



**THE COUNCIL OF THE AMATEUR ROWING ASSOCIATION - MINUTES OF AN ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL** held on Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> September 2008 at the Royal College of Physicians, 11 St Andrews Place, Regents Park at 2.00 pm.

**PRESENT AND APOLOGIES**

**EXECUTIVE OFFICERS**

Mrs D.M. Ellis CBE, Chairman	Present
G. Harris, Deputy Chairman	Present
Mrs A. Phelps, Deputy Chairman	Apoloiges
R.M. Paterson, Hon. Treasurer	Present

**APPOINTED MEMBERS**

R. Phelps, CUCBC (Div 8)	Present
M. Blandford-Baker COUR (Div 10)	Present
H. Trotter, Leander Club	Present
M.D. Williams, London Rowing Club	Present
C. George, Thames Rowing Club	Present

**ELECTED MEMBERS**

B. Millns (1)	Northern	Present
T. Edwards (2)	Yorkshire	Present
S. Darnbrough (3A)	Lancashire & Greater Manchester	Present
J.C. Davies (3B)	Cheshire, Merseyside & N.Staffs	Present
P. Fenoulhet (4)	East Midlands	Present
C. Anton (5)	West Midlands	Present
B. Foster (7)	Bedford, Huntingdon, Peterborough	Present
A. Johnson (9)	East Anglia	Present
A. Weekes (11)	Upper Thames	Present
P. Moore (12)	Reading	Present
A.J. Evans (13)	Middle Thames	Present
J. Biddle (14)	Staines & Molesey	Present
R. West (15)	Kingston & Twickenham	Present
M. Carr (16)	Chiswick & Mortlake	Apoloiges
Mrs S Cassidy (17)	University of London	Present
Dr N. Jackson (18)	Barnes & Hammersmith	Present
P. Lorenzato (19)	Putney	Present
M. Stallard (20)	Lea Valley & Essex	Present
J. Clayton (21A)	Lower Thames & Medway (& Chairman SERRC)	Present
A. West (21B)	Kent & Sussex Coast	Present
M.E. Green (22)	Hampshire & Dorset	Present
Mr R Leach (23)	WAGS (substitute for Mrs P Sondheimer)	Present
R. Mallett (24)	Devon & Cornwall	Present
Welsh Amateur Rowing Association – (2 representatives)		Not present
Scottish Amateur Rowing Association - (3 representatives)		Not present

**MEMBERS APPOINTED BY COUNCIL**

Miss K. O'Sullivan	Chairman National Coaching Committee	Present
R. Murray	Chairman National Championships	Present
M. Martin	Chairman Junior Rowing Commission	Present
C. Llewellyn	Chairman National Competition Committee	Present
S. Ward	Chairman Water Safety Sub Committee	Present
M. Humphrys	Chairman National Development Committee	Present



## **MEMBERS CO-OPTED BY COUNCIL**

Miss A. Faiers		Apologies
B. Hawden		Present
W.C. Thomson		Present
J. Turnbull		Apologies
Mrs F. Dennis		Present

## **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

Hon. Life Vice-Presidents -		
C.G.V. Davidge OBE		Apologies
J.A. Veats		Apologies
M. Brandon-Bravo OBE		Present

## **ARA STAFF**

J.R. Allsop	Financial Controller	Present
Mrs R.E. Napp	National Manager	Present
D.W. Tanner OBE	International Manager	Present
Mrs P. Randolph	Minute Secretary	Present

## **REGIONAL CHAIRMEN**

C.W. Eales	Chairman Wessex Region Rowing Council	Present
------------	---------------------------------------	---------

## **ALSO ATTENDED**

Ms F. Rennie	BUCS	Present
C. Smith		

## **1. CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS**

Mrs Ellis welcomed M. Martin, Chairman of the Junior Rowing Commission, and F. Rennie from BUCS (formerly BUSA) to the meeting.

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Noted and recorded above.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

*Non pecuniary*

Mrs. D. M. Ellis : CCPR Director; BOA Director

M. D. Williams : FISA

*Pecuniary*

C. George : Tutor and assessor

G. Harris : Tutor and assessor

Miss K. O'Sullivan : Tutor and assessor

## **4. MINUTES OF THE MEETING** held on Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> June, 2008, subject to the amendments detailed below, were agreed to be an accurate record and signed.

Item 1: Harold Blogg - delete *London Rowing club*, insert *Chairman of Thames Regional Rowing Council*.

Item 9: delete *P. Attwell*, insert *P. Clements*.

Item 10.1 Future Governance of the ARA: replace: C. George put forward the view that Clause 11f of the Articles of Association would allow Mrs Ellis to be appointed for a further term of office.

with: C. George put forward the view that Clause 11f of the Articles of Association would allow Mrs Ellis to be appointed for a further term of office, *conditional upon there being no other applicants*.



