

MCAA T&F League Proposals to the AGM – 2022

Part 1. League Management Committee Proposals for 2022

Management proposal 1: inclusion of a mandatory anti-doping statement.

British Athletics has mandated that all licenced events include a mandatory anti-doping statement.

The committee therefore propose the following addition to rule 9-4:

Rule 9-4d) Team managers must ensure that all athletes are aware of and comply with the following UKA anti-doping statement:

“An entrant shall be deemed to have made him/herself/their self, familiar with, and agreed to be bound by the UKA Anti-Doping Rules and to submit to the authority of UK Anti-Doping in the application and enforcement of the Anti-Doping Rules.

The UKA Anti-Doping Rules apply to entrants participating in the sport of Athletics, for 12 months from the date of the league match in which the athlete competes, whether or not the entrant is a citizen of, or resident in, the UK.”

Management proposal 2: match non-attendance.

The committee propose the following addition to rule 9-14:

A match will be considered attended by a club if there is at least one athlete, or at least three officials, from the club. If a club fails to attend a match (covered under rule 9-14) then they will score zero league points for that match.

Management Proposal 3: Officials and required levels – aligning with British Athletics guidance

The committee note that our rules covering the requirements on clubs to provide officials do not align with British Athletics event licencing requirements. The committee therefore propose the following:

Proposal 3

That rules under 9-3 covering requirements on host club and requirements on visiting clubs with respect to the provision of officials, be updated to align with the minimum required for a British Athletics level 1 event permit. Recognising that the permit conditions require two qualified officials in a field team then we propose additionally that a full field team (i.e. at least four people of which at least two are qualified) gains +10 points for officials.

Thus we propose the details under rule 9-3 become (underlined and bold where new):

Host club shall be responsible for the provision of at least:

Chief Starter (**Level 1+**)

Marksman/Starter's Assistant (**Level 1+**)

Chief Timekeeper (**Level 2+**)

Track Referee (**Level 2+**)

Field Referee (**Level 2+**)

All participating clubs, including the host club, shall provide AT LEAST the following officials (and where possible graded):

- . One Track Judge
- . One Timekeeper
- . Four Field Judges

Clubs will gain 5 points per requisite qualified level 1 or above official for timekeeper and track judge, **10 points for a full field team that includes two officials at the necessary (see notes below) levels of qualification** or 5 points for a **full** field judge team (**i.e. having at least four individuals**) that includes at least **one qualified member (see notes below) to a maximum of 20 points**. Teams with a missing timekeeper, track judge or any of the 4 field officials required for a full field team will be deducted 10 points for each missing official up to a maximum of 60 points

Notes: If officiating a long throw or the Pole Vault a QUALIFIED field team must have at least four individuals and these must include a Level 2+ in addition to a level 1+, for all other field events a QUALIFIED field team of at least four individuals must include at least two qualified officials (Level 1+).

Note: the permit guidance can be found here:

<https://www.uka.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Guidelines-Principles-2022-Competition-Providers-outdoor-Final.pdf>

Which in terms of a level 1 permit contains the following notes with respect to officials:

FIELD JUDGING TEAM

Field Referee Level 2+;

At least two qualified officials per event running at any one time and for long throws and pole vault one of those must be at least level 2 or above;

Additional Field: Additional helpers are required and this is acceptable if instructed by a competent lead official

OFFICIALS STARTER TEAM

Chief Starter Level 1+

Starter's Assistant Level 1+

TRACK TEAM

Track Referee Level 2+;

Additional Track Judges: an additional three or more Judges / umpires

TIMEKEEPERS WITH PHOTO-FINISH

Chief Timekeeper Level 2+;

Additional Timekeepers: Preferred at least 3 qualified timekeepers. However, if no additional TK available, times can only stand for Power of 10 purposes if the electronic timing works

TIMEKEEPERS WITHOUT PHOTOFINISH

Chief Timekeeper Level 2+;

At least 3 qualified timekeepers (fewer may be acceptable for middle distance only events)

Management committee proposal 4: Improving team participation, and general competition opportunities, for athletes by allowing clubs to enter three athletes in selected events.

The committee would like to make the league as athlete focussed as possible – noting the league’s aim to foster and encourage the development of Track & Field athletics throughout the Midland Counties. We wish to do this at the same time as developing the team competition aspects for both club and athlete. To support this aim the committee propose the following:

Proposal 4

That clubs be allowed to enter a limited number of scoring third string athletes in events. The clubs to choose where to place these additional athletes for any given match. The maximum number of scoring third string athletes will be fixed. Rule 9-12f would be retained but N revised slightly in recognition of the additional choice for athletes and clubs.

