

## 2025-26 BUCS COMPETITIONS GROUP - MEETING 2 - MINUTES

<b>Date</b>	Tuesday 02 December 2025
<b>Time</b>	10:00 - 15:00
<b>Location</b>	Microsoft Teams

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>
Anna Russell (AR) Ffion Hewlett (FH) Ed Baker (EB) Sophie Dunning (SDU) Chris Purdie (CP) Sam Johnson (SJ) Victoria Carnall (VC) Laura Hockaday (LH) Alison Davidson (AD) Scott Dale (SD) Marcus Henson Sophie Peace Neal Kington Alice Wilkie (AW) Nick Burley (NB) Max Bergin (MB) Tonye Dokubo (TD) Maddi Canell (MC) Tanyel Mustafa (TM) Jodie Lawrence (JL) Dan Roberts (DR)	Chair Cardiff - Wales Lancaster – North West Nottingham Trent – East Midlands SSS - Scotland UCL - London Exeter – South West Sunderland – North East Exeter – Senior Managers Network Rep Canterbury CC – South East Warwick – West Midlands Sheffield Hallam - Yorkshire BUCS BUCS BUCS BUCS BUCS BUCS BUCS BUCS BUCS BUCS
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>
Hannah Underhill (HU)	BUCS

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b> Apologies / Welcome	AR

Apologies from Josh Darley, Harriet Broadway, and Hannah Underhill	
<p><b>2. Minutes and Matters Arising (Meeting '1' 2025-26)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Basketball England – No update, issue raised on behalf of the sector, but they are limited by their systems.</li> <li>2. Potential for 2 in person meetings:  BUCS – Definitely interested but don't have the budget internally to fund a second in person meeting.  CP – with the pacing of the season it just doesn't feel feasible to fit fixtures</li> <li>3. Walkover Data Collection: BUCS – We can add additional drop-down options to the walkover options but that's not something we can change mid-season.  <b>Action: BUCS</b> – Follow up on additional functionality of uploading walkover forms to match cards</li> <li>4. Numbering System for Papers – Has been actioned.</li> </ol>	AR
<p><b>3. Notice of Change 1 – Competition Format - Sailing – Test Event Introduction</b> TM introducing a paper coming through option 3a. No further comments</p>	TM
<p><b>4. Notice of Change 3 - Competition Format – Sailing – Yachting Championships</b> No further comments</p>	TM
<p><b>5. Notice of Change 2 - Competition Format – Canoe Polo – Introduction of Trophy BUCS Points</b> TM introducing change in line with changes to gender eligibility. No further comments</p>	TM
<p><b>6. Notice of Change 4 - Competition Format - Knockout Opt-Out - Post-Season Competitions</b> NK introducing alignment of post-league knockout sports and their timeline for knockout opt-outs. No further comments. <b>Knockout opt-out link <a href="#">here</a>.</b></p>	NK
<p><b>7. Notice of Change 5 - Competition Format – Rowing – Introduction of Beach Sprint Championships</b>  JL Introducing notice of change through option 4 for Beach Sprint Championships following increased demand due to introduction of the event at the 2028 Olympics.  JL – Looking at feedback around institutions not located near a coast, there are many institutions who have previously entered this events that are not located near a coast, so this hasn't been an issue for training/accessibility in the past.  EB – Previous feelings were that we shouldn't be extracting results from not a BUCS event. Will this be the case that we're taking results from an open event and extracting the BUCS results from that category?  JL – Ideally the student category will be a BUCS category athletes and these are</p>	JL

