



Captains' Meeting Minutes

Thursday 5th week Hilary Term 2022
7pm, 17th February 2022
Bernard Sunley Lecture Theatre, St Catz

Chair: Amelia Standing (OUWBC)

Attendance (voting members):

College boat clubs – 57

OURCs – 5

Squads – 4

Absences: Brasenose, St Peter's

1. **Welcome**
2. **Minutes of the Last Meeting**
Available at www.ourcs.org.uk
3. **Matters Arising**
No matters arising
4. **Conduct around race desk** – David Seale to speak

The OURCs Senior Treasurer spoke on the spirit of racing. It was stated that Bumps was a student event but had seen an increasing amount of all around argumentativeness. The Meeting was reminded that the purpose of Bumps racing was to have fun. Captains were asked to, whilst they were welcomed to make appeals, consider whether these appeals were realistic and would lead to a fairer outcome. Captains were asked to send relevant people to race desk with evidence, but not to send a whole boat with the aim of crowding and intimidating race desk. It was stated that the same thing applied to abuse or shouting at race desk, which Race Committees did not have to listen to. The Senior Member concluded that there were high expectations of race desk, that initiatives from the Secretary and Sabbatical Officer had shown commitment to running fair racing, and that commitment to fair racing should go for everyone involved.

5. **COUR Report**

At the last meeting of COUR it was clarified that, following the discussion in the last meeting, the Council wished OURCs to update their requirements of capsized drills to ensure that all small boats users have taken a capsized drill under the auspices of OURCs. The purpose of this was to ensure a standardisation of training. Following OURCs reports to COUR, OURCs were asked what they were doing to reduce no PFD incidents.

6. **Change to the Code of Conduct** – James Lucas to speak
Simple majority to pass

Changing the requirements of capsized drills. This is a change requested by COUR, who would like to ensure that there is a consistent standard of capsized drill training across all OURCs members.

Change:

2.4.a. *All Member Clubs must ensure that their athletes are safe to go on the water. This involves:*

...

ii. *ensuring that only those rowers who have taken an OURCs capsized drill, or can prove that they have taken a similar one elsewhere, may use singles, pairs or doubles.*

To (changes in red):

2.4.a. All Member Clubs must ensure that their athletes are safe to go on the water. This involves:

...

ii. ensuring that only those rowers who have taken an OURCs capsized drill may use singles, pairs or doubles.

Proposed: James Lucas (OURCs)

Seconded: Ty Rallens (OURCs)

It was explained by the proposer that COUR had asked OURCs to change the rules, with the rationale of standardising capsized drills across Oxford. The Sports Safety Officer (and Rowing Sabbatical Officer) had faced difficulty determining whether an outside test was valid or equivalent.

It was asked if the rule applied equally to the squads, how the squads would follow it, and if the Senior Members of the squads were taking responsibility for the squads to follow this rule.

It was asked how many outside capsized drills are accepted versus ones taken at Oxford and clarified that this year no outside tests were accepted; all drills were therefore carried out in Oxford this year. It was stated by the captains that it is sometimes difficult to get a capsized drill at Oxford. It was stated that recently, signups had been done by Google form, with a drill run when enough people had signed up. The Sabbatical Officer requested input on the difficulties of getting capsized drills (e.g. because of limited capacity) from the captains, either in the meeting or by email to sabbatical@ourcs.co.uk.

The University women's captain spoke against the motion. It was explained that many keen rowers at Univ stay over vacations, but not enough to do regular 4s or 8s training. In the past their coach, who is qualified by BR to run capsized drills, had run the drills in the river over the vac. This motion appears to restrict the number of rowers who could train in the vacation. It was stated that rowers ask weekly when they can get a capsized drill from OURCS/OUWL and that they don't happen frequently enough. It was stated that it would be safer if people could do the capsized drills immediately when they need them, rather than waiting many

weeks until the next drill comes along. It was stated that a Univ rower recently had an ejector crab, and that rower would have been safer if they had already received a capsized drill. It was also stated that the cost of OUWL's capsized drills is significant when a free alternative is available for some. The University captain stated that other groups in Oxford should be able to run capsized drills with BR qualified coaches in Oxford, and COUR ought to be willing to recognize these. The Rowing Sabbatical Officer recognized that this was very useful feedback.

It was asked what "an OURCs capsized drill" meant in the text of the rule, and if there was scope for considering the University capsized drills "OURCs drills". The Rowing Sabbatical Officer explained that this might be possible; right now the only recognised OURCs capsized drills are run by OUWL, and whilst the Sabbatical Officer could commit to exploring options they could not say what would or would not be accepted as the process would have to go through the Sport Safety Officer, and possibly COUR.

The University women's captain also pointed out that many people arrive at university with years of experience, including representing GB and others at the Olympics. It was stated by the captain that these rowers have properly documented capsized drills from their prior experience, and that the future rule should be changed to recognize these properly documented drills. It was stated that people who already have outside drills and take them again in Oxford use up some of the little capacity available, taking away from new scullers when there isn't enough space. The Sabbatical Officer stated that there can be administrative difficulties with tracking down coaches from years ago and their qualifications; it was stated that it isn't always clear what proper documentation is. In response, it was suggested that capsized drills taken within a certain number of years could be accepted.

It was asked whether clubs with BR qualified coaches such as University would be willing to offer their ability to do capsized drills to other clubs without coaches with those qualifications. Concern was expressed that otherwise a two-tier system might develop. The Univ women's captain clarified that they would be available to other clubs.

Voting:

For: 4

Against: 51

Abstaining: 8

Motion fails.

7. Change to the position of Osler House W1 in the Starting Order for Torpids 2022 – Beinn Khulusi to speak.

Two thirds majority to pass.

