

BUTBA End of 2015/16 Season Meeting Minutes
Saturday 18th June 2016
Mansfield Superbowl – 17:00

Persons present:

Committee

Shaun Parsons (Chair)
Paul Marks (Treasurer/Cup Co-ordinator/Acting Secretary)
James Larkin (Tournament Co-ordinator)
Kirsty Ralph (Collator/Ex-Student Representative)
Matt Fidgett (Student Representative)

Charlotte Richardson (Female Representative)
Louise Parker (Press Secretary)
Kian Mistry (Webmaster)
Frazer Bowen (Club Development Officer)

Students

Josh Hewitt (Portsmouth)
Joe Harrison (Birmingham)

Ex-Students

James Horwood
Tim Hughes
Saqib Shabbir
Gina Overy
Frazer Bowen
Charlie Baldwin
Tom Hutchinson

1. SP welcomed everyone to the meeting. SP stated that he had received an email from Darren Ellis with some comments and some votes which would be included in discussions.
2. PM presented the state of the financial accounts attached)
 - We will have 3 funds at the beginning of the next year, £780 in the Ex Student, £680 in the Student and £570 in the Club Development Funds. We have spent some money from the latter this year but we would invite proposals from the members about how to use them.
 - Overall, we made a loss of £13 from our events but this was covered from a previous surplus.
 - £81 has been spent on next year's Challenge Match trophies as they did not arrive in time but could be re-used.
 - A full end of year statement will be presented at the Start of Season meeting.
3. Only 2 Chesterfield prizes remain which will be posted to the recipient

4. Constitutional Amendments

- a) A brief discussion was held. FB asked whether or not allowing clubs to be made up of both students and ex-students would undermine clubs' recruitments as they'd no longer be required to get students to fill teams. PM responded that our entry forms could still require fully student teams but we could hold some events which were truly mixed if we removed

this clause. The amendment was about giving us more flexibility.

A vote was taken with 13 in favour (plus Darren Ellis by absentia); 2 against and 2 abstentions.

- b) A brief discussion stated that as some events would still be student only, there still needed to be an honorary system. PM stated that again he was proposing this to try and remove some restrictions. CR proposed an amendment:

RNK 6.0 Where an entry form requires that an event requires entries from student only teams, if a student club is short of players, they can apply to the committee to use a student from another club.

RNK 7.0 Where a club wishes to invoke RNK 6.0; they must make all attempts to find bowlers from within their club before applying to the committee

RNK 8.0 The Committee will decide on an application as soon as practicable but in any event, within 48 hours of the request being made.

A vote was taken on the amendment with 15 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention. (DE's vote was not considered as the proposal had been amended).

- c) This was immediately amended from the floor to the following:

RNK 22.0 Where student entries are allowed by RNK 3.0; each university submitting an entry comprised wholly of persons from that university shall be guaranteed one entry to that event.

A vote was taken and passed by 16-0-1

Due to the next amendments being affected by what the makeup of the new tour would be like, item 5 was discussed next

5. Policy Amendments

- a) Two competing tours were proposed. The first was outlined in the agenda as proposed by PM. The second as proposed by James Larkin is as follows:
- b) BUTBA would run two tours, but slightly different from PM's proposal. The general structure would be 4 student-only events based around our university clubs with 4 separate ex-student events. These would be short format, low cost events, almost exactly as PM has proposed. These ex-student events could well be organised in the same place and time as the student ones, but not necessarily so. These could have higher entries/prize funds etc. and could also allow entries from non-member adults to boost numbers.

There would then be at least 2 joined up events where students and ex-student would compete together and may well compete in the same teams. Entries may be allowed from adults in these events as well.

In addition, we would attempt to run at least 1 event like Airport doubles in conjunction with the BTBA.

There would also be two championships as we have run for the previous 2 years.

Both scenarios were discussed and questions put to each proposer. CR asked PM whether he thought his 'open' tour would price out students from entering. PM stated yes, it probably would price teams

out, but those latter year students as individuals would be able to transfer across. The clause as passed at 4b) would apply and perhaps there may be scope for some of the club development fund to be used to allow each university to apply for a team to be funded (either in full or in part), once per year to enter an open tour event.

But the student tour would be the focus for the students. And we would guarantee to hold at least 3 of the student events and a championship, with the possibility of more if required.

PM admitted it was effectively splitting the tour into 2 tours, one wholly for students and then a main tour for everyone, but would be focussed towards the ex-students.

JL stated that his version wasn't as radical, but by having distinct events for student and ex-students then we could do formats to suit both parties and by having some fully merged events, this would allow interaction between students and ex-students which if you split the tours completely, you may not get.

A vote was taken with 5 in favour of PM's proposal; 9 in favour of JL's and 3 abstentions.

Having decided on 5, the meeting reverted back to item 4d):

d/e) PM amended his own proposal to reflect the new reflection of the tour. There would be Student Men, Student Ladies, Student Handicap & Universities, points gained from the Student only and Mixed events. Ex-Student Men, Ex-Student Ladies and Ex-Student Handicap from the Ex-Student only and Mixed events.

No vote was taken as this was effectively a reversion to the default as no proposal had been received to keep the ladies rankings merged, and in any event with distinctly separate events for Students and Ex-Students, a merged table would not be required.

However, an amendment was proposed from CR that a new table should be created for mixed events only for Men, Ladies and Handicap which ranked all students and Ex-Students together in their respective sections.

This was passed 15-0-2

f) JL explained his points system. A counter proposal was tabled from the floor that the men and ladies should still be ranked separately, but that the points system should be changed to 25, 18, 14, 11, 8, 6, 4, 3, 2, 1.