<p>conversations we can have with British Rowing – there may be caveats to not exclude potential non-BUCS competitors from student sport.</p> <p>EB – Will the results be head-to-head? As this could see better BUCS competitors achieve worse results due to performance against non-BUCS competitors.</p> <p>JL – Believe it is head-to-head, but this will only be against those in your category. In terms of competing and losing to non-BUCS competitors that's something we can speak to British Rowing about to ensure that extraction of results and the running of the event is representative of the merit of the BUCS competitors.</p> <p>AR – Doesn't feel like this event is particularly accessible for a lot of institutions, and this change would look to be extracting results from an event that some BUCS institutions are already attending, which might not be equitable.</p> <p>SD – Region also felt that this should have been consulted on rather than a notice of change and mirror feeling this might not be inclusive.</p> <p>NB – We currently have other events where we extract results (e.g. 10k, and heptathlon/decathlon). Difference from those events is that there is the opportunity to be knocked out whereas other events all compete fully through the event. As such comparing to those events what is the feedback that makes this change feel more non-inclusive? Is it that we're asking to attend another event or is it competition specific?</p> <p>AR – For some institutions, their students also aren't attending those other extracted events, so adding more events of that type increases the inequality of accessibility to some BUCS events.</p> <p>CP – We're not dealing with large amount of numbers, and even though this would be an extracted category, we should be looking to encourage participation by recognising this as a BUCS event, potentially this could be seen as increasing accessibility.</p> <p>JL – Happy to take any further feedback on the running of the event to her email - <a href="mailto:jodie.lawrence@bucs.org.uk">jodie.lawrence@bucs.org.uk</a> – to help shape the event in partnership with British Rowing (who are also pushing for this and willing to work to make this a BUCS event)</p>	
<p><b>8. Notice of Change 6 - Competition Format - Tennis - New Discipline Introduction - Padel</b></p> <p>NK introducing a new discipline for a standalone Padel event. Intention is for a single weekend competition in the first year, with a potential expansion to a similar model to tennis with regional qualifiers towards a central final.</p> <p>EB – Wondering why it's being introduced as a discipline of Tennis rather than as its own sport? Especially as Padel players and Tennis players don't overlap massively.</p> <p>NK – Choice to go through option 4 was in line with the LTA formally recognising Padel as a discipline of tennis. We don't plan to run Padel as a subset of tennis; we're hoping that as it grows it will have its own identity of its own which will capture that different body of athletes. There will be some overlap of athletes but there shouldn't be anything that massively holds back Padel from further expansion (i.e. as a league and knockout programme) of a Padel programme through our full sport review process should the sport grow to that size.</p> <p>AR – Shared concerns in the tracker that this could replace tennis? Anecdotally within Cardiff they have also seen an increase in tennis membership with the rise in Padel</p>	<p>NK</p>

<p>popularity.</p> <p>CP – Reminiscent of the situation around the rise of futsal, which had some but not lots of crossover with football and over time as futsal grew there was the right space for it to grow and little issues with growing that sport into the programme it is today.</p> <p>NK – As the sport grows if there is issues with crossover the programme introduced would be the right one to make sure that athletes don't have to choose between the two sports.</p> <p>AR – On coming through option 4, that fits best with the new framework as the discipline does fall under an existing NGB.</p>	
<b>9. BREAK</b>	All
<p><b>10. Proposal for Change 1 – Competition Format - Swimming Team Championship Format</b></p> <p>JG Introducing an event that BUSL run in house at BUCS as part of Swimming Team Championships.</p> <p>JG – Feedback asked if this replaces BUSL? It wouldn't be replacing BUSL, it would be more in line with a collaboration where BUCS will be adopting the BUSL format. Nothing should change from a student or institution perspective; it will just be coming under the BUCS banner.</p> <p>SD –. One question on how hosting might work and whether pool time requirements will change?</p> <p>JL – Current requirements and format will remain the same when it comes under BUCS.</p> <p>SD – Other concerns were around that the format is very popular but under BUCS more of the major high-performing teams might start participating which could change the experience for some of the BUSL teams – especially where institutions may want to enter multiple teams.</p> <p>JL – We had lengthy discussions with BUSL around what this programme is looking to target, and what the outcome of this change would be. In line with that discussion. for the first season, we would be limiting to one team – which is currently the case under BUSL. If we do see a change in entries and institutions moving forward desire an increase in participation, then that is a change that can be made on review going into further seasons.</p> <p>SP – Feedback was that they didn't want to see more participatory/introductory sport to be limited in its access so useful to know that it won't be for the first season. Moving forward it would be beneficial to make sure that this is reviewed and can be changed moving forward.</p> <p>FH – A lot of Welsh institutions do use BUSL for wider participation of their athletes, and it moving under BUCS could see the types of teams competing change. Equally it will then be something that will come under institutions BUCS budget which may increase costs.</p> <p>JG – BUCS are trying to keep the competition format as identical as it can be to how it currently is run, so there shouldn't be a change in costs for institutions beyond small changes in entry fees.</p>	JG

