using the observations reported, but ultimately at their own discretion, the head referee can decide if a penalty should be applied to the team, if it should be replaced with a warning or simply if no action should be taken.



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

Introduce rule 1.5.7.5. – 1.5.7.6.

1.5.7.5. – The head referee shall be independent from the host university and host branch

1.5.7.6. – Rule 1.5.7.5 may only be waived (with the approval of the BULSCA committee) in the event that all senior judges attending the competition are affiliated with the host university or host branch

#### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

Host clubs are often perceived to retain some small slight advantage at their home competitions that cannot be avoided, due to better knowledge of sports centre layout etc. This often leads to some host clubs developing reputations for “performing favourably” at their own competitions. Over my time within BULSCA I am aware of such reputations having existing around Nottingham competition (say pre 2010/2011) and Warwick competition (say 2011-2014). Such reputations can develop at any competition and steps should be taken to avoid this.

At Birmingham University Competition 2017 the club appointed a Head Referee affiliated with the University of Birmingham. The head Referee was notified of rule infractions by teams from the University of Birmingham in Swim and Tow, but rather than applying penalties (DQ's) to the teams they instead used their discretion to simply give warnings. In this case infractions were due to “coaching” of competitors by other club members of the side (DQ 205). Those involved in the “coaching” were warned to stop by BULSCA judges but ignored them.

Club captains should be aware that it is not infrequent for warnings to be given to clubs for “coaching”. However, examples such as this cause issues for BULSCA in that it questions the fairness and impartiality of BULSCA judges affiliated with host competitions. This eventuality should be avoided wherever possible to prevent the perceived “home competition advantage”. Ensuring that a head referee is not affiliated with a host university is one step towards achieving this.

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

Action	Deadline
Include rule 1.5.7.5. – 1.5.7.6. in 2017-2018 competition manual	2017-2018 season



## **Proposal B -Allocation of judges to SERCs**

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

General Meeting

**Proposer Name and Position**

Mark McCorquodale (Former Uni of Notts Committee (various), former Bulsca Secretary, Judge)

**Seconder Name and Position**

Catherine Owles (Former Uni of Notts President, Judge)

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

Ensure the judging process in BULSCA competitions is as open and transparent as possible.

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

Rule 1.5.2. : “At least two (2) officials shall be independent from the host university and host branch. At least one (1) independent official shall be allocated to the aquatic-based SERC and at least one (1) independent official shall be allocated to the land based SERC.”

Notes from internal BULSCA guidance documents regarding judge allocation:

“When allocating judges to SERCs, care should be taken to ensure that on each SERC there are judges connected to at least two universities and wherever possible judges from at least two RLSS branches, in subjective marking positions. Subjective marking positions are those where judgement is required to assign scores, rather than a prescriptive marksheet. Ideally the Judge Marking Overall should also be from a different University or Branch of that of the Setter. Providing they have suitable experience to carry out this role”



At Birmingham Competition 2017 my understanding of the affiliations of officials associated with the SERC were as follows:

	<b>Wet</b>	<b>Dry</b>
<b>SERC setter</b>	Uni Birmingham (Warwickshire branch)	Uni Loughborough
<b>Judges panel review</b>	Uni Birmingham (Warwickshire branch)	Uni Birmingham
<b>Head Ref</b>	Uni Birmingham (Warwickshire branch)	Uni Birmingham
<b>Overall judge</b>	Uni Warwick (Warwickshire branch)	Uni Bath
<b>Other judges</b>	Uni Birmingham (Warwickshire branch)	Uni Southampton
	Uni Birmingham (Warwickshire branch)	Uni London + Uni St Andrews
	Uni Birmingham (Warwickshire branch)	Uni Bristol
	Uni Warwick (Warwickshire branch)	Uni Nottingham
	Uni Warwick (Warwickshire branch)	Uni Swansea
	Uni Warwick (Warwickshire branch) + Uni Bristol	Uni Birmingham

Note this is in part based on historical affiliations. Officials are often deemed to lose an affiliation after that have not been directly involved with a club for 3 years (I believe). However, this is often in reality not the case.