**Item 10.5 ARA Structure:** N. Jackson asked for this minute to be amended. Some discussion followed, B. Millns said there had been a strong feeling at the June meeting that Council had cleared that a Chief Executive Officer was to be appointed. D. Ellis said Executive was in agreement with Council that a CEO should be appointed, but Executive believed that the timing of the appointment was important. N. Jackson said he thought that Council had been told that Executive would be pressing ahead forthwith with an appointment. The Chairman referred back to the February minutes when M. Williams advised that the budget made provision for a CEO in 2009, as part of provision for the gap that would be left by Mrs Ellis standing down from her role as Chairman in 2009. JC Davies quoted the following sentence; that the post would be advertised immediately after the Olympic regatta. T. Thomson said that was in response to the situation being planned for at that stage, ie that in 2009 Mrs Ellis could no longer be Chairman. That position had subsequently changed. Following this discussion Council agreed that N. Jackson's words should be amended, as he had requested, as follows-

Delete: N. Jackson wished to challenge the proposal, agreed by Executive, that a Chief Operating Officer should be employed. He believed that this decision was not consistent with the information given to Council at the previous meeting. He believed that a Chief Executive Officer should be appointed, responsible for the day-to-day management of the business of the ARA and the Chairmanship should be devoted to leadership. He asked Executive to look again at this proposal.

Insert: N. Jackson *refused to take note of, indeed rejected, the proposal*, agreed by Executive, that a Chief Operating Officer should be employed. He believed that this decision was not consistent with the information given to Council at the previous meeting. He believed that a Chief Executive Officer should be appointed, responsible for the day-to-day management of the business of the ARA and the Chairmanship should be devoted to leadership. *He asked Executive to get on with preparations for the appointment of a CEO.*

### 5. MATTERS ARISING

- 5.1 **Level 3 Fixed coaching Costs (Item 6):** to come back to the November meeting. K. O'Sullivan would send the L3 fixed coaching costs that had been circulated to the Regional Coaching Commissions, to J. Clayton. **Action: KOS**
- 5.2 **Umpires Qualifications (Item 6):** NDC to address at the October meeting. **Action: MH**
- 5.3 **Test Event funding (Item 7):** The £100,000 had not been forthcoming. The Chairman had verbal confirmation of £80,000 from SEEDA for the test event.
- 5.4 **Competition Review (Item 10.3):** To cover under the report of the National Competition Committee.
- 5.5 **Chief Executive Officer (Item 10.5):** To cover further under the Executive Report if wished.
- 5.6 **Incident on Tideway (Item 10.6):** M. Humphrys explained that three rowers had saved the life of a person trying to commit suicide on the Tideway in very difficult circumstances. Mrs Ellis had provided certificates to mark their actions and outstanding contribution and these would be presented at the Thames Regional and General meeting in November.
- 5.7 **National Schools Regatta (Item 10.6):** S. Ward said that he and C. Llewellyn were reviewing the safety issues and this was in hand with the Chairman of the Regatta.
- 5.8 **Veteran Commission (Item 17):** This related to the inconsistency between ARA and FISA criteria in age groups and categories. Mrs Ellis had spoken to the Chairman of the Veteran Commission and confirmed it was on their agenda for the next meeting.

C. Anton said coaching was currently a contentious issue and he would like to repeat his request for the numbers of those who had registered and completed courses to be a regular item in the Report of the Coaching Committee. He asked about progress with raising the profile of the Volunteer Helpers Guide. K. O'Sullivan noted his request for figures. She said she had asked for a higher profile for the guide on the website, currently available to download from the Volunteer section, and she would follow this up. **Action: KOS**

### 6. FISA

The Chairman reported that work with FISA was ongoing to ensure consistency in the Anti Doping policies of FISA, the ARA and WADA. There have been slight difficulties with some issues and FISA was being very supportive. The ARA has to adopt a UK Sport policy and rules (verbatim) but there is flexibility to adopt appendices to bring these rules in line with FISA where there is any conflict.

The FISA Ordinary Congress report was attached to the Executive Report. Referring to Item 5 of the report, M. Williams advised that Brandenburg did not have an 8-lane course in place at the moment.

**European National Rowing Federations Report:** The Federations had met on 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2008. C. Anton asked if the International Manager had supported the establishment of a European Rowing Junior Championship. D. Tanner said that GB was strongly against; the World Rowing Junior Championships was our key event and there were already a number of important regional matches in the calendar for juniors. There had been a significant lack of agreement at Congress about the date but now it had been agreed he would discuss again with GB junior coaches. GB was unlikely to participate, particularly give the timing of the second half of June.

**Coupe de la Jeunesse Congress Report:** Congress had met on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2008. No questions on the Report.

M. Williams said FISA's Extraordinary Meeting in 2009 presented an opportunity to put forward any changes to the rules and also to make proposals, should the Association wish to do so.

