

2025-26 BUCS NATIONAL COMPETITIONS GROUP - MEETING 5 - MINUTES

Date Tuesday 14th July 2026
Time 10:00-15:00
Location Microsoft Teams & University of York

ATTENDEES

Anna Russell (AR)
Blake Brown (BB)
Sam Johnson (SJ)
Ffion Hewlett (FH)
Ed Baker (EB)
Chris Purdie (CP)
Harriet Broadway (HB)
Laura Hockaday (LH)
Marcus Henson (MH)
Sophie Dunning (SDu)
Neal Kington (NK)
Alice Wilkie (AW)
Nick Burley (NB)
Hannah Underhill (HU)
Max Bergin (MB)

APOLOGIES

Alison Davidson (AD)
Josh Darley (JD)
Vicky Carnall (VC)

ORGANISATION

Chair
South West
London
Wales
North West
SSS / Scotland
Yorkshire
North East
East Midlands
West Midlands
BUCS
BUCS
BUCS
BUCS
BUCS

ORGANISATION

Senior Managers Network
Student Rep
South West

Item	Action
1. Apologies / Welcome Apologies from JD and VC. Welcome to BB who is stepping in as REP for the South West.	
2. Minutes and Matters Arising (Meeting '4' 2025-26) i) American Football Both actions passed on to Tonye Dokubo (TD) and in progress. ii) Badminton NB discussed with the SAG the possibility of specifying a minimum number of shuttlecocks to be provided. Feedback was that this would not be feasible because shuttlecock deterioration depends on several factors, including the brand/model used and the standard of play. It may only be possible if a specific make and model were mandated, but this would reduce flexibility for Members and could increase costs. BUCS and the SAG were also not aware of any reports of insufficient shuttlecocks being provided. iii) Rugby Union Update (DR) Following recommendations in Meeting 4, BSR, North/South 1 and SAG feedback was collated. Men's BSR teams: 10/10 responded – 7/10 in support. North/South 1 1st teams: 7/9 responded – 3/7 in support. So based on that it would be valuable to have another discussion within CG to determine a recommendation. SJ – Split between what the top teams want and what everyone else wants. Whilst we can see the merit to what the top teams want, the concerns around the top teams gatekeeping the league may be fair. AR – External leagues shouldn't have an impact on top leagues, but these are otherwise eligible students who are being excluded. Has a normality criterion been suggested? NB – The regulation wording states how many fixtures they would need to have been fielded for. It is a fixed number, not a % like normality. EB – A lot of the difference in opinion feels like it's between current BSR teams and aspiring BSR teams, and moving ahead with this change could widen the gap between them. DR – This doesn't affect North/South 1 teams' chances of promotion as this only affects eligibility for the National Championship knockout competition. AR – What are thoughts on that these are eligible students and it is only in this particular knockout competition? AR – Doesn't seem like there's a strong enough rationale to reject as this doesn't affect eligibility to compete and is instead moving it back towards general regulations and allowing more to play. EB – Could we lift the line that external competitions had to still be a university team, i.e. allowing players to play for a partnership club.	

DR – If we allowed external clubs to be considered part of the university's teams it would move away from the principle of being able to pull players from your clubs – i.e. your 2nd team competes as an institution team in an external league and you want to pull a player up to your 1st team.

EB – If they want to move towards eligibility why don't they remove the necessity of having played X% of fixtures.

AR – Personally leaning towards support as it doesn't limit eligibility, but there is opposition in the room.

NB – We have the % requirement to encourage external clubs to allow the high-level athletes who want to compete in BUCS (e.g. academy players) to compete in the league season.

CP – Don't agree with the 33% but support this change as it moves towards an opening back up of eligibility. Concerns around how institutions and BUCS Staff will determine that a club is an institution club that competes externally.

DR – The NGB will verify that the team is part of the university club. At the beginning of the season teams will be asked to get confirmation that their external teams are part of the university structure [and therefore eligible].

Put to a final vote in the room to decide implementation: REPS – 8 in support, 1 rejection.

CG recommends implementation

iv) International

Further comms have been issued, but issue could be who it is going to at each institution. If any further issues, report to HU and Leyanne Jenkins (LJ).

v) NCG Trends Update (AR)

NK – Tracker has been reported as difficult to engage with for individuals with some forms of neurodivergence.

