

BUTBA 2014/15 EGM & EOSM

Saturday 20th June 2015; 16:00; Tolworth Bowling Alley

Committee Present:

Darren Ellis (DE), Chair
Paul Marks (PM), Secretary
James Larkin (JL), Ex-Student President
Tom Chuter (TC); Student President
Louise Parker (LP); Collator
Frazer Bowen (FB); Forum & Social

Apologies:

Craig Harmon, Treasurer
Matt Harris, Club Development
Rachael McKenzie, Press
Paul Williams, Tournament Coordinator

Members Present by Group:

MMU: 1
Birmingham: 8
Nottingham: 4
Loughborough: 2
Ex-Students: 7

DE welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedure that there would be two meetings today, an EGM followed by the EOSM.

DE stated that the EGM was called to discuss a proposal to reduce the size of the committee. PM clarified that the proposal itself was not called for to be discussed as an EGM, but as the subject matter would make voting pointless; an EGM had been called as an Administrative procedure.

However, there has been a question raised prior to the meeting whether or not an EGM could be called in this manner, and more particularly whether or not the constitution had been followed for the calling of the EGM.

PM stated that in order for an EGM to be called; a motion has to be submitted by 2/3 committee or the equivalent of 10 votes. PM called the EGM under the latter, but could not name the 10 voters, and confirmed he did not write them down as it was not a controversial point and did not think it would be an issue.

DE called for a vote on whether the correct procedure had been followed:

Yes: 11
No: 0
Abstentions: 17

With 0 votes against the calling of the EGM, the EGM is deemed to be called in accordance with the constitution.

JL introduced his motion to the council (see agenda explanation).

Joe Harrison (JH) expressed concern that under the proposal, 3 members would have a veto power effectively which is quite a small number. JH also asked how the non-voting members would be called to account.

JL stated that a small core committee of 4 or 5 was very common with far larger organisations; ultimately the elected members are held to account by the members and if the members can remain to change the personal either by not voting, or calling for a motion of no confidence. JL confirmed that Non-exec members have existed previously and have worked reasonably well. Again, accountable to the council as they are still required to be elected.

Shaun Pasrons (SP) asked whether the roles of Club Development and Forum & Social had been deliberately left out; JL stated that they had not, he simply had left them off, but if they were to be added back they would be to non-executive positions. SP then proposed a formal amendment to add these to the non-executive roles (seconded by TC)

JH also expressed concern that the Student and Ex-student representatives were not on the voting committee and as this was a core element representing our members; these should have voting rights. PM asked whether the vice-chair was supposed to feed back the rep's views to the voting committee. JL stated originally that this was not the intention of the vice-chair role. JH (seconded by TC and a general murmur of approval) proposed a formal amendment to move the rep back to the committee. JL confirmed he didn't want them named as rep, rather than 'president's' and there was no objection.

DE then called for votes on the two amendments (if which they both passed, the proposal as a whole would pass)

Chair calls for vote on first amendment to add back the roles of Club Dev and forum to non-exec roles)

28 for, 0 abstentions or votes against.

DE then called for vote on the 2nd amendment: (to move the ex student and student reps back to the executive voting committee:

28 for, 0 abstentions or votes against.

No email votes were counted as proposal amended from the floor

The following proposal has passed and the Constitution will be updated as follows:

TPN 10.0 The following positions shall be elected by the BUTBA Council in accordance with the constitution; each position is defined within the document entitled "Responsibilities of BUTBA Officers", available with this document as defined in TPN 3.0:

TPN 10.1 The Chair

TPN 10.2 The Vice Chair

TPN 10.3 The Student Representative

TPN 10.4 The Ex-Student Representative

TPN 10.5 The Treasurer

TPN 10.6 The Secretary

TPN 10.7 The Tournament Co-ordinator

TPN 11.0 All officers, except the Chair, shall have one vote in Committee meetings. In the event of a tie in any Committee vote, the Chair shall have the casting vote.

TPN 12.0 No Individual may hold more than one office that is defined in TPN 10.

TPN 13.0 There shall be further posts which shall be elected by the BUTBA Council, but shall not form part of the Committee and shall not vote in committee meetings:

TPN 13.1 The Website Co-ordinator

TPN 13.2 The Press Secretary

TPN 13.3 The BUTBA Collator

TPN 13.4 The Cup Collator

TPN 13.5 Club Development Officer

TPN 13.6 Forum & Social Officer

[TPN 13.7 Female Liaison Officer] (see EOSM item 5f below)

TPN 14.0 Individuals may hold more than one position under TPN 13 and the positions may be filled by a holder of a position under TPN 10.

