



**O U R C s**

# Captains' Meeting Minutes

Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> week Michaelmas Term 2017

19:30, 7 November 2017

Harris Lecture Theatre

Chair: Katherine Erickson

## Welcome

52 present

Magdalen + St. Hilda's had no representatives.

## Minutes of the Last Meeting

Available at [www.ourcs.org.uk](http://www.ourcs.org.uk)

## Matters Arising

### Election

- **OURCs Captain of Coxes – Joanna Egan**

*Proposer: Joe Hitchen (OURCs)*

*Seconder: Elysia Hannaford (Jesus)*

**Passed unanimously**

### Vacant OURCs Positions:

OURCs Sponsorship Secretary

### Amendments to Code of Conduct

- Change 2.2.2: 'British Rowing 'Row Safe' (RS)' to British Rowing 'Row Safe 2017' (RS)
- Change 2.3.1: 'RS, section 2.3' to 'RS, section 7.1'
- Change 2.4.c.v: 'failure (RS, section 1.8)' to 'failure (RS, section 8.1 and 8.7)
- Change 2.4.c.v: 'exhaustion (RS, section 5.1)' to 'exhaustion (RS, section 8.2)
- Change 2.4.c.v: 'aid (RS, section 5.2)' to 'aid (RS, section 8.3)
- Change 2.4.c.v: 'diseases (RS, section 5.3)' to 'diseases (RS, section 8.4)
- Change 2.4.d: 'maintaining a safety notice board in a prominent place in the boathouse, according to RS, section 1.1.' to 'maintaining a safety notice board in a prominent place in the boathouse (RS, section 2.1)

- h. Change 2.4.e: conducting risk assessments (see RS, section 1.2), and specifying a Code of Conduct based on these (see RS, section 1.3), which should be available on the College Boat Club's website and followed on a day-to-day basis.

To

conducting risk assessments (RS, section 9), and specifying a Code of Conduct based on these, which should be available on the College Boat Club's website and followed on a day-to-day basis.

- i. Change 2.6.1: 'own assessment before boating (see RS, section 1.7)' to 'own assessment before boating (see RS, section 9)'
- j. Change 2.6.6: 'all other clothing (see RS, section 2.1)' to 'all other clothing (see RS, section 7.3)'

Change 2.6.9: 'visible through 360 degrees. (See RS, section 1.7.)' to 'visible through 360 degrees. (See RS, section 7.1)'

Proposer: Oliver Hedges (OURCs)

Secunder: Hakim Faiz (OURCs)

**Passed unanimously**

### **Amendments to the Code of Conduct**

Previous rule:

Code of Conduct

2.8 Rules specific to the Isis

#### 3. Boating/Landing

b. From the Univ raft, crews must boat pointing downstream, but may land either upstream or downstream so long as they do not interfere with other crews.

*Change to:*

Code of Conduct

2.8 Rules specific to the Isis

#### 3. Boating/Landing

b. From the Univ raft, crews must boat pointing downstream, but may land either upstream or downstream as long as they do not interfere with other crews. Crews landing upstream must begin their movement to cross the river upstream of the Cherwell Cut entrance and should cross quickly and directly angled to their landing raft, so that they are never at any point rowing on the wrong side directly against normal circulation.

*Proposer: Rachel Quarrell (SU)*

*Secunder: Oliver Hedges (OURCs)*

**Passed unanimously**

### **Amendments to the Rules of Racing**

a) A1.6: Entry Requirements

*Add:*

4. At the date and time of close of entries all entries shall be complete and eligible. Any boat not complete and eligible at the cut-off time shall be withdrawn from the competition unless the race secretary or their

deputy has acknowledged a technical issue (e.g. a swim test database error) applying to individuals named in the crew and this error is the only reason the crew is ineligible. This acknowledgement must be sent prior to the deadline.

Notes – (4) clarifies what “close of entries” means in a competition. This does not stop crew-members being substituted later on under the usual rules.

*Proposer: Rachel Quarrell (SU)*

*Seconder: David Locke (SU)*

**Withdrawn**

b) A3.14: Technical Rowovers

*Previous rule:*

A3.14 Technical Row-Overs

1. A Race Committee may disallow otherwise valid bumps and award row-overs to crews in the following circumstances:

a) Crews that were only caught due to unavoidable external circumstances.  
(etc)

*Change to:*

A3.14 Technical Row-Overs

1. A Race Committee may disallow otherwise valid bumps and award row-overs to crews in the following circumstances:

a) Crews that were only caught due to **circumstances external to their control and which they could not avoid. For clarity, this does not include racing accidents internal to the crew such as their own equipment breakages, malfunctions, crabs or similar, by which crews must abide.**  
(etc)

*Proposer: Rachel Quarrell (SU)*

*Seconder: David Locke (SU)*

**Passed Unanimously**

The Senior Umpires are concerned that the rule regarding associates in bumps is not, as written, reflecting current practice. The existing rule was intended to permit up to three different associates in a college's men's boats and three in a colleges' women's boats *across the combined days of a bumps regatta including Rowing On*, ie a maximum of six associates per college per bumps competition.