Osler House Boat Club is the club for clinical medical students, and was restarted last season (2020/21) after a long period of dormancy. Osler House W1 enquired to the RowSab last year regarding starting in fixed divisions with other W1s. This was declined, but in a subsequent Captains' Meeting, it was confirmed that "*the federated clubs, in the Captains' Meeting, should hold final authority over future Starting Orders*", and the following added to the constitution as clarification:

- *A3.9.f The Starting Order may be amended through a motion passed in a Captains' Meeting.*

- *A3.9.g Any motion to amend the Starting Order or to alter the rules governing the Starting Order in A3.8 and A3.9 must be brought in accordance with the procedural rules associated with a constitutional alteration under 1.11.”*

There is precedent for this decision, as stated in the minutes of the Captains’ Meeting:

“It was pointed out that last year a motion to insert Osler House into the Starting Order was prevented. It was hoped by the proposers that this rule amendment would allow such decisions to be passed back to the captains. An explanation was given of how motions to amend Starting Orders have been applied in the past: **it has been quite common to have had motions that apply to new or returning clubs”.**

This refers to the occasions where A3.9.f was utilised allowing Somerville M1 to be inserted in Torpids Division 4 (of 7) in 1996 and St Hilda’s M1 to be inserted at the bottom of Division 6 in Eights in 2009.

As a newly revived club, it is extremely important to us to maintain our ability to cater to all clinical medical students who wish to keep rowing despite the constraints of their medical education, as well as students wishing to learn to row for the first time. This was made difficult last year due the randomisation ensuring Osler W1 and W2 were chasing one another as we only possess one functional shell thereby creating an equipment clash, which was only temporarily resolved due to the generosity of Balliol college boat club who donated equipment. As the start order stands, and if the proposed rule amendment’s to be discussed later in this meeting are passed, Osler House will be locked into an equipment clash for many years to come. While this could be resolved, W2 would have to reapply as a new entrant and be placed at the bottom of Division 7, negating their hard work and achievements overbumping each day last year.

An additional benefit of this motion would be to prevent the mismatch in experience and speed in these low divisions, as Osler Boats, are due to the nature of the club, composed of 4th to 6th years – primarily senior rowers – which is not an advantage most other crews in division 7 share. Last year this led to Osler W1 winning blades after rowing no more than 18 strokes on any given day, each crew they bumped were then subsequently over-bumped by W2 before boathouse island. This mismatch does not serve any of the crews in that division, particularly the novice crews who have trained hard and are looking for a competitive race against crews of a similar standard.

Therefore, before the later revision of the rules, we would like to propose the following: **Osler House W1 to be placed into the Torpids 2022 Starting Order on the 12th bungline of Women’s Division 4 (or equivalent position, if divisions are shortened).** We believe this is reasonable on the following grounds.

- Osler’s motion last year to be placed higher in the order was not brought before the captains, despite existing precedent as discussed earlier, leading to the current placement of the two boats which is unsustainable for the club and a hinderance to its members.
- Division 4 is the division of the lowest-ranked W1 in fixed divisions (Regents Park), meaning that Osler House W1 will not be as mismatched as last year; however, bung-line 12 would mean that we will still have to earn the opportunity to race other W1s by racing well for consecutive years (Regent’s Park are placed 4th , at least two +4 seasons away).
- Placing W1 in Division 4 would mean our W2, who, while placed 2nd in Division 6 are likely to move up to Division 5 over the course of Torpids 2022 due to their seniority of the crew can also use our only shell to race, and will continue to be able to in future years.

- If the order is not altered, the progress of the club will be halted by W2 having to chase W1 for multiple seasons to come.

Proposed: Beinn Khulusi (Osler House)

Seconded: Lucie Ayliffe-Daly (Osler House)

The proposers stated that they had been denied this motion last year and so were bringing it now. The proposers stated that Osler House had in the past dropped out of the Bumps charts after lots of years not racing but now, with more financial stability and more stability of athlete intake, they planned to continue for a long time. The proposers stated that their main reason for bringing the motion was that no one had had fun in their races last year, either Osler House W1 or the crews ahead of them, as racing wasn't close enough to be exciting. The proposers stated that this motion would prevent them having to borrow a shell due to equipment clashes with their W1; both boats are currently in the same division. The proposers explained that building a large side with two women's boats was important to Osler, as rowing only with other medical students allows them to co-ordinate better outing times with medic's schedules.

The proposers stated that they were asking to be put at the bottom of Division 4 (a move of 10+ places), citing previous precedent from Wolfson M1, LHM M1, St Hugh's M1 and Somerville M1, most of which were moved up 30+ places between seasons. These precedents were queried as having been the introduction of newly formed sides rather than the reinstatement of a pre-existing club after a hiatus removed them from the rankings, and St Benet's and Regent's suggested as alternative precedent.

It was stated that all the crews between Osler House W1's proposed position and its current one would move down a place, beginning with Pembroke W2, but clarified that only a few crews would be impacted in terms of their opposition faced, or their racing time. It was also clarified that it was not certain that all of the affected crews (most in a Rowing On division) would actually enter this year. It was unknown whether these factors would result in other clubs having two boats in the same division. It was confirmed that Pembroke W2 would not have to Row On this year, whilst Osler House W1 would, as which crews have to Row On is determined by the preceding year's Finishing Order.

A representative from Green Templeton College (the most recent newly formed boat club) spoke on the shared history of Osler House and Green Templeton; 14 years ago Green and Osler House 'divorced' with Osler House keeping their position in the Bumps charts, and Green Templeton having to start at the bottom. The representative from Green Templeton stated that it had been very difficult for GTC to always be in the lower divisions, which they had had to overcome, and that they felt that it was unfair for Osler House to 'queue jump', particularly considering their shared history. The representative from Green Templeton stated that they would be open to re-merging; Osler House stated that they preferred to be separate from college clubs so that they were able to schedule around their medics. Osler House also stated that the 'divorce' hadn't been easy for them either; afterwards they had got spoons for many years until no one wanted to row any more and they stopped entering Bumps.