The EGM was closed at 16:30

The EOSM was then formally opened immediately following the EGM with the same composition at 16:30.

1. Introduction from the Chair

DE welcomed everyone to the EOSM and briefly highlighted some aspects of this year's tour. DE explained that more detail can be found in his full report, detailed below. DE briefly mentioned that BUTBA had for the first time run both a student & ex-student championships and we have also introduction of the Pinfeed magazine. There has been continued dialogue with the BTBA, particularly regarding discussion of the affiliate membership which has not progressed as we hoped and as a result, it will not be renewed for the following year.

2. Presentation of reports

Enclosure 1: Chair's Report

DE explains that Craig Harmon has sent his apologies for non-attendance but has provided a short statement to be read:

"A copy of my report for the season can be found on the BUTBA website. Further details on the state of the funds can be found in the report. As you are all aware I am now standing down from this committee.

I would therefore like to record my gratitude to those committee members with whom I have served over the years. I, more than most, understand the demands that are placed on those people whose role requires an active presence. I would therefore like to thank you for your time as, without your dedication, there would be no tour.

I would like to wish my best wishes to the incoming treasurer and will be on hand to provide assistance during the handover."

Enclosure 2: Treasurer's Report

PM stated that there had been an issue over the last few seasons from the members regarding transparency and general awareness of committee decision and how they are made. PM further stated that he had produced a report which briefly summarises the key decisions of the committee this season and some notes of the discussion. PM hopes that this will be a continued feature of future secretaries.

Enclosure 3: Secretary's Report

PM read a statement from PW regarding the franchises received for the next year's events:

"Franchises received before the deadline:

- *Loughborough Diamond Sixes (Ilkeston)*
- *Man Met Handicap Matchplay Quads (Chesterfield)*

Franchise Applications received during extended deadline:

- *Birmingham Baker Fives Franchise form (although a further tweak was required as the franchise applicant wasn't clear on the proposed location)*
- *Nottingham Doubles*
- *Nottingham Trios*

Notes:

(Within the extended deadline) Four applications were received from one ex-student, however the individual did not meet the 'Part A' requirements. Despite a request specifying the requirements of 'Part A', the individual did not respond. Therefore I do not deem the franchises as compliant and therefore not suitable for consideration. As I will not be in post for 2015/16, all information will be issued to the incoming TC."

3. **Formal Approval of the 2013/14 EOSM Minutes**

Darren proposed confirmation of last year's minutes. TC asked whether the introduction of one member – one vote had the effect of removing the additional votes the committee used to enjoy. PM confirmed that this was correct and that each person who had paid membership in the season (or for the preceding season in the case of voting at the SOSM) would receive one vote. The minutes were then formally confirmed by JL and LP.

4. **Matters arising from the previous minutes**

a) *Cup*

PM stated that a committee had been formed with himself, TC and FB who had come up with three proposals. However, there was one proposal which the committee favoured over the other two and that was a Baker format. The proposal in its current format would see a league style format between local universities which would be 3 or 5 baker games (taking around an hour). From that, play-offs would be organised later in the year from the winners of the local leagues.

Gina Overy (GO) expressed concern about travel time and cost for not very much bowling. PM stated yes that was the intention; this would be equivalent to a football/hockey BUCS type matches with similar travel times, but the big advantage here was that lineage costs would be negligible and this was the sort of format that might raise the interest back of BUCS in the league/playoff style form.

SP wanted the club committees involved and they should report after the summer to implement it at the start of season meeting. Matt Fidgett (MF) stated that he agreed and they could look through the other proposals as well as this one and take the best elements from each, similar to how the champs format was discussed and agreed on.

Marie Smith (MS) asked what the council was asked to be voted on at this meeting. PM clarified that at this stage was limited to the re-introduction of the Cup for the 15/16 season and in the baker format was the proposal on the table. The exact details could be sorted out at a later stage and presented at the SOSM.

