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| Glouc Bowls Assoc  TRANSPARENT | **GLOUCESTERSHIRE BOWLS ASSOCIATION**  **A Member of Bowls England.** |

**G.B.A Joint Executive Committee**

**Minutes of meeting of Saturday 27 July 2019**

**Falcon B.C. : 10.00 a.m.**

**Members present**: Chair and Secretary - Lindsay Collin (County Administrator and WD BE Delegate) LC, Martin Bevan (Deputy County Administrator) MB, Anne Beaven (WD co-opted Delegate) AB, Keith Hawkes (Deputy County Treasurer) KH, Jane Hawkes (County Treasurer) JH, Myra Savage (GBA Match Secretary) MS, Roger Harrison (GBA Match Secretary) RH, Linda Bennett (WD Representative) LB, Avril Hole (Deputy County Treasurer) AH, David Rolls (MD Representative) DR

**Not present:**  David Williams (MD BE Delegate)

1. **Minutes of Joint Executive Meeting of Saturday 13 April 2019** Accepted as a correct record, and ratified.
2. **Matters arising from minutes**

2.1 Dates of meetings (Item 2.2) Conversation about cancelled Men’s 20 July Divisional Delegate Meeting. Probable that such a July meeting will not normally be held in future, so only if business requires a (special) meeting

2.2 Youth Development (Item 6.1 (b)) Noted that this will still need to be addressed, with DR’s input appreciated, once he has more time after the completion of his Coach Bowls Level 3 qualification. Could also be part of agenda Item 7.

1. **Preliminary matter - LC**

3.1 Competition issue. Chair (LC) ran through the background to the competition appeal received from a member of Tewkesbury BC, re their removal from the National Championship Fours competition (Qtr-final). Various stages :

* Ruling from MD Competition Secretary at the time
* Appeal. Initial grounds for appeal. Later grounds
* Subsequent meeting with MD Competition Committee
* Letter to appellant from Competition Secretary after the meeting
* Communication from appellant to Bowls England (Alistair Hollis). Response/guidance
* First involvement of Administrator, at BE instigation, possible because of no previous involvement by herself with the decision
* Agreement from appellant to accept an objective review by Administrator
* Delivery of the review paper. This also copied to MB, who then circulated to members of Men’s Division Management Committee. Women on JEC unaware of any of this (so LC will send the review paper to them for information)
* Acceptance of outcome by appellant, as long as action taken to improve the appeal procedure for competitions is undertaken

3.2 Competition Regulations & Rules. Extensive discussion re the production of a common set of competition regulations and rules for the whole (unified) Association. Agreed to be a necessary development. Chair had already provisionally conferred with the Men’s Competition Secretary and the Women’s Competition Secretaries re the possible setting up of a working group to draft an entirely new set of rules, based on the best practice already evident in the two existing sets of divisional regulations and rules. Particular attention should clearly be focused on appeal procedures. Agreed that the proposal from LC would be supported by the JEC and that a working Group consisting of the Administrator (Chair), Ian Gauld and Christine Magee would be set up forthwith.

 A significant point discussed was that of timescales involved in the process, as a fair degree of work would be involved in the production of the draft document, and it would be doubtful that this could be done in time for consideration at the October Divisional Delegate Meetings. It was, however, pointed out by the Chair that there was no actual constitutional change involved, which gave some flexibility as to when any ensuing set of rules could be completed, allowing for ongoing review and consultation. There might even be a possibility that they would not be operational for the 2020 season, though strongly felt that the Appeal Procedures at least should be finalised and in use by 2020. Regulations and Rules might for that year be published as a small separate booklet for general circulation in 2020, depending on progress. [Action : LC ]

1. **Financial Report - JH**

4.1 Affiliation update 2019 affiliations generally going well. Quite a few club secretaries were advising of changes, as had been laid down in our procedures (contained with the GBA Club Handbook and on the GBA Web Portal). But similarly noted that a significant number of club secretaries are still not complying. More reminders necessary. [Action : LC ]

4.2 2020 Affiliations Clubs will be advised of the 2020 process in the near future, with membership numbers updated to 30th September 2019 and affiliations paid to the County Secretary by a date in November 2019. [Action : JH, LC ]

4.3 Divisional levy After discussion of the figures, agreed that a levy of 45p per head would be required per member, to maintain sufficient funding for GBA2010 & JEC costs going forward and particularly to cover the fact that GBA2010 is now responsible for funding of the GBA Club Handbook. Noted that the new series of three ‘handbooks’ had resulted in a total saving, in 2019, of circa £300 – compared to the two divisional handbooks in 2018.