HU – We could use a form to capture responses, rather than them having to type in the Excel spreadsheet.

SD – Feedback can still come in through REPS.

EB – It would be good if forms and papers were linked.

NB – With a form would you be able to dip in and out to give feedback? If not, they would need all feedback ready to submit at once, or we would get multiple submissions to process. Also, on the spreadsheet you can see which institutions have already replied and may find their responses help with your own.

HU – Some forms allow you to edit your responses, and as it would be collated into a spreadsheet anyway, we could run both simultaneously – which may add a little more admin.

At regional meetings when the papers are run through could feedback be filled in as those discussions are had.

NB – Would REPS be able to support with upskilling/supporting those struggling with feedback?

SD – That is offered already and some do take up that support.

CP – Don't take away from the work that you, as REPS, are doing and taking on the work too much on behalf of members. We do now have the data from the tracker to show others engagement, and the tracker supports us much better than previous feedback methods. HU – Another piece of feedback is sharing the papers via more avenues. EB – A lot of the regional feedback is it would be useful as it doesn't always reach all staff, or some staff aren't sure who's responsibility it is to provide the feedback. HU – We do want, ideally, 1 person responding through the form and that person is collating feedback from relevant parties before submitting their feedback. AR – Echoing Chris that the tracker hasn't been in place that long and there's more we can do to disseminate the tracker and seek feedback. REPS are already contacting institutions who have not replied on the tracker. AR – Outcome of governance review may change the type of feedback we are seeking. NK – The CG meetings are aligned with the regions and nations meetings and the timeframe should allow for papers to be released before those meetings. Outcome: The group agreed that the tracker remains valuable, but that accessibility, dissemination and regional meeting alignment should be improved. HU and AR will meet on 17 July to confirm next steps and share these with REPS.	
3. Proposal for Change 1 - Competition Format - Rugby League - National Trophy Draw Change This proposal recommends a change to the BUCS Rugby League National Trophy draw structure to improve competitive integrity and reduce the frequency of repeat of same opposition from league fixtures within the knockout competition. Following consultation with participating institutions, where 68% of respondents supported some form of nationalisation, the proposed compromise is to retain a regionalised Last 16 round to minimise travel costs and logistical pressures, before moving to a national draw from the quarter-final stage onwards. Feedback indicated that institutions believe this approach would create a more meaningful national competition, increase fixture variety, and provide a stronger competitive challenge, while concerns raised around travel, cost, player welfare and academic commitments would be largely mitigated by keeping the opening round regionalised. The proposal is therefore presented as a balanced, evidence-led change that enhances the student experience and competition quality while limiting additional burdens on institutions, with implementation proposed for the 2026–27 season. CG Tracker Feedback (as of 14 July): • 36 responses recorded. • Support: 15 • Seen & Noted: 21 • Reject: 0 CG recommends Implementation Action: In light of the change to the National Trophy draw, HU will confirm and circulate the extended Knockout Opt-out deadline to affected institutions.	HU

4. [Proposal for Change 2 – Competition Format – Squash – National Trophy Draw Change](#)

This proposal recommends changing the BUCS Squash National Trophy knockout draws from the current unseeded, regionalised format to a seeded, non-regionalised structure from the 2026–27 season.

As the Squash National Trophy draw takes place after the completion of the league programme, the Squash Sport Advisory Group believes there is an opportunity to better reflect team performance by using final league standings alongside SquashLevels ratings of eligible players to determine seedings.

The aim is to improve competitive balance, reduce the likelihood of the strongest teams facing each other in the early rounds, and create more competitive semi-finals and finals.

Under the proposal, all teams would receive a national seeding, with higher-seeded teams receiving any necessary byes, while league position would continue to be prioritised when comparing teams from the same league. The change is intended to strengthen the integrity and quality of the competition, reward season-long performance, and provide a more meaningful national knockout experience for student athletes.

CG Tracker Feedback (as of 14 July):

- 39 responses recorded.
- Support: 15
- Seen & Noted: 24
- Reject: 0
- In comments column, no rejections, but 3 supportive institutions highlighted that it is better for the competition but would increase travel costs.

AR – What is the reason for the SAG doing the seeding, rather than BUCS staff?

NB – The SAG will be doing the seeding work as it was a proposal from the group and the BUCS Executive would not be able to commit the time to this process, especially if we started doing similar for other sports. The SAG already does the seeding for the Individual Championships in squash and other SAGs/individuals do this for other Individual Championships.