Supporting decisions for the AGM

In support of the principle above the following recommendations are made (although it is recognised that variations in these details could be made if the AGM so wishes):

- That the maximum number of third string scoring athletes be set at **five** per club per gender per match;
- That the N value in all divisions be set at the same value and that this value be determined by the AGM as either **N=30** (current maximum value that we have used in the league), **or N=32, or N=34** (the latter being the value that may be reached by using just the standard A and B string team structure and filling all 17 individual events).

- That scoring be as follows:

Points by position	6 team match	7 team match	8 team match
A string	11, 9, 7, 6, 5, 4	12, 10, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4	13, 11, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4
B string	9, 7, 5, 4, 3, 2	10, 8, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2	11, 9, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2
C string	7, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1	8, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1	9, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1

- That the AGM decide whether C string athletes need to exceed a performance standard to score.
- That those track events that are run in lanes be run as seeded races based on an athlete’s Power of Ten performance.
 - o Note: seeding to be automated within the results / match declaration software based on best times provided by team managers. The best times to be those from current or previous season and taken from Power of Ten. Late declaration changes are not to affect the seeding – late replacement athlete simply to run in same race and lane as the replaced athlete.
 - o We recognise that at times there will be anomalies in race allocation but believe the benefits to the large majority of athletes outweigh the impact of the occasional anomaly.

Management committee proposal 5: The value for N in rule 9-12f

This proposal depends on the AGM's decision on Committee proposal 4 (introduction of a limited number of third string athletes). Should the AGM not adopt proposal 4 then the management committee proposes the following:

Proposal 5

That the AGM reviews the current N values and selects appropriate values for N in rule 9-12f.

The proposal is that the AGM selects between:

N=30 for all divisions,

And

N=30 for divisions 1-3 and N=27 for the regional divisions.

Management committee proposal 6: Seeding in laned track events

This proposal again depends on the AGM's decision on Committee proposal 4 (introduction of a limited number of third string athletes) as that proposal needs a level of seeding to make it work.

Feedback received through the season suggests that the split of races into an A race and B race is putting people off. Given this, and should the AGM not adopt proposal 4, then the management committee proposes the following:

Proposal 6

That those track events that are run in lanes are seeded based on an athlete's Power of Ten time (suggestion is best time over previous and current season). The seeding to produce a minimum number of races subject to track constraints (number of lanes) and ability of the time-keeping team, as judged by the Chief Timekeeper, to cope with the numbers in any given race.

(Notes: seeding to be automated within the results / match declaration software based on best times provided by team managers. The best times to be those from current or previous season. Late declaration changes are not to affect the seeding – athlete simply to run in same race and lane as the replaced athlete. We recognise that at times there will be anomalies in race allocation but believe the benefits to the large majority of athletes outweigh the impact of the occasional anomaly.)

Management committee proposal 7: Technical events weekend

It has been well known for some time that certain technical events (such as hurdles and PV) provide very limited competition for athletes in most, and at times all, divisions. Recognising this the management committee has secured six prospective league dates across the season to allow this proposal to work if accepted by the AGM. The committee therefore proposes the following:

Proposal 7

That one league date (of the six available) be used to promote a single match where a limited number of technical events are held. Clubs from all divisions to be invited to this single match and the events to be conducted as per a normal league match. (It is expected that the match length will be around two and a half hours.)

Supporting decisions for the AGM

In support of this principle the following proposals are made for the events, although we recognise that alternative options will exist:

- That the events are:
110H, 100H, 400H, Steeplechase, 400m, PV, TJ, HJ, HT
- That seeding for laned track events be used.
- That athletes competing in this specialist day may compete in all other matches within their own division.
 - o We recognise that this gives athletes in these particular events five, rather than four, matches a year. However, we believe this is more than compensated by the fact these athletes are generally poorly served in a standard round of league matches – we are giving them at least one decent competition.
- That performances may be carried forward into the next full round of league matches.
 - o The committee feels it is important that we retain the club element. To achieve this we recommend that an athlete's performance from the specialists' day be carried into the next league round and compared with performances achieved in the full league round match. The event score is then based on performance comparison. As the athlete can compete in the specialist day as well as the next round we recognise that these athletes get two bites at the cherry. But again we believe this is a reasonable compromise in order to: retain club competition, to give the specialists decent competition and to provide competition to those athletes who do not wish to attend the specialist day. We also recognise that weather conditions on the two days may be different – but suggest this is an acceptable risk to take.
- If the events above are selected by AGM vote then we recognise two of them (400m and HT) could potentially produce significant numbers of competitors. To allow us to protect the timetable participant numbers (per gender per event and for all events) will be capped at 32 based on the athlete's Power of Ten recorded best performance in current or previous year. We also recognise that if there are 32 male and 32 female hammer throwers the event length will be around four hours.
- If it can be arranged we will organise specialist coaching and officials' training opportunities as part of the meeting.
- The match costs to be covered on a pro-rate basis, dictated by a club's competing athlete numbers, across all clubs who have athletes in the specialist day.