### 7. INTERNATIONAL REPORT

Council received the report of the International Manager. Further to the report:

**European Championships:** GB has evolved a strategy for this event with the intention of giving international racing experience to rowers on the way up. One headline from 2008 was an exceptional Silver medal for the W8. The International Manager would be proposing a similar strategy going forward and in future it would become part of the Senior strategy. It had been an exceptional season and D. Tanner was very proud of the outstanding achievements of the Olympians and Paralympians. GB had not topped the medal table in rowing since 1948. The fantastic level of back-up and support, achievable through funding and sponsorship, had led to an exceptionally well-prepared team. Living close to the course and outside the Olympic village was an additional cost but a great investment and D. Tanner wished to express grateful thanks to all sponsors and funders. He felt sure that everyone had very much enjoyed and appreciated the TV, radio and press coverage. This year the BBC had been present for eight days of racing, and the host broadcaster had made a huge commitment to rowing. Many other sports would dearly like this kind of coverage. The investment the Chinese had made, for example the overhead camera, was used to great effect at the lake. Unfortunately it was not used for the Paralympic Regatta but that had been an outstanding event for the adaptive athletes too. 23 Olympians and 7 Paralympians had returned with medals.

The Chairman invited questions. C. Anton reminded D. Tanner that last year he had explained to him the difference between targets and expectations. He wished to congratulate the International Manager and the team on beating the targets and meeting the expectations. He asked about the disappointing result for the juniors at Linz, particularly with regard to sculling. D. Tanner said he did not have the answer at this stage but there would be a review with the coaches. His team would also be looking at the transition from junior to senior sculling. At that age young scullers tended to come through from clubs and there was more work to be done in that area.



N. Jackson welcomed the clear club attributions given to squad members. He said we were now in the club-hopping season and would be grateful for guidance. What is the ARA policy towards the tapping up of individuals in squad boats? What is the ARA policy towards coaches of squad boats tapping up individuals from clubs other than their own? Where are those policies set out? D. Tanner said that with regard to tapping up, until there was a single club registration policy, and Council had a policy itself, it was very difficult to monitor. All GB squad members were required to name one club when they registered with the International office. This was done in October and in April. That club could not be changed without the International Manager's approval and a good reason. Once the year started the recorded club was the one the squad rower stayed with. Each rower was also invited to include their school or first club, university, senior club in their biography. It was important to recognise the investment made in the early days by clubs but sometimes the athletes did need to move on, for example to one of the High Performance centres.

In response to H. Trotter's query about lottery grants, D. Tanner said that this year grant would stay as it was to end of November for the Olympic athletes. He said if anyone had not been spoken to about their grant or wanted clarification, he would like to know, and would be pleased to hear from them. With regard to the Head of the River Race, the normal procedure for seniors, in a non-Olympic year, was that 10 working days before the Heads, squad rowers would be released to the clubs, subject to an agreement between the chief coach and club with regard to training requirements.

### 8. FINANCIAL MATTERS

The Treasurer presented the following –

#### **National Management Accounts (3 months to end June 2008)**

The surplus shown in the accounts reflected grants and other sources of income not finalised or received at the time of preparation. Most of the other variances came about because of timing and the surplus was expected to even itself out as the year progressed. Notes 5 and 6 referred to staffing. The overspend on coaching would be addressed by incoming grant.

#### **International Management Accounts (3 months to end June 2008)**

There was a substantial positive variance in first quarter, once again down to sponsorship income received earlier than expected.

D. Tanner advised B. Hawden his latest information was that the Caversham site rates would be reviewed in February 2009.

Re note 5, National Accounts, R. Napp explained that the UKCC trainers were being employed to develop indoor rowing training in association with ISPAL and EFDS. The profit made on delivering these courses was part of the ARA Strategy.

N. Jackson asked for an explanation of the impact on inflation on the figures presented. R. Paterson said that it had not been evaluated. D. Tanner said the depreciation of the pound had a significant impact on the international budget. R. Phelps asked whether ARA investments were spread across banks to spread the risk. M. Williams responded that they were not and that the Finance sub-committee would review this.

Referring to the variance shown for the magazine, M. Blandford-Baker asked if the consequence of a mistake made by the advertiser had been passed on as a cost to the Association. R. Napp said she would check, but she believed that the sum he referred to had been recouped.

**Action: R. Napp**

R. Phelps asked for clarification of the different UK Sport income headings listed in the International accounts. D. Tanner said the Podium funding related to the number of athletes on grants in the Olympic squad. The UK Sport Operation was an additional grant to add value to that and came from the Exchequer. A number of different government sources were

involved; it was complex and he believed that in future the system would be simplified. The CEO costs were spread across National and International accounts.

The Chairman said this was a positive budget. However, since returning from the Olympics there had been no confirmation of grant because the government had put a block on it. The ARA was extremely dependent on public funding. Rowing was one of the most successful Olympic sports but funding was a complex and difficult situation and caution was advisable.