It was asked whether Green Templeton had had the option to bring a similar motion when they were inserted at the bottom of the Starting Order; it was stated that they had not had that opportunity. Many captains expressed the view that it sounded as though it had been unfair and not fun for Green Templeton,

and that a better solution should have been available back then, as should be available for Osler House now. The representative from Green Templeton replied that as a club they had overcome and had fun.

Voting:

For: 50

Against: 9

Abstaining: 7

Motion passes.

8. Amendment to the Rules of Racing - Ty Rallens to speak

Two-thirds majority to pass

Preserving Bumps racing requires the support of a large coalition of other entities, including the University Sports Safety Office, the Senior Umpires, the Proctors, and British Rowing. Since I instituted the previous version of the rules for Starting Order motions in MT21w1, many of these partners have raised grave concerns about the previous language. Some have pointed out ways the rules distort the incentives of competitors, others negative safety effects of the rules, and still others have threatened very credibly to withdraw their support for Bumps happening at all unless the rules are fixed. In light of this feedback, I too see the need for change.

The problems with the previous rules include:

- It is possible within the rules to overturn the safety decisions of event officials.
- They create an incentive to strategically not appeal to the SUs, whereby a popular college could seek to improve its result at the expense of a less-popular college.
- As discussed by the captains previously, “vexatious” is poorly defined. The OURCs Senior Member sees no practical way to implement the intentions of A3.9.f.ii.
- The previous language asserts far more authority for OURCs and the Captains’ Meeting over the Starting Order than prior precedents can support.

My proposed solution backs away from asserting broad authority over the Starting Order but preserves the powers of the Captains’ Meeting which have established precedents. While the previous language claimed the power to amend the Starting Order generally with enumerated exceptions, the new language positively defines specific circumstances under which a Captains’ Meeting may consider amendments. The enumerated reasons cover prior precedents and foreseen needs, with some clarifications:

- The new A3.9.f.i covers the precedents of Somerville M1, which was inserted in Torpids Div 4 (of 7) in 1996, and St. Hilda’s M1, which was inserted at the bottom of Div 6 in Eights in 2009. The Hilda’s starting location is made standard.
- The new A3.9.f.ii covers the specific situation which led to drafting the one-time A3.21 rules section for handling complaints after racing.
- The new A3.9.f.iii is intended for clubs in a situation like Osler House, where having multiple crews close within a division might lead to kit clashes for years to come.
- The new A3.9.f.iv is intended to allow a careful amount of flexibility, should unforeseen needs arise.

Should new circumstances arise in which the Starting Order requires amendment, new reasons may be added to the list under A3.9.f through motions which follow the procedure for constitutional amendments.

Change:

A3.9. Starting Order

[a-e unchanged]

- f. *The Starting Order may be amended through a motion passed in a Captains' Meeting.*
 - i. *Motions to alter previous race results are subject to the following conditions:*
 - 1. *No decision of the Senior Umpires may be overturned.*
 - 2. *The motion must be brought at the next available Captains' Meeting after racing.*
 - ii. *The Senior Member may veto vexatious Starting Order motions, but must provide a statement for the minutes of the reasons for doing so.*
- g. *Any motion to amend the Starting Order or to alter the rules governing the Starting Order in A3.8 and A3.9 must be brought in accordance with the procedural rules associated with a constitutional alteration under 1.11.*

To (changes/amendments/additions in red):

- f. The Starting Order may be amended through a motion passed in a Captains' Meeting **for the following reasons:**
 - i. **When a newly-founded boat club or side plans to enter multiple boats in the competition, to insert its first boat at the bottom of the second to last division (or at the top of the new entrants, whichever is higher), subject to successfully qualifying in Rowing On.**
 - ii. **When incontrovertible evidence, which must be provided to the Captains' Meeting, demonstrates that a crew raced with an ineligible athlete, to move that crew downward by a maximum of 12 places.**
 - iii. **When a Rowing On crew which competed in the previous year requests to be treated as a new entrant under A3.9.b.ii.**
 - iv. **When the OURCs Senior Member brings a motion to amend the Starting Order.**
- g. Any motion to amend the Starting Order or to alter the rules governing the Starting Order in A3.8 and A3.9 must be brought in accordance with the procedural rules associated with a constitutional alteration under 1.11.

Proposed: Ty Rallens (OURCs)

Seconded: James Lucas (OURCs)

It was stated that stakeholders in Bumps had convinced the OURCs Secretary that the wording of the previous rule was a safety concern, hence the bringing of this new motion. It was explained that this proposal aimed to change the rules governing Starting Orders to a list of specific things that can be changed at Captains' Meetings, rather than an open-ended rule with a list of specifics that could not be changed. It was clarified that the withdrawal of some of these stakeholders from Bumps on the grounds of the concerns listed in the proposal was a credible concern, and something that OURCs wished to avoid.

The Secretary stated that the best way to deal with Race Committee rulings that boat clubs felt were unfair was to appeal to the Senior Umpires through the appeals process during racing, highlighting the workshops on the appeals process being run this term. Appealing to the Senior Umpires under Rule A1.10 was given as an example of an appeal that might be made if a club felt that the Disputes Procedure had not been followed correctly. It was stated that the workshops on appeals were part of the drive for a transparent and accountable race desk discussed previously in the meeting.

It was clarified that the preceding motion by Osler House would not have been possible if the proposed rule change were in effect. It was clarified that a newly-founded boat club such as Reuben would be able to insert their first boat in accordance with A3.9.f.i, and also noted that no more newly founded 'sides' (adding boats of another gender to an existing club) are likely.

The details of the procedural rules associated with voting on a constitutional alteration were clarified: motions require a 2:1 majority of those in favour to those against, and an overall majority of those present and eligible to vote to pass.

Voting:

For: 37

Against: 0

Abstaining: 26

Motion passes.

9. **Changes to Rules of Racing** – Ty Rallens to speak

Simple majority to pass.

Equalising the number of men's and women's divisions in Bumps, starting Trinity Term 2022. In Summer Torpids 2021 division parity was offered, with equal numbers of entries for M and W. We therefore propose to make division parity permanent for Torpids and Eights, beginning with Summer Eights in 2022.

