



Captains' Meeting Agenda

Tuesday 1st Week, Trinity 2025

19:30, 29th April

Doctorow Hall, St Edmund Hall

Chair: Georgia Douglas (OUBC)

1. Welcome

College Clubs: 49 (Absences from Osler House and St Catherine's)

OURCs: 5 (including the chair)

Senior Umpires: 1

OUBC: 1

Total Votes: 55

Georgia Douglas was resolved as the chair of the meeting.

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting

Available at <https://ourcs.co.uk/organisation/meetings/>

3. Matters Arising

4. Transfers – Oscar Hayden to speak

Objections may only be made if:

The athlete is not a bona fide student, fellow or visiting student at the college they are transferring from.

*The athlete has never been a **student** member of the college they are transferring to.*

Transfers under A1.2.a

- Emma Grummitt – Wolfson to New College
- Rosie Thorogood – Christ Church to Somerville
- Joe Gellett – St Anne's to St Peter's
- Kate Maddern – St John's to Keble
- Barbara Tyler – University to New
- Verity Black – St Edmund Hall to Green Templeton
- Andrew McNey – Reuben to Pembroke

No objections to transfers. All transfers completed.

5. ~~Change to the Rules of Racing – Oscar Hayden to speak~~

~~A3. Rules of Bumps Racing~~

~~[...]~~

~~7. Rowing On~~

~~d. Rowing On races shall be timed rows with a rolling start, measured from Longbridges raft to a semaphore placed approximately midway between Univ Boathouse and the Head, with the fastest crews to qualify.~~

~~i. 1st VIII's or Torpids consisting of 9 Full Members of that College Boat Club participating in Rowing On races will qualify regardless of time, but may still be excluded on safety grounds (A3.7.k).~~

~~Proposed with the support of the Oxford University Sports Federation, this motion is intended to ensure that all colleges can participate in Bumps, with no colleges not participating in the foremost event in Oxford due to speed.~~

~~Proposer: Oscar Hayden (OU Sport/OURCs)~~

~~Seconder: Q Sun (OURCs/St Edmund Hall)~~

Withdrawn to seek further safety consultation. Captains were encouraged to contact that Sabbatical Officer if they had any thoughts.

6. **River Closures** – Jack Davies to speak

a. **Isis Spring League**

Sunday 4th May (2nd Week) - 12:00 until End of Racing or Closing Time

b. **Summer Eights**

Rowing On:

Saturday 24th May (4th Week) - 08:30 until End of Racing or Closing Time

Eights Proper:

Wednesday 28th May (5th Week) - 11:00 until End of Racing or Closing Time

Thursday 29th May (5th Week) - 11:00 until End of Racing or Closing Time

Friday 30th May (5th Week) - 11:00 until End of Racing or Closing Time

Saturday 31st May (5th Week) - Opening Time until Closing Time

Proposed: Jack Davies (OURCs)

Seconded: Oscar Hayden (OURCs)

All river closures approved. Oriel Regatta was encouraged to be submitted to appear in the fourth week meeting.

7. **Change to the Code of Conduct** – Julia Bellardo to speak

2.8 Isis specific rules

[...]

e. Special rules applying to the Gut

[...]

- i. No **unregistered or** 'novice' status cox may go through the Gut until they have completed 10 outings, **at least 3 of which must be on the Isis**. Until that point coxes from boathouses upstream of the Gut should spin at Longbridges, and coxes from boathouses downstream of the Gut should spin in the bay outside the Sea Scouts Boathouse when safe to do so.

Proposer: Julia Bellardo (Balliol)

Seconder: Joshua Maisuria-Hull (Merton)

The proposer explained that the motion was to clean up the unclear rules and to adjust the number of Isis outings needed to go through the gut.

It was asked if this would limit coxes if the flag was constantly light blue. It was stated that no it would not – as the current rules require 10 Isis Outings as it is under “Isis Specific Rules”.

It was asked whether this rule stopped people who registered as novice coxes but had previous experience would be limited. It was agreed that this would be a very unlikely edge case and that the vast majority would be registered as Experienced if they have lots of non-isis outing experience.

It was asked if the definition of outings could be altered if it was mentioned elsewhere. This is the only use of the word “outings” in the Code of Conduct and the rule would work with its intended effect despite the previous interpretation.

For: 50

Against: 1

Abstain: 4

The motion passed.

8. Change to the Rules of Racing – Sascha Frey to speak

A3. Rules of Bumps Racing

[...]