AR – Around how pool hosts are selected and how that is funded. What is the process for duel meets? Who arranges securing the pool and who pays for the pool?

JG – It is currently organised by the institutions, upon entry teams put down whether they can host those meets. When BUSL put together conferences they keep in mind which pools are available. The running of the meets will be further outlined in our rules and regulations when implemented.

AR – Whilst teams compete in BUSL, not every institution will be aware of the logistics and that is maybe missing from the paper. And this could mean there are costs or IA resources that readers aren't aware of.

LH – Issues shared to do with funding and accessibility worries. Additionally, questions around the requirements of officials.

JG – It isn't currently a requirement, and there would be no requirement on needing officials in the first two phases. Once at the level of finals this would be centrally hosted by BUCS and organised by BUCS.

EB – Concerns that by bringing this under BUCS, what was the BUSL competition is no longer an offer. The likelihood is that by bringing this into BUCS with BUCS points, the higher calibre swimmers who weren't competing in BUSL will now be participating and this will see the loss of opportunity for participation in the sport. Whilst we can review it in a year or two, if the alternative no longer exists to go back to, it might just see the loss of this as an option for more accessible sport. However, there is recognition the current BUCS offer does also need to change, and this is a successful format.

JG – This proposal was brought to us by BUSL as they wanted our support to ensure the sustainability of the offer – both BUCS and BUSL shared the reservations that have been raised as part of our discussions with them. But as BUCS we recognise the opportunity to improve our offer in this situation and will continue these conversations with BUSL to ensure the programme reflects the current intention of the offer from BUSL.

SD – Some feeling that by bringing it into BUCS we're creating the potential for change by trial and error, seeing the offer get worse before it gets better, and with this event being as successful as it is avoiding that would be ideal.

JG – We don't see this as trial and error because there's no intention to make any changes other than BUCS brand and BUCS points, but in terms of event delivery this is the exact same event.

EB – Could we not have two versions, one with BUCS points and a second version without those points?

JG – That was considered as a possibility (e.g. by looking at long course and short course results) for creating a Shield and Trophy level. But we didn't want institutions who didn't take part in qualification events to see that as us devaluing them in the running of this event. As BUCS we want to see this change, as our current format isn't the best fit, and this presents as a great opportunity to make an event that is better for BUCS, BUSL, Institutions and Students.

AR – Reviewing the tracker there is great support, but feedback in the NCG is there needs to be more detail in the paper surrounding different implementation models, logistical delivery, costs, and other concerns raised that were discussed before the paper was submitted before regions can confidently back this change. Especially as there's enough time for this to be reviewed before the next NCG.