CG recommends Implementation

Action: In light of the change to the National Trophy draw, HU will confirm and circulate the extended Knockout Opt-out deadline to affected institutions.

HU

5. [Notice of Change 1 – Competition Format - Baseball – Knockout Competitions Structure](#)

This notice explains the restructure of the BUCS Baseball National Championship from a single 12-team finals competition into two separate six-team competitions: the **National Championship** and the **National Trophy**, effective from the 2026–27 season.

The primary aim is to improve player welfare, competitive quality and fairness by reducing the maximum number of games a team can play during finals weekend from five to four.

The reason for the change, is due to concerns that the current format places excessive strain on pitchers, increases injury risk and can lead to depleted squads competing in the latter stages, reducing the quality of the National Final. Under the new structure, teams will qualify through league performance, with both

competitions using a two-group format followed by semi-finals and placement matches. The National Trophy will also provide a meaningful national competition for emerging and second teams, supporting the continued growth and development of HE baseball while maintaining a high-quality Championship competition. CG Tracker Feedback: Only positive comments re: change Outcome: The change was noted, with no comments or objections raised.								
6. Notice of Change 2 – Notice of Change 2 - Trial Event - Athletics - Seated Shot Put AW introduced agenda items 6 and 7 together, noting that both papers add new para events to the athletics programme and increase the scope of the BUCS offer. The ambulant 1500m was selected following UKA advice, as it aligns more closely with domestic competition opportunities. Outcome: The change was noted, with no comments or objections raised.								
7. Notice of Change 3 - Trial Event - Athletics - Ambulant 1500m Outcome: The change was noted, with no comments or objections raised.								
8. Notice of Change 4 – Taekwondo – 2026-27 Delivery JG introduced the paper confirming the return of Taekwondo for 2026–27 as a single two-day event. BUCS points and EUSA qualification will be determined through this event. In response to some feedback on the tracker, it was clarified that, in individual category events, BUCS Points are awarded only to the highest-level category as standard; therefore, Novice categories would not receive BUCS Points. Outcome: The change was noted, with no comments or objections raised.								
9. Break								
10. BUCS General Regulation Changes for 2026-27 – Set 2 <table><tr><th>Regulation</th><th>Comments and Tracker Feedback (as of 14 July)</th><th>CG Outcome</th></tr><tr><td>REG 6.1.2.1.7–REG 6.1.2.1.10 (Currently REG 6.1.2.1.7)</td><td> 43 support, 0 reject, 4 seen & noted. In response to question on the tracker regarding a Paralympian competing in the first year, NB clarified that this would be no different to any other individual, with them having to beat the same baseline NGB points or performance threshold in order to earn BUCS Points and then that would be the new BUCS record to be beaten in future. NB advised that Archery and Pentathlon were </td><td>Recommends Implementation</td></tr></table>			Regulation	Comments and Tracker Feedback (as of 14 July)	CG Outcome	REG 6.1.2.1.7–REG 6.1.2.1.10 (Currently REG 6.1.2.1.7)	43 support, 0 reject, 4 seen & noted. In response to question on the tracker regarding a Paralympian competing in the first year, NB clarified that this would be no different to any other individual, with them having to beat the same baseline NGB points or performance threshold in order to earn BUCS Points and then that would be the new BUCS record to be beaten in future. NB advised that Archery and Pentathlon were	Recommends Implementation
Regulation	Comments and Tracker Feedback (as of 14 July)	CG Outcome						
REG 6.1.2.1.7–REG 6.1.2.1.10 (Currently REG 6.1.2.1.7)	43 support, 0 reject, 4 seen & noted. In response to question on the tracker regarding a Paralympian competing in the first year, NB clarified that this would be no different to any other individual, with them having to beat the same baseline NGB points or performance threshold in order to earn BUCS Points and then that would be the new BUCS record to be beaten in future. NB advised that Archery and Pentathlon were	Recommends Implementation						