4.4 LC sought, and gained, confirmation that the recently-received payments for National Championship competitors from Bowls England had been forwarded to the divisions for disbursement. Some confusion over the former GBYDS monies (from Bishop’s Cleeve).

1. **Handbooks and Web sites - LC**

5.1 Proposal to continue as the same in 2020, with the three ‘handbooks’. Should be much easier to produce on the second occasion, as well as LC no longer having work commitments to complicate the compilation processes. Agreed by committee.

5.2 Distribution Last year had been a difficult one in relation to distribution, with quite large numbers of all the ‘handbooks’ having to be distributed by hand to non-attendees at the divisional Delegate Meetings. Difficulties partially linked to early dates of the meetings in 2019, so LC asked that Delegate Meetings be taken back to a little later in 2020. Late arrival of the Bowls England Yearbooks this year also necessitated a lot of hand delivery, equally tedious.

5.3 Present Web sites Generally doing quite well; thanks to Sylvia Pearse for the development of the Men’s Divisional site. One or two elements of the content of all three yet to be made fully operational. MB clarified where the Men’s teams and results were to be found; LC suggested that the ‘header’ be ‘Fixtures/Teams/Results’ rather than just ‘Fixtures’. [Action : LC, MB ]

5.4 Intention, longer-term, would be for there just to be one Web site, just based on what is currently the ‘Portal’; this would save costs. However, to the user, they would still gain the impression that there were three separate sites, and we would anyway need both LC and Sylvia Pearse to maintain the various elements – just too much for a single person to undertake. The rationalisation unlikely to take place until 2021.

1. **Safeguarding - JH**

6.1 JH had had a lot of training recently, so she explained the situation :

* JH gave the background and the source of most of the basic information and the templates for documentation that clubs would expected to produce and utilise, which is the BDA’s Web site [www.playbowls.org](http://www.playbowls.org) . Lots of ‘downloads’ and forms available there.
* All clubs are expected to have a ‘Safeguarding Officer’. Need to unify the name – not use ‘Child Protection Officer’ any more. DR noted that, in practice, most ‘vulnerable’ people in bowling were not young people.
* To protect themselves, clubs must have the policies and procedures in place, or they are at considerable risk if anything goes wrong. LC noted how one or two large cases (anywhere in England) could throw the bowling world into turmoil, as the sport as a whole is not financially able to cope with large-scale money damages likely to be awarded.
* Timescale for implementation discussed :
	+ More advice for Gloucester Clubs. E-mail as soon as possible. LC to produce
	+ Specific guidance to clubs, on the basis of current advice form BDS. Also quite urgent; JH to advise
	+ Arrange a course specifically for the County, through the BDA. DR will approach the BDA to set up a relevant course, either in the Autumn or next Spring, preferably the former. MB would arrange Cotswold as the venue, once a date is known. [Action : DR ]
	+ Pressure to be put on all clubs to attend the ‘local’ course and set up the necessary procedures before the 2020 season. A need to register with the appropriate agency [Action : LC ]
1. **Promotion of bowling in Gloucestershire - LC**

All JEC members had received copies of the ‘communications’ from Peter Iles (Cotswold BC) and also LC’s very detailed first written response.

LC made certain initial observations and then the matters raised by Mr Peter Iles [PL] were responded to by every JEC member in turn, with a wide range of views being expressed.

* LC expressed her disquiet at the way the matter had been initially dealt with :
	+ By PI not directing his first approach to the correct person (the County Administrator), even though her details were well known throughout the county and by the Cotswold Club Secretary
	+ By the then Deputy County Administrator not advising the County Administrator of the approach and that the document had arrived with him
	+ By inappropriate initial consideration at a Men’s Division Management Meeting, when the matter related to the whole Association. But no follow-up nor response anyway
	+ By the matter being ‘lost’ as a result of the then Deputy County Administrator’s resignation

This is why the matter was not in any way brought to the Administrator and the JEC’s attention until about seven months later