In very recent years this has been reinterpreted by OURCs and captains to mean three on each day, permitting colleges to use up to 15 different associates in men's boats and 15 more in women's boats in the five days of racing including Rowing On. This has probably evolved to cope with the complications of increasingly demanding academic schedules, but it undermines the existence of bumps as a college-funded, college-centred Cuppers event, and it opens the door to appeals being decided in what captains might consider a very unexpected way. Either the rule or the use of it must be realigned.

The numbers of associates overall being used in bumps, and the degree to which they therefore take places from genuine students, should be considered. However, the requirement for all rowers to have taken a Page 3 of 5 swim test within the previous six years probably limits the amount even an over-generous rule would be used in any given club. Furthermore, it has become common, particularly in Eights, to use recent alumni/ae as associates to fill crew gaps, which maintains good relations with them and benefits everyone. The captains are urged to balance these factors carefully.

There are four reasonable options:

- 1) return to the original meaning of the rule and clarify the wording to ensure that everyone understands the three associates are per gender group of the club per competition;
- 2) change the rule to formally permit three associates per gender group of the club per day (matching recent practice);
- 3) change the rule to permit different associates per gender group of the club per day, but a lower number (eg 2);
- 4) change the rule to permit up a total of associates per day (eg 3 or 4) but across the combined crews of the club, ie permitting maximum flexibility between men's and women's crew associates while ensuring that the maximum number of possible associates used will not grow too large. This would probably appeal to many but would require excellent communication and agreement between the men's and women's sides of the club, otherwise one gender group could either deliberately or accidentally use up all the day's associates by making speedier online substitutions. [The original rule was written to minimise the potential for confusion or selfishness within the club's administration.]

Captains are invited to consider the four options above and, without taking a binding vote, to discuss which two of the four choices might prove most popular and sensible for intercollegiate rowing. We will then draft new rule options based on the sense of the meeting, to bring to a formal vote in January after there has been time for more club members to give their views to captains.

*Proposer: Rachel Quarrell (SU)*

*Seconder: David Locke (SU)*

The captains had a discussion about these options. The main points that came out of this:

Option 2 with max in total, or Option 1 with a bigger cap are preferable.

Rowing On potentially should have a stricter rule. Either limited associates, or that those used in rowing on must also be used in the races.

Explanation with the spirit of the event should be provided along with it (maybe reviving the old section that covered these).

Exceptional cases where a club can't get a 1<sup>st</sup> boat out, they can apply for more associate slots.

**Action Point: The SU's to draft several proposals for the next meeting.**

### **Defibrillator Purchase**

"Currently there is no access to a defibrillator on the Isis stretch. For those of you involved in your club's safety audit, there is a question on it about whether there is access to one. Given the large amount of high-intensity activity which goes on both on the water and in boathouses with ergs inside, I would like to ask the captains for their opinions on getting OURCs to pay for one and put it on boathouse island. This is only a

preliminary motion, but it would set things in motion to find an exact figure for how much one would cost including the case (approximately £1500) and find a location for it."

*Proposed: Eddie Rolls (Pembroke)*

*Seconded: Kieran Wachsmuth (Pembroke)*

**Action Point: Eddie to look into practicalities such as location and price**

### **Transfers under A1.2.1**

*Objections may only be made on the grounds that:*

*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*

a. Philip Moseley (Phil did his undergraduate medic years at Exeter, before moving to GTC for clinic years, he rowed with us all three years, and wishes to continue doing so.), from GTC to Exeter. Typically allowed.

**Passed**

b. Iain Mcgurgan from St Hilda's to Oriel. Typically allowed. **Passed**

### Major Transgression Meetings

a. **Lincoln** - No lifejacket. £50 fine.

b. **Trinity** - No lifejacket. £50 fine.

c. **Christ Church** – No Lifejacket. £50 fine.

d. **Wolfson** – No Lifejacket. £25 fine.

**All Ratified**

**Wolfson received a lower fine due to having a responsible response to their no lifejacket; they realized themselves, landed at the next available opportunity and notified an OURCs member. They were also proactive after the incident in preventing any future occurrences.**

### **AOB**

a. **Lukas to speak about the fine system**

b. **Oliver to speak about lights**

c. **Oliver to speak about Sunday closure**

d. **Alex to speak about lifejacket servicing**

e. **Hakim to speak about the quiet zone**

f. **BUCS Regatta**

g. **Reminder about BR safety audits**

h. **Mailing Lists**