	incorrectly listed and would not be eligible sports in 2026-27. A concern was raised as to whether individuals would aim to just beat baseline/record so that they could have more chance of winning in future years. EB asked whether para athletes could instead be rewarded for being within a percentage of the required baseline/record, rather than needing to beat it outright, to avoid penalising athletes for factors outside their control or discouraging best performances.		
REG 6.2.2.4-REG 6.2.2.C (Currently REG 6.2.2.4)	45 support, 0 reject, 3 seen & noted. Comments as per REG 6.1.2.1.7-REG 6.1.2.1.10 (Currently REG 6.1.2.1.7).	Recommends Implementation	
REG 8.3.7	38 support, 0 reject, 7 seen & noted. Longer-term intention is to move this regulation into sport-specific regulations. In response to questions as to whether additional matches could be played where sport-specific tiebreakers are exhausted, NB advised that additional matches are often impractical to factor in – for example due to limited time between leagues ending and a knockout competition or playoffs based on the standings taking place. Focus is on exploring if there could be more sport-specific steps that could use alternative performance indicators. EB proposed whether BUCS Points earned in	Recommends Implementation	

	previous X seasons could be used, as is the case in some competition structure changes.		
REG 9.7	39 support, 0 reject, 5 seen & noted. The issue of a match official withdrawing is covered by REG 10.6.3 and where there is doubt over the legitimacy of a match official withdrawing, evidence can be requested and if believed that no official was appointed/booked, there is a process for reporting the breach of REG 10.2 detailed in REG 10.6.4. AR noted an undefined fine in the wording. NB explained that this allows for the fine to be set considering the amount that is not being paid to the other institution/Playing Entity. EB noted any fine should exceed the unpaid invoice amount to avoid institutions opting to pay the fine instead.	Recommends Implementation	
REG 9.10 (NEW)	45 support, 1 reject, 5 seen & noted. Discussed that where this has happened in the past, has usually been through IA error, rather than intentional scheduling. Was raised that there are other competition integrity matters not being addressed – what make this more important? NB advised that not more important, but that a solution had been put forward for this situation and not those others (such as general team selection concerns) yet.	Recommends Implementation	
REG 11.2.11	17 support, 20 reject, 9 seen & noted.	Recommends implementation of the	

	Discussion focused on increasing the percentage of team sheets needing to be completed to pass the check, the change to the cap for fines, institutional administrative capacity, and BUCS Play functionality which may be affecting team sheet completion. NB explained the points sanction change is appropriate for squash due to its higher league points allocation. NB queried why institutions were suggesting there needed to be more room for error as team sheets are a long-established requirement and common in many competitions outside of BUCS now. No good justification for central venue format sports to be treated any differently. Concerns raised over BUCS Play functionality, fairness, support for institutions, and proportionality of sanctions. It was highlighted that with the fines being raised at the end of the season, they don't impact those who have caused them to be incurred. Suggestions included mid-season intervention and improved BUCS Play notifications.	points sanction change for Squash only. Does not recommend implementation of the changes to the percentage of team sheets needing to be completed to pass the check of the change to the cap for fines.	
REG 14.1.1	46 support, 1 reject, 0 seen & noted. Comments regarding amber weather warnings were noted but felt that	Recommends Implementation	

	not practical to be risk assessment based and likely to be mitigated through things like coach company cancellations which could be argued to fall under one of the new points.		
REG 14.1.2–REG 14.1.3	44 support, 1 reject, 0 seen & noted. Note for regions to update MyBUCS pages and member directory.	Recommends Implementation	
REG 14.1.4	4 support, 49 reject, 2 seen & noted. NB noted that most concerns raised were regarding difficulties institutions would face splitting costs, creating too much administrative work. EB noted institutions cannot always provide timely updates despite expectations.	Does Not Recommend Implementation	
REG 14.2	14 support, 38 reject, 2 seen & noted. NB noted that most concerns raised were regarding difficulties institutions would face splitting costs, creating too much administrative work. EB noted that the North West were more supportive of this proposal than REG 14.1.4. Also, that one institution has asked whether if a match has to be rearranged a second time, could there be a way for an institution to not be penalised if they can't afford this.	Does Not Recommend Implementation	
REG 14.3	47 support, 0 reject, 0 seen & noted. Comments on timeframes for sharing of dates were noted but not relevant to the proposed changes and no desire from CG/BUCS	Recommends Implementation	

