British Universities Lifesaving Clubs Association Meeting held on 8th December 2007 University of London Union

Attendance:

Kate Wade (Chair), Daniel Sedgewick (Club Development Officer), Daniel Graham (Company Secretary), Stuart Ward (Judge), and representatives from the following University Lifesaving Clubs: Loughborough, Nottingham, London, Bath, Warwick, Birmingham, Southampton, Cambridge, Swansea

Apologies:

Oliver Croad (Secretary), Chris McCorquodale (Treasurer), and representatives from: St Andrews, Oxford.

- 1. The minutes of the previous meeting were proposed and accepted as a true and accurate record.
- 2. In the absence of the Treasurer, his report was read to the attendees on his behalf. There have been several developments since the AGM of which clubs should be aware. Firstly, a bank account has been opened. However it has been opened with the NatWest Bank, and not with the Co-op. This is because of the greater flexibility of the NatWest bank, along with the same free banking offered by the Co-op. Specifically, a Co-op account could only be managed by post, internet, or at one specified Post Office branch, whereas using NatWest will allow us to use any branch

The current balance of the account should be (I've not received the statement yet) £447.20. Of this, £92.70 was collected at the Southampton competition, to be used for the maintenance of the new website, and the remaining £354.50 was transferred into the account by the RLSS when they closed their BULSCA 'Cost Centre'. I believe that this money may be a combination of surplus from last year's championships, and from 'failed' appeals.

Now that the bank account is set up, it is fairly future proof. The only possible problem on the horizon is if we are not accepted as a Community Interest Company, and have to set up as a (normal) Limited Company, then we may need to change account type (or bank) as this account is only available for charities, community groups, etc.

The bank balance itself if very healthy and I am confident that we will have enough funds to run a successful championships, and to put money towards other events/activities/equipment, as required.

Chris McCorquodale BULSCA Treasurer

- 3. Kate Wade stated that the new website was now up and running at www.bulsca.co.uk and was being maintained by an external party, due to difficulties in finding individuals within BULSCA who had the necessary skills and time to do so. Presently the website is being maintained free of charge, but this is not necessarily a permanent arrangement.

 Due to technical complexities, it was suggested that the Facebook group be used as an electronic forum for inter-club communications.
- 4. Dan Graham stated that the Articles of Association and Memorandum of Association had been completed. He had attended a course run by HMRC to ensure that everything was in order. The necessary forms had been completed and signed, and presently the complete package was with a JP who was completing Form 10 free of charge. Once this was completed, the package could be sent off to Companies House to register as a Community Interest Company.

The membership fee was set at £25, with a waiver on application for new clubs.

5.

6.

1. The suggestion to limit the League to a maximum of eight competitions provoked detailed conversation, a vote was held.

For: 3 Against: 3 Abstentions: 2 Result: No change to the present (unlimited) system.

2. The suggestion that one League competition should be wholly sports orientated provoked discussion, with several parties recalling the attempts that Loughborough had made at hosting a speeds competition.

For: 1 Against: 6 Abstentions: 1 Result: The league competition format remains as it is.

3. The suggestion that heats should be seeded provoked lengthy discussion. Several alternatives on how this should be done were tabled; including – submitted entry times, team performance at the previous competition, team performance average over the season. The advantages and disadvantages to each were discussed; including whether each event was seeded individually, or whether the competition was seeded as a whole. The general consensus was that seeding was desirable although complex to administer. A suggestion was made that a standardised electronic entry form was used, to enable competition hosts to easily transfer data into the standardised scoring spreadsheet.

For: 7 Against: 1
Result: Heats for the relay events shall be seeded. Loughborough agreed to trial a system at their competition, with a view to total implementation for the 08/09 season. This will be confirmed in May.

- 4. The suggestion to remove the Swim & Tow relay was unanimously rejected.
- 5. The suggestion to have separate leagues for incident performance and race performance was unanimously rejected. It was agreed that a table detailing these performances would be placed onto the website for interested parties.
- 1. The issue of competition SERCs was raised, with certain "reality" problems being highlighted. The suggestion to remedy this problem was that all SERCs were to be evaluated by the Head Judge prior to the competition. A potential problem was that very often the Head Judge is also a SERC setter. It was put forward that if all SERCs are verified by the same person (as there are very few people who act as Head Judge) there is a possibility of SERCs becoming formulaic, and potentially giving an advantage to certain teams. After lengthy discussion, the proposal to create a "panel" of suitable people was put forward. The SERC setters would then be able to contact a different people, avoiding any suggestion of bias or repetition. The discussion then centred on whether the SERC should be reviewed and approved by a group, or alternatively just one

person out of a nominated group.

Against: 0 For group reviewing: 1
For one person from a group reviewing: 7 Abstention: 1
Result: A group of approved persons shall be created and their contact details circulated to provide a "reality checking" and "problem spotting" service. This will be implemented as soon as the approved persons are appointed and all clubs will be

notified. In the interim it is advised that incidents are checked by the head judge or another experienced judge/incident setter prior to the competition.