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

Introduce rule 1.5.1.3-1.5.1.4:

1.5.1.3 – Officials affiliated with the host club or host branch must be approximately evenly distributed between the aquatic-based SERC and the land-based SERC.

1.5.1.4 – Failure to comply with rules 1.5.1.2-1.5.1.3. shall result in a competition being designated as non-league counting, at the discretion of the BULSCA chair. In the event that the BULSCA chair is also affiliated with the host club this responsibility shall be designated to the BULSCA secretary.



#### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

Depending on how one treats historical affiliations the Birmingham Competition 2017 may have been run contravening the competition rules. Regardless of whether this is the case the exclusive involvement of officials from the Warwickshire branch in the running of every step of the wet SERC was inappropriate in light of the range of officials in the dry SERC not associated with Warwickshire branch.

This is important as a result of the so-called “home-advantage”. Note that although all judges mark in accordance with RLSS guidelines, these guidelines are none the less subjective to a certain extent and as a result it is not uncommon for different regions to develop different understandings of “ideal” treatments. Therefore the same treatment could be marked differently by judges from different regions. Furthermore, judges are often long-standing members of clubs that may have been involved with training of clubs members. Judges affiliated with clubs therefore have often passed on these specific preferences to their club members. Although this is NOT in any way inappropriate or could be construed as cheating, this can provide a distinct “home advantage” for clubs if a large proportion of judges at the competition are affiliated with their club. This can be demonstrated by noting that in this wet SERC, of the top 8 teams, 5 of them were affiliated with the host club.

In order to minimise this effect it is desirable to ensure officials associated with the host club/branch are evenly distributed across the two SERCs.

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

Action	Deadline
Introduce rule 1.5.1.3-1.5.1.4 to competition manual for 2017-2018 season	2017-2018





## Proposal C - SERC Casualty Recommendations

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

General Meeting

### Proposer Name and Position

Holly Willing – University of Birmingham Away Competition Secretary 2016-17

### Seconder Name and Position

Julia Whitworth – University of Birmingham Captain 2015-2016

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

Introduce a recommendation for the allocation of casualties to judges within Wet & Dry SERCS.

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

Currently, there is no allocation process for assigning judges to casualties. The only requirement to become a BULSCA official is to demonstrate that you could pass Life Support 3. Following up on whether the BULSCA Official has met this condition recently is up to the current BULSCA committee and could be easily overlooked. Some judges are also RLSS Branch SERC Officials, this is different from a BULSCA official as they are required to be RLSS Survive and Save instructors.

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

Addition to section 5.8 in the Guidelines for Setting a Simulated Emergency Response Competition:

'Wherever possible, number of judges permitting, the allocation of casualties to judges will follow the following recommendation:

- BULSCA Officials only (i.e. not RLSS Branch SERC Officials) will be limited to judging phone, overall and CPR casualties.

Therefore, RLSS Branch SERC Officials will have no limitations and will be able to judge remaining casualties.



Where multiple BULSCA Officials and RLSS Branch SERC Officials remain after allocation of CPR, phone, overall in both SERCS, RLSS Branch SERC Officials will be given precedence over BULSCA Officials in terms of judging.'

#### **Motivation – Why are you proposing this?**

I am proposing this change to ensure that judges are completely comfortable attending competitions and judging casualties in a SERC. It should also ensure that judges who have additional qualifications are judging the more technical casualties and therefore result in a greater segregation of marks within that casualty. Thus, resulting in an improved competitive environment for the teams. Finally, it should be noted that this is only to introduce these as guidelines for the SERC setter and can only be implemented if sufficient judges attend the competition.