DE then called for a vote on this
16 votes for, 1 against, 5 abstentions

The Cup-Coordinator (to be voted on later) will form a group with the club captains/committees to discuss a baker style format for the cup and report back with a working proposal to be implemented at the SOSM for the 15/16 season.

b) *Reformed Constitution docs*

DE explained that the current constitution was bulky, verbose and a lot of it was fairly unnecessary. PM had re-drafted these documents and condensed them down to a main 6-page document; with then small sub documents for individual events thereafter, restricted to a few pages each.

The only comment from the floor was from Mark Jeffs (MJ) who clarified that the new voting procedure was included. DE called for a vote on adopting the new documents:

Floor Votes: For: 18, Against: 0, Abstentions: 10

Proxy Votes: For: 3

Email Votes: For: 8; Against: 1; Abstentions: 3

Total: For: 29; Against: 1; Abstentions: 13. 67% in favour and new constitution passes.

5. Constitutional Proposals

- a) *Proposal to shrink voting committee passed in EGM above.*
- b) *Alumni Membership (Constitution)*

PM introduced the idea to the council as a way to try and increase ex-students numbers in the long term. LP asked if we actually know why the students are not converting to the ex-students? – Need to find the reasons why, before trying to implement solutions which may or may not have any effect. JH stated that Ex-student teams seem to be established (i.e. a lot bowl with the same people at different events) and it is therefore quite tricky for new ex-students to break into - a graduated student has to find a group to bowl with. PM confirmed that this way a graduating student could stay on as a student for another year and then a group of graduating students could come over to the ex-student tour together.

TC asked how this would affect honorary bowlers. PM clarified that the honorary bowler would, for alumni purposes could count as the uni he was registered with when he was a student. Also, the alumni bowler would count as one of the uni's honorary bowlers and would only be able to bowl in events where the honorary bowler could.

MS stated that she thought this was a fairly drastic proposal at this moment when, as LP said we don't know the cause. MS also pointed out that this could have a detrimental effect of students – if a uni had the choice between a new up and coming bowler, and the alumni bowler, then they would probably choose the alumni bowler which inhibits new students coming through.

MS likes the idea of Alumni bowling, but not in this way. Perhaps this is more a question of networking as part of the ex-student rep role to improve transition between students and ex-students.

JL stated that that was partly the purpose of the ex-student fun bowl, his view from the role was that the perception that some of the ex-students are 'elite' and need to break down the barriers.

MS stated that perhaps even clubs themselves can retain a list of graduated student and try to keep them on their mailing lists etc. and try to retain them as bowlers. JL stated that we had a fresher's trios for students; perhaps do something similar for new graduates to do the same.

DE then called for a vote on the proposal.

Floor Vote: For: 3; against: 18; Abstentions: 2

Proxy votes: Against: 3

Emails: For 7; Against: 2; Abstentions: 6

Total: 10 for, 23 against, 9 abstentions.

Proposal failed to reach required 66% majority.

c) *Meeting decisions (Standing Order)*

JL stated that we had technical rule which means that decisions don't take place until the end of the meeting which caused the EGM scenario. There was little debate and most agreed that the rule had no major impact if it changed.

DE called for a vote:

Floor Vote: 21 for; 1 against

Emails: 11 for, 1 against, 3 abstentions

Proposal passes; MET 4.3. amended to:

"To consider changes to the Regulations or Standing orders, which, if approved, will come into effect as soon as they are passed by the council"

d) *University Play-off of the challenge match (Standing Order)*

Frazer introduces his proposal as he feels that the University team rankings at the moment feels a bit empty – the winners get a shield but would like something more. SP questioned that a play-off was surely more attributable to the cup? FB agreed in part, but the cup was a large team event the finals only qualified from one or two weekends. This would be different and qualified for over the whole season and would give something to play off for.

PM stated that the original proposals was that this play-off would be run alongside the challenge match and format decided by the TC as part of the weekend. GO liked the idea but suggested that the timing of the event should be during term time. LP also stated that if you did this on the challenge match day, then you potentially have an issue where some of the student rep squad for the A-team match would have conflicts with wanting to play in this. PM stated you would make this event handicapped, but agreed that doing this would have an impact on the B-team squads. LP also stated that you needed to do something similar for ex-students as well. There was a suggestion of Alumni from the floor but not clarified.

FB then wished to withdraw the motion until it was fully thought out. PM stated that a proposal could not be withdrawn as per the constitution, but it could be amended in such a way that it would carry no constitutional effect. The general consensus seems to be in agreement but just the technicalities need to be ironed out.