5. Substitutions

a. Substitutions fall under ~~two~~ four categories; regular, extraordinary, **designated**, and **examination**.

b. [...]

~~e~~ i. Coxing substitutions [...]

~~d~~ ii. Regular substitutions will be approved [...]

e. **c**. Extra-ordinary substitutes [...] *This will include changes to the linked rules in this paragraph, where all mentions of A3.5.e will be A3.5.c instead.*

d. Designated Substitutions

i. A designated substitute must be declared to the event committee by the Entries Deadline. This will typically be done by use of the 'Notes Section' for the crew in which they are substituting **from**, in the format "Designated Substitutes: [Name 1], [Name 2]"

ii. Only names on the "Primary crew list" may be designated substitutes. Associate members cannot be designated substitutes. Staff Honorary Members may not be a designated substitute in a second crew.

iii. A designated substitute may replace a member of a crew one higher for a single day during any bumps campaign, regardless of A3.5.a.i. For the avoidance of doubt, using a designated substitute in a third boat to replace a designated substitute in a second boat will count as one day for all substitutes involved.

iv. No athlete may race under this rule for more than one crew in one day.

v. Each crew may have a maximum of two designated substitutes.

vi. Designated substitutes may be rejected if the Race Committee have reason to believe it is being made in bad faith or to gain an unfair competitive advantage

~~f~~ e. [...] (Examination Substitution Rule)

Proposer: Sascha Frey (St Hugh's)

Seconder: Shea Heaney (St Hilda's)

The proposer explained that the motion had two parts, a grammar clean up and the designated substitution. Two people from each boat may be designated, at which point they may be able to substitute up for one day only, and then down again if not the last day.

These need to be registered when entries are done, and there are restrictions as to when people may not go up. There is no reason needed for why they need to go up for a day – situation differs to extraordinary.

Aim is to allow captains and crews, and OURCs, to plan ahead of time and not have to ask for an extraordinary substitution on the day of Eights.

Friendly amendment was accepted to spell substitution correctly in A3.5.b.ii, apologies from the Sabbatical Officer for mistyping it in the agenda.

It was explained that the crew move is only to one higher – no higher than that, and that the restriction is one crew, not one race – substitutes can do sandwich boat races.

It was asked whether you need a regular substitute at the end of a daisy chain. Yes, the issue is to have the chain and have other rowers' sub in at the bottom.

It was suggested that it could take out the examination rule, and parts of the extraordinary sub rule.

Friendly tweak - “for the avoidance of doubt, as an example”
v. “Two members of each crew may be designated substitutes”

Daisy chaining was discussed again and whether vii. A3.5.e.ii could be referred to add guidance to doing so. It was decided that the clause was unsuitable, but this would be considered over Summer Eights, perhaps even a real example, and try and add it at the end of term.

It was asked if clarifying that “sub(s)” could move, it was rejected to avoid stopping each substitute doing one race each in a sandwich boat race, which that could stop.

It was discussed where in the system the substitutes should be noted. There was some debate between whether putting the substitutes in the higher crew to make it easier to check on the day and keeping it in the lower crew to aid checking it beforehand. It was decided that checking beforehand would be preferable and notes could be made elsewhere by OURCs to ease on the day admin.

Asked whether something happened between two crews rowing. Observed that it could be a problem overall, but this motion couldn't solve that, as extraordinary subs could also be a problem. Could be undesirable as well – decided to discuss another time.

If you needed an extraordinary substitute, it was confirmed that this wouldn't use a day, and you could use the extraordinary sub in your lowest crew as well. It won't be expected to be used where you haven't planned.

For: 53

Abstain: 2

Against: 0

The motion passed.

9. Change to the Rules of Racing – Grant Rowley to speak

A3. Rules of Bumps Racing

3. Eligibility

a. In addition to general entry requirements for OURCs events listed in A1.6:

[...]

ii. No person may row in two crews ~~or cox two crews~~, although it is permitted to row in one crew and cox another. This does not include crews which have failed to row on under rule A3.7.

iii. It is permitted to cox up to two crews, provided (1) they are not both the highest ranked men's and women's crews for that college, and (2) they are not competing in immediately adjacent divisions.

If the college captains wish to enter a cox for two different crews, they must provide their name and University card number to the OURCs Sabbatical Officer. Their coxing request will then be included on the agenda for the next meeting.

At the next Captains' Meeting, the Captains will be given the opportunity to register their objection to the request, and it must be passed via a motion.

Permission for an individual to cox two crews has effect from the end of the Captain's Meeting at which it is announced by the OURCs Sabbatical Officer.

iv. All crewmembers...

