## League Management Committee proposal 1: Providing improved clarity in the rules consistent with league management committee decisions made during the 2023 season.

Background: A few issues arose during the 2023 league season that required the existing set of rules to be interpreted by the league management committee. This in effect created "case law" examples. The committee believes these clarifications should be incorporated in the constitution/rules.

## Outline of issues.

The following issues identify where rule updates are required to remove uncertainties in the descriptions. The management committee will update the rules to remove the uncertainties in line with committee decisions made in-year. Annex B provides working drafts of these updates to provide a more detailed view of how these changes are intended to work.

Issue 1: what happens if an official discharges part, but not all, of their duties (for example a timekeeper is there for most of the match but has to leave before the women's 5000 m and the relays)?
Issue 2: given photo-finish is now used in most (if not all) division 1 and 2 matches, how do we score timekeeper officials' points given that both manual and photo-finish tasks are valid timekeeping activities?
Issue 3 (a perennial problem rather than one found only in 2023): what threshold do we apply when judging if a club has "failed to provide the required officials for two matches"?
Issue 4: rule 9-14 indicates that a club may be excluded from the league for the following season if it misses two or more matches and yet rule 9-3.1e mandates removal from the league (but allows re-election) if a club fails to provide the necessary officials on at least two occasions. If a club misses a match it will by definition have not provided the officials - the mandatory aspects of rule 9-3.1e and the non-mandatory aspects of rule 9-14 are inconsistent.
Issue 5: if a club uses more than the allowed number of $C$ string athletes (against a given sex) how do we correct the scores - in other words which scores do we disregard?
Issue 6: at times field judges have allowed athletes to use a shorter TJ board than that mandated in the rules, how do we score the event in this situation?
Issue 7: athletes have attempted the TJ and/or PV and are yet not sufficiently fit to achieve the minimum standards in a safe manner, how do we best support athlete safety?

Background: At the 2022 AGM clubs were optimistic that relatively small regional divisions of six teams would be able to readily find club hosts, venues and officials. (Note: "small" is used here as each regional division includes teams that field only a limited number of athletes, and indeed clubs withdrew before the season, meaning we often had matches that were something like four-team matches.)

This optimism proved unfounded and all regional divisions struggled with venues, hosts and officials.

We also note that costs of track hire etc. have increased and the cost to host a (non-photo-finish) match is around $£ 800-£ 1000$.

Clubs, however, still express an interest in minimising travel - suggesting three regional divisions is working well in terms of athlete, team management and officials travel.

Proposal: That we reduce the number of divisions to five, with two pan-area divisions of six teams each and three regional divisions organised geographically with the number of clubs balanced across these three regional divisions (current estimates are for regional divisions of either $8,8,8$ or of 8,8 and 9 teams). This will save around $£ 3,500$ of hosting costs over the year.
We recognise that some tracks will have less than 8 lanes (and beyond the 100 m straight certainly less than 9 lanes). The rules already allow for the situation where the number of teams exceeds the number of lanes (e.g. as used in 2022 at Wolverhampton for a 7 team division 3 match).

## Proposal 1 from Solihull and Small Heath: reduce to 2 pan-area and 3 regional divisions <br> [Secretary's note: for completeness SSH's identical proposal is copied below.]

In order to increase competition, reduce the number of divisions from 6 to 5 . Having 3 regional divisions helps considerably to reduce travel \& this wouldn't be achieved by having only 2 . Division 4 SE, had only 5 clubs because of the withdrawal of Corby \& Harborough, \& not all of the remaining clubs could host or provide sufficient qualified officials. It ended up with 1 club hosting twice. It appears that other divisions had similar problems.
SSH therefore propose that the league has divisions $1 \& 2$ as at present \& 3 regional division 3 s with the latter 3 having 8 clubs in each if possible. This would reduce cost, improve the competition \& make it easier to find venues \& officials.

## League Management Committee proposal 3: refinements to how we score C string athletes in order to protect the timetable.

Context: feedback received by the league management committee indicates that the inclusion of a limited number of $C$ string athletes has proved popular; has encouraged the participation of more event specialists from the clubs and improved the competitiveness of events.