<p>AW – Tracker is split between 22 acceptance and 4 rejections, which creates a decision of whether NCG want to reject the proposal based on the feeling and concerns among NCG or whether it's better to implement the changes with the feedback in mind rather than reject because we can foresee potential issues with the how entries are prioritised by institutions.</p> <p><b>10.1 Discussion continues surrounding the tracker.</b></p> <p>AW – Preference from the BUCS office is that this is pushed through with the proviso that challenges will be addressed in the next NCG.</p> <p>AR – It comes back to that it will be an institutions choice as to whether they enter and how they choose to engage. As such we will look to recommend implementation for the sustainability of the BUCS team championships event with clarification of:</p> <p>The format, opportunity to expand beyond 1<sup>st</sup> teams, costs, and logistics, and/or how this event can encourage/ensure participatory sport isn't lost moving forward</p> <p><b><u>NCG recommends implementation.</u></b></p>	
<p><b>10.1 Discussion on Efficacy of the NCG feedback tracker</b></p> <p>FH – Not all the institutions are adhering to filling out the tracker, rep roles is to gather that feedback and within regional meetings and other discussions the membership are feeding back to reps differently than they are represented on the tracker.</p> <p>CP – Whilst we are the representatives in the room, it's a 2-way street with this group and the membership. They can raise it with you but if they're not then going ahead and giving that detailed feedback on the tracker, which they do have the choice to use. If the members aren't feeding back, we create these pauses in decision making where we don't progress, which ultimately limits opportunities for students.</p> <p>SD – With this paper specifically there was some confusion on whether this was replacing BUSL or running alongside BUSL and that has made institutions hesitant to vote.</p> <p>AW – With this paper specifically (but this is also relevant for other papers) there's a lot of work that will be needed to be completed between acceptance from NCG and implementation and delivery, and this will also be delayed by a move to resubmit the paper.</p> <p>NB – With the feedback, whilst we understand that feeling from regional reps may be different to the tracker. It's hard for us in the room at NCG to quantify how comprehensive the feedback from those external conversations is as a feeling on behalf of the region (as some regions are very large in terms of number of institutions), which is why reporting back on the tracker is imperative as then that feeling can also be recorded in a quantifiable way that should then align with that feedback from reps.</p> <p>NK – Technically the NCG is an advisory group that delivers a recommendation, so the BUCS office could progress forward with papers despite negative feedback – but we would prefer to not go down that route. Part of the purpose of the group and the tracker is to allow us to be a data led organisation that is making decision in partnership with the membership.</p>	

<p>EB – Often members have questions that they feel need answering before they can give an answer and that is a reason as to why there is a discrepancy between the tracker and the feedback from reps.</p> <p>AW – There needs to be confidence between BUCS, NCG Reps, and the membership to come to BUCS with these questions outside the NCG meetings.</p> <p>SJ – There is some frustration on all sides with the tracker, it is being raised and would be good to keep doing so at regional meetings that without that feedback on the tracker we move more towards reps giving their institutions experiences or individual opinions gathered from conversations and that often isn't going to be fully representative of the whole region.</p> <p>AR – There has been more engagement through the seen and noted options so that option might be good to push more among the regions.</p> <p>CP – Share the feeling that reps are pushing the tracker as much as possible, and that BUCS are making changes to ensure that feedback is easier to give (e.g. papers being released to deadlines to allow time for feedback).</p> <p>VC – Within the region institutions are very spread out, even within participation at regional meetings this causes issues.</p> <p>AW – BUCS will ensure event team include an email to contact in future papers so that questions can be answered when they arise.</p>	
<p><b>11. Proposal for Change 2 - Competition Format – Rugby Sevens – Introduction of Men's Shield</b></p> <p>ES introducing a paper for the introduction of expansion to include a Men's Shield.</p> <p>EB – Rugby Sevens, even with this change, is still concentrated towards the top of the pyramid (as even a 2<sup>nd</sup> team will have a lot of crossovers with 1<sup>st</sup> team XV players). Doesn't feel this addresses the issue of increasing the types of students we're engaging with this offer. But does see how it's a step towards that. How is the 'reflect the expected standard' of team selection going to be enforced?</p> <p>ES – On the distinct levels of competition, should the event hit capacity then it will only be the 1<sup>st</sup> teams from tier 1 and below that are prioritised for selection and 2<sup>nd</sup> teams will only be entered should we not hit capacity.</p> <p>NB – It would be far too over complicated for us to introduce restrictions between a team's XV selection and their sevens teams without potentially excluding competitors that no-one wants to be excluded. Reason for using the language of "expected" is to show that we are introducing different levels to cater to different people, but without putting in overly restrictive regulations.</p> <p>AR – 17 support, 2 reject on the tracker.</p> <p><b><u>NCG recommends Implementation</u></b></p>	<p>ES</p>
<p><b>12. Discussion Point 1 - Men's BSR Milk Championship Eligibility</b></p> <p>DR introducing a discussion on the change to RUU 2.4.4.</p> <p>SD – Feedback from region is that we shouldn't be blocking students from playing student sport so are supportive of this change.</p> <p>EB – Same goal within the region that we shouldn't be limiting access for students to student sport.</p>	<p>DR</p>