Management committee proposal 8: Allow co-operating clubs

The committee recognise that some clubs struggle for both athlete and officials numbers. There is a British Athletics process whereby clubs can form a composite team for league competition and the committee has agreed to two such teams for 2023. However, the committee recognises that some clubs may not wish to go down that route and so we propose the following:

Proposal 8

That clubs, following a vote from clubs in the appropriate division(s) organised by the league secretary, and with the subsequent agreement of the league management committee, be allowed to co-operate for the purposes of the league. Applications to be received no later than the AGM so that reasonable estimates of the divisional structure can be determined. The number of co-operating clubs to be limited to combinations of two. Any two co-operating clubs would share athlete slots, officials' duties and league fees – and it would be up to the co-operating clubs to decide how these items would be divided/shared. Within the league results, performances would be assigned to an athlete's home club and would appear as such on Power of Ten. For match team scoring we would combine scores from the cooperating club pair and this would be used for match position and ultimately promotion/relegation.

Co-operating teams would be allowed from different divisions with the higher division being the one in which the co-operating team would sit.

Management committee proposal 9: 2024 divisional structure – do we want more regionalisation?

Feedback received by the management committee suggest clubs prefer to limit travel distances. This can be achieved by extending the concept of regionalisation. However, we all like certainty in terms of prospective promotion and relegation. As 2022 has now concluded we wish to leave promotion/relegation into 2023 as it is but consider how we might approach 2024. Given this the committee propose the following:

Proposal 9

That we introduce more regionalisation into the league beginning in season 2024.

Supporting decisions for the AGM

Against this principle we propose that the AGM addresses the following questions sequentially:

Question 1: Do we want full regionalisation – five regional divisions running on four dates and followed by a finals day, OR do we want to retain some pan-area divisions?

Question 2: If we want partial regionalisation - do we want one or two pan-area divisions?

Management committee proposal 10: reward for clubs providing support with officiating

The committee note that the league was only successful in 2022 because some clubs were prepared to help out with officials' duties beyond the minimum required of them by the rules/constitution. The rules provide no recognition for this additional support. With that in mind the committee propose the following.

Proposal 10

- a) If an attending (i.e. not the host) club steps in and provides an official (or officials) for the key roles of track ref, field ref, start team, then they shall be allowed to count them against their own club officials' requirements. (For example, if a club allows their L2 field judge to swap to the field ref role then the providing club still scores +5 points for a qualified field judge.)
- b) If a club provides an additional qualified official (or additional officials) that are loaned to other teams for a given match, then the providing club may carry forward to the next match the points for that/those officials. The receiving club does not score the +5 points for the qualified official. (For example, if club A attends match number two with two L2 field judges and loans one of these to club B then for match three it will be judged that club A has already scored the +5 points for a qualified field judge. The receiving club (club B) in this example will not score the +5 points in match two as they attended match two with no qualified field judge.)
 - a. Note: the intention here is to provide some benefit to clubs who loan out officials in order that a match can proceed on the day. It is recognised that clubs may come to informal loan arrangements before match day and this is still encouraged – but this proposal is designed to address on-the-day issues and their impact on the match proceeding or not. We also recognise that the loaning club (club A in the example) could simply not provide a L2 at match three (as they have already got the points). But our expectation is that clubs would not do this and would only be missing a L2 if there were exceptional circumstances.

Part 2. Club Proposals for 2022

Proposal from BRAT: that we allow U20 and U17 athletes to compete using their own throw equipment and/or hurdles specifications.

Context.

As we all know, if an U17 or U20 athlete is selected to compete in the Midland T&F League they will do so using senior equipment. This is fine for flat track events and jumps but for throws and hurdles these younger athletes do of course have to use senior specified equipment.

Ideally we should be able to rely on the YDL Upper (and other) leagues to provide appropriate club based opportunities. Looking at the YDL Upper we can see however, that **only 55% of MCAA T&F League clubs compete in this league**. Compounding this, and probably more importantly, we find that for the throws and hurdles the participation levels in the YDL Upper are very weak, particularly below the 12 clubs across the two premier divisions. We note below the premier divisions that **63% of these events operated with 2 or fewer athletes** in 2022 round 1 matches. Other leagues, such as the Heart of England League, offer even fewer opportunities and/or lower competition standards.

Is there, therefore, a way forward where we allow U17/U20 athletes to compete with their own throw weights / hurdle heights?

AND

If we do this, can we do so in a way that is fair to both senior and junior athletes?

