

Scottish Universities Sport

AU President Forum #5
Heriot Watt University 4 May 2007

Present:	Ed Nicholas	Chair, Edinburgh, SUS Exec	EN
	Chris Berry	Secretary, St Andrews, SUS PAC	CB
	Anna Anderson	Dundee, SUS PAC	AA
	Andrew Mallon	Heriot Watt, SUS Comps	AM
	Angus Stevenson	Strathclyde, SUS Comps	AS
	Paul Thomson	Paisley, SUS Exec	PT
	James Fairwood	Aberdeen	JF
	Will Mackenzie	Stirling	WM
	Barry Earl	Napier	BE
	Chris Wilson	Glasgow Caledonian, SUS Comps	CW
	Andy Smith	Robert Gordon University	ASm
	Ian Lowe	Abertay, SUS PDC, SUS Exec	IL
In Attendance	Stew Fowlie	SUS Sports Manager	SF
	Quentin Sloper	BUSA Executive Representative	QS
	Niall Sturrock	Non Student Representative	NS
	Mark Brian	BUSA	MB
Absent	John Baxter	Queen Margaret's	JB
		UHI	
		SAC	

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of 9 March 2007 have been accepted.
2. SUS Code of Conduct- BUSA Controversy
 - a. EN notes positive influence the SUS CoC has had on the BUSA Leagues.
 - b. BUSA Exec have now announced opposition to certain clauses, specifically standard wins. BUSA exec have deemed standard wins not valid.
 - c. EN reminds forum that the CoC was submitted to BUSA for feedback before implementation last summer. No opposition was made then. Official comments did not come until late winter. MB notes that the conversation between SUS and BUSA on the CoC started well, but BUSA never saw the final version. MB notes BUSA also never chased the final version.
 - d. MB states BUSA support for concept of a CoC, and supports much of the SUS CoC, however takes offence to areas where CoC is in direct conflict with BUSA Regulations and areas where it affects the outcome of a national competition.
 - e. QS notes Chairs Forum opposition to Standard Wins. EN notes the poor turnout to the latest Chairs forum, with 5 of 14 representatives present.

- f. NS- Only problem with standard wins is that we have put it into regulations. Many other institutions put standard wins in illegally. EN notes that in doing so, SUS has been more open and honest about its practices.
- g. EN notes standard wins have worked with numerous NGB's. MB counters that BUSA had problems before walkovers were brought in. Walkovers are punishments specifically to give incentives for teams to play.
- h. AA notes negative effect walkovers have on smaller institutions. EN notes that institutions are struggling with increasingly tight schedules.
- i. NS calls for paper in response to BUSA'S walkover strategy. SF notes that CoC has reduced unplayed matches by 1/3.
- j. EN notes punitive nature of walkovers which increase likelihood of teams giving up mid-season. EN urges BUSA to trial standard wins. AS and EN enquire on methods for moving forward.
- k. MB- Methods for moving forward: proposal should be written and put to the Chairs Forum, to be passed on to BUSA Exec.
- l. EN, AS, GS note that the Chairs Forum is ineffective, enquire about bypassing it for the BUSA AGM. MB insists proposal MUST go through Chairs forum. NS notes support for working within existing BUSA system.
- m. NS suggest EN and SF make a presentation to student directors- if convinced, they could circulate the idea effectively. Also if the 4 student directors for in unison for anything then it automatically goes through.
- n. QS positive about the proposal route, however they may be concern amongst 2 of the directors.
- o. SF- People who are most affected are the smaller institutions, so it is them we must target for support. EN notes concern that big institutions are well represented and may oppose.
- p. QS notes that it is organised institutions such as Durham which do well with current system. QS notes that as a AU President opposes change, he thinks we must force institutions to put teams together. But it is for the Exec to decide, and best done through persuading the competitive director and the 4 student directors.
- q. AS- suggests middle ground. 2 tiered system suggested. Also relaxing rules on walkovers due to lateness.
- r. MB and SF- Regarding lateness, no flexibility in regulations, up to institutions to be flexible. BUSA can ask for flexibility but cannot force this on institutions.
- s. ASm asks if we could we punish institutions for poor requests for a walkover. GS asks if other conferences have similar rule-flexibility problems.
- t. MB- Many regions have problems with improper walkovers, which could aid to the no-walkover debate.
- u. SF- Suggests tabling two papers separately, one on standard wins and one on increasing flexibility and reducing the number of intentional walkovers.

