



**O U R C s**

# Captains' Meeting Agenda

Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> week Trinity Term 2023

7.00pm, 18<sup>th</sup> May 2023

Doctorow Hall, St Edmund Hall

Chair: Ella Stadler (OUWBC)

## Attendance (voting members):

College Clubs: 54

OURCs Committee: 5

Senior Umpires: 2

1. **Welcome**
2. **Minutes of the Last Meeting**  
Available at [www.ourcs.co.uk](http://www.ourcs.co.uk)

**No objections. Minutes ratified.**

3. **Matters Arising**  
No matters arising
4. **COUR Report** – Natasha Smith to speak

COUR met at the end of 2<sup>nd</sup> week, there were no points of interest aside from updating the committee on the outcome of the Proctors closure request, which has granted permission for pairs and doubles to boat during the weekday morning closure, beginning in Michaelmas term, Sunday 8th October, 2023.

5. **Transfers under A1.2** – Natasha Smith to speak

*Objections may only be based on the following:*

- Athlete is not a member of the college they are transferring from
  - Athlete has never been a member of the college they are transferring to
- Under A1.2.a:*

- Nina Djukanovicova – Jesus to Linacre (papers in order)

**No objections. Ratified.**

6. **Extension of Student Status** – Natasha Smith to speak  
*Two-thirds majority to pass*

**Charles Buchanan (Pembroke):** Charlie has recently submitted his corrections and is expecting to receive his leave to supplicate shortly after summer 8s. We would like to apply for an extension in case he receives leave to supplicate early, up until the 28th of May.

*Proposed: Thomas Johnston (Pembroke)*

*Seconded: Nik Baya (Pembroke)*

Voting:

For: 59

Against: 0

Abstentions: 2

**Extension of student status granted**

**7. Associate to row in Senior Divisions under A3.5.1.d – Hazel Bott to speak**  
*Simple majority to pass*

William Lanthier-Rogers (Merton) and Santiago Castiello (St Anne's) to row in St Anne's first (and only) boat. William would row on Wednesday and Thursday, Santiago for Friday and Saturday of Summer Eights.

"Due to a few of our Anne's M1 having exams in 5<sup>th</sup> week, we are short of rowers for a couple days of racing. Therefore, we would really appreciate having these two people row with us as associates. Given that our M1 is in a senior division (div 3) we need permission for this, but we don't have an M2 so this is our lowest men's boat. Without these guys we won't be able to get an M1 out so please help us out"

*Proposed: Hazel Bott (St Anne's)*

*Seconded: Jemima Bird (St Anne's)*

It was asked what the current academic status of both associates is, the proposer informed that William is still doing their degree at Merton, Santiago has recently graduated.

Voting:

For: 58

Against: 0

Abstentions:

**Motion passes.**

**8. Eligibility full/associate motions – Rachel Quarrell to speak**

As there are a number of motions regarding eligibility, Rachel has attended the meeting in order to highlight a number of facts from the perspective of senior college administrators and as a Senior Umpire.

College rowing is funded by a portion of tuition fees, plus donations, thus the committee of bursars regard it as a sport for students. Suspended students are typically considered by the bursars as not being allowed to participate in student sport. Eligibility within bumps racing is a serious matter as the places available to participate in bumps is limited, with racing occurring only 8 days a year. These places are thus under a lot of pressure, and bursars want to make sure the money from the club goes towards the students of the college who are fully eligible and should be prioritised for the seats.

Currently, fellows are permitted as they sit on governing bodies, and have access to development offices and can help advocate for a boat club. When passing new eligibility rules, captains should consider carefully the worst case scenario as well as the best case scenario, such as how some rules may benefit your rivals. Some colleges have widened fellowship to include non-stipendiary fellowships. The discussion of staff contracts came up approximately 12 years ago, following which the number of users

of this rule grew rapidly over three years and were largely experienced rowers, granting a large advantage to some clubs. After this response, the rule was then changed to what we have now.

Research associates and post docs can continue within the university system for a long time. Across 18 departments, there are approximately 8,500 postdocs, 2,800 in medicine. This group is made up of primarily science researchers, thus the more science-heavy colleges will have more postdocs. The captains are urged to consider the longevity and how it blocks student spaces in crews, since post-doctoral placements can be extended indefinitely, even if initially short-term. If a large group of people are suddenly made eligible, within 5 years that could have a large impact on the first eights. Additionally, the experience offered by such members provides a competitive advantage.

It was noted that while often written with a specific situation in mind, the Captains are encouraged to consider alternative applications and edge-cases, such that changes put forward are clear about what is and is not permitted and require minimal interpretation by the Senior Umpires or OURCs Committee.