LH – BUCS institutions already have control over their selection across the season and if they wanted those teams to compete in BUCS they could have done so across the season.

FH – There are other sports with external competitions that may push to be aligned with this if the regulation is changed/removed. Equally this regulation was trying to lessen the gap between BSR and the tier below, but removing the regulation gives more space for that gap to grow.

SJ – There will be other sports that look at this as an opportunity to challenge their regulations and potentially ask for the same.

AR – Agree that other sports may ask the same, and in terms of IA workload this might be too much for them to track if different sports have different eligibility requirements.

EB – Is there a clear framework for determining what is and isn't a 2<sup>nd</sup> team for each institution when one of those teams is competing externally to BUCS?

DR – What has been discussed so far is that levels are set to below BSR so that there's no issues there with the teams competing in a stronger competition. We would get NGB collaboration with that so that we're clear on what is and isn't below BSR level. Additionally for a lot of students, they aren't being given the choice, these are institutions where the competition the teams play in are already decided by the institution and then they don't get to compete in BUCS despite wanting to.

SD – How important are these other leagues to the wider rugby landscape, and is allowing teams to play in those taking away from BUCS? These changes could encourage participation in external competition.

NB – Are the NCG comfortable with BUCS dictating whether teams are allowed to compete in external competition? Additionally, are there resource issues for IAs in tracking player eligibility.

EB – This is something that can sit separately to other sports due to the collision sport exception.

DR – Agree this is different to other sports as Men's and Women's BSR through to Milk Championships are already the only sports where the knockout has eligibility criteria.

NB/DR – The regulation was initially brought in because teams had concerns around squads in the league gaining stronger players when it came to the knockout competition. Instead, they want players who had committed to the programme throughout the season to compete. Initially this was brought in just for the playoff. Additionally, it helped bring to partner clubs that if they wanted BUCS teams to be a pathway for their players then in order for them to compete in the big games at the end of the season, they did have to contribute to the BUCS league throughout.

EB – If rejecting the regulation is to encourage players to join BUCS but the regulation was originally brought in to encourage participation in BUCS, then the question does seem to be more on whether we want BUCS regulations to be making that determination on behalf of members.

DR – Intention of change would be that the players that would be coming in to play would be students who would otherwise have been playing for a BUCS team had that team been entered into BUCS rather than an external competition.

**NCG recommends that there is scope for a proposal, but it would need context around the existence of the regulation and the logic and implementation of the change (with regards to determining the quality of external teams).**



### 13. Discussion Point 2 - Competitions Landscape Review Next Steps

NK reopening discussion on potential changes identified off the back of the Competitions Landscape Review.

#### National Trophy:

Q1) Is the National Trophy still an important competition to determine the 'best' Tier 1 team nationally? Or should the teams be competing within their conferences only at this level?

AR – Feedback on the tracker suggests students do value the trophy.

MH – Students do still value it as proving the best in 'Tier 1' but there are still issues with the distance of travel increasing too quickly by rounds.

LH – Regionalisation can be considered but not wanting to remove that competitive balance that it offers. Students do see it as valuable, sometimes winning the trophy is more prioritised than winning the league.

FH/SD – Students do still value the Trophy. Part of the draw is that there's a change in who teams play compared to their league.

EB – Issues with travel have decreased with the early regionalisation and the competitive balance of new teams from different tier 1s is an appeal of the competition.