Proposer: Galen Brown (Wolfson)

Seconded: Mads Hoefer (Wolfson)

The proposers had found it to be the case that with bad weather and coxes leaving that it is sometimes down to luck with how many coxes they get trained. Entering fewer boats than they would like, or using rowers with less coxing experience.

It was asked that instead of leaning on rowers to cox, that we would just be replacing leaning on rowers to race two races, to lean on coxes to race twice. It was argued that they find trying to encourage rowers to cox is much more difficult than asking coxes to cox a second race.

It was asked why we ought to replace rowers with less experience with people who have more experience and thus taking that training time from more inexperienced people. It was agreed that work could be done to change this rule to avoid that objection.

It was pointed out that coxes cannot do W1 and M1 for the same college, but they can do lower boats, and this might unfairly impact smaller colleges with only two boats.

It was argued that coxing recruitment is a challenge, but that is part of the sport. Needing experienced coxes to run racing is a different issue to generally needing coxes.

The proposer argued that they think it's reasonable that it limits it to two, and with the last couple of years it has been difficult.

Continued, sounds like there is a coxing deficit to the number of crews. How many crews have a deficit? They have one or two between. Is it not feasible to fill those slots with associates in lower crews?

It was agreed that it potentially is, but ideally not. It was asked why someone potentially doing three races was more ideal than a cox joining. It could also be a cox at another college who isn't racing.

It was pointed out this this could be risking doing the opposite of what was intended – it could be exploited to put better coxes into both first and second boats and result in inexperienced coxes losing out and quitting. Clubs might end up with zero coxes after those leave, rather than one who could have improved.

It was suggested that the idea from this could be used when relaxing restrictions, rather than as a rule – instead of a complete relaxation of membership, colleges could be expected to use their own coxes twice.

Agreed that when the SUs are able to recognise that there has been a multi-year issue, associates in fixed divisions were already allowed before senior status only at Torpids 2025,

It was asked if in a scenario where you had one cox who was unavailable for a day, would it permit a one-day swap between crews? Yes, the proposers believed it should.

It had earlier been suggested that rowers should be able to row if they have eight of them. It was argued that coxes have rights too – sometimes they may not be able to step up due to academic commitments or otherwise, and this would put more of a load on them by prioritising the rowers.

Two years ago, we discussed composite crews and there was a consensus of “if you haven't got the number of people to fill a crew, unfortunately you don't have the numbers to enter than crew”. Bumps is always oversubscribed, and clubs that are dominated by associates and alumni might benefit from this rule. It could also be a rule that could be useful for the proposers, but it could make other clubs worse or cause other issues.

Comments from the SU: long term concerns about coxing recruitment and development if this rule were used a great deal. The proposers had only registered three new coxes so far this academic year. Bad idea to create a rule in response to a single problem, usually leads to problems.

Supply scales with demand, this could result in half as many experienced coxes. Also, some wording issues – no objection criteria and a few conflicting parts. Good example of where college rowing should come together – for example from Univ, who have too many coxes for their crews.

Some of the principles behind it are good, nobody wants crews who have trained to lack racing. Could one off exceptions be made? Potential solution – use OxCox and pop a message out.

For: 4

Abstentions: 1

Against: 50

The motion did not pass.

10. **Election - Rowing Sabbatical Officer 2025/26** - Oscar Hayden to speak

- Esther Tan (Jesus)
Proposer: Eleanor Prince (St Hilda's)
Second: Jack Forrest (Jesus)
- Harriet Anderson (Christ Church)
Proposer: Robert Doane-Solomon (Pembroke)
Second: James Hopkinson (Queen's/OURC/OURCs)
- Mark Proberts (Univ)
Proposer: Alex Rigamonti (Univ)
Second: Lily Harris (St Hugh's)
- Sophie Kubik (Linacre)
Proposer: Emily Stone (Linacre)
Second: Catherine Stephenson (Somerville)

All candidates made a 3 minute speech, before questions were asked. Two rounds of voting then occurred.

Round 1

Esther Tan: 8

Harriet Anderson: 14

Mark Proberts: 11

Sophie Kubik: 20

RON: 0

As per the OURCs constitution, the two most popular candidates proceed to a run-off if nobody achieves a majority of votes.

Round 2

Harriet Anderson: 20

Sophie Kubik: 32

Sophie Kubik is elected the Rowing Sabbatical Officer for 2025/2026.