	to change as have been reviewed in recent years.		
REG 14.5	44 support, 0 reject, 4 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
11. BUCS Sport Specific Regulation Changes for 2026-27 – Set 2			
Regulation	Comments and Tracker Feedback (as of 14 July)	CG Outcome	
AMF 15	34 support, 0 reject, 9 seen & noted Concern noted regarding leagues where not all teams play each other away or equal number of away matches. SAG considered this but felt proposal suitable and better than current situation.	Recommends Implementation	
AMF X (NEW)	33 support, 0 reject, 9 seen & noted	Recommends Implementation	
BAD i-BAD v	31 support, 0 reject, 12 seen & noted	Recommends Implementation	
BAD 8 and BAD X (Formerly BAD 8)	27 support, 0 reject, 14 seen & noted	Recommends Implementation	
BSB 2	14 support, 0 reject, 23 seen & noted	Recommends Implementation	
BSB 7.3	10 support, 0 reject, 26 seen & noted	Recommends Implementation	
BSB X (NEW)	12 support, 0 reject, 25 seen & noted	Recommends Implementation	
BSB Y (NEW)	11 support, 0 reject, 26 seen & noted	Recommends Implementation	
Basketball Appendix 5 (BUCS Match Officials Requirements)	34 support, 0 reject, 9 seen & noted	Recommends Implementation	
BAS 5.3	12 support, 20 reject, 11 seen & noted. Concern about supplier price increases in future and general cost implications for institutions. Proposed by the SAG for reasons given, provides no financial or other benefit to BUCS.	Does Not Recommend Implementation	
BAS 10	31 support, 0 reject, 14 seen & noted. Action: NB to speak to SAG regarding possibility of allowing use of e-scoring as an alternative.	Recommends Implementation	NB
DOD 4	14 support, 2 reject, 22 seen & noted.	Does Not Recommend Implementation	

	Concern that institutions may struggle to meet the timeline, particularly around the start of term and holidays. 30 days considered too early, potentially leading to teams not withdrawing but then conceding walkovers.		
DOD 6.2.6	12 support, 0 reject, 26 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
DOD 6.3.5	11 support, 0 reject, 27 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
DOD 6.5	10 support, 2 reject, 25 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
DOD 7.1	12 support, 0 reject, 25 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
FOO 5 / Appendix 5 (BUCS Match Officials Requirements)	36 support, 0 reject, 9 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
FOO 6.4 (NEW)	28 support, 0 reject, 15 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
FOO 7	20 support, 9 reject, 15 seen & noted. Concern about the impact of teams being unable to wear established kits. Language regarding “very dark” taken from NGB rules. FA and FAW – and their referees – do not expect teams to wear these colours, can lead to referees refusing to cover matches as not taking place in line with NGB rules and guidance from referees societies.	Recommends Review and Resubmission	
FUT 11	17 support, 9 reject, 13 seen & noted. Comments as per FOO 7.	Recommends Review and Resubmission	
GOLF 3.4.7 (NEW)	13 support, 0 reject, 23 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
Hockey Appendix 5 (BUCS Match Officials Requirements)	20 support, 0 reject, 20 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
HOC 5.2	17 support, 0 reject, 24 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
HOC 8	26 support, 0 reject, 16 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
HOC 13.X (NEW)	12 support, 14 reject, 13 seen & noted.	Does Not Recommend Implementation	

	EB: Sets a precedent for other sports and could create fixture scheduling issues. SD: Welfare and workforce issues are not unique to hockey. NB: The proposal outlines why it is felt that hockey has specific challenges to be addressed.		
Netball Appendix 5 (BUCS Match Officials Requirements)	16 support, 5 reject, 19 seen & noted. NB clarified that the SAG had tried to engage with Netball Scotland and Wales Netball as well as England Netball. Discussions covered: A “mentor” being present should be considered as an alternative to an “assessor”; suggestion that some B Umpires “working towards” A, can be better than existing A Umpires who don’t regularly umpire high level matches; suggestion that some B Umpires are “Talent Identified” and could this be a more achievable new minimum requirement; concerns regarding the Welsh teams in the Premier Tier, as no support mentioned from Wales Netball and Cardiff and Cardiff Mett currently struggle to source B Umpires, let alone A Umpires.	Recommends Review and Resubmission	
NET X (NEW)	12 support, 7 reject, 22 seen & noted. Discussions covered concerns raised regarding a potential need for upskilling of Table Officials and/or complexity of completing scoresheet and severity of sanction for non-compliance. NB	Recommends Implementation	