Key details of this proposal are given in the attached Paper 1 [added as Appendix].

All proposed changes below are subject to the approval of the Proctors of an earlier start time for Bumps, and, if approval is granted, are to apply from Trinity Term 2022.

1. Change:

A3.2 Divisions

a. *Unless resolved otherwise by a Captains' Meeting or the Event Committee:*

i. *Torpids shall consist of 6 Men's divisions and 5 Women's divisions. The top 5 Men's divisions and the top 4 Women's divisions shall be designated "Fixed Divisions" and the remainder "Rowing On Divisions";.*

ii. *Eights shall consist of 7 Men's divisions and 6 Women's divisions, with the top 5 Men's divisions and the top 4 Women's divisions designated "Fixed Divisions", and the remainder "Rowing On Divisions".*

iii. *In Torpids divisions shall consist of 12 boats, plus the "Sandwich Boat", except for the bottom divisions, which shall consist of 13 boats.*

To (changes in red):

A3.2 Divisions

- a. Unless resolved otherwise by a Captains' Meeting or the Event Committee:
 - i. Torpids shall consist of 6 Men's divisions and 6 Women's divisions. The top 4 Men's divisions and the top 4 Women's divisions shall be designated "Fixed Divisions" and the remainder "Rowing On Divisions";.
 - ii. Eights shall consist of 7 Men's divisions and 7 Women's divisions, with the top 4 Men's divisions and the top 4 Women's divisions designated "Fixed Divisions", and the remainder "Rowing On Divisions".
 - iii. **Fixed Divisions shall consist of 12 boats, plus the "Sandwich Boat". Rowing-On Divisions shall be of variable size not exceeding 12 boats plus the sandwich boat (or in the bottom division, 13 boats), depending on entry numbers, to be determined and announced by the Event Secretary and Senior Umpires following the close of entries. Men's and Women's Rowing-On Divisions for a given event need not be of the same size.**

2. Remove:

A3.2 Divisions

- a. *Unless resolved otherwise by a Captains' Meeting or the Event Committee:*

...

~~iv. *In Eights divisions shall consist of 13 boats, plus the "Sandwich Boat", except for the bottom divisions, which shall consist of 14 boats.*~~

And renumber A3.2.a.v-ix to A3.2.a.iv-viii

3. Insert (additions in red):

A3.7 Rowing On

...

- j. Results
 - i. Rowing On results shall become finalised on midnight of the following day, after which no further appeals will be considered and the Event Committee shall resolve any remaining ties by ballot.
 - ii. The only exception to this is in the event of a technical bump being awarded to a Rowing On crew, in which case the bump (and any attendant appeals and refusals, as defined in A1.4a.ix and A3.14) shall be applied on the first day of Bumps Proper.
 - iii. **The slowest Men's crew, and the slowest Women's crew, shall automatically be deemed not to have qualified, even if the event is otherwise undersubscribed, and may not be subsequently invited to race under A3.8.d or A3.8.f**
- k. **The Senior Umpires shall exclude, regardless of qualifying time, any crew which does not demonstrate the minimum standard of safety; such crews will be deemed to have failed to row on. In making this evaluation, the SUs will consider:**

- i. Rowing all 8 for the whole course
- ii. Steering competently and obeying marshalling rules
- iii. Not catching multiple crabs
- iv. Evidently attempting to race (i.e. rowing the whole course at rate)
- v. The Senior Umpires shall also consider excluding any crew finishing more than 30 seconds behind the next-slowest crew, and any crews finishing behind that crew.

4. Insert (additions in red):

A1.5.h. The Senior Umpire has the authority to:

[i-iv unchanged]

- v. To exclude from racing any crew deemed unsafe or unfit to race.

5. Change:

A3.10 Starting Procedure

...

h. For a race to be deemed to have taken place, at least 10 boats (for full divisions) must be attached to their bunglines when the starting gun is fired. In half-division racing, only one of those taking part in the division that day need not be attached when the starting gun is fired.

To (changes in red):

h. For a race to be deemed to have taken place, at least 10 boats (for full divisions) must be attached to their bunglines when the starting gun is fired. For divisions of fewer than 11 boats, a race may be deemed to have taken place if all bar one boat were attached to their bunglines.

Proposed: Ty Rallens (OURCs)

Seconded: James Marsden (OURCs)

It was explained by the Secretary that adding an extra division to ensure gender parity in Bumps impacts the Senior Umpires, who are concerned that crews who race in Bumps are safe. Compromises to permit the adding of another division were elaborated on. It was explained that, to accommodate the possibility that not all the spaces in the divisions would be filled, the top four divisions of each gender were proposed to be of maximum size, with the other division sizes chosen by the Senior Umpires and Event Committee to maximise the number of safe boats rowing. Secondly, it was explained that participation in Bumps had been declining over the past five to seven years, with sometimes fewer crews entered than the number of places. Considering this, to ensure that Rowing On, the qualifying event to participate in a challenging race like Bumps, was a 'real qualification', a compromise made in this proposal was a one boat cut of the slowest Rowing On crew. This was intended to ensure that Rowing On always remained a race in which crews are put under pressure to row quickly, more demonstrative of their ability under Bumps-like like conditions. It was explained that a discretionary power of the Senior Umpires to exclude crews they judged unsafe to race had been added explicitly to the rules in this proposal, including the criteria under which crews might be judged. Finally, it was also explained that this proposal would change the division size in Summer Eights from 13 bunglines to 12 plus the sandwich boat. 12 bunglines (plus sandwich boat)per division was the same size as

pre-2012. Division sizes were increased in 2012 following evidence of large numbers of crews competing in Rowing On in the preceding years.