H. Trotter asked what financial provision was being made now for anticipated cuts in 2013.

D. Tanner said that the management had to be prudent and planned to be in a strong financial position in 2012. The Chairman said that the majority of funding came from government bodies that required it to be spent in a very specific way. The income from sponsorship was a huge advantage for the sport. A.J. Evans believed the situation emphasised the importance of the links being forged with marketing experts, such as our FTSE 100 partner, and welcomed this alliance.

**Subscription Rates 2009.** The proposal that the rates should remain as 2008 was put before Council. C. Anton asked if the Association could afford to forego an increase, in light of the current financial situation. R. Paterson said the view of the Finance sub-committee was that there had been an increase last year and they would not wish to propose another this year.

R. Phelps said he felt the current rate of student subscription was too high. F. Rennie (BUCS) said she had put forward a strong proposal to the National Manager for a reduction in student membership. R. Napp said there was a working party looking at this in the wider context of the current membership structure. She believed there was a strong case for a low cost basic membership for people taking part in some of the broader range of activities outlined in the new ARA Strategy.

Council agreed that there would be no increase to subscription rates for 2009.

## 9. NATIONAL REPORT

Council received the report of the National Manager. Further to the report the Chairman asked R. Napp to go through the ARA Strategic Plan 2009 - 2013 for the benefit of those who had not received her slide presentation.

The plan had been circulated by email and some amendments made in the light of feedback already received, including alterations to the vision statement. This reflected the importance of club facilities and volunteers to the sport, as well as London 2012 and the legacy. In the past the plan had focussed on juniors and the ARA now needs to see how more adults can be attracted into the sport, both as participants and volunteers. We have been asked to demonstrate that what we propose is backed up by robust research. Our projections are based on research by Sport England's 'Active People' (available from the Sport England website.) The research carried out on behalf of the ARA by AstraZeneca, its FTSE 100 partner, has been extremely valuable and underpinned the strategy and bid. R. Napp went through the findings of the research and the demographics of the various groups that rowing could attract. How the ARA appealed to these groups, raised awareness and altered perceptions would be very important and the ARA would work on this with AstraZeneca. The member survey had matched well with the feedback from the general public.

Many ARA members say they would continue in rowing but research demonstrates that they do drop out because of changes in lifestyle. An important factor for rowing is retaining and attracting back and we believe we can retain if we can match aspirations. There is a competitive group and a larger casual group, both of which we need to address.

The Sport England strategic outcomes are Grow, Sustain and Excel. Sport England has a target of 1,000,000 more participants over the next four years, to be achieved through 46 sporting governing bodies increasing participation. The Active People survey will be repeated annually to monitor targets. Rowing's target is 5,000 new rowers taking part once a week. We currently have a 5% growth in membership although some of those are under 16 years. The ARA welcomes the work being done with BUCS on areas of this.

There is a proposal to provide 50 packages of stable boats, appropriate for adult learn to row, which is at the heart of this growth. It will include adaptive boats to enhance provision for disabled people. People who row are generally competitive so challenges and competitive opportunities need to be more flexible. A working party which includes M. Stallard, A.J. Evans and K. Stapleton, is looking at this aspect to see what is needed to deliver this programme. The National Manager asked those interested in joining a working party to come forward at the end of the meeting. Transportation of boats was an issue for members and we will look at a system of having boats in two or three locations in each region so that clubs can run fun competitions locally without people having to use trailers. These could also be used for touring and endurance events, and may be attractive to students, and older people. This would build on the model already being used by skiff rowers.

R. Napp explained how funding for coaches in clubs could be used. She recognised that payment for coaching was a controversial issue already under discussion. The idea was that clubs would be given choice and could opt to pay a coach or use the funds in other ways. There would have to be a target for the clubs in order to raise participation among the over 16 age group.

R. Napp went through some of the activities suggested, including individual challenges, to broaden the appeal and said there would need to be IT investment to support these. To underpin the proposals the Association will have to look at areas of the structure, namely insurance and membership, as well as the current capitation scheme. F. Rennie asked what percentage of targets would come from indoor rowing. R. Napp said she did not know at this stage, but one challenge was that people doing indoor rowing needed to identify themselves as rowers.

Sport England would be carrying out a satisfaction survey to check that we are able to sustain growth. 80% of people questioned in the recent survey believed that the ARA is good at governing the sport and Sport England have advised that is regarded as a high level and so our target will be to maintain that.

'Excel' was an area that R. Napp and D. Tanner would be refining over the next few weeks. The competition status review addresses progression amongst the talent pool. The Strategy has been submitted to Sport England and the outcome should be known by the end of December. The current funding will go through to June 2009 because of the extended consultation period. This is the funding application and strategy; the next stage is to look at the action plan and how we deliver this.