Proposal 11

That we allow U17 and U20 athletes to compete in the Midland league using their age group weight specifications in the throws and hurdle heights in the U17 men 400H and U20 men 110H races.

We propose that we apply a compensation factor, post event, to the U17 and U20 performances achieved using non-senior equipment. This would be done automatically within the results software when calculating event scores.

Discussion.

Clearly it is always going to be easier to throw a lighter weight. If we are to let juniors use their throws weights / hurdle heights then we need to compensate for this. We can look at athletes' performances (via PoT) to see, say as a worked example, how far someone throws the senior hammer as an U20 compared to that athlete throwing the U20 hammer. For the men's hammer U20 athletes throw, on average, 12% shorter with the 7.26kg senior hammer than with the 6kg U20 hammer. For U17 athletes the data indicates an athlete will throw 23% less with a senior hammer compared with an U17 weighted hammer.

A worked example of how this would work in a match is shown in tables 1a and 1b in Annex A, in this case, for an U17 athlete. By design we expect, on average, the athlete to finish in the same match position and this is what we find.

Compensation factors can be calculated for all events of interest – see table 2 in Annex A.

Clearly, not all athletes develop at the same rate and the compensation factors are necessarily averages. The **judgement is whether the compensation factors are good enough to allow us to offer U17 and U20 athletes the competitive opportunities to use their own weights / hurdle heights** in the MCAA T&F league.

Annex A to BRAT's proposal: some performance detail

Part 1: using men's hammer as a worked example

Table 1a: BRAT attended match on 17 July (division 2). A string Hammer throw results

Name	Distance thrown	MATCH POSITION
Mark Elliot	48.34	1
Andrejs Virsics	45.80	2
Martin Roberts	32.38	3
Jamie Callaghan (U17) BRAT	31.45	4
Marc Juffkins	22.15	5

Table 1b: Projected result – where we estimate what the U17 athlete might have thrown if they had used their U17 (5kg) hammer.

Name	Distance thrown	Age	Compensation factor	Compensated result	MATCH POSITION
Mark Elliot	48.34	SEN	0	48.34	1
Andrejs Virsics	45.80	SEN	0	45.80	2
Martin Roberts	32.38	SEN	0	32.38	3
Jamie Callaghan	41.32**	U17	23% reduction	31.82	4
Marc Juffkins	22.15	SEN	0	22.15	5

** - Jamie's throw taken from his YDL match result on 7 August with the 5kg (U17) hammer

Part 2: Compensation factors by event

Table 2: Compensation factors by event

Event	Compensation Factor U17	Compensation factor U20
HT Men	23% reduction	12% reduction
HT Women	18% reduction	N/A
SP Men	22% reduction	12% reduction
SP Women	18% reduction	N/A
DT Men	20% reduction	9% reduction
JT Men	12% reduction	N/A
JT Women	12% reduction	N/A
110H Men	N/A	4% addition
400H Men	4% addition	N/A

Annex B to BRAT's proposal: Midlands YDL Upper – athletes per event for throws and two hurdle races. Pink is 2 or fewer athletes, yellow is 3 athletes.

Match 1 2022	Prem NE		Prem SW		NE A		NE B		NE C		SW A	
	Entered	Maximum possible	Entered	Maximum possible	Entered	Maximum Possible	Entered	Maximum Possible	Entered	Maximum Possible	Entered	Maximum Possible
Men U20 110H	3	12	2	12	0	16	0	12	1	12	1	6
Men U20 SP	5	12	6	12	6	16	2	12	1	12	0	6
Men U20 DT	5	12	5	12	5	16	0	12	2	12	2	6
Men U20 HT	3	12	3	12	1	16	0	12	0	12	2	6
Men U20 JT	8	12	5	12	3	16	2	12	2	12	2	6
Men U17 400H	1	12	2	12	1	16	0	12	1	12	2	6
Men U17 SP	8	12	8	12	5	16	7	12	3	12	2	6
Men U17 DT	7	12	8	12	2	16	4	12	2	12	2	6
Men U17 HT	4	12	3	12	0	16	2	12	0	12	0	6
Men U17 JT	8	12	8	12	3	16	4	12	3	12	2	6
Women U20 SP	7	12	4	12	5	16	4	12	4	12	3	6
Women U20 DT	7	12	2	12	3	16	4	12	5	12	2	6
Women U20 HT	5	12	3	12	4	16	3	12	3	12	2	6
Women U20 JT	4	12	7	12	1	16	5	12	4	12	1	6
Women U17 SP	8	12	7	12	8	16	2	12	2	12	4	6
Women U17 DT	5	12	7	12	2	16	3	12	2	12	2	6
Women U17 HT	1	12	3	12	2	16	0	12	1	12	3	6
Women U17 JT	7	12	7	12	6	16	2	12	2	12	2	6