It was concluded by the Secretary that Bumps could also remain as the status quo, and that both would be good outcomes, with trade-offs in either format. This was elaborated on: it was stated that if this motion failed but with multiple suggestions for improvement from the captains it would be taken away and re-worked, and a variation on it could be proposed next term to apply to the next academic year. It was stated that drafts of this proposal had been made public for comment by the captains and Oxford College Rowing over the winter break, but that more comments and improvements were welcome from this meeting. It was however stated by the proposers that, after many hours of workshopping with the Senior Umpires, they felt that this was the best workable version of this proposal. It was also clarified that if this motion was brought back in Trinity Term it could not apply to Summer Eights 2022 as the event paperwork needed to be written prior to the start of term; some captains felt that this was unfairly time-pressured.

It was asked why an extra division of men's boats had moved from a Fixed to a Rowing On division, and whether this was to bring parity to both genders. It was stated that this decision was actually proposed on safety grounds to address the concern that mid-bottom divisions contained crews (e.g. from clubs that had undergone membership collapse) that weren't necessarily safe. It was stated that making these Divisions Rowing On would not impact the standing of strong crews who, following Rowing On, would be placed back in the same order, but would catch unsafe crews and remove them from that division.

It was noted that nothing would stop a boat club entering a 'sacrificial crew' to expect to be the slowest, and also noted that if that crew were not the slowest crew they would Row On, so they should be prepared to row Bumps.

It was asked whether an adjustment could be made to the proposal to eliminate the slowest crew at Rowing On to allow all the Rowing On crews to race at the Senior Umpires' discretion if it was a close race (e.g. within five seconds). It was stressed by the captain that they wanted to avoid a situation where every boat is competent and training hard, but one doesn't get to race. It was agreed by the proposers that this discretion would be nice, though noted that discretionary powers can put the Senior Umpires in difficult situations when deciding whether to let a crew race or not. It was also noted that the cut of one crew was a result of bargaining down from a higher number. The proposers acknowledged receipt of a statement from the captains that a change to not cut the lowest crew if the race was close was desired.

It was stated that if, if the motion passed but the demand for large divisions was demonstrated for a couple of years, then another motion to expand Eights division sizes again would be possible.

Multiple captains strongly stated their wish to vote on the various parts of the proposal separately on the grounds that rule changes impacting gender equality shouldn't be considered together with rule changes impacting safety. It was asked why another women's division could not just be added without other changes, and a captain stated that they felt that equality was being 'held hostage'. A captain stated that though they really appreciated the work that had been put into the proposal they did not want to balance gender equality with other ideas as gender equality was not compromisable on. The proposers stated that the proposal was effectively a proposal to add another division to Bumps, an action requiring an adjustment of the Event Plan, so it was important to end up with an event plan that Senior Umpires were generally happy

with. The proposers stated that they felt it was a case of other major safety things that had become unearthed when the first major change to add a division had been proposed. The proposers also stated their concern that the Senior Umpires might not feel they could safely start a race if the Rules of Racing passed in the Captains' Meeting added up to a 'hodge-podge' event, as might happen if the proposal was not passed as a slate.

A captain asked whether it was possible to bring a motion to make the 7th Men's Division of Torpids into a Women's Division. It was confirmed that this was possible, but it was also observed that filling a whole division at short notice might be difficult.

It was asked whether, if the motion were split and some parts were rejected, it would be possible to hold an emergency Captains' Meeting to resolve any situations arising. It was stated that it would be possible, but it was observed that could be risky if a solution could not be found; it was also pointed out that the Senior Umpires were volunteers who do not work for us.

A floor motion was brought to split the motion into parts A3.2, A3.7, and A3.10.

Proposed: Charlie Kniebe-Evans (Univ)

Seconded: Lloyd Arnold (Univ)

It was observed that to vote on A3.2 would still mean voting on the extra division, the flexible division sizes, the change to which divisions were Fixed, and the change in maximum division size together.

Voting on floor motion:

For: 7

Against: 50

Abstaining: 1

Motion fails.

Voting on proposed motion as a slate:

For: 61

Against: 0

Abstaining: 3

Motion passes.

10. Change to the Rules of Racing – Ty Rallens to speak

Simple majority to pass

No filming whilst cycling alongside a race. The rule prohibiting filming whilst cycling alongside a race is moved from the Bumps-specific section of the rules (A3) to the General rules of racing (A1), making it apply to all races. Filming whilst cycling is already prohibited in the Competitors' Instructions for non-Bumps races.

1. Insert:

A1.11.b. Cyclists shall not use any item or device (such as a mobile telephone or hand-held video camera) that prevents them from paying due care and attention to their cycling. Cyclists shall have both hands available to control their bicycle at all times while cycling during a race.

2. Remove:

~~A3.19.c. Cyclists shall not use any item or device (such as a mobile telephone or hand-held video camera) that prevents them from paying due care and attention to their cycling. Cyclists shall have both hands available to control their bicycle at all times while cycling during a race. Cyclists shall look where they are going and at the path ahead at all times. (It is strongly suggested to ride slightly behind your crew, so you can see them and what's on the towpath at the same time. Umpires shall use their best endeavors to accurately observe the race while riding safely).~~

Proposed: Ty Rallens (OURCs)

Seconded: James Lucas (OURCs)

It was clarified that this proposed rule change would not forbid filming with a hands-free device whilst cycling, unless doing so prevented the cyclist from paying due care and attention to their cycling. It was also clarified that the penalty for breaking the rules governing filming whilst cycling was a fine.

It was questioned why OURCs had rules governing the behaviour of cyclists accompanying crews. The historical context of these rules were explained; they were introduced following an incident of a collision between a cyclist accompanying a crew during a race and a pedestrian on the towpath, in which the pedestrian's laptop fell in the river.

It was pointed out that the language "both hands available" was discriminatory.

A friendly amendment was added to A1.11.b. "Cyclists shall not use any item or device (such as a mobile telephone or hand-held video camera) that prevents them from paying due care and attention to their cycling. Cyclists shall have all hands available to control their bicycle at all times while cycling during a race."