The option for more event specialists to be included in the match scoring was the key idea that originally underpinned the $C$ string idea. However, a study of results suggest that the C string scoring system, as currently defined, additionally encourages clubs to use, at times, non-event specialists in the C string role. It has been noted that inclusions such as these can disrupt the timetable and is particularly an issue for JT and DT.

Proposal: that we protect the match timetable by refining the C string scoring in a way that continues to encourage club inclusion of a third event specialist but removes a large part of the incentive to include non-event specialists.

## Proposal:

We introduce a way of moderating $C$ string scores so that these scores reflect an athlete's performance relative to other athletes (across the B and C strings) in that event. This is achieved by aligning $C$ string performances with $B$ string performances in such a way that a $C$ string cannot score more highly than any $B$ string athlete who has posted a better performance. Conversely good C string performances (good in the sense that they are better than some of the $B$ string performances in an event) are awarded appropriately. The scoring is defined in such a way that $B$ string results and scores are completely unaffected. A few examples are given in Annex A to illustrate the approach.

## League Management Committee proposal 4: reimbursement of costs for EDM and wind gauges.

Proposal: that we encourage the use of wind gauges (to improve athlete experience and allow better results posting on Power of Ten) and EDM (to speed up the measurement of long throws). To support this it is proposed that the costs of EDM and wind gauges are fully reimbursed to the providing club, either from a levy on clubs at matches where these systems are used; or by having a host reimbursement figure above the $£ 650 /$ match if EDM and/or wind gauges are hired/used.

## League Management Committee proposal 5: further use of photo-finish equipment.

Context: athletes, noting that the Power of Ten requires the use of photo-finish times for elements of its rankings, greatly prefer to have their sprint times recorded by photo-finish rather than manual timing.

Proposal: that the requirement for clubs to consider the use of photo-finish be extended to all divisions as per the suggested rewording of the appropriate part of rule 9-3.1a below (note the re-wording also tidies up cost allocation for the use of photo-finish):

9-3.1a (part) The host club shall be responsible for the provision of at least:

## . All Match Fees

. For Divisions 1 and 2 photo-finish equipment and a qualified photo-finish team should be provided if affordable equipment is available. Costs to be shared by the participating clubs.
For other divisions, clubs should aim to provide, for at least one match, photo-finish equipment and a qualified photo-finish team if affordable equipment is available. Costs to be shared by the participating clubs.
. (AGM 2022) The following officials to be provided at a level which matches or exceeds the minimum level required by UKA licencing conditions for a level 1 permit:

Chief Starter (note, currently the requirement is at least level 1)
. $\quad$ Marksman/Starter's Assistant (note, current requirement is at least level 1)
. $\quad$ Track Referee (note, currently the requirement is at least level 2)
. Field Referee (note, currently the requirement is at least level 2)
etc..

## Proposal 2 from Solihull and Small Heath; also proposal 1 from Abingdon

"Assuming that the Technical meeting is to continue, it should be a stand-alone match with no league or match points earned. It certainly isn't right for points to be gained when something like $80 \%$ of the athletes can't compete. Most of the athletes who do compete already gain many points for their clubs as it is relatively easy for them to gain maximum points in league competitions when there is little opposition."

## Proposal 1 from Kidderminster \& Stourport

Issue: In the regional divisions we have many spaces in the relays.

## Solution

Allow one B string option per club for Men and one $B$ string option per club for Women for the 4 relays. ( $4 \times 100 \mathrm{mM}, 4 \times 100 \mathrm{~mW}, 4 \times 400 \mathrm{mM}, 4 \times 400 \mathrm{~mW}$ )
Scored in a similar way to other B string events.

## Benefits

1. Team spirit. Increase inter-team interactions. Spreading the fun.
2. Athletes more likely to travel if they have extra event to compete in.
3. Team managers able to whip up enthusiasm as there are more athletes needed.
4. Getting more athletes to stay to the end of the day adding to atmosphere etc
5. Rewards clubs for getting more athletes involved. (Growing the sport)

## Issues

So this B relay team option might not be appropriate for the top Divisions due to timing issues.
Perhaps this should only apply to the lower divisions.