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

Action	Deadline
Update Guidelines for Setting a Simulated Emergency Response Competition	2017/18 season



## Proposal D - Simplify Casualty Specifications

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

General Meeting

### Proposer Name and Position

Holly Willing – University of Birmingham Away Competition Secretary 2016-17

### Seconder Name and Position

Julia Whitworth – University of Birmingham Captain 2015-2016

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

Simplify the casualty specifications for the Dry SERC and Wet SERC

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

Currently, casualties within a SERC can be defined from any RLSS publication. This makes it difficult for clubs to combine their training for RLSS awards, most commonly within the Survive and Save scheme and Life Support courses, with competition training. Furthermore, judges may be placed in the position where they are judging a SERC casualty having had no previous experience with the appropriate rescue and first aid techniques and little time to prepare given the time constraints of the competition.

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

Change the Competition Manual:

5.3.2.5. Rescue and first aid techniques will be judged in accordance with the latest published protocols from the Royal Life Saving Society (UK).

To:

5.3.2.5. Rescue and first aid techniques will be judged in accordance with the latest published protocols from the Royal Life Saving Society (UK) Survive and Save Manual for Instructors and Life Support manuals.



#### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

I am proposing this change to encourage the participation of clubs within the Survive and Save Awards scheme in order to further improve their abilities as lifesavers and their performance within competitions. It will also aid in structuring competition tailored training. In addition, since it is common for judges to be RLSS UK Officials (requiring that they are Survive and Save instructors), then most judges will be aware of the most appropriate treatment and rescue. I appreciate that some lifesavers with a surf background may feel at a disadvantage, however there are ocean aspects to the Survive and Save scheme which would still be applicable to SERCs. Finally, removing the potential to use casualties from the NPLQ removes conflicting advice regarding the difference in approach from a professional lifeguarding perspective and a lifesaving one.

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

Action	Deadline
Update competition manual	2017/18 season



## Proposal E - League Competition Medals

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

General Meeting

### Proposer Name and Position

Abbie Collins - Loughborough Chair 16/17

### Seconder Name and Position

Sam Kirkland - Loughborough Head Coach 17/18

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

Adequate recognition for the B League throughout the season in league competitions.

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

In the League Competitions at present only the top three competition places receive medals. This generally consists of A teams which excludes B team efforts. Consequently, despite B teams performing as well in their respective league, they are typically not rewarded for their performances because of how the results are currently done.

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

In league competitions, the results of the A league and B league should be announced following the results of the overall standings. With this, medals would also be awarded to the top three teams in both A league, and the top 3 teams in the B league at every league competition.

### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

This is being proposed to give fairness to both leagues and to ensure recognition to both the A and B teams in the leagues. At present, the competitions are scored as A and B teams being separate, however, only the competition places are announced and recognised in the form of medals. The reason for this proposal is largely because the B league teams are currently not receiving sufficient recognition for their efforts as they rarely make the top 3 competition places as this naturally tends to be the A teams. Moreover, there have been several competitions over recent years where the A league rankings have been different to the competition places and therefore teams have not been recognised for their efforts during the results.





Medals are a small cost at a competition and therefore this proposal is feasible, and would have significant benefits in recognising the performances of both respective leagues.

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

Action	Deadline
Should this proposal be successful, changes would need to be formalised in the BULSCA League Rules and Regulations, with this change looking to come in take effect for the start of the 2017/18 season.	Summer 2017

#### Resources – What will your proposal cost? What equipment/manpower is needed?

Resource	Source	Quantity	Price	Cost
24 x additional medals at every league competition	Dependent on medal provider used by respective clubs (price estimate given using Running Imp)	24	£0.69	16.56
			VAT	3.33
<b>P&amp;P:</b>				NA as already covered with the 12 medals brought at present
<b>Total Cost:</b>				£19.89
<b>Total Profit:</b>				

## Supplementary Documents (Attached)



### FREESTYLE 10

£0.69 EACH

IN STOCK

All prices displayed are exclusive of VAT. All sizes shown are approximate.