Voting on amended motion:

1. Insert:

A1.11.b. Cyclists shall not use any item or device (such as a mobile telephone or hand-held video camera) that prevents them from paying due care and attention to their cycling. Cyclists shall have all hands available to control their bicycle at all times while cycling during a race.

2. Remove:

~~A3.19.c. Cyclists shall not use any item or device (such as a mobile telephone or hand-held video camera) that prevents them from paying due care and attention to their cycling. Cyclists shall have both hands available to control their bicycle at all times while cycling during a race. Cyclists shall look where they are going and at the path ahead at all times. (It is strongly suggested to ride slightly~~

behind your crew, so you can see them and what's on the towpath at the same time. Umpires shall use their best endeavors to accurately observe the race while riding safely).

For: 56

Against: 5

Abstaining: 3

Motion passes.

3. Change to the Rules of Racing – Ty Rallens to speak

Two-thirds majority to pass

Changing Exclusivity stipulations to only apply to Bumps. The Exclusivity clause was written before the introduction of Isis Winter League, so the original wording was intended to apply only to Bumps races and Autumn Fours. This proposed change brings the wording of the rule more back in line with the spirit, preventing athletes from switching colleges between Bumps racing, whilst not penalising them for competing in IWLs or A4s for their 'new' college prior to organising a transfer. IWLs, it should be noted, have far fewer restrictions on associate members than Bumps and are competed in much more 'casually' by many boat clubs.

Change:

ii. Exclusivity

1. An athlete may only compete as a non-associate member of one College Boat club in any academic year.

To (additions in red):

ii. Exclusivity

1. An athlete may only compete **in Bumps** as a non-associate member of one College Boat club in any academic year.

Proposed: Ty Rallens (OURCs)

Seconded: Evan Roberts (OURCs)

No questions or comments.

Voting:

For: 63

Against: 0

Abstaining: 1

Motion passes.

4. **OxBumps Proposal** – Dominik Kloepfer to speak

Simple majority to pass

As many of you already know, the members of Wolfson College Boat Club have been doing our best over the past years to provide live bumps updates during Torpids and Summer Eights through use of OxBump, a free app created and previously maintained by two of our former members, Susan Graham and John McManigle. Although various appeals have been made over the years to receive sponsorship for this app, or to sell it to OURCs so that they might run it centrally, it has always fallen back to us as a club to run it without external support. We have done so happily, as we are aware that many Oxford colleges and their boat clubs now use and promote this app to check historic bumps charts, flag statuses, river conditions, and of course live bumps feeds; and we feel it is a worthy service to provide.

With the app creators no longer in Oxford and fewer non-racing supporters available to take charge of the live updates, we have taken it upon ourselves to create 'OxBump Marshal' slots within our club, and have begun to train all of our members in how to use and update the app so that we might continue to provide this service to our fellow clubs. However, this puts a strain on our rowers and coxes because we would have to fill these additional marshal slots on top of our regularly assigned marshal and umpire slots. Four years ago, this meant we had a total of 47 marshalling slots to fill for only 54 people. Understandably this was quite difficult to arrange, and many members were asked to take double shifts on top of their rowing, coxing, and academic commitments.

To alleviate this pressure while still providing live info on bumps races, we asked to reduce our allocation of marshalling and umpiring slots with the equivalent of 1 race desk helper per day, and have been granted this ever since. We would like to request to extend this arrangement for the upcoming edition of 'Torpids', where we will need around 16 OxBump marshals to keep the coverage live.

Finally, while we are fully aware that it is our own choice to continue to ensure OxBump is run and kept as close to 'live' as possible, we are also aware that many, if not most, of your clubs and corresponding colleges have come to enjoy and rely on this app as well; it would therefore be a shame if we were unable to run OxBump to its full potential this 'Torpids' due to a simple lack of manpower. It is for this reason that I beg your consideration and support today.

Proposed: Aimee Ruffle (Wolfson)

Seconded: Dominik Kloepfer (Wolfson)

The complaint was raised that OxBump did not work properly on Android; Wolfson captains apologised and stated that they would update it to work on Android phones.

Further explanation was provided on how marshalling and umpiring works during Bumps. It was explained that lots of volunteer labour is needed marshalling, umpiring, and running race desk, and that clubs are required to provide volunteers to fill a number of 'slots' determined by the number of boats entered from their club. It was explained that race desk helpers, who can come from any club not just OURCs, count for several marshalling/umpiring slots meaning that clubs who send race desk volunteers end up with fewer marshals. It was clarified that this motion reduced Wolfson's marshalling allocation by an amount equivalent to them sending one race desk helper per day.

Voting:

For: 51

Against: 6

Abstaining: 7

Motion passes.

5. Transfers under A1.2 – James Lucas 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*
 - Sarah Clifford: St Hugh's to Linacre (papers in order)
 - Adomas Klimantas: Wolfson to St Hugh's (papers in order)
 - Annika Moslein: Balliol to University (papers in order)
 - Denise Swanborn: Queen's to Pembroke (papers in order)
 - Aurelia Sauerbrei: Wolfson (St Cross) to Lincoln (papers in order)

No objections. Ratified.

6. Extension of Student Status under A1.1.a.i.1.a – James Lucas to speak

Simple majority to pass

- a. **Jonathan Israel (St Antony's)** is suspending his studies for the next twelve months, but still wishes to continue rowing with the SABC this year, competing in Torpids and Eights. He is unable to suspend from his course for a shorter period of time due to his course's cycle of assessments. Jonathan has suspended for a series of physical and mental wellbeing reasons, and has also been unable to effectively undertake fieldwork or research in Sub-Saharan Africa (Kenya, Ethiopia and Nigeria) primarily due to COVID. He is also uniquely unable to return home to Western Australia due to border closures, and this is unlikely to change, so he will be remaining in Oxford. Jonathan only rowed for three months prior to starting Oxford, and is part of a St Antony's O1/M1 crew in Div III/IV composed of seven rowers who have only commenced rowing in the past twelve months. He is not a blues/international/professional rower. Written approval from his Senior Tutor has not yet been received by the Rowing Sabbatical Officer.
Proposed: Philipp Dietrich (St Antony's)
Seconded: Fuchsia Hart (St Antony's)

It was explained that written approval from the Senior Tutor had not yet been received; therefore, this vote would grant permission from the captains for Extension of Student Status, contingent on the receipt of the Senior Tutor's letter by the Sabbatical Officer. It was clarified that, should the vote pass and the letter from the Senior Tutor be received, a notification that this Extension of Student Status had gone into effect would be sent to captains.