## Proposal 2 from Kidderminster \& Stourport

Issue: In the regional divisions we have events with only two or three athletes in. (100m hurdles, Steeplechase)

## Solution

Double points (or points and a half) for an under-filled event. 1 event per gender. So maybe 100m hurdles Women's and Men's Steeplechase.
Staying the same for the season so facilitates traction/momentum.
If announced now team managers and coaches have plenty of time to train athletes.

## Benefits

1. Improve standards in the unpopular events
2. Encourage athletes to try events that they may be more suited to.
3. Nobody wants to run in a race on their own!!!

## Issues

Again this may only be appropriate for the lower divisions. So only applied to some divisions.

## Proposal 2 from Abingdon: remove the specialist event match.

Proposal 3 from Abingdon: remove C-string athletes.
Proposal 4 from Abingdon: remove bonus points.

Proposal 1 from Yate and District: that we have mixed $4 \times 400$ relays in matches 2 and 4 and single sex $4 \times 400$ relays in matches 1 and 3 .

Increase the frequency of the mixed 4* 400 relay from 1 to 2 matches within the season.

With the increase in visibility of this event on the international scene and exposure at recent major championships, it has become very popular within the athletes, and I am regularly asked why it is restricted to just 1 match of the season at the moment.

When it is run, all teams enjoy it and it is very well supported from the spectators, so I feel it is time to increase this to 2 matches a season, say Match 2 and Match 4, reducing the regular single sex relays to the other 2 matches.

## Annex A: examples for a modified approach to C string scoring.

## Points scales (6 team example):

B string scoring ladder remains unchanged (same as we used in 2023):

## 9, 7, 5, 4, 3, 2

## New C string scoring ladder:

We write the $C$ string results alongside the $B$ string results aligning them on performance. This alignment allows us to read across an appropriate C string score from the particular B result (and thus B string score) against which it is aligned.

In this way, if a $C$ performance equals or exceeds any $B$ string performance the $C$ string will be awarded a score that reflects this "B-equivalent" performance namely a score within the range of the $B$ string scale: 9 points down to 2 points.

However, if a C string performance is below the lowest B string performance then the $C$ string scoring picks up after the last $B$ string score as per the following extended scoring ladder:

$$
9, \quad 7, \quad 5, \quad 4, \quad 3, \quad 2, \quad 1.0, \quad 0.8, \quad 0.6, \quad 0.4, \quad 0.2, \quad 0.1
$$

We illustrate all this below with a men's HT example, which shows the basic concepts, followed by a couple of more examples on the next page.

HT Men example, as per usual we would expect $B$ and $C$ strings to compete together and so the $B$ and $C$ performances are naturally aligned:

| B\&C event result | B\&C event: athlete \& performance | B string posn | B string performance | B string points | C <br> string posn | C string performance | C string points | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | BB 45.02m | 1 | BB 45.02m | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | BBB 41.23m |  |  |  | 1 | BBB 41.23m | $(9+7) / 2=8$ | Note 1 |
| 3 | DD 37.35 m | 2 | DD 37.35m | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | CC 28.76 m | 3 | CC 28.76m | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | EE 23.21 m | 4 | EE 23.21 m | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | AA 16.94 m | 5 | AA 16.94m | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | CCC 10.32m |  |  |  | 2 | CCC 10.32m | 1.0 | Note 2 |
| 8 | DDD 8.22 m |  |  |  | 3 | DDD 8.22m | 0.8 | Note 3 |
| -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Notes:

1) This $C$ string athlete produced a performance that placed between first and second places in the $B$ string. The score assigned for this $C$ string performance is therefore the average of 9 ( $B$ string first place) and 7 ( $B$ string second place).
2) This $C$ string performance is below the lowest placed $B$ string competitor. In this example there are only five $B$ string athletes. The $C$ string score is thus the next value on the extended scoring ladder below the last placed $B$ competitor - in this case the unused $B$ string last place score - namely 1 point.
3) This $C$ string performance is the next in the sequence and therefore takes the next point value on the extended scoring ladder - in this case 0.8 points.