DE then called for a vote on the concept of a university play-off event to crown the winners of the Uni ranking events

For 20; abs 2

Proxy voters: abs 5

As vote is amended; email votes are not counted

The proposal is passed, on a non-constitutional basis. The new committee would look at this and report back at the SOSM with developments.

e) *Female Ranking Tables (Standing Order)*

LP introduced the proposals on behalf of the proposer who was not present: There are worries of female bowlers on tour; and particularly scratch ones as a lot choose to go into handicap which leaves the event such as the scratch masters with only 6 participants.

This proposal would see women score points in both scratch and handicap concurrently and would remain combined for now. Handicap Masters invite system changes to the top 6 men student & ex; top 4 ladies from female handicap. Scratch qualifiers cannot receive an invite to handicap masters.

JH stated he was concerned that we were going backwards in that we were re-allocating quotas in the handicap system when they were not required – as handicap means everyone competes equally. He was also concerned that it would have a disproportionate effect on the low average bowlers who end up being forced to bowl in the scratch due to potential drop-outs when they have absolutely no chance of winning.

Charlotte Richardson (CR) stated that she bowled on the scratch tour this year and entered the masters with little chance of winning, but enjoyed it for the experience and progressed her as a bowler.

SP stated that perhaps forcing the women to go in scratch against their will perhaps was too drastic, but the collator should consider publishing tables on each event to see whereabouts the women would have appeared in the scratch table to see where they would have finished. This would perhaps show the women that for the following year, they can compete create and would go into scratch.

PM stated that the scratch ranking tables directly assign places to the rep squad and so in order to qualify and not rely on a wild-card, hopefully women who wanted to be considered for the rep squad would choose to enter the scratch tables.

JL stated that the proposal had been formally split into two proposals; the first part was the continued merging of student and ex-student women creates format difficulties with events. In the current way, the student and ex-student formats have to be identical, which does not allow for flexibility when running the ex-student tour (i.e. perhaps smaller team sizes) as they have to follow the same format for the tables.

LP: Disadvantage of non-merged events – can be the only person in the ranking tables at each event; this has been shown time and time again and is no point turning up if no competition. The merged format at least provides some (although the prizes aren't always reflected as such so at some events; you are still getting a prize for turning up)

JL countered that if you had two women; then at the moment it was fairly ineffective anyway as 10, 9 & 8 were given. JL suggested that you could split the tables, and just include the women and men together in one scratch table. You could then extract the women only data to a new table. This way, if a woman performs substantially better and beats quite a few men, but the second place woman does not; instead of getting 10, 9, 8 etc; you might get 28, 19, 6 which reflects the way a bowler has bowled compared to everyone and is a further reward. In this table, you can have split students and ex-students; but also have competition.

LP stated that that was all well and good, but the female view was that any merging on the scratch with the men, regardless of how you did it, would turn a lot of the lower average bowlers who were considering scratch to go back to handicap so she didn't think it would work.

DE called for a vote on part I) – to keep the female rankings merged between student and ex student

Floor vote: For: 18 + 1 proxy (19), against: 2 + 2 proxy (4), Abstentions: 3

Part I) passes – them women's rankings remain merged; but on a year by year review

DE then called for a vote on part ii) – to create a separate women's handicap table, and that women score points concurrently.

Floor vote: For: 3; Against: 11; Abstentions: 6

Proxy vote: For: 1; Abstentions: 2

Email vote: For: 5; Against: 6; Abstentions: 4

Total vote: For: 9; Against: 17; Abstentions: 12

Motion fails; the ranking tables remain as they are currently.

f) Female Liaison Officer

DE read the statement included in the agenda in support of the proposal as the proposer was not present.

TC asked how this would interact with clubs to fulfil the role?

Phil Manning (PHM) spoke in favour of the proposal: Female voice is under represented on tour and on the council – so that is the main aim of the proposal and will aim to increase overall female participation. Represent student and ex-student female alike – the voices from the females is that this position is needed.

MS stated that this surely was part of the representative roles and if it wasn't then you should have a male equivalent rep as well? S stated that she thought the role a little unnecessary and perhaps the focus should be on getting the reps to do their role better and work with the members more.

LP stated that the view from the proposer, and also from her was that females on the tour were not comfortable to address their respective rep (regardless of who held the role) and have come to her instead; purely because she was a female and on the committee. LP then stated that she had then put that view across which have dismissed by the very male oriented committee.