	advised that no qualification required and completion of scoresheet is straightforward. Action: NB to share supporting resource and respond to concerns.		NB
NET 5.2	23 support, 4 reject, 16 seen & noted. Many teams indicated they would struggle to meet requirements with existing or nearby venues, particularly with only two months' notice. Questions raised as to what happens if a venue is provided that doesn't meet the requirements – walkover, PUP etc. BB: 5.2.2's restrictive run off requirements will make it difficult for South West.	Recommends Review and Resubmission	
RUL 6.3.1	9 support, 0 reject, 24 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	NB
RUL 6.3.4	13 support, 2 reject, 18 seen & noted. Action: NB to feedback to the NGB concerns raised regarding teams giving "appropriate care advice" and level of reporting required for advice.	Recommends Implementation	
RUL 12	15 support, 0 reject, 17 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
RUU 2.2.7 (NEW)	13 support, 0 reject, 24 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
RUU 2.2.8 (NEW)	11 support, 0 reject, 26 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
RUU 2.7 / RUU 3.6	9 support, 1 reject, 26 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
RUU X.5 (NEW)	20 support, 0 reject, 18 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
RUU 7.2.5 (NEW)	14 support, 0 reject, 24 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
RUU 7.2.6 (NEW)	12 support, 0 reject, 25 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
RUU 7.2.7 (NEW)	11 support, 0 reject, 25 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	
RUU 7.2.8 (NEW)	11 support, 0 reject, 25 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation	

RUU 7.7 / RUU 8.6	9 support, 0 reject, 27 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
SOF 1	11 support, 0 reject, 21 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
SQU 14	15 support, 0 reject, 21 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
SAI 2.1.1-SAI 2.1.2	11 support, 0 reject, 22 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
SAI 2.1.4 (NEW)	10 support, 0 reject, 23 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
SNW 8.4	11 support, 0 reject, 22 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
SNW 8.X (NEW)	13 support, 0 reject, 20 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
TEN 7.2	19 support, 0 reject, 19 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
TEN 8	14 support, 0 reject, 22 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
TEN 8.X (NEW)	19 support, 0 reject, 19 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
TEN 9.6.3	19 support, 0 reject, 20 seen & noted. BUCS to look at replicating for Squash and Table Tennis.	Recommends Implementation
TEN 11.5	19 support, 0 reject, 19 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
WAT i-WAT iv	16 support, 0 reject, 20 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
WAT 2	17 support, 0 reject, 19 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
WAT 3.X (NEW)	14 support, 0 reject, 22 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
WAT 3.7	15 support, 0 reject, 21 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
WAT 4 / Appendix 5 (BUCS Match Officials Requirements)	13 support, 0 reject, 22 seen & noted. Confirmed no limit to costs.	Recommends Implementation
WAT 5	15 support, 0 reject, 21 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
WAT 6	15 support, 0 reject, 20 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
WAT 7	14 support, 0 reject, 22 seen & noted.	Recommends Implementation
WAT X (NEW)	14 support, 2 reject, 20 seen & noted. NB: Scoresheets are critical to fixture delivery, like for basketball and volleyball. While a walkover is a strong sanction, it is necessary to ensure fixtures run successfully.	Recommends Implementation

12. Making Changes – Year One Review

NK Introducing sports that have been through their Year One review of the “Making Changes to BUCS Competitions Framework”

3 part review:

Events matrix, Participant feedback, and Member institution feedback.

Overall score determines next steps.

- i) [Cross Country MTB](#)
3 As. Automatic adoption into the full BUCS programme – will be scoring BUCS Points.
- ii) [Cyclocross](#)
3 As. Automatic adoption into the full BUCS programme – will be scoring BUCS Points.
- iii) [Padel](#)
3 As. Automatic adoption into the full BUCS programme – will be scoring BUCS Points.
- iv) [Sailing Yachting Coastal Championships](#)
3 As. Automatic adoption into the full BUCS programme – will be scoring BUCS Points.
- v) **Discussion**

AW – the cycling programme was reviewed as a whole at the end of last season. Some of the entry numbers have been lower than anticipated, so some learnings to be made on how we put on trial events – mainly on timings in the calendar after securing a provider.