## Two additional scoring example to show how this new C string scoring works

100m Men example, $B$ and $C$ strings ( $B$ and $C$ competed as separate races):

| B string race result | B string performance | B string points | C string race result | C string performance (aligned) | C string points | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | FF 11.4s | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | DD 11.5s | 7 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | FFF 11.6s | $(7+5) / 2=6$ | Note 1 |
| 3 | AA 11.7s | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | CC 11.8s | 4 | 2 | AAA 11.8s | 4 | Note 2 |
| 5 | EE 12.0s | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | BB 14.0s | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Scale | 1.0 | 3 | EEE 14.5s | 1.0 | Note 3 |
|  | extension to | 0.8 | 4 | BBB 18.3s | 0.8 | Note 4 |
|  | allow | 0.6 | 5 | No athlete | -- |  |
|  | 6 B string | 0.4 | 6 | No athlete | -- |  |
|  | \& 6 C string | 0.2 | You can only have 6 C string in a 6 team match. |  |  |  |
|  | scores | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1) The winner of the $C$ race posts a performance in-between the second and third place in the $B$ race. In this case the $C$ points are the average of the $B$ string $2^{\text {nd }}$ place ( 7 points) and $B$ string $3^{\text {rd }}$ place ( 5 points), i.e. average of the two scores noted in red.
2) Second in the $C$ race posts a performance that equals that of fourth place in the $B$ race. $C$ points are therefore matched to the $B$ fourth place points (blue text, 4 points).
3) Third in the $C$ race posts a performance below the last $B$ performance. Points are therefore assigned from the full extended scoring scale (1.0 points - green text).
4) Fourth $C$ string then picks up the next point value on the extended scale -0.8 (pink) in this example.

HJ Women example, B and C strings:

| Overall B\&C result | B\&C combined: athlete \& perf. |  | B string performance | B string points | C string posn | C string performance | C string points | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | FF 1.50m | 1 | FF 1.50 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | DD 1.40m | 2 | DD 1.40 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | DDD 1.35m |  |  |  | 1 | DDD 1.35 | 6.5 | Note 1 |
| 4 | FFF 1.30m |  |  |  | 2 | FFF 1.30 | 5.5 | Note 1 |
| 5 | AA 1.30m | 3 | AA 1.30 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | AAA 1.25m |  |  |  | 3 | AAA 1.25 | 4 | Note 2 |
| -- |  | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  |

Notes:

1) The first two $C$ string athletes both posted performances between the $B$ string $2^{\text {nd }}$ place but ahead of the $B$ string $3^{\text {rd }}$ place. The scores assigned for these two $C$ string athletes are therefore placed between a value of 7 ( $B$ string second place) and 5 ( $B$ string third place), but in a way that differentiates between C string first place and C string second place.
2) This $C$ string performance is below the lowest placed $B$ string competitor. In this example there are only three $B$ string athletes. The $C$ string score is thus the next value on the extended scoring ladder below the last placed $B$ competitor - in this case the unused $B$ string fourth place score - namely 4 points.

## Annex B: Under proposal number 1: Existing rule and recommended re-wording noted below.

Issue 1: what happens if an official discharges part, but not all, of their duties (for example a timekeeper is there for most of the match but has to leave before the women's 5000 m and the relays)?
Issue 2: given photo-finish is now used in most (if not all) division 1 and 2 matches, how do we score timekeeper officials' points given that both manual and photo-finish tasks are valid timekeeping activities?

Existing wording:
9-3.1e(part 2) (AGM 2022) 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 above) levels of qualification or 5 points for a full field team (i.e. having at least four individuals) that includes at least one qualified member (see notes above) 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 (AGM 2019).

New wording to be along the following lines with the final version to be determined by the league management committee following the AGM:
9-3.1e(part 2) (AGM 2022) 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 above) levels of qualification or 5 points for a full field team (i.e. having at least four individuals) that includes at least one qualified member (see notes above) to a maximum of 20 points. If a non-host club provides a timekeeper that is used within the photo-finish team, should photo-finish be in use, they will be judged to have fulfilled their timekeeper requirements.
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 (AGM 2019).
To guarantee either the additional 5 points for an appropriate level of qualification or to avoid the deduction of 10 points for a missing official a club must ensure their officials fulfil their full match duties. If an official delivers only part of their full match duties then the points assigned to that official may be adjusted at the discretion of the league management committee. The league management committee shall assign a score for that official in the range +5 to -10 depending on the particular circumstances.