After various discussions, with the new tour, there was a motion from the floor on whether the system should be changed at all. It was agreed that this would be voted on first. For a change: 3 (plus DE who was in favour of JL system); Against a change: 11; abstentions, 11

The proposals and alternates were therefore not adopted.

g) PM stated that currently our hands were a little tied on qualification in terms of numbers and this would allow a season by season review of who qualified, so long as it was published well in advance of the end of the season by the committee.

A vote was taken with 3 in favour; 13 against (plus DE) and 1 abstention. The proposal failed to pass.

h) There was a counter proposal from DE which wished to add the role of Club Development Officer to the proposed positions. PM stated that he did not agree with the proposal and stated that the Vice-chair under his proposal would be responsible for this area and could appoint someone if they wished to the role.

As a result, SP proposed 2 votes; the first for the proposal as stated here if that passed; a separate vote to add the Club Development Role.

In discussion for the first one, FB stated he was concerned that reducing the number of committee roles increased potential for risk as there were less persons checking each role was being performed correctly within the committee process. PM agreed that this was a risk, but he stated that current committee structure was not workable. At the moment engineering a discussion between 13 members before then asking for a vote of 6 was a lengthy process. Also these 5 persons would have to commit to being available as one of the criticisms was that the committee are quite slow to respond. Reducing to 5 in total meant that hopefully things could be decided quickly, and that the 5 could work more closely with each other to get things done.

Vote 1: 11-1-3 (+ DE until Vote 2 was confirmed) so passed.

Vote 2: 5 (+ DE) for; 7 against; 5 abstentions. In this instance PM stated that a 66% majority was required to make a decision on a TPN clause and therefore asked those who abstained to recast their votes.

Retaken Vote 2: 7 for (+ DE); 9 against (1 person declined to re cast). The required number to pass was 12 and therefore the proposal failed. The new committee to be voted on shall be only 5 positions.

A discussion was then held on the proposal to amend TPN 14.0. FB asked what would happen if the criteria wasn't met. PM stated nominations would remain open until such time as it was (as it stood this year with PM to be a student for 16/17, the clause was satisfied).

CB asked what would happen if there was a student/ex-student split over one position but that was the only student nomination. PM stated that the student would get the position by default unless it was for treasurer in which case the council would have to be satisfied the person was qualified for the role.

JH asked if you had a student/ex-student split for all 5 positions but the ex-student won each one; what would happen. PM stated that the positions would be voted in the following order: Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer, Tournament Co-ordinator, Secretary. The chair would be a free vote (unless CB's scenario applied) but then if an ex student was nominated for positions 1 – 4; the ex-student nominee at position 5 would be withdrawn.

SP called for a vote: 13-2-2. Proposal passed.

- i) JL confirmed that this would actually only apply at RNK 15.3 (i.e. before Captain's best estimate) and would not supersede a valid league average from the current or preceding season. JL also confirmed it would apply for one event only, at which point the unqualified BUTBA average would be used instead.

DE in his statement stated that he felt that up to 50 pins was too much of an advantage. JL stated that if the person had not bowled for 10 years, then it would be unlikely that they would hit those heights. JH was concerned that if that person had only a 130 average 10 years previously, they could enter on an 80. JL confirmed that would be an added incentive to return to bowling and for one event; he didn't mind that.

SP called a vote: 13 – 3(+ DE) – 1. Motion passed.

At the end of the constitutional proposals the meeting returned to policy proposals.

5. II) A general discussion agreed it was too low. DE's comments were that he didn't mind an increase, but disagreed that it should be left to a TD to decide and it should be consistent between events. This was unanimously agreed by the floor. JL proposed a 150 scratch with 50 handicap.

A vote was taken: 12-1-4

- III) This was generally agreed as an aspirational point but with nothing on the table, there was nothing to vote on

6. Election of Officers

- a) Chair – Kirsty Ralph, elected 14 with 2 abstentions.
- b) Vice Chair – Nominations were received prior to the meeting from FB and TH. Both gave a short speech and fielded questions from the floor (which were asked of each candidate).

FB stated that his previous experience on the committee meant he was used to how it operates and that as club development officer, this was something he was passionate about and that he liked to give something back to the tour.

TH stated that he had been bowling for 18 months on the tour and was passionate about bowling. He ran leagues at home and he said he was now in a position where he could put some time into the role.

CR asked both candidates whether they would look to appoint a student representative of which both candidates express that they viewed this as a fundamental role and would do so.

SS asked whether the candidates had any ideas to increase student memberships. FB responded that he would like to speak to the existing clubs and contacts we currently had and see what we could do for them.

TH stated that he also would be looking to speak to existing clubs and would try to get to the reasons for less students bowling and would try and come up with proposals to reverse this.

JH asked for each candidate to describe themselves in one word or phrase; FB: diplomatic; TH: Information gathering

SP called for a vote where both candidates left the room. TH: 9; FB: 4; Abs: 2

- c) Treasurer – Paul Marks 15 for, 0 against, 1 abs
- d) Tournament Co-ordinator – James Larkin 10 for, 6 abs
- e) Secretary – Sarah Hood (TH being withdrawn as being elected vice-chair)
15 for, 1 abstention

7. Any Other Business

- a) Cup for 16/17. PM stated he planned to introduce the Cup proposal as voted on for the student members during the year at the start of next year. To remind members, it was a baker league, 1 games bowled at your home centre and submitted to PM each week. Teams would be ranked and points awarded for ranking position. The event would run for approximately 10 weeks where the top 6 would be invited to a finals day.

Meeting ended 19:07