At this point, representatives from Swansea joined the meeting.

- 2. The suggestion to limit the number of SERCs that one person can set was unanimously rejected, as there are now many SERC setters within BULSCA. It was however accepted as good guidance.
- 3. Complaints have been raised concerning the delays in publishing results from competitions. It was agreed that mistakes in results need to be caught before publication, and it does take time to go through the paperwork. It was unanimously agreed that the present limit of 14 days was reasonable. Further to this decision, punishments for contravention of this rule were discussed. The proposal of a £5 fine, with an additional £1 fine for each extra day of lateness was put forward, with the money going into BULSCA.

For: 7 Against: 1 Abstention: 1

4. The rule concerning the wearing of spectacles (5.3.1.6) was once again questioned. The same discussion that always surrounds this issue followed. The proposal was to remove the rule.

For: 7 Against: 1 Abstention: 1 Result: The rules concerning the wearing of spectacles will be removed and implemented from the Nottingham competition, subject to individual venue's risk assessments.

- 5. The suggestion that additional items can be added to the First Aid kit list that is presently in rule 5.3.8.1.3 was unanimously rejected.
- 6. Concerns were raised about the flaccid nature of the "rigid crosslines". Issues with the rigidity of the piping used, and the strength of the joints were highlighted. Several suggestions were made including; BULSCA investing in a well built set and using that at all competitions problems with storage and transportation were highlighted; returning to using a rope as the crossline. It was generally agreed that the present crosslines are unacceptable, and problems have arisen in competitions due to this. The proposal put forward was to remove rigid crosslines and use ropes instead.

For: 2 Against: 3 Abstentions: 4 Result: No change to the present rules regarding the construction of crosslines.

7. An issue concerning the "death" of a team member during a SERC was raised, in particular how they would be told. After discussion it was agreed that if a competitor "dies" during a SERC they need to die instantly and remain in the SERC area. It was suggested that a rule be added to state that the competitor will be deemed to be unconscious and not-breathing, it was also added that there should be no additional points for performing First-Aid on a team member.

For: 8 Against: 1 Abstentions: 0

Result: Rules will be amended.

7. Dominic Roberton gave a presentation about the planned training trip to Olivia in September 2008

The trip in 2007 was a great success. It is planned to be repeated with a similar format in 2008. Provisional dates are $1^{st} - 15^{th}$ September 2008. Plans are to use the same accommodation unless the number of people wanting to attend increases drastically. To secure a place on the trip a deposit of £125 per person needs to be made by the 10^{th} February. All information regarding this trip will be communicated through the facebook group 'Oliva2008 – for information'. Considering the option to have a 10day trip which will involve just the training or a 14 day trip that will allow people time to relax after the training and explore the area.

8. Kate Wade stated that due to booking difficulties, the location for the Championships would be at Burgess Hill pool near Crawley. Entries are required by the 12th of December. All events will be seeded, and therefore entries will be electronic in the form of an Excel spreadsheet. Awards, qualifications and the names of individual competitors are required by the 9th of February.

As a related point, questions were raised about turning when carrying manikins. The judges present agreed that any submersion of the manikin from the moment the competitor touches the turning edge, and the moment they pass the 5m mark shall not be considered a penalty.

As a related point, questions were raised about the records that BULSCA maintains. A lengthy discussion ensued about whether the requirement to be competing under the banner of a University was necessary. It theoretically encourages people to compete for their University and so raise the profile of BULSCA. Conversely, it means that the international athletes competing within BULSCA are unable to set records when competing for their country. No decision was reached due to time constraints. This will be followed by through e-mail discussions and a decision will be made before the BULSCA championships on the 1st of March 2008.

9. Bids to host the 2009 BULSCA University Championships were put forward by Bath and Swansea. Short presentations by representatives from each University were made, followed by questions from the attendees.

Bath: 1 Swansea: 7 Abstentions: 1

- 10. Clubs were encouraged to promote local development with neighbouring Universities and within their Branch. Daniel Sedgewick will be writing a club development newsletter.
- 11. Future integration with BUSA was once again raised. Dan Graham highlighted the principal reason for the rejection of the proposal put forward by Stuart Richardson; namely an insufficient number of regularly competing Universities. It was agreed that BUSA recognition was desirable, and should be strived for by encouraging the development of more University clubs. Hopefully with the introduction of a BULSCA Club Development Officer, and good relationships with the Anna Walters of the RLSS, this will progress more rapidly than it has in the past.
- 12. A proposal was put forward to have an open forum about the future of BULSCA where all interested parties could attend and speak, not just the club captains. It was agreed that this was desirable, and the Championships was suggested as a suitable occasion for such an event to be arranged.

13. A question was raised about the rules for the 4x 12m Line Throw Relay; whether or not it was legal to collect the thrown line with the competitor's feet. Judges could find nothing specifically disallowing it, providing that all other requirements about catching the line were complied with.	e