Passed unanimously.

- b. **Barley Rose (Keble)** is a third-year DPhil student rowing with us at Keble. All the main experimental work of her Ph.D. involves working with large numbers of young Sitka Spruce trees (a common conifer). These are the trees she used for the first two years of her PhD. For the 3rd and 4th-year experiments, she needed specific families of trees, so they had to be grown for her. However, due to the very cold weather last spring, making it on average the coldest in a decade, in late February, the trees that should have come out of dormancy didn't begin to grow until the end of May. This meant that the trees were too small to experiment on as planned in July and meant delaying research by a year. As a result, she has suspended her PhD by two terms, Michaelmas and Hillary. She still rows with the college and actively engages in the MCR. Based on this, we would ask for an extension of her student status so she can compete in the Keble W1. She has never trialled with any Blues squads or competed internationally. This extension of student status would expire on the first day of Trinity Term 2022, when Barley will resume her DPhil.

Written approval from her Senior Tutor has been received by the Rowing Sabbatical Officer.

Proposed: Maryam Sajjad (Keble)

Seconded: Emily Morbey (Keble)

No comments or questions.

Passed unanimously.

7. **Ratification of Club Safety Reviews** – James Lucas to speak

- Exeter - £50

No objections, comments, or questions.

Ratified.

8. **AOB**

- a. **Applications for Rowing Sabbatical Officer** – James Lucas to speak

It was explained that formal applications for Rowing Sabbatical Officer are likely to be opening soon. This is a role held for one year by a student who has just graduated. The Rowing Sabbatical Officer invited anyone interested to get in touch for more information, and asked captains to pass this invite on to their clubs.

- b. **Statement for Captains regarding Marshalling & Umpiring Rotas** – Ty Rallens to speak

Statement from Bernard Tao - who will be preparing the Marshalling and Umpiring Rotas

This year entries close on Tuesday 6th Week at 12 noon. Once incomplete crews have been scratched we'll be preparing the first draft of the Rowing On start order, and the Rowing On Marshalling Rota.

This will be published on Tuesday Evening / Wednesday Morning

Please note: Any crews who scratch from Rowing On will not change the requirement to send marshals for Rowing On, but will be taken into account when preparing the rota for Wednesday to Saturday.

As the Scratch Deadline is 23:59 on Friday 6th Week, with Rowing On held on Saturday, we have 1 day less than in previous years between Rowing On and Bumps. This year Bernard will be creating the rotas on Saturday morning - which will be before we have run Rowing On.

All scratches that have been received by the deadline will be accounted for. Crews who fail to Row On, or are scratched after the deadline for any reason, will not change the number of Marshals and Umpires that the club will need to provide.

When creating the rota, the starting positions of each of your crews is taken into consideration, and shifts are distributed to minimise clashes as far as practicable, and to spread the shifts between your crews.

This includes considering that crews near the top of a division may bump up, or crews near the bottom of a division may be bumped down. It's not possible to account for all possibilities (e.g. a crew dropping from Bungline 1 down a whole division on day 1), and it's your responsibility to supply Marshals and Umpires for your allocated slots.

You can choose to swap with another club if necessary - but we will not be able to facilitate that for you. If you have made any swaps, please have captains from both clubs involved send us confirmation via email, and we'll make the appropriate update to the rota.

Finally, as we have for the past year, we'll be creating pre-registration forms. We'll be publishing the link to the forms at the same time as publishing the rotas. There will be one form for Rowing On, and a separate form for the main Bumps event.

Extra Division in Torpids and Eights

We propose to add an extra women's division to both Torpids (starting in 2023, i.e. next academic year) and Eights (starting in 2022, i.e. **this academic year**), so that there are as many men's divisions as women's divisions. To do this whilst accounting for varying numbers of entries, we suggest making the size of Rowing On Divisions flexible. Key changes that we'd propose are described below.

- **Torpids to consist of 12 (6M 6W) and Eights of 14 (7M 7W) divisions.**

This will apply from Torpids 2023 onwards, and Eights 2022 onwards.

- **Fixed Division size to be 12+1 in both.**

This is a decrease from the previous 13+1 in Eights, as entry numbers have been falling in recent years and smaller divisions can be more easily run on time to accommodate the necessarily longer day with the extra division.

- **Fixed Divisions will be the top 4 divisions for both genders in Torpids and Eights. Men's and Women's Divs 5 & 6 in Torpids and 5, 6 & 7 in Eights will be Rowing On Divisions.**

If, after a little while of adopting this system, it's found that there's a consistent difference in number of entries/div sizes between Men and Women there's scope for the rules to be amended again so that these numbers might be altered proportionally.

- **The expected Rowing On Division size for a given event to be agreed and announced by the SUs and Event Sec within two days after close of entries.**

The size of Rowing On Divisions will be set in order to maximise the number of expected safe crews able to race (though may be reduced in accordance with the event plan to account for river conditions e.g. high stream). Men's and Women's Rowing On Divisions for a given event need not be of the same size.

The flexible sizes of Rowing On Divisions means that the start times of Rowing On Division crews (even those not newly inserted) might not be as readily predictable. For this reason close of entries may have to be earlier to allow division sizes to be set (**as in Summer Torpids 2021**). A suggested closing date for entries is the Tuesday ten days prior to Rowing On.

- **Rowing On.** The purpose of Rowing On remains to ensure that only safe crews take part in Bumps.