9. **Amendment to the rules of racing** – Holly Haines to speak  
*Two-thirds majority to pass*

This amendment is intended for those who have actively participated in college rowing in the past e.g. as undergraduate or DPhil students, and have become post docs hired by a University Department. These 'Postdoctoral Research Associate' contracts usually do not provide a postdoc with a new college from which they could transfer back to their original college boat club under the current rules.

Under the current transfer rules, a post doc with a college affiliation ('Junior Research Fellow' / 'JRF') is permitted to transfer back to a previous college, so the intent of this amendment is simply making that rule uniform to all post docs regardless of contract type.

This amendment does not allow post docs with no previous college rowing association to transfer to a club. The amendment is further targeted to a small number of dedicated individuals by the stipulation that the post doc must have been an active / senior member of their previous club, as defined by at least three terms of membership, attested by the captains of that club in the transfer request.

Rule addition to A1.2. regarding transfers (in red):

A1.2. Transfers

[...]

- d. Where a Postdoctoral Research Associate associated with a University department, without a respective college boat club, has been a student member of College Boat Club A (as defined in A1.1.a.i.1) for at least three full terms and wishes to have membership of College Boat Club A, they may be transferred by the following procedure:
  - i. The Research Associate must provide to the OURCs Sabbatical Officer:
    1. Their name;
    2. Details of the type of University card they hold, and the number;
    3. Written permission of the captains of College Boat Club A, including confirmation of their previous status as a student member for at least three terms.
    4. Proof of academic status, including the finishing date for their departmental contract.

- ii. At the next Captain's Meeting, the OURCs Sabbatical Officer will include a list of transfers requested under this section on the agenda that have been received before the publishing of that agenda.
- iii. At the next Captain's Meeting, the captains will be given the opportunity to register their objection to the transfer. Objections may only be based upon one of the following:
  - 1. The individual is not a Postdoctoral Research Associate employed by a University department; or
  - 2. The Research Associate has not been a student member of College Boat Club A (as defined in A1.1.a.i.1).
- iv. In the event of an objection, the OURCs Sabbatical Officer will resolve whether or not the transfer can be brought under this section. This must be resolved before the end of the meeting in which the motion was raised.
- v. Transfers have effect from the end of the Captain's Meeting at which they are announced by the OURCs Sabbatical Officer.

*Proposed: Eimear Conroy (Christ Church)*

*Seconded: Holly Haines (Christ Church)*

The proposer asserted that this motion has been put forward with the intention of allowing a student who has recently received a postdoc to continue with their club, and it is not an effort from Christ Church to recruit more experience into the club. The proposer is willing to amend the proposed rule to close any loopholes.

The captains expressed they didn't feel it would be very sporting for the graduate-heavy clubs to have such a large advantage. It was also noted that JRFs are time-limited, while postdocs can continue for a much longer period. This could lead to a group of people in the top boat who don't move on from the club and would widen the gap between the postdoc heavy clubs and the undergraduate clubs. The proposer suggested stipulations could be made to limit the number of postdocs in each crew, or to limit the period for which they are eligible to participate as a full member.

It was stated that such a rule would exclude postdocs who are not ex-Oxford students, isolating this group. The proposer informed the captains that the rule has been limited in such a way as to make this a smaller step and could be expanded further. Additionally, this rule does not qualify ex-Oxford students who have been hired as a member of staff in any other role.

It was asked why postdocs could not just row in a lower boat as an associate, as they would still benefit from being a part of the community without filling a higher boat seat which should be filled by current students. The proposer responded that there are large differences between W2 and the lowest boat, which doesn't offer as much motivation to improve. This was followed by the suggestion to join a town club, or to move to a coaching position within the club.

In other transfers, these are allowed to permit someone to be attached to their original club and social circle. Additionally, they are fully eligible members of a club, thus the number of seats available across the event are still the same.

The rules as proposed does not stipulate when the full member status ends.

The proposers opted to table the motion and may bring it again to a future captains meeting.

**Motion tabled for further discussion.**

**10. Amendment to the Rules of Racing – Hamish Tynan to speak**

*Two-thirds majority to pass*

Frequently Asked Questions:

Q: Why are you putting forward this motion?

A: As a principle, we believe that students or fellows who have experienced serious and unresolvable welfare issues should be able to fully participate in college rowing. We also know several people who have unfortunately been the victims of such welfare issues, both within and outside our club, and we believe that it is worth providing them with the right to fully participate in college rowing.

Q: Could boat clubs abuse this article to stack college crews?