NK – Update on change to the process for trial event categories when relating to Gender Eligibility, with the following wording added to Route 3B:

“Where BUCS is required to add a new Event Category to an existing event because a change in NGB or international federation gender eligibility policies/position now prevents a group of participants, who were previously eligible, from competing in an existing category, the new category may be enacted immediately without formal paperwork. The new category will be added on BUCS Play and to the Event Entry Information ASAP prior to an event. This is treated as a trial category for governance purposes, reviewed post-event in the same way as other trial categories, and, where the review is successful, progressed to BUCS Points the following season.”

EB – Would a paper be completed following coming through this process, if just for adherence and transparency?

For those concerned about Karate this year, this is formalising how BUCS can make reactive changes.

NK – For these papers to pass we currently have an 80% response rate. This has been a struggle for the paper authors as collecting feedback can be a struggle and if we don’t meet the threshold due to lack of responses, we may not be able to pass the papers.

If the 80% response rate is not met, NK asked whether CG could act as an alternative route for reviewing the responses received and determining whether a paper can progress.

EB – What is the value of IA responses on the event, as they don't attend and often their involvement is the entry process and logistics. Far more important is the student feedback of the event. NB – The 3rd element is the feedback of the institution through the IA. EB – An institution is not going to have much extra input on the majority of events beyond the student experience, unless they have directors of sport or support staff SD – For some events we have consulted coaches for that feedback and that is a different insight to students. NK – Conscious that we're cutting out the member voice if we remove the member feedback. EB – Could we flip it instead to a threshold of negative responses from members. AR – Not sure the CG offers better insight than the review, it's possible no-one in the room has had a student attend the event. Action NK – Review how IA feedback is used within the Making Changes process, including whether the process should move from a response-rate threshold to a negative-response threshold.	NK
13. Standing Item #1 – Events Update Staffing and Event Allocation: Harvey Burn has come in to replace Jodie Lawrence. With this, there has been some changes to the Event Sport Leads for the 2026-27 season. These can be found here (Event Allocation 2026-27.pdf) Please direct all sport related queries to the event lead in the first instance. Note that a lot of the team are taking annual leave/secondments during the summer, for any urgent enquiries email events@bucs.org.uk. Summary of 2025-26: ○ 154 Events ○ 47 Event Sports Medal Request: Event medals, Conference Finals, additional medals from BBW etc – can be requested up until 31 July through this form. 2026-27 calendar is being updated on the website. There are multiple events open for bid right now: ○ Canoe Slalom – Closing Friday 31 July ○ Gymnastics – Closing Sunday 26 July ○ Cyclocross – Closing Friday 21 August ○ 10m TT – Closing Friday 30 October ○ 25m TT – Closing Friday 30 October ○ Road Race – Closing Friday 30 October Making Changes Updates – items through Option 3B (Trial Categories)	

○ Clay Pigeon Shooting Novice Category – Adopted – Shot 50 Clays through 6 Stands, compared to 100 Clays through 13 stands. 31 Entries into Novice. 233 entries total, therefore 13% of total entries. ○ Cycling: Criterium Racing – Another year of probation, was not run due to dates of 3rd Party event, and NGB dates not aligning. ○ Modern Biathlon and Pentathlon: Para Categories – Another year of probation (Very few entries) ○ Rowing Regatta: Para Categories (Very few entries) ○ Canoe Slalom: Kayak Cross - Adopted ○ Canoe Sprint: Mixed K2 - Adopted ○ Rowing: Indoor Championships – 250m Sprint - Adopted ○ Rowing Head: Championship 2x - Adopted ○ Snowsports: Autumn Dryslope – Snowboard Cross – Another year of probation Concerns around the fixed features, obstacles and quality of matting at the venue. It couldn't be seeded by a governing body as it lacked several features – such as start gate/timing EB – Are there concerns that we will get a rush of sports wanting to make changes with the success of the new framework? NK – We haven't seen a huge uptick in sports making requests. Internal review process is robust, so not everything that comes into the office gets output as a paper.	
14. Standing Item #2 – BUCS Competitions Update 2025-26 Season Review Link - BUCS 2025-26 Season Review.xlsx The BUCS 2025-26 Season Review will be shared with the network in comms on 24 July. Some key highlights include: • 26,007 fixtures were scheduled this season • 94% fixture completion rate • 89% team sheet completion rate • 1,349 walkovers • 285 voids • Fencing had the best fixture completion rate of 98% • Netball had the best team sheet completion rate of 94% Thank you for everyone's help with the League Adjustment Meetings in preparation for next season. Max and I enjoyed attending these and really appreciate the work that has gone in across the regions to ensure that the leagues are in the best place possible for the season ahead. Max and the team are currently in the process of building the leagues onto BUCS play, and these will be live on 24 July. Sam and Neal presented at BUCS Conference on the outcomes of the League and Knockouts Evolution process, with a clear consensus from the membership that a 'rip up and start again' approach is not supported, and targeted intervention in specific regions with 'evolution where needed, not just change for changes sake'. A	