JH stated that this role guarantees female representation on the committee and needs to be there. SH and PM agreed with MS but stated that regrettably, the female view was not represented well when debates were had.

LP further stated that she left the committee debates because the view of the women are not being heard. The creation of the position would mean that the female rep would have to be listened to as being a formal role and also give a good impression to the female members that there is a person who is there to represent the minority of the tour and someone they can feel comfortable discussion women's issues with. Also, there are other issues which might be better kept.

MS clarified that this is for a non-voting role.

DE then called for a vote on the creation of the position to the non-executive committee:

Floor votes: For: 19, Against 3; Abstentions: 6

Proxy vote: For: 3

Email vote: For: 9, Against 1; Abstentions: 5

Total vote: For 31; Against: 4; Abstentions: 11. 68% in favour and passes.

The proposal passes and a new committee role is agreed.

6. Election of Executive Committee Officers (Voting Members)

a) *Chair*

FB opens the debate and illustrates why he should be selected for the job.
(Highlights his 3 points from the agenda)

PHM; refers to his points, but does not repeat them instead states that he brings a new perspective to the tour, wishes to be a catalyst for change.

Question from DE re BUCS – PHM states that that BUCS can't be considered until the tour is functioning properly which he does not believe it is at the moment.

TC asks what changes he envisages. PHM states that at the moment one person organises the tour from franchises. PHM wishes to overhaul the franchise system completely and makes a person accountable – make it similar to the PBA and other professional organisations. FB states that surely the current person responsible is the TC is it not? PHM stated that because it relies on franchises, there is an opportunity to pass the buck – don't think it works and it needs to change.

JY states that Transparency & Accountability of the committee are a problem, how does PHM intend to combat it. PHM states by making people responsible for the decisions accountable and less 'hiding behind' constitutional arguments. The tour seems to be overcomplicated and you can't always find out why a problem has occurred and the person required to fix it. More autonomy for committee decisions and then hold them responsible.

SP states that the focus needs to be on student clubs, we have only 5 regularly active clubs now; there were lots more a few years ago and nothing has been done to combat this slide. Club Development Fund is in place and needs to be utilised. BUTBA is also not accessible and needs to be more open when you come to an event. Also need this for ex-students. SP highlighted the need to venture outside of the Midlands; we have gone to Torquay this year and as a result, Exeter attended and they didn't attend many others. Also went to Norwich, but we need to go out to these places even if the events not well attended to advertise the tour. Also, we need to cater for all abilities – lower average new bowlers; plus the high end which compete with the best. Also need to embrace change – and make fairly radical ones and sometimes make some changes without the consequences being fully analysed and see what happens. Our Long term goal should getting back into BUCS as this will secure the future of the tour.

DE read a question submitted from emails – Why priority on ex-student? SP stated that the large majority of ex-students come from bowing as a student first students; therefore the more students = more ex-students. Shouldn't be any detriment; but the focus should be the students.

TC stated that tournaments constituent ingredient; we have a problem – how would you change this? SP stated that he would ensure that one of the TD/TS would be a committee member on every event. Also need to reduce the time of formats and get there and back within reasonable hours and formats should be 4 – 5 hours. Keep some of the longer ones; but need to trial out some different things.

SP also stated that there is not enough accountability, we don't hear from the committee regularly enough – needs to be on a monthly basis.

PHM: Students becoming ex-students in recent years – also how many students are actually running the show – do the students actually wish to become more involved? Declining ex-students are a concern which aren't directly tackled by your proposal.

SHP reiterated that helping the students assists the ex-students in the long term.

LP asked how SP would address people who have bowled as an ex-student but left the tour; how do you get them back? SP states that networking and student clubs can help with this aspect. Also, the 2 MSL teams have helped as well create this network. SP also stated he doesn't have the answers yet, but is sure he can get them out of the new committee if they work together.

FB: Copy the student things that works in the ex-student side – i.e. could ex-students bowl with alumni teams rather than student teams? SP stated that he wouldn't be in favour of having more alumni events as it would be restrictive, but a one-off format e.g. the champs would work well.

TC asked what qualities SP would bring to the role. SP stated he has been with Birmingham for 3 years and he is strong willed and don't like things to get out of control.

DE asked about continuing relations with the BTBA. SP stated he was disappointed to hear about affiliation benefits. Need to meet with them face to face; get them interested in uni bowling – this is a new avenue for bowlers other than YBC's.