Issue 3 (a perennial problem rather than one found only in 2023): what threshold do we apply when judging if a club has "failed to provide the required officials for two matches"?
Issue 4: rule 9-14 indicates that a club may be excluded from the league if it misses two or more matches and yet rule 9-3.1e mandates exclusion if a club fails to provide the necessary officials on at least two occasions. If a club misses a match it will by
definition have not provided the officials - the mandatory nature of rule 9-3.1e and the non-mandatory nature of rule 9-14 are inconsistent.

## Existing wording

9-3.1e(part 1) Clubs failing to provide the required officials for 2 matches, without a sound reason, will be excluded from the League and will need to reapply to the League for the next season. Entry will be at the Committees discretion (AGM 2019)
9-14 The failure of a club to attend two or more matches (excluding the "technical events match") may result in the expulsion of such club from the League for the ensuing season.
(AGM 2022) A standard 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.

New wording to be along the following lines with the final version to be determined by the league management committee following the AGM:
9-3.1e(part 1) Clubs failing, without a sound reason, to provide at least three of the required six officials for two or more matches whether or not the club attends these matches may be excluded from the League and will need to reapply to the League for the next season. Entry will be at the Committee's discretion (AGM 2019). Clubs failing, without a sound reason, to provide at least four of the required six officials for three or more matches whether or not the club attends these matches may be excluded from the League and will need to reapply to the League for the next season. Entry will be at the Committee's discretion.
9-14 The failure of a club to attend two or more matches (excluding the "technical events match") may result in the expulsion of such club from the League for the ensuing season. As per the definition of non-attendance a club missing a match will also have failed to provide the necessary officials and as such rule $9-3.1 \mathrm{e}$ will apply. (AGM 2022) A standard 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.

Issue 5: if a club uses more than the allowed number of C string athletes (against a given sex) how do we correct the scores - in other words which scores do we disregard?

Existing wording:
9-12a (AGM 2022): In addition to $A$ and $B$ string competitors, each club shall be entitled to enter a limited number of " $C$ " string competitors in the individual events.
Each club may choose the events in which they enter the "C" string competitors. For a standard divisional match a club may use five "C" string slots per gender per match. For the technical events match clubs shall be entitled to use two "C" string slots per gender.

New wording to be along the following lines with the final version to be determined by the league management committee following the AGM:

9-12a (AGM 2022): In addition to $A$ and $B$ string competitors, each club shall be entitled to enter a limited number of "C" string competitors in the individual events. Each club may choose the events in which they enter the "C" string competitors. For a standard divisional match a club may use five "C" string slots per gender per match. For the technical events match clubs shall be entitled to use two "C" string slots per gender.
If a club uses more than the allowed number of $C$ string athletes per sex then any $C$ string scores beyond the allowed number will be deleted starting with the C string score from the latest timetabled event. If in determining this correction it is found that more than one event has the same timetabled start then the highest $C$ string score or scores from these equally latest timetabled events will be removed.

Issue 6: at times field judges have allowed athletes to use a shorter TJ board than that mandated in the rules, how do we score the event in this situation?
Issue 7: athletes have attempted the TJ and/or PV and are yet not sufficiently fit to achieve the minimum standards in a safe manner, how do we best support athlete safety?

Existing wording
9-11b The Women's Pole Vault will start at 1.70 m and progress in 10 cms up to 2.10 m . The Men's Pole Vault will start at 2.10 m .

9-11e The Women's Triple Jump will use a minimum of a 7 m board and the Men's Triple Jump will use a minimum of a 9 m board.

New wording to be along the following lines with the final version to be determined by the league management committee following the AGM:
9-11b The Women's Pole Vault will start at 1.70 m and progress in 10 cms up to 2.10 m . The Men's Pole Vault will start at 2.10 m . If an athlete either during warm-up or during the event itself is judged to be unfit to participate safely in the event then the field judge team may request the athlete to halt their participation so as to ensure athlete safety.
9-11e The Women's Triple Jump will use a minimum of a 7 m board and the Men's Triple Jump will use a minimum of a 9 m board. If an athlete's performance is below these minimum board setting values, for example if a judge allows the use of a 7 m board for male athletes, then the performance may be recorded in the results but will score zero points. If an athlete either during warm-up or during the event itself is judged to be unfit to participate safely in the event then the field judge team may request the athlete to halt their participation so as to ensure athlete safety.