- v. SF, NS, EN discuss comparing rankings with and without walkover rule. EN notes that the effect is slight.
- w. EN- Divisional Chair Forum is on Friday 11 May. From there it should go to the BUSA AGM. **ACTION** EN, GS, ASm, SF to meet to produce a paper for Chairs Forum, BUSA AGM.
- 3. Knockout Draws – AS begins discussion by asking if KO draws could be released earlier, allowing teams more time to prepare.
 - a. EN- no dissenters at Chair Forum. Asks MB about feasibility of regional template.
 - b. MB- BUSA has set templates which are chosen close to the date. NS wonders if the template could be chosen and published in January.
 - c. MB- No difference to BUSA. Must now be sent to exec or Comps Director.
 - d. QS suggests setting a date, such as the end of January.
 - e. **ACTION** EN to propose a date and put it to Chairs Forum, Exec.
- 4. SUS Points Table- Rank Scottish Teams and Institutions
 - a. It is decided this belongs in SUS Competitions Committee.
 - b. SF- Comps for Strategic decisions, SDC for technical decisions, AUPF for operational matters and BUSA matters.
 - c. EN- need to filter out more to make AUPF effective.
 - d. EN, NS discuss need for greater transparency of where things are dealt with, especially regarding Comps vs AUPF.
 - e. SF- believes SUS has a clear system, with the SUS Sports Manager to sort out all grey areas.
- 5. SUS Eligibility
 - a. SF- Out for comment, get back to SUS with feedback. BUSA Eligibility a non-issue. In other representative matches it becomes problematic.
 - b. AS and NS stress that we need to be nominating athletes, especially if we are funding them. NS says we should have SUS be done similar to BUSA eligibility. SF questions ability of SUS to chase each sports union.
 - c. SF raises further debate- whether SUS/BUSA squads should be the best you can put together, or the best you can put together by the SUs.
 - d. NS- Coaches, SDCs, Captains, etc don't have the power, they must be nominated. SF adds that there is no agreement on this issue yet. AN notes that currently, non-SU members could play on a team and incur expenses for the relevant SU.
 - e. **ACTION- SF-** Process will be reviewed, with consistent guidelines to be produced.
 - f. **ACTION-** SF- Brief coaching staff on eligibility requirements.
- 6. SUS AGM, Presidents Training, BUSA AGM
 - a. SF urges all presidents to educate their incomings and circulate BUSA and SUS related correspondence with incomings.
 - b. **ACTION** EN to circulate BUSA AGM flight details and hotel information.
- 7. BUGS

- a. EN- 99% sure it will be hosted by Edinburgh in 2008. Will require investment by SUS and its AU Presidents. Volunteers will be necessary.
8. Sports Tours
 - a. QS- warns AU Presidents of the poor health and safety records of many sports tour companies.
 - b. (??)- BUSA should recommend tour companies with good practice.
 - c. QS- believes there is a much bigger issue of awareness amongst AU's of the actions of Tour Companies, clubs.
 - d. WM- notes strict policy of Stirling towards Tours. **ACTION- WM** to circulate tour regulations.
 - e. EN- Its an issue every institution needs to figure out on its own, but needs to be aware of.
 - f. MB- reminds AU's not to allow tours which conflict with potential KO dates.
9. SUS Hall of Fame
 - a. SF – We need to decide who goes in, whether only students qualify, etc. Project for another year. **CARRY FORWARD**
10. Reports
 - a. SF Reports on SUS Exec
 - b. AA Reports on SUSPAC
 - c. GS and AM provide Comps report.
 - d. IL produces PDC Report.
11. AOCB
 - a. AA- streamlined email system- where is this going?
 - b. EN- stressing need to remove the choice from clubs when possible.