Paul Williams sent his apologies for not being able to attend and PM read out a statement detailing his application.

Enclosure 4: Statement from Paul Williams

DE then called for a vote and the candidates were asked to leave the room.

Frazer Bowen: 0

Shaun Parsons: $21 + 14 + 2 = 37$

Phil Manning: $3 + 7 + 1 = 11$

Paul Williams: $2 + 8 = 10$

Shaun Parsons is elected Chair

b) Vice Chair

No nominations were received prior to the meeting and therefore nominations were taken from the floor – Frazer Bowen & Marie Smith

FB elected not to give another speech and referred to his earlier statement.

MS gave a short speech stating she wanted to be involved in the committee having been bowling for a while on the tour. She has opinions and ideas for proposed changes and can give these from a new perspective. She has been involved in committees in the past and have run leagues and have relevant admin experience. Also agrees that Students are the priority and that will help the ex-students. She intends to be around for a while and thinks she can be of value.

JH asked for some elaboration of her ideas. MS stated she was a fan of the league type system that was tentatively referred to in the cup discussion and believes this needs to be explored to get back into BUCS. Also club development needs to be increased. MS acknowledged that this would be directly her role but will encourage this from other committee members.

SP asked how she has got new bowlers into league bowling in her league. MS stated that more often than not, it was by approaching people who bowl, but not in the league already – integrating them gradually into it.

DE called for vote:
FB: 8
MS: 14 + 3 proxy (17)

Marie Smith is elected Vice-Chair

Several persons left the EOS at this stage, being that the remainder of positions were mostly unopposed.

c) Ex Student Representative

JL withdrew his nomination; leaving PHM unopposed
12 for; 3 abstentions

Phil Manning is elected Ex Student representative

d) Student Representative

Matt Fidgett (unopposed)
14 for; 3 Abstentions

Matt Fidgett is elected Student Representative

e) Secretary

Matt Harris (unopposed)
Floor votes: 6 for; 6 abstentions;
Emails votes: 12 for; 5 abstentions

Matt Harris is elected Secretary

f) Tournament Co-ordinator

James Larkin (unopposed)
For 15, Abstention 1

James Larkin is elected Tournament Co-ordinator

g) Treasurer

Paul Marks (unopposed)
PM stated that he was standing for this position as no other nominations were received. If a suitable candidate (i.e. qualified/experienced) by the SOSM then PM would step down in favour

For: 12; 3 against (want for qualifications); 2 abstentions

Paul Marks is elected Treasurer

7. *Non-Executive Positions (Non-voting)*

The following persons stood unopposed and have been elected to non-executive committee roles:

BUTBA Collator – Kirsty Ralph
Club Development Officer – Frazer Bowen (nominated from the floor)
Forum and Social Officer – Saqib Shabbir (nominated from the floor)
Website Administrator – Kian Mistry
Press Secretary – Louise Parker
Cup Co-ordinator – Paul Marks (nominated from the floor)

Nicky Donowski expressed with her proposal that she wished to be considered for the role of female Liaison officer. Gina Overy also expressed an interest in this position. A proposal was received from the floor that the election of this role should be held over to the SOSM which was unanimously agreed.

The Final election was for the position of Student Representative Squad Manager which is outside of the BUTBA Committee.

Louise Parker (Manager) and Dan Frazer (Assistant Manager) were elected unopposed for a term of 3 years.

8. Franchise System

JL proposes that the committee organise a calendar template; and only after this point should the franchises be tendered to the council to then try and fulfil those avenues to try and control certain aspects.

SP asked at what point this would occur from if agreed as franchises have already been tendered for this year. JL responded that only 4 have been submitted so a big gap is there to start this system; the committee will look at the gaps and ask for franchises to fill these gaps from specific locations. In future it would be fully organised in advance.

DE called for a vote on this policy:

For: 13 + 2; 0 against; abstention 5 + 1 = 6

9. AOB

DE thanked everyone for attending and passed his best wishes onto the new committee. The Council expressed their thanks to DE for his service to BUTBA and previously on the BUCS Sports Advisory Group for the past few years.

The new committee would notify the Council when the date of the next meeting would occur via email.

The Action points to be discussed at the next meeting were agreed as follows:

1. Cup Proposal
2. Report into a Uni Play-offs from the rankings table
3. Formal nominations and election of the Female Liaison Officer
4. Calendar Confirmation

Meeting was closed at 18:30