virtual webinar took place on Monday 13 July for those unable to attend Conference and can be accessed here. Liberty Andrews is replacing Kris Jackson as the Regional Competitions and Events Coordinator, starting on 1 August.	
15. Standing Item #3 – BUCS International Competitions Update EUSA 2026 Events: EUSA Games 2026, 18 July - 2 August, Salerno. Our athletes are preparing to depart for Salerno, Italy, with 7 teams attending from the UK. Attending from the UK: UCL, Durham, Strathclyde, Edinburgh and Imperial, competing in Badminton, Beach Volleyball and Table Tennis Men and Table Tennis Women. In total there are over 1,850 athletes attending from over 160 universities. EUSA Rowing 2026, 26 - 29 August, Zagreb, Croatia. Attending from the UK: 67 athletes from 7 Universities: Reading, Oxford, Oxford Brookes, Strathclyde, Nottingham, Bristol, UWE. EUSA Combat 2026 - 8 - 17 September, Tirana, Albania. Judo - 34 Athletes from 23 different universities. Karate - 28 Athletes from 11 different universities Taekwondo - 45 athletes from 29 different universities. This is one of our largest delegations to be selected for the Combat Championships. No further updates since slides presented at last meeting.	
16. Standing Item #4 – BUCS Inclusion Update Anti-Racism Charter introduced at BUCS Conference. Inclusion by Design work currently taking place internally to ensure that our competitions continue to be as inclusive as possible. No further updates since Meeting 4.	
17. A.O.B. i) NCG 2026-27 Proposed Dates: • Meeting 1 - 6 Oct • Meeting 2 - 15 Dec • Meeting 3 - 16 March • Meeting 4 - 1 June • Meeting 5 - 13 July ii) South East Regional Rep Luke Sandy-Renton (University of Brighton) has been appointed as Competition Rep for South East.	

iii) Rules and Regulations Review Process

Looking to move timeline earlier in the season and to use an online form to capture proposals from Members and submissions from Sport Stakeholder Groups to improve process.

EB – With reg review process can it look to be aligned with regions and nations cycle.

Outcome: BUCS will consider how the regulation review timeline and process can better align with regional and nations meeting cycles, including the potential move from spreadsheets to an online form.

iv) Sport Specific Affiliations Document

NB – BUCS Executive are considering removing the Events section as believed that most, if not all this information, is also covered in the Entry Information and/or sport specific regulations, so is unnecessary duplication but also thought that IAs or competitors don't use this document for Events as they do for Leagues/Knockouts. What are the group's thoughts on this?

MH – Personally I use it more for League and Knockouts.

EB – We signpost to that document during captains training.

Outcome: The group noted that the sport specific affiliations document is being used, particularly for league and knockout activity, and is also signposted during captains' training.

v) BUCS Points for Team Championships (Events)

Following [Paper # 1](#), [Paper #2](#) and [discussions](#) at previous National Competition Group Meetings, BUCS has progressed changes to the way BUCS Points are allocated across Team Championships (Events).

The review enabled BUCS to develop a clear rationale for change and explore a number of potential allocation models. Following consideration of member feedback, Competitions Group reviewed the proposals in March 2026 and supported changes to the BUCS Points model and associated regulations. Of the four models presented during the consultation, Option 1 was identified as the preferred approach.

What is changing?

- BUCS Points will be allocated across an entire gender category at a Team Championships, rather than separately by competition level (Championship/Trophy/Shield).
- Teams from all competition levels within a gender category of a Championships will be combined into a single overall ("global") ranking.
- A higher finishing position in the global ranking will always receive more BUCS Points than any position below it (until the points places run out)..
- Where two or more teams are tied in the global ranking, the BUCS Points available for the relevant finishing positions will be combined and shared equally between the tied institutions or Playing Entities.

This change will be incorporated into the first release of the 2026-27 version of Appendix 1 (BUCS Competition Offer and Associated BUCS Points).