R. Leach asked what research had been done to find out how many clubs were already running at full capacity. He said he also believed that the rules and regulations discouraged volunteers from coming forward. R. Napp said that anecdotally this was heard regularly in meetings and was to do with legislation and accountability. Volunteers did need to be supported by training. R. Leach said for many the training was seen as an obstacle in itself. R. Napp said that looking at club capacity was another piece of work, together with the critical mass of people needed to support a successful club. If a club has very competitive athletes it needed a broad base of people to support their coaching and equipment costs.

J. Clayton asked about a national campaign to market clubs. R. Napp said the Association would develop a marketing and communication plan with AstraZeneca who would remain as



its partner through to 2012. She believed they would be a great support and hoped that if Council decided to hold a National Conference they might be able to attend that. She was asked what would happen if the funding application was not approved? R. Napp said plans would have to be tailored. F. Rennie asked about the Assurance scheme. R. Napp said Sport England had stated they were extremely committed to working with governing bodies, they had to achieve their targets through this work, for them there was no Plan B.

**Environment Agency – Block Licence Scheme:** R. West confirmed that privately owned boats were charged at the higher rates. The new scheme would be put in place for 2009.

### 10.1 National Development Committee

Council received the report of the National Development Committee. There were no matters arising.

### 10.2 National Coaching Committee

Council received the report of the National Coaching Committee. There were no matters arising. The Junior Rowing Commission had met earlier in the day, but M. Martin, Chairman of the JRC, had had to leave the meeting. The Chairman undertook to contact him by email.

**Action: DME**

### 10.3 National Competition Committee

Council received the report of the National Competition Committee. Arising from the report: **Racing Calendar 2009:** Council was asked to look at the latest version of the Calendar, presented for information only. C. Llewellyn would be very glad to receive updates and was still awaiting information. He reminded members that the Calendar must be approved at the November Council meeting and after that it would not be changed again.

**Boat Identification:** This was covered by the Rules of the ARA, not the Rules of Racing, and was an item in the Executive Report.

**Qualification of Umpires:** This change clarified the remit of the trainee umpire.

**Senior Classification:** This clarified the situation with regard to the allocation of points to international rowers and was included to address an inconsistency. The rule will no longer refer to teams but any international competitor who rows for an English club.

**Closing of Entries:** Referred to the use of email and removing the requirement for the regatta organiser to send a copy of the draw for each crew.

#### **D Recommendations**

The recommendation put before Council was set out Appendix A to the report (and as Appendix 1 to these minutes). A number of proposals had been brought to the Council meeting in June and Divisional Representatives had been charged with disseminating further, to give as much opportunity as possible for people to give feedback. C. Llewellyn thanked all those who had responded and asked A.J. Evans to outline the response.

A.J. Evans said that the main source of response came from the efforts of the Divisional Representatives and an article in Rowing & Regatta. Unfortunately some of the diagrams that the group had hoped would be included were not, but all responses had been considered by the group. On the whole there was approval that something was being done, and many additional aspects of the rules were raised. Proposal 2, running the scale of points from 0-12 was not widely commented on but was generally agreed to be a good idea. Nobody objected to the top-up levels for HWR and HRR which probably affected less people. It was clear that there was a great feeling that a vast number of novice status rowers are recreational rowers who have no wish to join the performance pathway, and A.J. Evans believed the work being done on the ARA Strategic Plan would go some way to sorting this out. Proposal 1, to reduce a qualifying race from 4 to 2 generated stronger debate and most dissension. There were suggestions about points being related to size of competition entry, some suggested points went from 0 –72, with points weighted for the level of competition. However the Group had been tasked with putting forward a simple, cost effective system that could be implemented soon and that would be achievable next year using OARA.



Those who had responded have not yet had a reply and that would be addressed. C. Llewellyn said that there had been some very useful comments but this proposal dealt with the main issue of not enough points on offer. To attempt to do anything other than that at the moment would have knock-on implications that would make it difficult to implement next year. If this proposal was accepted the Committee would go back to some of the suggestions received. Paul Lorenzato asked if the vote would be on all 5 proposals together, or one at a time. Feedback in his Division was that people would be happy with proposals 2-5 but some reluctance to go with proposal 1.

Mrs Ellis invited questions on the proposal. B. Foster said that if Council was voting for the 5 proposals as one entity he had been mandated by his Division to vote against. R. West said this would also apply to him. R. Murray put forward the view that it was proposal 1 that made the difference, the rest being largely cosmetic. If Council did not support proposal 1 little would change and, to some extent, they were interlinked. J. Clayton said that the group had modelled these proposals and if there was no change the situation would continue to deteriorate.