The slowest boat of each gender will be not Row On, regardless of entry numbers. In addition, the Senior Umpires shall exclude, regardless of qualifying time, any crew which does not demonstrate the minimum standard of safety; such crews will be deemed to have failed to row on. In making this evaluation, the SUs will consider:

- i. Rowing all 8 for the whole course
- ii. Steering competently and obeying marshalling rules

- iii. Not catching multiple crabs
 - iv. Evidently attempting to race (i.e. rowing the whole course at rate)
 - v. The Senior Umpires shall also consider excluding any crew finishing more than 30s behind the next-slowest crew, and any crews finishing behind that crew.
- **Racing would have to start earlier in Torpids (and likely Eights as well). Proposed racing start times are 11.30 in Torpids and 12.15 in Eights, with river-opening at 11:00, and 11:45, respectively.** This will require Proctors' permission; these rule changes are conditional on this permission being granted.

Ty Rallens (OURCs Secretary)

James Marsden (OURCs OCM)

James Lucas (Rowing Sabbatical Officer)

Additional Points

Why add an extra division?

In Summer Torpids 2021 there were 7 M and 7 W divisions, of 9+1 format (9 crews plus a sandwich boat). 37 M and 39 W crews took part in Rowing On. Though typically there are fewer W entries for Torpids in 'normal years', when division parity was offered there were equal numbers of entries for M and W. We therefore propose to offer division parity again for Torpids and Eights.

What do we currently have?

Torpids has 6M+5W divisions, each of 12+1 format.

Eights has 7M+6W divisions, each of 13+1 format. (Eights used to be 12+1 until 2012 when it was enlarged.)

Would M or W divisions race first?

We propose something like: one gender races first in Torpids (e.g. WMWM...), with the other racing first in Eights (e.g. MWMW...), alternating every year.

When can Bumps start and end to accommodate an extra division?

Both Torpids and Eights have historically opened the river to racing crews at around 11:30am (10:30am on the last day of Eights). Bringing this timing back substantially will need Proctors' permission since it will impact on six work days. (It will also require the race desk team to start earlier.)

In Torpids, the last possible time to run the final division of the day is 5pm due to sunset. In Eights, consideration may have to be made of evening training of town clubs; in past years, the final division has not run later than 6:45pm.

What are the rules on division timings?

In both Torpids and Eights there must be a minimum of 25 minutes between start times. This is a requirement in the current [rules](#) (A.3.10.c.), as this is the minimum amount of time considered necessary for warming up and attaching to bunghines, allowing for hold ups. This rule isn't being considered for change.

What are other limitations on division timing?

30 minutes between planned start times is considered to be the minimum 'practical' interval between planned division start times. Longer gaps between divisions are useful when there is a lot of river traffic (hence potential hold-ups), larger division sizes and less experienced crews (hence more time needed to warm up and attach to bunghines). It is however expected that 30 min divisions could be managed, especially with the flexibility to respond to entry numbers with smaller lower divisions if needed, and punctual arrival at bunghines.

On the subject of river traffic: Although ad hoc movements of non-racing traffic can't be planned for, Bumps division start times are timed so as not to clash with commercial cruiser operations. These don't generally take place during Torpids (unless it's very good weather in which case one of the two local companies may run a small number of trips, but even then they can be negotiated with since they're doing this largely so that spectators can watch Bumps). Cruiser sailings are a big problem in Eights, during which nearly all the sailings of both local companies depart their docks at Folly Bridge on the hour or half-hour. It is not possible to have a race start less than 10 minutes before a sailing time without holding them up, which has been the reason for some odd-sized division timings in the past. During Summer Torpids 2021 the expanded timetable was switched to have all divisions starting at -:15 or -:45 which worked much better around these sailing times (though 30 minutes between division times is still considered a 'practical minimum').

Differences between Torpids and Eights?

Torpids has already been finishing at the latest possible time of day with minimal time gaps of half an hour for years, so a shift to 12 divisions will need a significantly earlier start to racing. Fortunately the timing can remain on -:00 and -:30 timing due to the very low amount of river traffic. Eights has had quite a few 35-min and 40-min gaps in recent years, to allow for increased commercial river traffic, so shifting to 14 divisions but sticking to 30-minute intervals tied at -:15 and -:45 would mean only a small change to the timing of the first racing division.

Why reduce the Eights division sizes?

The original expansion of Eights from 12+1 to 13+1 in 2012 was made due to increasing participation numbers at the time; however, later years have shown that entry numbers have in fact been broadly falling from that year onwards (timing that coincided with the rise of tuition fees from £3k to £9k pa), so division sizes in this proposal are decreased to match.

Introduction of a set minimum of crews who won't qualify at Rowing On

Having a minimum number of crews fail to Row On is a safety consideration designed to ensure that all crews who actually race Bumps are competent and able to race the course at speed with appropriate control - as crews without this ability can lead to unsafe situations. Introducing a set minimum number of crews who will not qualify at Rowing On explicitly into the rules provides a framework for the Race Secretary and Senior Umpires to work from when setting the flexible division sizes. (I.e. it provides a guidance of how much to shrink the divisions by if there are fewer crews entered than the theoretical maximum capacity of all full divisions - a situation particularly possible for W entrants following the addition of another division.) In addition to this, the [rules](#) as they currently stand (A1.4.a.viii. and A1.5.h.iii.) also permit the Event Committee and SUs to remove any crew from the competition on safety grounds if necessary; which safety grounds are being assessed are now formally enshrined in the Rules of Racing.

How do these changes affect the 'half division' contingency plans for high stream?

Some of the Stream Contingency Plans for running Torpids under high-stream conditions dictate moving to half divisions. All half divisions would have the size '6+1' counted from the Head of the River down, regardless of flexible division size. As is already the case under the current format of Torpids/Eights, if either Divisions 4-6, or all divisions, were to move to half divisions (as per the contingency plans) the number of crews in Bumps would be substantially decreased - with "Rowing On crews", and some of the lowest "fixed division crews" not competing.