

ERTC AGM

SAWSTON SPORTS CENTRE,
NEW ROAD,
SAWSTON,
CAMBRIDGE,
CB22 3BP



13TH OCTOBER 2013.

MEETING STARTED 13.45

MINUTES

1. AGREEMENT OF AGM MINUTES FROM 2012

Minutes are on Trampoline-East website and was issued after the 2012 AGM

2. CHAIR'S REPORT (REPORT ON WEBSITE)

3. REPORTS FROM 2013 COMMITTEE (REPORTS ON WEBSITE)

- I. Development Squad report
- II. Competitions report
- III. Judging Coordinator report
- IV. Coaching Education Coordinator report
- V. DMT report
- VI. Welfare Report
- VII. ECGA representative report Query on where the money goes from ECGA – does money go to region, or BG? Courses are not run at a loss any longer – Action – look into this as a region with ECGA.

4. ERTC CONSTITUTION

Draft constitution is on Website. Constitution agreed by all clubs present

5. 2014 COMMITTEE

Committee disbanded and re-elected for 2014. New members elected: Robin Atkins for National Comp rep; Sarah Jones for Regional comp representative. Emma Armitage was re-elected as DMT rep after voting by clubs in the lead up to the AGM.

Nominations for Treasurer were requested after this meeting, if anyone from the region is interested in taking on this role.

6. AOB

A reminder that County reps are invited to approach their county committee to represent Trampoline. There are currently no reps sitting in Essex, Hertfordshire or Bedfordshire. To apply, the person should contact the chair for their county.

NEW STRUCTURE MEETING

STARTED AT 3PM.

AGENDA

1. STUART WELCOMED GUESTS AND SET GROUND RULES

One vote per club will count. As this is likely to be a lively discussion, all were asked to respect other's points of view and not talk over one another.

2. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BG STRUCTURE WITH LATEST CHANGES AND CLARIFICATION OF SOME QUESTIONS NOT COVERED BY THE DOCUMENTATION

RP/NW attended the BG technical review on behalf of the region. Tumbling rep kindly allowed 2 reps to attend from the region. Meeting was stage managed, covering all aspects rather than just the TRA structure. Meeting was led by Jane Allen, CEO of BG. Each principal was voted on and agreed by each region. Opportunity given in last 15 minutes for questions and opinions, but reassurance that all feedback was being reviewed and would be responded to in the following week. Implementation panel has now issued a revised structure with same changes. As a region we have issued a list of points made from all regions and any/which points have been addressed/responded to (this is on the Trampoline-East website, thanks to Dave Kingaby for collating this).

Sue Lawton- Feedback from BG AGM on 12th October - Martin Laws tried to explain to BG that this is not political but that every region is against the structure on the principal that this does not demonstrate a developmental structure. Peter Heames is responsible for giving direction to judges on how to judge an armset, which he feels to be impossible to do. Coach Ed rep for Trampolining was not consulted in the restructure. Revised structure only top-dresses the issues rather than dealing with these points.

Nicki Weller - Overwhelming feeling at the BG technical review meeting was that every region was expressing concerns on the proposed structure and felt that they had not been well heard. The revision, whilst showing that they have heard, may not show that they have listened and have taken note. Overwhelming feeling was that BG structure was being pushed through regardless of each region's objection. This was not a consultation meeting.

3. BG PROPOSED STRUCTURE - EFFECT ON TECHNICAL PREPARATIONS AND SQUAD - JACK KELLY

Jack's report is on the website. Jack is said to be vehemently against this proposed structure.

Tony Fagelman – Change is not a bad thing but needs to be consulted and should be there for a reason. Issue is that there was no consultation for this structure, and the current system has brought about the success of our trampolinists at the recent worlds.