SD – Some questions on reviewing Trophy for competitions where there is only tier 1, but recognition that the knockout opt-out does represent an option to avoid that competition.

SJ – Value the opportunity to compete against different teams.

**Action: AR/REPS** – Sub-Group formed to discuss and bring to BUCS how the build process of the National Trophy should look. - Expression of interests to join the group to be sent to [Hannah Underhill](#)

#### Tier 2 & below season extension:

LH – Don't see a need to extend the deadlines, only see it causing greater issues with logistics and student availability.

EB – Region sees how it could be beneficial but don't feel there's a strong need for change.

SJ – Wonder if there's an opportunity for some sports (e.g. collision sports) to have that extended deadline. But with how difficult it is in term 3, for just cricket, to work around exam dates avoiding adding more challenges was favoured.

FH – Mixed feedback of support, some do view it as beneficial but there is a recognition that there isn't staff resource

MH – There's no perfect option as academic timetabling is varied by institution but some recognition that likely we have hit a sweet spot that generally works best for all. Specifically, concerns were raised about moving fixtures beyond Easter and the student logistics and availability beyond that date.

SD – Another mixed bag of feedback like those mentioned before, additionally some concerns that it creates more opportunity for institutions to play around with fixtures around dates that it's harder to get fixtures played.

NK/AR – Lots of potential within this for negative unintentional knock-ons of extensions: Student availability, venue and travel logistics, staff resource etc...

NK & HU

<p>NB – the intention of extending the deadline is stop support getting fixtures completed, but it might be that the better solution is a review of competition structure sport by sport.</p> <p><b>NCG recommends not to look at any changes to the deadline.</b></p>	
<p><b>14. Discussion Point 3 - Team Championships (Events) BUCS Points</b></p> <p>NB introducing the proposed different models for BUCS points.</p> <p>EB – Note on the paper itself, because it predominantly is about BUCS points and because how BUCS points work and affect competitions is niche means there's a bit less feedback. It would be good to go back out again, following the feedback so far, with a couple of options that are easier to digest and hopefully we get more feedback on.</p> <p>SD – Feedback was split between Option 1 and 2 evenly. Option 1 favoured because it aligned more closely with other programmes points structures. Option 2 selected to reward more difficult/important fixtures and finishing higher.</p> <p>AR – Concern on option 1 around teams choosing to drop from Champs into Trophy to get more points.</p> <p>NB – Option 1 does limit knowledge on how BUCS points are going to be divided as it depends on the quantity of entrants, which hopefully should help to avoid manipulation to maximise BUCS points. It will even see some competitions (i.e. Shields) not be awarded BUCS points if Champs and Trophy are at full capacity. This could see a decrease in participation if there's not a BUCS point reward, but it would be a shame if participation decreased because they no longer guaranteed BUCS points.</p> <p>EB – There are competitions already where BUCS points are cut-off even at championship level, but teams are still choosing to enter. This could see a benefit of a better allocation of funds away from focusing on where BUCS points are for some institutions.</p> <p>AR – Consensus is that the review should take place.</p> <p>NB – Is there consensus to progress with an option or do we need more detail presented and given feedback on?</p> <p>AR – Given the lack of consensus on the tracker, more detail on option 1 and 2 would be ideal.</p> <p><b><u>NCG Recommends presentation of follow-up paper presenting Option 1 and Option 2 in more detail.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>NCG Recommends proposing a change/removal to REG 6.1.2.2 as part of the paper for the above options with the Regulation wording proposed change provided.</u></b></p>	<p>NB</p>
<p><b>15. Standing Item #1 – Events Update</b></p> <p>Canoe Sprint – The event category is a Mixed K2 – it got introduced as a test for 2024-25 but it will remain in probation for 2025-26. The feedback was good, but entries were not very high.</p> <p>Taekwondo – exploring options in this space and will share updates in due course.</p> <p>The implementation of Test Events is happening – BMX is open for bidding</p> <p>Cross Country has been confirmed Charnwood College on 31<sup>st</sup> January (update as of w/c 8<sup>th</sup> December)</p> <p>BUCS Points – Complete by Christmas for Term 1 events</p>	<p>AW</p>