A: No. Due to the extremely high standards for evidence, only a small number of students or fellows will be eligible for transfer under this article. Students or fellows must provide, in writing, from their Dean or similar, evidence of “The existence of a documented conflict which resulted in a Decanal investigation that concluded the student was the victim of this conflict”, and the Dean’s opinion that “the investigated conflict is sufficiently serious and unresolvable such that the student is unable to row with College Boat Club A for concerns of their welfare.” Given the small number of students or fellows who will be able to reach this evidential threshold, it is highly unlikely that this motion could be abused. To ensure abuse does not occur, aside from a high evidential threshold, a further safeguard has also been included. For a period of 5 years after its introduction, Captains will have the opportunity to repeal this article with a majority vote (instead of the normally required two-thirds majority) if they suspect it is being abused.

Q: Could Deans or similar use this article to stack their college crews?

A: No. The Dean or similar of College A can only provide written evidence to release students from College A, and a crew of College A cannot be stacked by releasing students or fellows from College A. Furthermore, written proof is required from two senior College officials tasked with sensitive disciplinary and welfare roles whereby “rubber-stamping” documents or even making false claims may be considered a serious professional breach.

Q: Have you consulted any Deans about this?

A: Yes. We reached out to multiple Deans and they said the change is a good idea, which is pragmatic and achievable from a decanal perspective. In their opinion, the likelihood of someone organising a meeting with their college Dean, falsely claiming harassment, just to row with another boat club is extremely remote. They also said that they cannot imagine there would be a pushback from Deans.

Q: Will this article breach the privacy of students who have been the victim of welfare issues? A: No. The article explicitly states that “At no point should the College officials or the student be expected to provide any confidential information relating to the underlying issue”. Furthermore, the names of students released under this article are not listed in the minutes for Captain’s Meetings.

Q: Why not make the victims of welfare issues race as associates?

A: If we only allow the victims of welfare issues to race as associates, we victimise them twice over. Not only have they experienced a serious and unresolvable welfare issue, but we also force them to race in the lowest boat of a college. People should not suffer from the serious

issues this motion addresses in the first place; if they do, there is no reason why this fact should restrict them to rowing in a college's lowest boat. Survivors of welfare issues should have the right to **fully** participate in college rowing, which includes fighting for selection to higher boats, a key part of the experience for anyone with a competitive streak.

Q: What welfare issues would count as sufficiently serious?

A: A serious issue one that required official College intervention.

Q: Could a student falsely claim harassment and incite a Decanal investigation in order to row elsewhere?

A: No. The Decanal investigation needs to conclude that the student was in fact the victim, and this is highly unlikely if the claim is false. Furthermore, the university harassment policy describes victimisation as a form of harassment itself, which carries serious repercussions, up to and including criminal charges.

Q: Why should students have the right to join a club of their choosing? A: This option already exists for students who are at a college without an affiliated College Boat Club, the existing rule under which students affected by our motion would be able to transfer. Because of the significant barriers required for release, we do not expect there to be many more transfers under this section in the long term.

Q: Why have you removed the article which gives captains a vote on a case-by-case basis? A: We were originally torn on whether to include such an option. Whilst it creates additional fail-safes to prevent abuse, it also creates a climate where a student might feel obligated to share more than what they are required to or comfortable with in order to win such a vote. The addition of the five-year option for repeal adequately replaces this case-by-case failsafe.

Rule addition to A1.2. regarding transfers (in red), changes from TT23 wk2 in blue:

#### A1.2. Transfers

[...]

- d. Where a bona fide student, visiting student, or fellow eligible under A1.1.a.ii.1 of college A is unable to row in OURCs competitions with College Boat Club because of an unresolvable conflict that causes a serious welfare reason documented by the Dean and Senior Tutor, or equivalent, of College A and wishes to be released from their ties to College Boat Club A, they may do so by the following procedure:
  - i. The student or fellow must provide to the OURCs Sabbatical Officer:
    1. Their name;
    2. Their written, and undersigned, request to be released under this rule;
    3. Details of the type of University card they hold, and the number;
    4. Written permission of the captains of College Boat Club A;
    5. Proof of academic status, including the finishing date for their course of study or fellowship. An enrolment certificate signed by the Senior Tutor, or equivalent, will be acceptable.
  - ii. The respective College officials ultimately responsible for disciplinary matters (e.g. Dean) and welfare issues (e.g. Supervising Welfare Lead) at College A must provide to the OURCs Sabbatical Officer and a Senior Umpire:

1. The existence of a documented conflict which resulted in a Decanal investigation that concluded the student was not at fault for this conflict.
  2. Their opinion that the investigated conflict is sufficiently serious and unresolvable such that the student is unable to row with College Boat Club A for concerns of their welfare.
  3. In the event of refusal to give permission by the captains of College Boat Club A, the respective officials may provide this in their stead.
  4. If both the disciplinary and welfare roles at College A are held by the same individual, the College's Senior Tutor must additionally sign off the documentation. This means that, at a minimum, two Senior College officials must undersign the above.
- iii. At no point should the College officials or the student be expected to provide any confidential information relating to the underlying issue.
  - iv. The release will have effect immediately when they are announced by the OURCs Sabbatical Officer. The student or fellow will no longer be eligible to row with college A in OURCs events except as an associate member, and will be considered a student of a College without a respective Boat Club, making them eligible for transfer under A1.2.b.
  - v. The requirement under A1.2b. for a student to not have previously competed in an OURCs event is voided in the event of a release by this article A1.2.d.
  - vi. From the date of introduction of this article A1.2.d there will be a 5 year period during which a Captains Meeting may repeal this article with a majority vote. This supersedes article A1.2.e and may be done in the event of suspected abuse but requires no evidence thereof.
- e. Any motion to amend the above rules must be brought in accordance with the procedural rules associated with a constitutional alteration under 1.11.5.

*Proposed: Hamish Tynan (St Hugh's)*

*Seconded: Erika Dutton (St Edmund Hall), Georgia Macfarlane (St Hugh's)*

The proposers stated they made a number of changes to the motion since the last meeting, with the focus being safeguarding. The change from "victim" to "not at fault" was made by request from a dean. It was noted that this motion seems as though the perpetrator would still be allowed to transfer if going to the Deans and saying they have been kicked out of their club. It was suggested that this motion could be used as a way to move the victim in the interest of keeping a good but problematic rower. This would not address the problem, instead simply avoiding it. It was noted that it is already within a Deans power to stop someone rowing as a perpetrator, however this rule could provide a Dean with an easy way out of a problem.

The proposers stated the intention of this rule is to cover localised boat club issues, where the issue is not significant enough for someone to transfer colleges, but enough to prevent someone rowing with their college club. The proposers believe that the decanal system is flawed, and this motion is trying to alleviate this.

It would be up to the victim to decide to leave, a dean would not be able to force them to, and the Captains would not be able to prevent it. A captain stated that they don't understand how it can be applied in a nuanced issue, and it needs to be dealt with properly in the club, this motion is just avoiding the problem.

It was then discussed why these issues could not be handled internally, the proposers stated they considered this to be a quicker route for introducing change, rather than every club having a good code of conduct. Captains expressed they felt this motion was being rushed through. An alternative route would be removing perpetrators on conduct grounds and would be supported by the proposers. There was broad support for introducing better code of conduct rules within college clubs instead of passing this motion.

A number of friendly amendments were proposed, summarised below:

- Add d.i.3 to confirm that the student has not broken any disciplinary rules of college A
- Make explicit the definition of exclusivity.
- A clause requiring the Sab to keep a log of such applications
- Remove fellows entirely from the motion

Voting:

For: 20

Against: 27

Abstentions: 9

**Motion fails.**

#### **11. Amendment to the Rules of Racing - Q Sun to speak:**

*Two-thirds majority to pass*

A1.1: Definitions and A1.2: Transfers within the Rules of Racing are the basis upon which the majority of racing and, crucially, Bumps racing can occur. Amendments to these sections of the Rules of Racing should be brought to the attention of the Captains with plenty of time before a vote is to be held in order to consider implications, wording, and improvements.

Placing amendments to these crucial rules within A1.1 and A1.2 will allow at least 48 hours' notice to all Captains on the exact wording of amendments, while keeping the two-thirds majority required to pass the vote.

Captains are reminded that the clauses of 1.11 of concern are as follows:

##### 1.11: Alteration to the Constitution and Code of Conduct

[...]

- c. Changes to the Constitution, Code of Conduct and the Rules of Racing, other than those listed in 1.11.1 and 1.11.2, may only be made at a Captains' Meeting.
- d. Proposed alterations to the Constitution must appear as an item on the agenda circulated at least 48 hours before the Meeting.
- e. Motions to alter the Constitution require a 2:1 majority of those in favour to those against, and an overall majority of those present and eligible to vote.
- f. Alterations to the Code of Conduct and Rules of Racing require a simple majority.

*Change:*

A1.1: Definitions



[...]

- d. Any motion to amend the above rules must be brought in accordance with the procedural rules associated with a constitutional alteration under 1.11.5.

, and:

A1.2: Transfers

[...]