4. PRINCIPALS OF EXISTING STRUCTURE AND POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF PROPOSED STRUCTURE ON PERFORMERS - SUE LAWTON

Background on how Existing structure came about. Old structure became a nightmare with too many qualifying to national finals – 140 girls in U11 at one point. A new structure was then introduced to enable

people to qualify up through the grades. This new system had problems with LMS/burn out, though, as routines changed as they changed age groups, which led to a lot of stress, psychological problems etc. Wayne pulled together a group of experts – Jack Kelly, Sue Lawton, Technical directors, judges, larger club coaches, coach-ed resulting in the structure we have been using. Presently, the banding is purely on ability rather than age. There has been a massive reduction in loss of moves under this scheme. There is a choice of 2 routines which give options to performers. Each routine was put together to create a developmental pathway. With the proposed structure, there is no development – e.g. no $\frac{3}{4}$ turnover therefore no preparation for the straight $\frac{3}{4}$ FSS. Club level 2 has 4 body landings, which does not encourage/create the ability to bounce high. Quality and difference between 2009 and 2013 shows the success of the current system. We now have the danger of no development pathway, and a mismatch between coach-ed and the structure – a coach may have to stop coaching at age 15/16 with introduction of $\frac{1}{2}$ in half out as they need to be HPC coach, but then can re-enter the performer after they reach age 17 as those skills are included in SCC. Performers have to either move down, or be pushed and pressurised beyond their ability at the current time.

Showpiece event was always the Sunday of the Nationals. Gala events and even the Saturday are qualification events.

Craig Carter – structure is also ageist.

Danger of those coming back into regional competition without biscuit matting, adequate equipment etc – safety issues with this in the region as these facilities are not available. Removal of ToF for those performers used to this will remove $\frac{1}{3}$ of their scoring ability.

165 people at National event did not hit the new criteria – roughly half of the competitors. Major concern is those coming into the sport later on.

Pat Dodson – Whilst agreeing with Sue, added note that no one will be forced to go back to level 6 as penalty for min tariff has been removed as an update to the structure. Response was that this is correct although routines not satisfying the criteria can not be used towards nationals finals.

Sue – most disappointing is that the current structure is now showing that it is working – the World games results were gold in syncro. Statistically there is an 80% chance that those in previous Olympics will then medal but we only have opportunity to send one person.

Nicki Weller – background reason for change was change on funding.

Pat Dodson – Is there any chance in us changing the mind of BG at this stage? Belief from both Sue L and the committee is that this is not likely to happen.

Craig Carter – Can we vote with feet by not showing up to any new structure competitions? Response – that is the individual's decision.

Sue – Suggest running new structure, as obliged to; but also run alternatives to cater for H - C. Regions should keep some form of developmental structure, preferably by competitions run on a separate day.

5. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER REGIONS

Stuart Kelly has limited information on what other regions are doing. SW region have issued their dates for 2014 regionals, other regions have not disclosed what their decisions are so far. BG last week issued note 'all regions are obliged to run the new structure...'

Jerry Broda – what happens if we run at a loss?

Sue Lawton – we will need to all go to BG to ask for funding to run the events if they are loss making. Some coaches with younger groups will be tempted with the new structure as it is easier than existing structure, especially with parents' pressures. Edgbarrow will not be putting any performers under level 8.

Neil Pike - We are covered under BG insurance for open competitions. ECGA will have to underwrite the competitions, whether they make a loss or not.

6. ALTERNATIVE STRUCTURES/PATHWAYS FOR OUR GYMNASTS, SHOULD WE WISH THIS. POSSIBILITIES:

GRADES H - E PLUS LEVEL 6;

GRADES H - C;

FULL OPEN COMPS USING GRADES H - A;

Note- we have to run NDP structure on a separate day to the open comp

Alternative discussed on the day – Regional BG competition 3,4,5 on the Saturday and existing structure on the Sunday as separate competitions.

Proposals were:

- 1) Follow BG structure – 0 votes in favour
- 2) Continue with existing structure and run H – C – 0 votes in favour
- 3) Run Level 6 only on a separate day (possibly a Saturday) then run open competitions to include grades H – C on a Sunday – 13 votes in favour
- 4) Run levels 3, 4, 5 and 6 on a separate day, then open competitions to include grades H – C on a Sunday – 5 votes in favour

It was agreed that those competitors who also compete in the National structure are not eligible to compete in the H-C competition.

Majority vote for level 6 competition to be run separately on Sat, 3 times a year (Jan, Feb and March), Open comp covering grades H – C on Sundays, 5 times in the year.

7. COMPETITION STRUCTURE (DATES/VENUES/FORMAT) FOR 2014.

Stuart Kelly asked for clubs with suitable venues to put their names forward to run competitions in 2014. Suggestion was to run comps on weekends of 26th January; 16th February, 30th March – all to include Level 6 on the Saturday; Open comp H – C on the Sunday, then 2 more competitions later on in the year.

Meeting finished at 5pm.

Trampoline East