The Chairman asked Council to vote on Proposal 1. C. Llewellyn said if the vote was against, there would be no difference to the process and Council would have to decide what it really wanted for the domestic competition side of the sport. If they went down the line of large quality regattas on one hand and smaller 'lower quality' regattas on the other it would be for Council to apply the criteria, this could not be self-regulating. Regattas that attracted mainly entries in the Novice or S4 category could re-register as a primary regatta. C. Llewellyn said there would be more opportunities to look at this as the new ARA Strategy was moved forward.

C. Anton said that the proposal for grand, national regattas had been put forward three or four years ago but this had not been tackled since. T. Thomson said that the issue of non-qualifying races was frustrating for many clubs. There were regattas that would be affected by proposal 1, however competitions could rearrange their programme to provide events that would be more attractive to crews, or have some non-qualifying events and take them out of the main regatta. The sport wanted people to be able to progress and wanted the structure to move, so people got stiffer competition and better racing. At the moment this was stagnant. The model showed that virtually nothing was happening in the domestic scene so far as competition is concerned. If Council accepted the advice of the working party it should, in his view, go ahead with this proposal and not waste a year's work. R. West said he was in agreement; the concept of dividing the regattas up was in his view nonsense. All regattas should be striving to improve the quality of events, racing and competitors, the goal was to drive up the quality of the standard of entries. R. West said it was ludicrous to have such a high percentage of oarsmen striving to avoid points or race at low status.

JC Davies asked the working party to clarify if all those who had regressed to 04 points would now go to 05 and have to re-apply to regress to 04. A.J. Evans said that they would.

Those in favour of supporting proposal 1 were asked to raise their hands. The vote for was recorded as 25, a significant majority. Proposals 2 to 5 were all voted on separately and carried with a significant majority.

The principles of Appendix A were therefore approved by Council for detailed wording of the Rules to be approved at the November Council meeting.

In response to a question about the ARA's role with regard to Proposal 5, C. Llewellyn said this was still in discussion and the values would be included in the Rules in November.



R. West asked about Umpires licences. The Chairman said there had been an administrative problem, that the Chairman of the NUC was aware and extended his sincere apologies to all involved.

**10.4 National Championships Committee:** Council received the report. It was noted the Championships would go to Strathclyde in 2010. Mrs Ellis read a letter sent to M. Brandon-Bravo, reassuring the ARA that the Holme Pierrepont regatta lake of 2000m would be retained for regatta use and training after 2009. The recent press reports about a 1500m course were not correctly reported.

**10.5 Executive Committee**

Council received the report of the Executive Committee. Arising from the report:

**Boat Identification:** The Committee proposed to Council that all regions should be required to carry boat identification, using the club code and unique number, with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2009. The Chairman put the proposal to a vote which was carried by a significant majority with J. Clayton's vote against recorded.

**Agreed**

**Athlete Reception:** The Executive's proposal that the ARA should host a reception for the 2008 Olympic and Paralympic athletes to say thank you to D. Tanner and the team, was fully supported by Council.

**Agreed**

**ARA Structure:** N. Jackson said he refused to take note of something that contained the phrase 'the next two years'. He said it was all too urgent for that and he expected Executive to get on with the appointment of a CEO within a framework of months rather than years. G. Harris asked what would be missing from the Association if this did not happen immediately. N. Jackson said that Executive had recognized that in appointing a Chairman after 2009 there would be a revised job specification. Those with whom he had discussed this said this must be, in the goals of efficiency and accountability, alongside a complementary senior officer position. He said that Council saw this as a Chief Executive post, which must not only be complementary but in office alongside the new chairmanship. In addition there were many projects which had been discussed by this Council, not least of which was that it was committed to delivering the 2012 project itself. The lead-in time for that, even though there was an excellent venue developed under the aegis of this Council, was short. The survival of the sport is the project he would describe as the 2013 project. That had to be lead and had to be looked at now. To do otherwise was not acceptable in terms of accountability and project delivery grounds. B. Hawden said there seemed to be two proposals with the two different roles of CEO and COO, which would substantially affect the administrative structure. He did not feel Council had engaged in any in-depth discussion about the various merits of the two roles, and believed there was a debate to be had around this. JC Davies said that over the years this Association had benefited from a volunteer who had taken on a full time executive role. He did not feel this was the correct structure for the future; the role of CEO and Chairman should be separated. The London Olympiad would add considerably to Mrs Ellis' role. Those who support the appointment of a CEO are following modern corporate governance by separating the roles and taking the pressure off the Chairman. C. George said that the current set-up had worked with dramatic success over the last eight years and asked why this model should be abandoned for another that has not worked so successfully, and in the context that Council had now decided to allow for a third term of office for the Chairman. He would ask what a CEO was going to do, at some considerable cost to the Association, during a four-year period up until 2012. He believed Council should respect the guidance of the Board or call a special Council meeting to discuss this specific issue. M. Williams said that three senior staff members would have a significant impact on the existing structure. He believed Executive has taken on the strong message from Council and believed that the appointment should be made in 2 years time, when they would have something to do and in preparation for senior staff leaving. The Executive was not willfully disregarding the views put forward by some members of Council, but did not see the point in spending a substantial sum of money on an immediate appointment that was not likely to achieve positive results. R. West said he did not argue with the time frame but

would not support a Chief Operating Officer. The Association needed continuity and expertise in place to manage a potentially difficult scenario in 2013.