QUANTITY - 1 +

#### MEDAL COLOUR: \*



#### ENGRAVING TEXT

I would like engraving on my item

#### UPLOAD ENGRAVING

I would like to upload my engraving

#### NO ENGRAVING REQUIRED

I don't want engraving on my item

TOTAL COST

£0.69



## Proposal F - HELP Sheets for SERCs

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

General Meeting

### Proposer Name and Position

Michael Jacklin – Loughborough Coach and Judge

### Seconder Name and Position

Chris Miles – Loughborough Coach

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

SERC Setters along with the Judges Panel to provide HELP sheets (signs symptoms and treatments) for each casualty.

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

New judges can use these sheets to assist there marking. All judges can use these to jog their memories and remember some of the less commonly known treatment points that are sometimes missed.

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

HELP Sheets to be provided for all SERC's to allow assistance for judges. I must emphasise these are HELP sheets and not MARKING sheets. Judges are expected to have the knowledge these are just there to assist with recognising little things competitors may or may not do to help differentiate between teams.

I am available via Facebook and I'm sure the Judging panel are also if Setters require any assistance in getting this information

### Motivation – Why are you proposing this?

Trialled at Nottingham Dry SERC last year the judges remarks were positive. These sheets are simply helping highlight any technical area the SERC setter is looking to test in his/her SERC. Judges aren't forced to use these sheets but they are there to refresh the memory on the specific casualty they are judging and also helps easily give the casualties instructions on how they should act.



Timetable and Actions – What do we need to do?	
Action	Deadline
HELP Sheets to become mandatory for SERC's	Start of 2017/2018 season
Sheets to be archived with the BULSCA Judging panel so that this isn't something setters will have to provide in the long term. Eventually when all casualties have a sheet the Judges panel can provide a basic HELP sheet to SERC setters which they can add to highlight key sections etc.	End of 2017/2018 season

Resources – What will your proposal cost? What equipment/manpower is needed?				
Resource	Source	Quantity	Price	Cost
RLSS DIRECT RESOURCES PAGE	NO COST			0
P&P:		0		
Total Cost:				0
Total Profit:				0



## Proposal G - Tied League

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

Online Voting

**Proposer Name and Position**

Oliver Coleman – BULSCA Judges Panel

**Seconder Name and Position**

Jamie Shone – BULSCA Chair

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

Add Clarification to Rules Manual

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

It has come to light the process for tie breaking the BULSCA league is not formally written down.

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

Add rules to guidance to web page to explain

If two teams are tied for points in the BULSCA league at the end of the season. Those teams shall be tie broke through first comparing number of first places finishes, should they still be tied then look at 2<sup>nd</sup> place, followed by 3<sup>rd</sup> until 9<sup>th</sup> is reached. At this point a tie shall be declared between those teams.

**Motivation – Why are you proposing this?**

When the scoring was brought in the break on a competition as removed.

This is the basis for how the league tie break works. Following the 3.14.3 as the first two do not apply in the case of the whole league.

**3.1.4** Ties in overall team point scores shall be broken using the following system:





**3.1.4.1 Ranking in the aquatic SERC**

**3.1.4.2 Ranking in the non-aquatic SERC**

**3.1.4.3 Most first-place final finishes;**

**3.1.4.4 Most second-place final finishes;**

**3.1.4.5 Most third-place final finishes...and so on.**

It is felt clarity is important for all clubs in the league around this issue.

**Supplementary Documents (Attached)**

All examples to tied league points.

[http://old.bulsca.co.uk/Excel/league\\_results/10\\_11/league.html](http://old.bulsca.co.uk/Excel/league_results/10_11/league.html) (A league 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>, B League 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>)

[http://old.bulsca.co.uk/Excel/league\\_results/07\\_08/league.html](http://old.bulsca.co.uk/Excel/league_results/07_08/league.html) 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> B league (look at one team finishing 6<sup>th</sup> 15 points due to league calculation at the time)

<http://old.bulsca.co.uk/Excel/leaguearchive.xls> 2004-2005 Show tie but not broken midway through the league. This was first year of national BUSCA rules and amendments to how the league was scored were made throughout that season. So no rules or process in place at that point. See Cm 1.0,1.1,1.2.