- d. Any motion to amend the above rules must be brought in accordance with the procedural rules associated with a constitutional alteration under 1.11.5.

to (*changes in red*):

A1.1: Definitions

[...]

- d. Any motion to amend the above rules must be brought in accordance with the procedural rules associated with a constitutional alteration under 1.11.~~5~~.

, and:

A1.2: Transfers

[...]

- d. Any motion to amend the above rules must be brought in accordance with the procedural rules associated with a constitutional alteration under 1.11.~~5~~.

*Proposed: Q Sun (OURCs)*

*Seconded: Natasha Smith (OURCs)*

Voting:

For: 58

Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

**Motion passes.**

## 12. Amendment to the Rules of Racing - Q Sun to speak:

*Two-thirds majority to pass*

Currently, A1.1.i.1.c allows students who have received leave to supplicate (*i.e.* formal completion of a degree) to continue to be Full Members of a college boat club provided the Captains vote to their 'extension of student status'.

The spirit in which this rule was written was that students that may receive their leave to supplicate at some point between a held Captains' Meeting and Bumps, or, perhaps, shortly before a held Captains' Meeting, may continue to compete with their clubs unaffected by this uncertainty. However, as detailed above, the current rules do not reflect this.

This amendment would place the rule back in line with the original spirit of the rule.

*Change:*

A1.1: Definitions

- a. Members of College Boat Clubs are classified either as:
  - i. Student members
    1. Bona fide students (in accordance with University Statute II) of their respective college(s), until such time as:
      - a. they leave or suspend their course of study – in extraordinary circumstances and with the written approval of the college's Senior Tutor, this period may be extended to a given date by a majority vote at a Captain's Meeting; or
      - b. a pass list or class list marking the end of the course is published; or
      - c. leave to supplicate for the degree is granted. In extraordinary circumstances, this period may be extended to a given date by a majority vote at a Captain's Meeting.

to (*changes in red*):

A1.1: Definitions

- b. Members of College Boat Clubs are classified either as:
  - i. Student members
    1. Bona fide students (in accordance with University Statute II) of their respective college(s), until such time as:
      - a. they leave or suspend their course of study – in extraordinary circumstances and with the written approval of the college's Senior Tutor, this period may be extended to a given date by a majority vote at a Captain's Meeting; or
      - b. a pass list or class list marking the end of the course is published; or
      - c. leave to supplicate for the degree is granted. In extraordinary circumstances *where leave to supplicate may be granted unusually quickly after the viva*, this period may be extended to *a given date the last day of the Bumps regatta in the current term* by a majority vote at a Captain's Meeting, *provided that leave to supplicate was not granted earlier than the last day of the Full Term before that in which the Captains' Meeting is held.*

*Proposed: Q Sun (OURCs)*

*Seconded: Natasha Smith (OURCs)*

Voting:

For: 57

Against: 0

Abstentions: 2

**Motion passes.**

13. **Ratification of Club Safety Reviews** - Natasha Smith to speak

- Wolfson - £60
- St Edmund Hall- £50

**No objections. Ratified.**

#### 14. AOB

- College training day - Rachel Quarrell to speak

The college training day happens each year, intended for new college committee members. This will be in 9<sup>th</sup> week and will cover how to fundraise, organise committee, delegate, planning for the year, deal with OURCs paper work, swim tests, how CMs work, intended for new captains/committees to learn, resources online. There will be a professional coach in attendance, please pass on to your successors.

- Eligibility and Associate/ Full Member checks – Q Sun to speak

Check your associates in the lower boats in RO crews are listed correctly as associates, and your full members as full. If anything is incorrect, please email the Secretary or Sab, condensed into one email and attach enrolment certificates if relevant.

- Conduct around racedesk – Joe Hitchen to speak

Racedesk includes marshals and umpires, all of whom are members of the university and the same community. We are all under the general CoC and harassment policy. Please don't abuse anyone from race desk or the marshals, treat them with respect. If there are any problems, we will go through the university complains procedure.

This applies to all competitors, especially around appeals which can be emotional and heated. Please talk to the Senior Umpires if there are concerns about the process, yelling at people doesn't solve problems. Likewise, coaches shouldn't shout bully umpires, coaches also fall under the club CoC umbrella.

- **Transfers under A1.2** – Natasha Smith to speak

*Objections may only be based on the following:*

- *Athlete is not a member of the college they are transferring from*
- *Athlete has never been a member of the college they are transferring to*

*Under A1.2.a:*

- Divya Agarwal –Brasenose to Pembroke (papers in order)

**No objections. Ratified.**

- Lightening the mood before Bumps – Q Sun to speak

Q Sun lightened the mood before Bumps.