Mrs Ellis reiterated that the Executive fully supported the appointment of a CEO. What the Executive was giving guidance on was that we could employ a senior manager, possibly on a consultancy basis, to look at issues such as building, before the Association went to the expense of employing a CEO. B. Millns said she believed there was a misunderstanding about a decision made originally by this Council about appointing a Chief Executive Officer and there was concern that the decision will not be taken forward. She said there were a substantial number of Divisional Representatives who had expressed concern about the organization and its accountability going forward. There was strong concern that two years was too short a time frame and that a person should be put in post sooner rather than later. There was funding to start that process in the fourth quarter of this financial year. She said that Council had to vote or come to some agreement because she believed there was a breakdown of trust between Executive and Council. She said that Council had made a decision that it wanted a CEO. Mrs Ellis said again that the Executive was not arguing with Council about the appointment of a CEO, it came down to timing. She would be happy to see anyone at ARA HQ to discuss in further detail how someone could be employed at a senior level to pave the way for a CEO.

**Action: Council members**

G. Harris said some members had mentioned accountability and asked where they felt there was a lack of accountability. B. Millns said she was not prepared to discuss that in an open forum. She would prefer to discuss with Executive as she did not believe it was appropriate for an open discussion. She welcomed the Chairman's invitation to ARA HQ and hoped this would restore unanimity. F. Rennie asked if the discussion about the CEO was a proposal or current status. Mrs Ellis said it was a point for clarification. J. Clayton said it was the timescales that worried him most. He had looked at the immediate appointment of a CEO in the light of his understanding that the Chairman could not serve a third term of office. Despite that he would not want the situation to drift and result in a situation where a CEO was not in place by 2010. C. George acknowledged that Council had not had the opportunity to discuss in the same level of detail as Executive had, he said he took his Executive responsibility very seriously and Council would have to have all the facts if they were taking Executive decisions. Mrs Ellis thanked Council for all the points put forward which had been taken on board.

**Action: DME**

**Rowing Appeal Procedure:** On behalf of R. Phelps, B. Millns asked for an update on Item 7 of the Executive Report. The Chairman said that the Association was reviewing its own procedures and timescales in the light of other model procedures. Any changes would be brought through the usual process and it was hoped to achieve this before March. The current policy carries on until the new procedure is in place.

- 10.6 Water Safety Sub-Committee** Council received the report of the Water Safety Committee. Arising from the report: The ARA response to the RoSPA review had been circulated to Council. Most of these items were in hand before the review started. Contact had been made with FISA in relation to the buoyancy issue and further discussions would take place. N. Jackson said he would like to see a more specific and decisive response. He would wish to see the words 'accept' or 'reject' used - or very rarely, 'consider' for each action. He felt the Association needed to emphasise what it would be doing and not what it might do. T. Thomson said bearing in mind all the work the Water Safety Committee had done on this he agreed that it could be more concise.
- 10.7 **Medical Sub-Committee** - the report was noted.
- 10.8 **National Olympic Committee** - the report was noted.
- 10.9 **National Paralympic Association** - the report was noted.



**11. APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS**

The appointment of the following committee and commissions were agreed:

**National Championships Committee**

R. Murray (Chairman), Mrs F. Dennis (Deputy Chairman), E. Rees (Secretary), C. Edwards, E. Grainger, N. Hubble, P. Ibbotson, J. Jenkins, D. Jillings, Mrs M. Massaro, G. Painter, L. Shindler, D. Smith, Mrs P. Sondheimer, D. Thompson, A. Watkinson.

**Junior Rowing Commission**

M. Martin (Chairman + Kitchin Society), J. Lee (Secretary), K. Bateson (N.West), K. Cahill (S East), J. Cheesman (WARA), D. Clarke (Yorkshire), A. Crawford (Thames Downriver), Mrs P Davies (GB/France Match), C. Foad (Wessex), G. Hammond (National Schools), Ms K. Howie (Northern), L. Wray (JIRR), Ms L. Lion (Thames Upriver), R. Murray (National Champs), J. Orme (West Midlands), R. Peacock (Scullery/NJSH), C.D. Riches (Schools' Head), Mrs P. Senior (WAGS), I. Somerside (SARA), Mrs N. Stallard (Eastern), P. Stevens, (East Midlands).