<p>AW- Cross country entry window may be shorter should we secure a venue. We also have some events with entries closing early in January (w/c 5<sup>th</sup>), so please be aware of these.</p>	
<p><b>16. Standing Item #2 – BUCS Competitions Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Team Entries: 4,866 (2024/25: 4,903), Institutions: 145 (2024/25: 145).</li> <li>- Fixtures (Sep – Nov): 11,607 (~94% Completion).</li> <li>- Women's RL9s has passed implementation, joint RFL and BUCS comms to be shared shortly.</li> <li>- SRIG – Project Groups forming for BUCS Points (Individual Events) and League and Knockout Review.</li> </ul>	<p>NK</p>
<p><b>17. A.O.B.</b></p> <p><b>Institutions not following REG 9.3.6</b></p> <p>EB - With the leniency around this has led to institutions pushing it further to a point where often details aren't confirmed until 2 days before. As such question was is this an issue in other regions and if so, are there other willing to form a sub-group looking to create a process to get that information or resort to sanctions.</p> <p>SD – Recognition it has been worse in the region this year than previous but with SE there's still an ethos to get it worked out and the issues have eased as the seasons gone on.</p> <p>LH – Same issues in the NE and they've also gotten worse, so happy to help with any sub-group.</p> <p>SJ – Echoes SD in that London/SE are looking at ways to work together but have noticed that it has been more common this season than previous.</p> <p>EB – A future process can still encourage that collaboration or even help make it necessary as part of the process but having that down in regulations could be beneficial both in increasing collaboration and in aiding with disciplinary action where it is needed.</p> <p>CP – It has been more challenging this year, but there's now more separation within institutions between who's looking after specific sports – some institutions have high performance teams that are looked after by different staff and in different ways to other sports.</p> <p>NB – Within the discipline team they are seeing more cases where Institutions are acting on incidents rather than looking at the wider picture that they may need to rely on the goodwill of their opposition in the future, especially in cases where the regulation breach was not deliberate.</p> <p>NB – As a second point, we have this layover regulation for confirmation of fixture details 48 hours before as well as intended departure times. So as part of this review it would be worth looking at an even wider picture of how we communicate fixture details. And as this is not something that we experience as a BUCS office, a member led solution would be ideal.</p> <p>SP – Part of the issues have been with new IAs, and it might be a case for comps reps to really support the sector in making sure they are given a bit of leniency and supported in upskilling.</p> <p>CP – Some understanding about whether IAs are full time over the summer or if they are just during the season and whether summer upskilling sessions are therefore as effective as we would like would help as well.</p> <p>NB – Discipline is willing to grant extensions to deadlines on the formal processes where institutions are trying to find a compromise between themselves.</p>	

<p><b>Action: REPS Sub-Group</b> – Expression of interests to join a working group to be send to <a href="#">Ed Baker</a>.</p> <p><b>Action: NK/HU/NB/MB</b> – Question for Digital team around venue changing on BUCS Play and whether that can have confirmation come through the system somehow.</p> <p><b>Terms of Reference</b></p> <p>NK - Group to receive updated ToRs from NK to sign and return. Chair role term is until July 2028, Reps serve as long as their Region / Nation is happy for them to do so.</p> <p><b>Change of Meeting 5</b></p> <p>Action: REPS/BUCS – Any issues with moving Meeting 5 forward a week to the 14<sup>th</sup> of July please let AR know.</p>	
--	--

### **Dates and times of meetings for 2025-26 season.**

Meeting 3 – Tuesday 03 March – 10:00 – 15:00

Meeting 4 – Tuesday 02 June (In Person) – 10:00 – 15:00

Meeting 5 – Tuesday 14 July – 10:00 – 15:00

[Competitions Group Feedback Tracker](#)