* Acknowledged that the game has an almost constant recruitment and retention problem, including in Gloucestershire, but certainly noted that many, many clubs were making sterling efforts to locally publicise, initially introduce, coach and then retain new members to replace those almost inevitably lost because of our predominant age group. LC pointed out that we were actually holding our ground remarkably well in terms of members (as proven by the statistics), though this varied considerably from club to club
* Considerable discussion about how new bowlers viewed the clubs at which they were introduced to the game, and the welcome they received at the clubs, and how central this would be to their ongoing recruitment as a member. Some clubs and some individuals in clubs were good at this process, but some almost unavoidably put potential new members off. Difficult to ever change this variability in the effectiveness of those initial and then ongoing interactions
* Good practice, such as ‘mentors’ and ‘buddies’, appreciated. Also important that clubs had someone with a remit to continually look out for the new members and even arrange games/competitions for them
* Suggested that the dominance of funeral services, retirement housing and financial planning sponsors’ signs and notices would put off younger people. Not really agreed, as many people would not even notice the associated signage
* Noted by several speakers that the available core of publicity and recruitment advice and resources was provided centrally by the agency specifically set up by Sport England to promote development within the game – appropriately named the Bowls Development Alliance. And that this support was useful and appropriate
* LC’s responding letter of 5 May 2019 had drawn PL’s attention to all of the schemes relating to the previous point, deriving from the BDA, many of these providing advice, resources and even money towards undertaking recruitment. ‘Play Bowls’ sessions crucial, with associated funding. But coaches, coaching training (‘Coach Bowls’) and club coaches absolutely the most crucial, with many new club coaches within the County in recent times
* PI saying that he found few people who already knew of any of the schemes above, does not mean that they had not been widely publicised (which they certainly had), but simply that people had not necessarily used what they had been told, nor even retained it ! Already known that copious amounts of what the Administrator sends out – on all matters – never gets beyond the Secretary, and few Club Committees actively explore the opportunities on offer
* Felt that, though counties (and possibly our own County) might augment the BDA materials, with locally-relevant materials – and we should look at this – the core would and should be the centrally-provided schemes and materials, as the problems were country-wide and there was no point in duplicating and ‘reinventing the wheel’ in most cases
* It was pointed out that PI’s ‘conversations’ with opponents visiting Cotswold could only have covered responses from a few individuals and a few other Gloucestershire clubs at best. The JEC could investigate views more widely, so should consider seeking more information from clubs in the County about what help they felt that they might need with development and recruitment. Agreed that LC should draft a questionnaire to go to club secretaries and circulate the draft for comment; reasonable urgency on this
* LC observed that she could not substantiate everything that PI had claimed in relation to availability of funding for development and recruitment intitiatives.
* A key factor was finding people, a person indeed, willing to take on this responsibility at county level. Previous initiatives (such as in 2017), had foundered after promising initial moves, through lack of ongoing support – the apparently key people just withdrawing and failing to contribute anything more (the BDA had even sent an advisor to facilitate the initiative in that case).

LC would respond again to Peter Iles, including making some of the above points. [Action : LC ]

1. **GBA mixed fixtures - MS/RH**

8.1 Arrow BC and Victory Park BC celebratory fixtures had gone well, but some question about the cost to the players, with different information being disseminated by various people. Confirmed that all such games that were the responsibility of the two County Match Secretaries would involve a £5.00 per head payment.

8.2 Noted that GB Britton mixed celebratory game on 25 August 2019 needed women players. MS would provide LC with a notice to circulate. [Action : MS, LC ]

8.3 The Gloucester Spa anniversary game in 2020 season would be on Sunday 5 July.

1. **Annual Luncheon - LC**

9.1 The menu had been confirmed. Flyer sent round recently by LC, with ticket order form to be returned to the County Treasurer.

1. **Preparation for Autumn meetings - LC/JH**

10.1 Need to consider any known Officer and Official changes now. The only one referred to at this time was that David Williams would not be standing as Men’s Division BE County Authorised Representative.

10.2 No known proposals for changes to GBA Constitution & Rules, nor any Divisional Regulations and Rules to be considered at the October Divisional Annual Meetings. LC said that it was possible that changes in the competition rules (Item 3.1) might spawn very minor tweaks to the relevant Constitution clause, but this was not known yet. Would be accommodated in some way.

1. **Bowls England Report - LC**

Nothing significant for LC to report, especially given the length of the meeting so far. Other than to note the impending 2019 National Championships at Leamington, and to wish all our Gloucestershire competitors good luck.

1. **AOB**

12.1 LC had produced a book on Etiquette on the bowling green (while Secretary of Page Park BC). General interest in seeing this, which could be used in other bowling clubs. [Action : LC ]

12.2 Bowls in Bristol Good recent meeting with Bristol CC, but future still seemingly very uncertain for some parks clubs. A further meeting expected in mid-August.

12.3 Use of wild card for mixed County games A brief discussion on the differing use in the two divisions. Confirmed that all women involved would have to satisfy the Women’s Division criteria for selection.

Meeting closed at 12.55 am

**Date of next meeting - Saturday 26 October 2019 - 10.00 am - Falcon B.C**