**Veteran Commission**

Dr A Cooke (Chairman); P. Barker (West Midlands), B. Cannell (Yorkshire), J.C. Davies (North West), B. Gibbs (Henley Veterans), H. Harvey, P. Ibbotson (Chairman of the Veteran Championships), C. Leaf (Eastern), M. Litvak (Thames), G. Nicholls (East Midlands), J. Northridge (S E River), Ms H. Stainforth (Northern), Mrs D. Squire (WAGS), R. Watkins (South East Coast).

C. Anton advised that P. Barker had expressed a wish to stand down from the Veteran Commission so there was likely to be a vacancy soon for the W. Midlands.

**12. PROPOSED MEETING DATES FOR 2009**

The meeting dates for Council for 2009 were agreed as follows:

Saturday 7 <sup>th</sup> February	Reports to ARA for circulation -	16 <sup>th</sup> January
Tuesday 9 <sup>th</sup> June		4 <sup>th</sup> May
Saturday 26 <sup>th</sup> September, and AGM		1 <sup>st</sup> September
Saturday 28 <sup>th</sup> November		26 <sup>th</sup> October

It was noted that the first Executive meeting was January 27<sup>th</sup>.

**13. AFFILIATIONS AND RESIGNATIONS**

Council was asked to note that the change of name recorded in the Executive Report for CCAT BC should be: Anglia Ruskin Boat Club

**14. CORRESPONDENCE**

There was none.

**15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**Music Licensing Fees:** Proposed changes to the licensing arrangements would be an additional financial burden on clubs. R. Napp said the consultation was on the ARA website, in the Your Voice section, and urged members to write letters in response.

**16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of Council takes place on Saturday 29<sup>th</sup> November 2008, venue to be confirmed.

The meeting ended at 5.50 pm



## Appendix 1: Agenda Item 10.3 – D Recommendations

### National Competition Committee Report Appendix A

The basic reasons behind the changes proposed are that the current status system ranging from Novice to 12 points, with racing split into 6 categories, is not operating well, since:-

- Very few rowers reach a points tally greater than 5.
- The system is not responsive enough in rewarding success and failure.
- There is great confusion at the Novice/zero points level.
- There is no incentive to competitors and coaches to race at the highest level.
- “Rare Racers” don’t hold the points that their performance merits and/or their high profile wins (e.g. HRR and HWR) deserve.

*Proposal 1. All events in which at least two crews cross the finish line shall be qualifying.*

***In the case of an event in which only two crews have been entered, if the verdict is n.r.o, disqualification etc, then the event would be non-qualifying. This rule would apply in all classes of racing.***

This single measure has by far the greatest effect upon the distribution of points. It increases the number of points won during a season by at least 60%. If it results in “over promotion” of rowers, then regression is possible, and this can be adjusted in future if there is a great problem.

*Proposal 2. An individual points range should be from 0 to 12, with sculling and rowing ranked independently.*

The confusion caused by the current system, in which “novice” is equivalent to having –1 point, since a rower is deemed to have zero points having won at the novice level, is removed. In the new system, anyone who has not won an event has zero points. As soon as they have won an event they have one point.

The separation of rowing and sculling is left unchanged at present.

*Proposal 3. The status system should be re-classified as shown below:-*

Class Name	Novice	Intermediate 3		Intermediate 2		Intermediate 1		Senior			Elite		
Points 1x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Points 8o	0	8	16	24	32	40	48	56	64	72	80	88	96



Existing system

Class Name	Novice	Senior 4	Senior 3	Senior 2	Senior 1	Elite
Points 1x	(-1)	0	1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8	9 10 11 12
Points 8o	(-8)	4	8 16	24 32 40	48 56 64	72 80 88 96

Advantages of the new system are:-

1. It accommodates the new range of points (0 – 12)
2. The changes from the old system are not great.
3. There are the same number of categories as in the existing system and therefore the same number of opportunities for winning.
4. The names of the groups, Novice, Intermediate, Senior, Elite are aimed at restoring the “pride” factor, lost when the system was changed from Novice, Junior, Junior-Senior, Senior to Novice, Senior, Elite.
5. The “conversion” rules for Junior wins are simplified: the first Junior 16(A or B), J18(A or B), and Sch/J win in any year will count for a Senior point.

The effect upon Juniors is that if they race only in their age groups (J16 and J18 (two years)), 3 points is the maximum they can achieve, regardless of the number of wins, i.e. one point per year.

*Proposal 4. Transition Arrangements*

Upon implementation, all those holding points 0 to 11 at present, should have their individual points tallies increased by one. This includes all those who have regressed their points at any stage. Current Novices should be registered as having 0 points.

*Proposal 5. Winners at Henley Royal Regatta and Women’s Henley Regatta should have their points topped up to agreed levels.*

In practice, this would probably affect very few rowers, so is not crucial, but is a high profile action. The current position, in which no points are awarded to winners at HRR is widely commented upon. Informal discussions with HRR and HWR have indicated that this general approach would be well received.

Both HRR and WHR should be kept informed of these proposals as the recommendations are progressed through Executive and Council.