11. **Change to the Rules of Racing** – Alex Rigamonti to speak

A3. Rules of Bumps Racing

17. Penalty Bumps

[...]

b. Dangerous Conduct shall include, but is not limited to:

[...]

vi. in Summer Eights, winding down too early after conceding to a crew behind, where doing so contributes to a dangerous incident.

Proposer: Alex Rigamonti (University)

Secunder: Ella Miles (St Peter's)

It was asked whether crews behind should have the most responsibility to avoid colliding during a bump. It was said that there was about two seconds between a cox getting a bump behind and being able to decelerate themselves.

It was asked as to whether it would discourage a crew for going blade on blade or blade on boat instead of shell on shell.

It was suggested that this isn't needed – dangerous conduct says nothing about what boat it is. There should be no favour towards either boat. But, having said that, it did provide some more clarity to the rules.

Against: 0

Abstentions: 24

For: 28

The motion passes.

12. **Change to the Rules of Racing** – James Hopkinson to speak

A3. Rules of Bumps Racing

3. Eligibility

a. In addition to the general entry requirements for OURCs events listed in A1.6:

- i. No member of the Oxford University Boat Club may participate in Torpids unless granted permission by a race committee. Permission will not be given to members of the four Blue Boats, Isis and Osiris except, a squad rower will be given permission to compete in Torpids as a cox and a squad cox will be given permission to participate as a rower.

- ii. A list of athletes will be put onto the agenda for the Captains' Meeting. Objections may be raised if an athlete has been given permission where it should not have been in clause i. A vote will be held on any athlete objected to.

~~University squad rowers and coxes are not allowed to compete in Torpids if they have been selected for a Boat Race crew (this does not include designated spares), or if, in the instance of their squad not having made its selection before Torpids, they are still in contention for a seat in a crew. A squad rower may compete in Torpids as a cox and a squad cox may compete as a rower.~~

Proposer: James Hopkinson (OUBC/OURCs/Queen's)

Seconder: Oscar Hayden (OU Sport/OURCs/Balliol)

It was explained that the proposers believed the rules currently didn't quite work, and weren't ideal administratively, and there was the potential for OUBC athletes who were not in a boat to be ineligible for Torpids, especially in the event of a sixth week Torpids. It was also suggested that this could make it clear that spares who sub into boats would be eligible, although this was later pointed out as not a current problem as retrospective punishment would not apply to people previously seen as not in contention.

It was stated that currently, the CSU enquires with the OUBC coaches, and this year the official answer to who "in contention" had been that the BRCL website displayed all athletes in contention.

It was argued that there were athletes who had conclusively withdrawn from OUBC around Christmas who were still present on the website and had raced Torpids.

It was suggested that this moved the boundaries of who decides eligibility, by removing it from the coaches who should be stating whom they (as selectors) deem to be in contention, and giving the power to decide this to OURCs officers, and it was also asked if we want to change where the boundaries are – did we want to remove all OUBC athletes from Torpids?

It was agreed that there was much to discuss and with the meeting already running late, it was withdrawn for discussion outside of the meeting.

13. Change to the Rules of Racing – Galen Brown to speak

A1. General Rules of Racing

b. Respective College

[...]

- ii. An athlete may only compete in Bumps as a non-associate member of one College Boat Club in any academic year. This does not include athletes registered as substitutions.

Proposer: Galen Brown (Wolfson)

Seconder: Mads Hoefer (Wolfson)

it was argued that, as mentioned before, a specific rule to fix a specific situation would potentially harm other clubs. Athletes could be in a boat and developed by a club to then swap over elsewhere the term after. Someone could also insist that they would only race if they were put down as a substitute.

It was pointed out that it could be possible for someone to attempt to win headship twice with two different crews if this was passed.

It also doesn't say which way round the substitutions are, and whether someone substituted out of a boat would be regarded as eligible for a move.

The motion was withdrawn to clean up and solve those issues.

14. **AOB**

Connor Philp – OURCs Treasurer

More clarity on fines. Not a complete list, but a list will be sent out after this meeting.

Bradley Croucher – Men's Captain, St John's College

Will send a sheet out about trailering collaboration and will appreciate feedback.

RQ

Governance Review – form hasn't yet been agreed. Form looked very different to what was expected.

Might affect COUR and how it is structured, but otherwise unlikely to get near OURCs.

Jack

Thank you for sitting through three hours.

Summer Eights entries are to close Wednesday 3rd Week – sub deadline is still at the same time. Get them out early.

Q

Programme will be compiled again – 10% of the profits going to Sobell House if all parties are happy – which they were.